

WREXHAM COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE

MEETING OF 12 JUNE 2017 **REPORT OF THE HEAD OF ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING**

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
22 – 26	RHO	P/2016/0589		√
27 – 32	WRO	P/2016/0937		√
33 – 37	WRO	P/2016/0942		√
38 – 45	WRA	P/2016/1048		√
76 – 79	RHO	P/2017/0189		√
80 – 85	BRY	P/2017/0217		√
121 – 125	HOL	P/2017/0304		√
129 – 131	PEN	P/2017/0356		√

Pages 22 – 26 RHO P/2016/0589

Site of former Ysgol y Wern, Hill Street, Rhosllanerchrugog, Wrexham
SPEAKER: FOR – Stuart Hatherall (Agent)

Pages 27 – 32 WRO P/2016/0937

38 Penybryn, Wrexham
SPEAKER: FOR – Stuart Hatherall (Agent)

Pages 33 – 37 WRO P/2016/0942

38 Penybryn, Wrexham
SPEAKER: FOR – Stuart Hatherall (Agent)

Pages 38 – 45 WRA P/2016/1048

The Goulbourne, Borrass Park Road, Wrexham
SPEAKER: FOR – Stuart Hatherall (Agent)

Representations

Two further representations received raising concerns largely addressed in the main report. One additional point is made:

Concern that the dwellings will be at a higher elevation than neighbouring dwellings with a line of sight through the site from those existing properties. Suggestions are made that the dwelling positions be changed to prevent direct overlooking.

Observations

I do not consider that the layout of the dwellings on the site as currently proposed will result in any issues of overlooking or other significant loss of amenity for the existing neighbouring occupiers. No changes to the site layout are therefore required.

Recommendation

Remains unchanged.

Pages 76 – 79 RHO P/2017/0189

7 Hafod Wen, Johnstown, Wrexham

SPEAKER: FOR – Stuart Hatherall (Agent)

Pages 80 – 85 BRY P/2017/0217

Land at Nant Court, Brymbo, Wrexham

SPEAKER: FOR – Stuart Hatherall (Agent)

Representations

1 additional representation:

- Disappointed to note that the representations regarding inadequate parking have not been addressed;*
- The development would be at the mouth of Nant Court. Parking is already limited and with no less than 8 new dwellings with only 1 parking space, I cannot see where additional cars of visitors can park safely;*
- Whilst I support the development in principle for the simply reason the development needs to be completed, I am concerned that parking will not be sufficient and this will cause issues in future. There should be at least some provision for visitor/unreserved overflow spaces.*

Recommendation

Unchanged.

Pages 121 – 125 HOL P/2017/0304

Barn 1, Holt Lodge Farm, Hugmore Lane, Llanypwll, Wrexham
SPEAKER: FOR – Stuart Hatherall (Agent)

Pages 129 – 131 PEN P/2017/0356

Columbine Cottage, Plas Bennion Road, Penycae, Wrexham
SPEAKER: FOR – Stuart Hatherall (Agent)

**ALL OTHER ITEMS WILL BE TAKEN IN TO ORDER SHOWN ON THE
ORIGINAL AGENDA**

Pages 12 - 21 ROS P/2016/0419

Applicant's Submission

Updated information about the business has been submitted. Since the agricultural appraisal was produced in February, there have been changes to the number of cattle as a result of the loss of 6 milking cows to TB, the purchase of 35 in-calf heifers and the sale of beef animals. The business currently has 340 cattle of which 182 are dairy cows. Whilst the total number of animals is slightly lower than in February, the breeding herd is now larger.

The changes in the herd structure have increased the Labour requirements to 5.699 labour units.

Observations

The changes demonstrate that this is a dynamic business that is implementing measures to remain profitable.

Recommendation

Remains unchanged.

Pages 46 – 56 ESC P/2017/0053

Further submissions

- *An integral part of the Inspectors rational in allowing the first appeal was the traffic count on the approach roads to the site.*
 - *The traffic count shows the number of daily movements of HGVs on the approach roads to the site.*
 - *There are separate counts for the B5097 and B5098.*
 - *Tables within the count show the daily usage of these roads with HGV vehicles.*
- At the time of the appeal the B5097 took 204 maximum sized HGVs per week, ranging between 14 and 37 per day.*

- The average for the proposed unit (now being considered as part of this agenda item) is 0.75 vehicles (1.5 movements) per week which amount to **0.007% increase in HGV movements on Talwrn Road.**

- At the end of the flock there will be a small peak of 11 HGV's to remove the manure from the site.

- Even the small peak of 11 HGV's at the end of the flock cycle is well within the daily fluctuations of HGV's on the B5097 which range from 14 to 37 per day. Given the existing daily fluctuations in HGV traffic, the peak at the end of the flock will be unnoticeable on the public highway.

Recommendation

Remains unchanged.

Pages 61 – 67 HOL P/2017/0143 and Pages 68 – 71 HOL P/2017/0337

Representations

Two further neighbour responses received:

- *The dividing hedge which is the boundary is not in the correct place;*
- *As adjoining occupier, we want to strongly advise that we are not against the planning of a dwelling; we just believe further consideration needs to be taken.*

Boundary Hedge

I am attaching photos of the boundary hedge (see below). We have already mentioned in our comments about the impact on the hedge. We believe the hedge is not "vigorous" as is stated in the report to planning committee. The proposed erection we believe will have an impact on what remains of the hedge.







Relocation of Boundary Wall

Also, we would like to mention that it would be a loss to the history of the village to knock down the front of the wall. We believe a destruction of an original piece of architecture could detract from the historic value of the area. We have aerial imagery dating back to when the piggery was still in use also the farm adjacent in the early 50's:



There are two other walls in the Village (at 'Smithfield and 'Fairview') dating back to the same era as the one they are proposing to knock down and whenever a proposal has been made to knock either of these walls down and rebuild in an

alternative location, the plans have been rejected. As this is extremely similar to this case, we believe the same rules should apply across the board and everyone should be treated equally when proposing.

Encroachment / Land Ownership

The dividing hedge, which is the boundary, is not in the correct place. We have consulted a building surveyor and have in fact had it stated they the development will be encroaching onto our land. We have written personally to the Applicant to inform him of the encroachment and to discuss this further as a civil matter.

Observations

The matters raised have been addressed in the main agenda report.

Recommendation

Remains unchanged

Pages 105 – 107 GWE P/2017/0265

Proposal

Substitute P/2017/1291 for P/2007/1291.

Recommendation

Remains unchanged.