

REPORT OF THE HEAD OF ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING
WREXHAM COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING
4 SEPTEMBER 2017

ADDENDUM

This report summarises information received since the Agenda was compiled including, as appropriate, suggested amendments to recommendations in the light of that information. It also lists those people wishing to address the Committee.

Where the Council has received a request to address the Committee, the applications concerned will be considered first in the order indicated in the table below. The remaining applications will then be considered in the order shown on the original agenda unless indicated by the Chair.

ITEM 4 – DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS

Page Nos	Community	Planning Ref	Speaker Against	Speaker For
31 – 35	WRR	P/2017/0520	√	√
68 – 74	RHO	P/2017/0598		√
75 – 82	WRO	P/2017/0608		√
83 – 89	WRC	P/2017/0611	√	
98 – 104	WRR	P/2017/0630		√

Pages 31 – 35 WRR P/2017/0520

36 Sandringham Road, Wrexham

SPEAKER: AGAINST – Mr K Higgins (Neighbour)

FOR – Mr S Lloyd (Applicant)

Applicant's Statement

Due to the poor condition of the trees at the rear of the garden it is the intention to remove the trees completely and replace them with a wooden fence to the height of 2 metres within a period of 1 month after their removal. The remainder of the garden will be landscaped to continue to provide habitats for wildlife.

Observations

The replacement of the hedge and trees with a 2 metre high boundary fence will ensure that the privacy of neighbouring properties is retained.

Recommendation

Amend condition 4 to read:–

The existing hedge which runs along the rear boundary of the application site shall be retained at a height of no less than 2 metres and maintained accordingly. If the hedge is to be entirely removed it shall be replaced, within one month, with a 2 metre high fence which shall thereafter be permanently retained.

Pages 68 – 74 RHO P/2017/0598

Land to the rear of 17 Queen Street, Rhos, Wrexham

SPEAKER: FOR – Mr P Lewis (Representing Applicant)

Applicant's Submission

Correspondence has been received from the applicant in response to a neighbour who has raised objections in respect of the following:-

- Proposal will block out light to the neighbouring dwelling;
- It will result in overlooking of neighbouring house and garden;
- The proposal will affect resale value of neighbouring dwelling;
- The view from the neighbouring house will be affected.

In addressing these issues the applicant has provided a photograph (see below) to demonstrate that the trees, which are positioned on the neighbouring occupiers rear boundary wall, allows No. 17 Queen Street privacy and that the nearest part of their building to 'the plot' has no facing windows. Also, No. 17 Queen Street is elevated from Off Duke Street therefore should the neighbouring occupiers want to fell the trees in the future, No. 17 Queen Street would still afford views over and to each side of the proposed dwelling without any loss of light. In order to address the issue of "overlooking neighbouring house and garden" the applicant would be prepared to discuss with the neighbouring occupier a sensible fencing solution which would be beneficial for both neighbours.

The applicant also wishes to draw the Committee's attention to a previous permission granted in May 1988 Code Ref No. RHO 15406 which he maintains has already established the principle of development on this site.



Observations

The issues raised have already been addressed in the main report.

I note the planning history details provided by the applicant and can confirm that this information is correct.

Recommendation

Remains unchanged

Bay Tree House Care Home, 99 Norman Road, Wrexham, LL13 7BG

SPEAKER: FOR – Mr S Hatherall (Agent)

Applicant's Submission

Revised Site Plan (Dwg No. A044/005) received 30/08/2017.

Consultations

Highway Authority raises no objection given the shortfall has been further reduced as a result of the increase in parking provision.

Representations

Local Member 29.08.2017 – Has sent in 6 no. photographs of the surrounding area of the application site. The Local Member states that the volume of traffic will increase should this application be granted. Objects to the application. 4 no. photographs added below and listed 1 - 4.

2 no. representations from the same property received 04.09.20167 – Objects to the application. Concerns raised include increase in traffic, notification of the application not received, inadequate on-site parking provision, access along the pavement and highway is impeded by parked vehicles. Photographs added below and listed 5 – 6.

Petition received with 21 no. properties objecting to the proposal. Concerns raised include increase in on-road parking, impediment to vehicles trying to pass on the highway, increased HGV's/lorry delivers to the café would cause disruption and increase in waste collection.

Observations

The agent has submitted a revised Site Plan demonstrating additional provision of 3 no. parking spaces, over the original proposed provision. This would increase proposed parking provision from 14 no. to 17 no, resulting in a shortfall of 29%.

This is considered would be an improvement to the existing situation which is a 50% shortfall, as well an improvement to the original proposed provision, which was a 42% shortfall.

Recommendation

Condition No's 2 and 4 attached to the permission to add reference to the date in which the revised Site Plan (Dwg No. A044/005) was received (30/08/2017).

Photo 1



Photo 2



Photo 3



Photo 4



Photo 5



Photo 6



Pages 83 – 89 WRC P/2017/0611

8 Albert Street, Wrexham

SPEAKER: *AGAINST – Mr E Stokes (Representing Residents)*

Pages 98 – 104 WRR P/2017/0630

9 Parker Close, Wrexham

SPEAKER: *FOR – Mr S Hatherall (Agent)*

Representations

3 additional objections submitted expressing the following concerns:-

- Loss of light;
- Loss of privacy;
- Intrusive/over development;
- Loss of green space and impact upon wildlife;
- Has an impartial tree survey been carried out;
- Loss of amenity and quality of life;
- Devalue of existing houses;
- Street scape if a 2 storey house is built – all dwellings are bungalows with the exception of no.9 Parkers Close;
- Is this in keeping with the Local Development Plan;
- Would like the existing hedge retained at a maximum of 2.4m in height;
- Vehicle access to be position to allow a parking space for deliveries and visitors neighbouring dwelling;
- Would object if the driveway was more than 12' wide;
- The existing stone wall should be retained;
- The existing street light should be remained in its current position;
- The front of the dwelling should be in line with the front of no.9;
- Will there be a party wall;
- Whether the dwelling will be in keeping;
- The number of bedrooms in the dwelling.

Observations

Many of the above matters above concern the detailed layout/design matters that will be considered in further detail at reserved matters stage. I refer Members to my main report in respect of the indicative details submitted with this application.

The potential impact of the development upon the value is not a material planning consideration.

Recommendation

Unchanged

**ALL OTHER ITEMS WILL BE CONSIDERED IN THE ORDER SHOWN IN THE
ORIGINAL AGENDA**

Pages 18 – 22 CEF P/2016/0985

Community Council: No objections.

Pages 47 – 53 ROS P/2017/0567

5 Grosvenor Crescent, Rossett, Wrexham

Representations

One further objection expressing the following concerns:

- Feel the extension is unnecessary;
- Potential to destroy the look of the street and devalue other properties;
- The extension defeats the object of a bungalow and will further devalue the property.

A further response has been received from the occupiers of 12 Grosvenor Crescent who have requested that the following observations are brought to your attention as they are unable to attend the Committee meeting.

In addition to the objections which have already been addressed in the main report, this objector has raised concerns regarding his wife's health condition which is brought on through anxiety. This proposal will exacerbate her condition.

There is a restrictive covenant on the estate which prevents development extending beyond the building line. This can only be considered via legal representation once construction has commenced. If approved, the objector will be forced to pursue this course of action which will not only cause unnecessary distress but also avoidable conflict.

We are not alone in our objections on this application; some of the residents were discouraged by the planning department to submit their objection. Therefore, you are not able to consider everyone's opinion on this application.

The application also suggests that this is merely replicating a previous amendment to No.7 Grosvenor Crescent. This is neither fair nor relevant as each application should be considered on an individual basis.

Observations

There is no planning policy requirement to demonstrate an extension to a dwelling is necessary. I have addressed the visual impact of the development in my main report. The impact of the development upon the value of the application site or neighbouring properties is not a material consideration.

In respect of the comments made by the occupier of 12 Grosvenor Crescent, personal circumstances in relation to an individual's health and the existence of a

restrictive covenant are not material planning considerations. Other concerns raised are addressed in the main report.

Recommendation

Unchanged

Pages 90 – 93 WRO P/2017/0613

Representations

Community Council 21.08.2017 – No comments.

Recommendation

Recommendation remains unchanged.