

WREXHAM COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE

MEETING OF 5 DECEMBER 2016

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
17 – 21	WRO	P/2016/0319		√
58 – 66	COE	P/2016/0963		√
67 - 70	HOL	P/2016/0964	√	√

Pages 17 – 21 WRO P/2016/0319

1 Y Groes, Salisbury Road, Wrexham

SPEAKER: FOR – Mr Mark Chadwick (Applicant's son)

Pages 58 – 66 COE P/2016/0963

Adwy Grange, Tanllan Lane, Coedpoeth, Wrexham

SPEAKER: FOR Mr Michael Dixon (Applicant)

Representations

1 additional representation making the following comments:

- We have lived at the end of Tanllan Lane for thirty years and, were it not for the fact that we know that our neighbour used to ride a horse, we would not have known that the stables existed;
- We drive along the lane regularly and, despite their being constructed in cream rendered breeze-block and with a tiled roof, they are not visible from the road and so do not encroach on the local countryside or green barrier;
- We have no objection to our neighbours replacing the stables with a bungalow, believing that such a modest change can only benefit the area, using previously developed land without detracting from the open aspect or green barrier;

- Our neighbours tell us that they intend to strive for passivhaus standards and this is very welcome; perhaps even a first for the area.

Recommendation

Unchanged

Pages 67 – 70 HOL P/2016/0964

Whitehaven, Church Street, Holt, Wrexham

SPEAKER: AGAINST – Mr Bowden (Neighbour)

FOR Mrs Campbell (Applicant)

Consultations

Further representations from the neighbour received raising the following points –

- *The extension will impact on the **main source** of sunlight in the garden, lounge and kitchen in the neighbouring property;*
- *The **close proximity** of the extension to the neighbouring property will affect their enjoyment of their home and garden;*
- *The extension is unequal in height and this will heighten the closed in effect on the adjoining property and affects the amount of sunlight and daylight entering their garden, lounge and kitchen.*

Observations

The proposed extension passes the vertical BRE test in relation to the neighbouring property, however fails the horizontal test. The existing garage at the neighbouring house already creates some shadowing to the neighbouring property and the proposed extension will not significantly increase this impact.

Recommendation

Recommendation remains unchanged.

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

Pages 22 – 30 RHO P/2016/0585

Applicant's Submission

The applicant has clarified the following matters:

- Admiral Taverns placed the property on the market on 22nd November 2013 whilst still attempting to recruit a tenant. It was continuously on the market until it was sold to the applications in May 2015
- Admiral Taverns confirmed they had the property 'to let' for 2 years from April 2013;

- There was limited interest in the property and one tenant was placed for only one week due to lack of customers.

The applicant has provided me with correspondence from Admiral Taverns confirm the above.

Recommendation

Unchanged.

Pages 71 – 77 RUA P/2016/0987

1 additional representation received objecting for the following reasons:

- There are three existing property units on this site. An increase in size of one of the existing properties would create an over development of the site in a low-density neighbourhood.
- Local Planning Guidance Note 13 – Rural Enterprise Dwellings states that applicants will need to submit a detailed appraisal to justify the need for a dwelling.
- There is currently an unoccupied granny flat at Y Berllan. It is apparent that the granny flat will be made part of the proposed development. Will condition 02 of planning permission P/2001/0220 now be null and void or will it be extended or transferred to the proposed development;
- The remaining space left by the proposed removal of a bedroom will leave a property that is not suitable for occupation in our opinion;
- The granny flat surely be a more suitable and less intrusive alternative;
- The application does not mention Mr Proudlove's father as being the reason behind the proposed development but sub-division of the existing building with alterations and extensions now providing two bedrooms in an already overcrowded unit;
- Local Planning Guidance Note No 13. Housing in the countryside. The proposed conversion and extension must not result in an increase of more than one third of the floor area of the original dwelling. We believe the proposed conversion will result in an increase of more than one third of the floor area of the original dwelling. Also, the second successive extension will completely dwarf the original in comparison; i.e. the extensions will be far bigger than the original dwelling;
- there is no plan to demonstrate how it is proposed to provide parking spaces for each of these units;
- The proposed court yard will not be able to provide parking for seven cars meeting the demand without possible loss of garden area to the front of the property;
- Local Planning Guidance Note No 20. We believe that the size and scale of the resulting extension would over dominate the existing dwelling by the joining of all three units together on one site;
- Loss of privacy and overlooking;
- We would urge you to consider the responsibilities of the council under the Human Rights Act. We believe that the proposed development would have a dominating impact on us and our right to the quiet enjoyment of our property.

Observations

Most of the matters above have already been dealt with in my main report.

The occupancy restrictions imposed on the existing annexe would not apply to the development if it is implemented. Indeed two of the three dwellings proposed will not be subject to any occupancy restrictions. The occupancy of one dwelling will be limited to a rural enterprise worker by condition, as explained in my main report.

Recommendation

Unchanged.

Pages 82 – 85 WRA P/2016/1002

Applicant's Submission

Amended plans have been received reducing the length of the proposed extension by 1m.

Observations

The reduced length of the extension will reduce any impact on the neighbouring properties. There is no adverse impact from the proposed amendments

Letters have been sent to the neighbouring properties advising them of the amended plans, requiring comments within 14 days.

Recommendation

That delegated approval is given to grant permission following the expiry of the consultation period subject to no additional matters being raised not already covered in the main report.