

WREXHAM COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE

MEETING OF 6 FEBRUARY 2017

ADDENDUM

REPORT OF THE HEAD OF ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING

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
14 – 25	SES	P/2016/0273		√
35 – 39	CEF	P/2016/0507	√	√
40 – 44	WRA	P/2016/0675		√
45 – 65	ROS	P/2016/0712	√	√
83 – 87	OVE	P/2016/1028		√
99 – 104	BAN	P/2016/1096	√	√
105 – 113	ABE	P/2016/1107		√
114 – 123	WRR	P/2016/1111	√	
152 – 155	HOL	P/2017/0001		√

Pages 14 – 25 SES P/2016/0273

Land West of Bedwell Road, Cross Lanes, Wrexham
FOR: Mr Patrick Lomax (Representing Agent)

Observations

For purposes of clarity I wish to amend the first reason for refusal so that it fully reflects why the development is considered to be inappropriate in this unsustainable location where there is limited access to public facilities and services. This change is shown below in my recommendation.

Recommendation

Amend reason for refusal no. 1 to read as follows:

1. The proposed development would be unsatisfactory and undesirable because the development involves a greenfield site and it is located outside any settlement limits as defined in the Wrexham Unitary Development Plan. The development is unlikely to operate in a sustainable manner taking in to account the site's location

relative to local services, facilities and public transport connections. The development therefore conflicts with policies PS1, PS2, PS4, GDP1 and H5 of the Wrexham Unitary Development Plan.

Pages 35 – 39 CEF P/2016/0507

49 Queens Square, Rhosymedre, Wrexham

AGAINST: Jamie Richards (Representing Neighbours)

FOR: Stuart Hatherall (Agent)

Representations

One further representation received and one petition with 12 signatories raising the following objections:

- The drawings in the report do not corresponding in relation to the location of garages;
- No indication of how cars will access the proposed parking spaces to the side of unit 3 as the parking on Queens Square is only for flats 1-12. Where will people park if more people get cars?
- A disabled parking space has been requested in the area where the proposed parking beside unit 3 is to be located; and
- The report states that the land behind (garage court) is in third party ownership, in fact it is Council owned.

Observations

The points raised above are largely already covered in the main report. However, for the benefit of Members I wish to clarify the following points:

- The land to the rear of the site (North West) is a garage court within Council Housing Department ownership. The car park known as Queens Square to the South East is adopted highway and open and available for public access and parking.

To reiterate, I do not consider that the proposed access from the garage court is critical given that two parking spaces can be provided from Queens Square in accordance with LPG16. The applicant will require the permission of the Housing Department to cross their land.

The parking layout of Queens Square is not formally laid out. As mentioned in the main report, the applicant can provide the proposed two parking spaces without any formal permission required from the Council. Any future disabled parking space provision would be required to take the layout of the car park into account at the time of its laying.

Recommendation

Remains unchanged.

Rhosnesni Methodist Church, Rhosnesni Lane, Wrexham
FOR: Stuart Hatherall (Agent)

Land at The Bungalow Darland Lodge, off Darland Lane and Gamford Lane, Rossett, Wrexham
AGAINST: Mr Tipton (Neighbour)
FOR: Mr Steve Jones (Agent)

Applicant's Submission

The applicant has submitted a further drainage report which has been written to reassess the suitability of the site to drain surface water. The report concludes the following:

- The soakaway test carried out suggests soakaways will work within this site. This is the primary method to be used for drainage;*
- The drainage ditch/culvert in Darland Lane offers an alternative method of surface water disposal if required;*
- Agreement will have to be reached with Wrexham County Borough Council Highways and Drainage departments if the ditch / culvert option is to be implemented; and*
- The drainage consultant requests further time to conduct more soakaways tests to fully map the site and confirm results. The submission is a pre-design preliminary analysis.*

Observations

The submitted report is noted and I comments as follows:

- The report does not offer sufficient clarification as to whether the development proposal can deal with surface water by way of soakaways without further investigations;*
- The main report deals with why the neighbouring drainage ditches and culverts are not a suitable alternative method of surface water disposal and WCBC's Senior Flood Management Officer has confirmed this to the case – permission/approval to do so is unlikely to be given;*
- Were more time allowed for the developer to further justify that the site can accommodate soakaways, this would not overcome the first reason for refusal that the development of the site for residential purposes is inappropriate in a green barrier.*

As such I do not consider that the application should be deferred for further consideration.

Recommendation

Remains unchanged.

Pages 83 – 87 OVE P/2016/1028

Land South of and adjacent to Trench Farm, Red Hall Lane, Penley, Wrexham
FOR: *Mr Darryl Wright (Representing Agent)*

Pages 99 – 104 BAN P/2016/1096

Greenacre, Overton Road, Bangor on Dee, Wrexham
AGAINST: *Mr Smith (Neighbour)*
FOR: *Mr B Hughes (Applicant)*

Representations

Three representations received making further objections on grounds already addressed in the main report, with the additional comments to state that the plans as presented do not bare resemblance to the building as partially built.

Observations

Members have already resolved to grant planning permission on the basis of the plans before them. Members are now being asked to reconsider this application on the basis of the minor change to the rear elevation eaves design.

Any discrepancies noted between the plans as shown and as has currently been built is now of no consequence. This is an application for planning permission for the proposal as shown in the application documentation and procedurally, there is nothing to say that the applicant may not correct minor discrepancies at a later stage. If this is not the case, it will be for the Council to determine whether it would be expedient to take formal enforcement action against the discrepancies.

Recommendation

Remains unchanged.

Pages 105 – 113 ABE P/2016/1107

Llwyn Onn Water Treatment Works, Cefn Road, Wrexham
FOR: *Mr Ian Turkington (Agent)*

Pages 114 – 123 WRR P/2016/1111

The Elms, Rhosddu Road, Wrexham
AGAINST: *Marc Jones (Resident of the Area)*

Consultations

Rhosddu Community Council:

1. The proposal to extend the premises will inevitably increase the capacity of the building for more employees and more visitors / clients. As stated in the Application, the staff and visitors / clients from Hafod will transfer to the Application Site, and will be in addition to the existing staff and visitors / clients already using the Elms.

The Applicants admit there is no existing dedicated disabled parking at the Elms, but promise to provide some. This will again increase pressure on non-disabled parking.

The Applicants state that parking is available at Ramano, but this is not within the Application Site. If the Applicants were serious in using Ramano as parking for people from the Elms the Ramano parking area would have been included in the Application Site, and a S106 Agreement or Planning Conditions could have linked the Ramano parking to the Elms.

Rhosddu Community Council objects on the grounds of over development and inadequate parking facilities being provided for the overall development proposal, and the proposed extension being an over development of a small site.

2. There will inevitably be an increase in traffic to and from Application Site as stated above. The access is on to Rhosddu Road which is the main access in to and out of the Bus Station on King Street. Also, Rhosddu Road is the main access and egress from Yale / College Cambria which has a plethora of buses and cars at the beginning and end of the College day.

Rhosddu Community Council objects on the grounds of poor access on to a busy road.

3. The Applicant proposes that there will be an increased number of visits from substance misusers (colloquially known as drug addicts) to the Application Site as a result of transferring some operations from Hafod.

The Rhosddu Community Council objects on the grounds of the detrimental effect the proposal will have on the amenity of adjacent occupiers, in particular the occupiers of Yale College Cambria which borders the Application Site on 2 sides.

When one hears of concerns being raised about having sweet shops next to Schools because of the health fears, to allow an expansion of a facility for drug users to frequent immediately adjacent to a Sixth Form College is sending out the wrong message to these young people. Furthermore, the Applicant makes great play on the fact of the proximity to the Bus Station and Railway Station as most of their clients will be using those facilities. Personally, I would not want my child coming out of Yale, and waiting in a Bus Station where drug users are waiting for a bus.

Drug users have a medical condition and should be treated in a hospital environment, not next to a sixth form college.

4. The Applicants propose to fell some trees (which are protected by virtue of the Conservation Area status). These trees are not affected by the proposed development and are a feature adjacent to the Rhosddu Road / Link Road junction. The Rhosddu Community Council recommends that no trees be felled until a proper landscaping scheme has been agreed by the Planning Officer and the Conservation Officer.

5. A Listed Building Application will be required before development can commence.

6. The internal arrangements do not appear to provide sufficient fire escape proposals.

Because of the amount of anti-social behaviour the Police have had to deploy additional personnel and resources to the area. The cost of funding this policing should be borne by those causing the problem. I would, therefore, suggest that if the Planning Department is minded to grant Planning Permission, then the Applicant should be required by a Section 106 Agreement to pay to the Police a sum to cover their additional costs arising out of the development.

Members will be aware that Football Clubs and the like have to pay the Police for policing football matches where anti-social behaviour is likely to occur, and this is no different.

The Community Council also makes reference to quotes regarding anti-social behaviour in Wrexham included in the Wrexham Leader dated Friday January 27th 2017 in support of the Community Council's views

Representations

One additional letter of objection expressing the following concerns:

- i. Not thought and consideration given to local residents;*
- ii. We already have 3 buildings, including The Elms, for the rehabilitation of alcoholics and drug users in the area as well as a drop in centre on Grosvenor Road, and the Salvation Army by the Park;*
- iii. We have enough problems with parking on our street;*
- iv. This is an access only street which no one takes any notice of and no one will take any responsibility for;*

Applicant's submission

Given the comments about Coleg Cambria in the Community Council's objection letter, I felt that it was important that you are aware that there has been Dialog between Lee Robinson (in his capacity as Chair of the APB) and David Jones - Chief Executive Coleg Cambria, about the proposed redevelopment and that Lee has reassured David that the changes will not adversely affect the college or students.

It is also worth noting that Arch/Kaleidoscope who are one of the partner organisations who be delivering services from the Elms have a very good working relationship with the college, delivering awareness sessions and opportunities for students to get experience of the substance misuse and criminal justice sectors.

I appreciate that Coleg Cambria have not made an objection, however this information may be useful to reassure Members if the concerns raised by the Community Council are raised at the Planning Committee on Monday.

Observations

Most of the above matters are addressed in my main report. However I reiterate that the merits of the use of the building are outside of the scope of the application.

The building is not listed therefore listed building consent is **not** required for the proposed use.

Recommendation

Unchanged

Pages 152 – 155 HOL P/2017/0001

Whitehaven, Church Street, Holt, Wrexham
FOR: Mr Robert Cambell (Applicant)

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

Pages 26 – 34 ROS P/2016/0303

Consultations

3 additional objections received on the following grounds:-

- *Overlooking, loss of privacy, loss of light*
- *Devaluation of existing properties*
- *Increase in volume of traffic on roads*
- *Increase in pollution from vehicles*
- *Loss of car park associated with Barton House and subsequent parking demands*
- *Flooding*
- *Increased demand on public services*
- *Access from drive required at all times of day due to medical employment*

The above issues are addressed in the main report.

Revised Recommendation

RECOMMENDATION A

That the Council enters into an obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 requiring:-

A financial contribution towards the provision of secondary education. The Head of Environment and Planning be given delegated powers to determine the final form and content of the obligation.

RECOMMENDATION B

Upon completion of the obligation, planning permission be GRANTED subject to the attached planning conditions.

RECOMMENDATION C

That if the obligation pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is not completed within six months of the date of the Committee resolution, the Head of Environment and Planning be given delegated authority to REFUSE planning permission for the following reason:-

1. Inadequate provision has been made towards the provision of additional education infrastructure. Without this additional provision, existing infrastructure does not have sufficient capacity to cater for the development. As such the development does not accord with Policy GDP2 of the Wrexham Unitary Development Plan.

Pages 156 – 158 LLR P/2017/0006

Proposal

Change in description from:-‘Siting of mobile home for use as temporary accommodation (2 1/2 years) (in retrospect)’ to:-

Temporary permission for retention of caravans for residential use for a period of 18 months

Consultations

Community Council – This is temporary accommodation and has already been here for more than 2 ½ years. A precedent should not be set for mobile homes ‘popping up’ around the village as none are sited in this area of application. Finally, the overall response was that a time limit for completion is required and if a strict shorter term were proposed then we would agree to this application on the grounds that at the end of the extended term (no more than 18 months) the mobile home is removed and the site is put back to its previous condition.

Representations

- *The caravans detract from the appearance of the World Heritage Site;*
- *The caravans are an eyesore which spoil the natural beauty of the area for both local residents and visitors to this stunning area;*
- *Caravan have been on site for almost 6 years and little progress has been made on the development;*
- *Loss of privacy;*
- *2.5 years is too long and the time period should be shorter;*
- *Devaluation of nearby properties.*

Observations

All matters raised have been considered in the main agenda report with the exception of concerns relating to the potential devaluation of nearby properties which is not a valid planning consideration.

Recommendation

No change