

WREXHAM COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE

MEETING OF 25 APRIL 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
25 – 32	COE	P/2017/0004		√
33 – 41	ESC	P/2017/0053		√
42 – 45	ROS	P/2017/0072		√
72 – 79	MAE	P/2017/0209		√
80 – 84	MAE	P/2017/0210		√

Pages 25 – 32 COE P/2017/0004

40 Heol Llewelyn, Coedpoeth, Wrexham
SPEAKER: FOR – Mr Stuart Hatherall (Agent)

Pages 33 – 41 ESC P/2017/0053

Talwrn Farm, Talwrn Road, Legacy, Wrexham
SPEAKER: FOR - Mr Ian Pick (Representing applicant)

Representations

One representation received from Ian Lucas MP relaying concerns of a constituent and one representation received which was initially sent to Cllr Mark Pritchard in his role as Leader of the Council. The representations received raise no additional issues to those already covered in the main report.

Recommendation

Remains unchanged.

Lower Honkley Farm, Stringers Lane, Burton, Rossett, Wrexham
SPEAKER: *FOR - Mr Bob Dewey (Representing applicant)*

Observations

The relationship of the previously approved scheme for 3 dwellings and the current application site layout has been considered further. It would appear that the proposed layout for 5 dwellings extends the previous site area quite significantly, which would result in further encroachment into open countryside. The previously approved site layout for 3 dwellings was designed to enclose the space around the Grade II Listed Building to create a courtyard within which the Listed Building formed an integral part. It also minimised any encroachment and resulting impact of new development upon adjoining open countryside. The current proposal creates a more open, urban form of development, which further encroaches into open countryside, adversely affecting the setting of the Listed Building. I am therefore recommending a further two reasons for refusal.

Recommendation

Add further reasons for refusal

- 3. The proposed development extends beyond the previously approved residential site area Ref P/2002/1333 and would further encroach into adjoining open countryside, a designated Green Barrier, detrimentally affecting the open character of the area. To allow the development would be contrary to policies PS2, EC1 and GDP1(a) of the Wrexham Unitary Development Plan.*
- 4. The proposed development lies adjacent to a Listed Building and the layout, form and scale of the development will harm its setting. To allow the development would be contrary to policy EC9 of the Wrexham Unitary Development Plan.*

Cheshire Cheese, Overton Road, Penley, Wrexham
SPEAKER: *FOR – Mr Stuart Thomas (Representing agent)*

Consultations

Council Ecologist: *The application is lacking in any ecological information and should therefore be refused. Detail on the proposed crossing is essential as otters are known to use this watercourse and there is also potential for an impact on bats and nesting birds. The proposed access onto the main road may also have ecological implications due to the loss of hedgerow and the proposed extension has not considered the potential for the building to support roosting bats.*

Applicant's Submission

- Plans of the proposed bridge crossing of Halghton Mill Brook;*
- Details of the proposed construction sequence of the private road.*

Observations

*The details submitted **do not** provide detailed information about the existing and proposed ground levels for the full length of the private driveway. Furthermore the submissions have not been accompanied by a Flood Consequences Assessment. The submissions therefore **do not** address reason for refusal no.4.*

Recommendation

The following additional reason for refusal be added:

7. In the absence of sufficient information to demonstrate otherwise, the development has the potential to adversely impact upon statutorily protected species and as such conflicts with policy EC6.

Pages 80 – 84 MAE P/2017/0210

Cheshire Cheese, Overton Road, Penley, Wrexham

SPEAKER: FOR – Mr Stuart Thomas (Representing agent)

Consultations

Council Ecologist: This application should be refused until adequate ecological information is supplied. Further detail is required to support a new access which will impact on existing hedgerow. The potential impact of the proposed building and access track on European Protected Species (bats and great crested newt) has also not been assessed.

Applicant's Submission

Details from the applicant's accountant confirming they do the annual accounts for his farm business.

Observations

*The details submitted **do not**:*

- provide any detailed information about the agricultural operations the applicant carries out;*
- the extent and location of the land that he farms;*
- identify why the building is needed on this site;*
- demonstrate that a building is required at this site;*
- confirm that the building will be used solely for an agricultural purpose.*

*In addition to the above the submissions **do not** address my concerns regarding the siting of the building.*

Recommendation

The following additional reason for refusal be added:

3. In the absence of sufficient information to demonstrate otherwise, the development has the potential to adversely impact upon statutorily protected species and as such conflicts with policy EC6.

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

Pages 13 – 24 LLA P/2016/0590

Observations

Notwithstanding the details contained in the application documentation and the acceptance of the general methodology of foul and surface water drainage it is considered necessary to impose a planning condition to seek detailed approval of the drainage design for the site. This is reflected in my amended recommendation.

Recommendation

Add condition.

13. No part of the development shall commence until a scheme for the comprehensive and integrated drainage of the site indicating how foul water, surface water and land drainage will be dealt with has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme as approved shall be implemented in accordance with a timescale to be agreed as part of the submitted details and maintained thereafter.

R: To ensure that effective drainage facilities are provided for the proposed development, and that no adverse impact occurs to the environment or the existing public sewerage system.

Pages 46 – 51 LLR P/2017/0123

Applicant's Submissions

The applicant has provided a plan to demonstrate the intended method of foul and surface water disposal. This includes confirmation of disposal of foul water to the existing public sewer network and the creation of soakaways for surface water. Detail has also been submitted in the form of a Construction Traffic Management Plan and detail of the proposed passing place and junction improvements as referred to in the main report.

Observations

Welsh Water have confirmed acceptance of the principle of the use of the public sewer network for foul water disposal.

I see no reason why the use of soakaways would not be appropriate on the development site. Given the small scale of the development and the requirement

for such measures to be approved under the Building Regulations, the proposed plan is deemed adequate. For this reason I have reworded condition no. 5 as shown below.

Given the prominence of the application site and the importance of ensuring that the design of the proposed scheme does not have a detrimental impact upon the wider landscape character, it is considered necessary to remove permitted development rights to ensure that the Council can have further control over additional development in the future e.g. extensions and outbuildings.

Highways have responded following the submission of a Construction Traffic Management Plan and passing place and junction improvements. The detail as presented is deemed acceptable and I have amended the appropriate conditions.

It is also considered necessary to add a planning condition to ensure that the existing boundary walls are retained around the site in the interests of the visual amenity of the area.

Recommendation

Amend condition.

5. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the drainage plan titled: Drainage Scheme – Surface and Foul Water approved as part of this application.

Reason: To ensure that effective drainage facilities are provided for the proposed development, and that no adverse impact occurs to the environment or the existing public sewerage system.

9. No part of the development shall be occupied until a passing place and the junction alterations as stipulated in Appendix 2 and 3 of the approved Construction Traffic Management Plan dated 4.1.2016 have been implemented in their entirety. The measures as required to be implemented shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

10. The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved Construction Traffic Management Plan dated 4.1.2016.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

Add condition.

13. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking, re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no further development shall take place under Classes A, B, C, D, E or F of Schedule 2 Part(s) A, other than the development hereby granted permission.

Reason: The development is located in a prominent position where additional uncontrolled development may have an adverse impact upon the wider landscape character.

14. Notwithstanding the requirements to implement a passing place in accordance with condition no. 9, the existing stone boundary walls as detailed on the approved layout plan shall be permanently retained.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the area.

Pages 52 – 63 SES P/2017/0165

Correction: The second plan on page 59 shows the proposed north-east elevation, **not** the proposed north-west elevation.

Dust, odour and noise management plans: Application P/2017/0204 has now been **approved**.

Recommendation

Permission be **GRANTED** subject to the conditions set out in my main report.