

## **WREXHAM COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE**

### **MEETING OF 2 MARCH 2015**

#### **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**

| <b>Page Nos</b> | <b>Community</b> | <b>Planning Ref</b> | <b>Speaker Against</b> | <b>Speaker For</b> |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------|
| 47 – 67         | SES              | P/2014/0781         | √                      | √                  |
| 79 – 85         | MIN              | P/2014/0851         |                        | √                  |
| 86 – 110        | WRO              | P/2014/0868         | √                      | √                  |
| 111 - 116       | PEN              | P/2014/0895         |                        | √                  |
| 146 – 150       | COE              | P/2014/0956         |                        | √                  |
| 151 – 154       | OVE              | P/2015/0010         |                        | √                  |
|                 |                  |                     |                        |                    |

#### **PAGES 47 – 67 SES P/2014/0781**

*Maelor Creamery, Pickhill Lane, Cross Lanes, Wrexham*

**SPEAKER:**                *AGAINST – Chris Waumsley (Representing interested party)*  
                                 *FOR – Guy Evans (Representing Agent)*

#### **Consultations**

##### **Ken Skates AM:**

I would be grateful if fair and careful consideration is given to the application, which will see the site brought back into use.

A significant number of new jobs were lost when the site closed in March 2014 and the proposals by the new owners could offer new skilled, stable jobs for local residents.

##### **Welsh Government (Head of Business Development):**

- I understand that Salisbury Poultry Ltd/Maelor Poultry have submitted a Planning Application in respect of the former First Milk Site at Marchwiell.
- I visited the site of their current operation, and was very pleased with the overall operation which has the highest quality rating in the industry. The total operation was very professional in all respects with a strong management team leading the growth.
- I am writing to emphasise the considerable economic benefits that this project will contribute to the wider economy;
- The initial £10 million investment by this company will create up to 150 new local jobs, and I am already in discussion about how to recruit staff from

disadvantaged areas locally, as well as ex-employees of the closed First Milk plant.

- This business would contribute at least an estimated £3 million annually to the local economy in terms of wages to employees and goods and services purchased from local suppliers.
- There would be a clear opportunity for local businesses to really benefit from this investment, and a number of local businesses are supportive of the business and have agreed to help assist the business locating in the area.
- The Welsh Government is firmly committed to working with new investors in food businesses, and this fits directly into the Welsh Government: Programme for Government, and the recently launched Food and Drink Action Plan 2014-2020.
- My concern would be that any delays in the process may determine that the business is not located in Wrexham. Other Local Authorities have already expressed an interest in this investment. In addition we have been discussing potential new partnerships and funding for new food businesses in Wrexham and this investment could make the difference to the business case.
- It would send a very positive & confident message to other national food and drink businesses that Wales is open for business and a vote of confidence in the area by a company choosing to move to Wrexham in preference to other competing locations.
- The benefits and substantial investment that this investment will bring to Wales should not be underestimated. It would be a significant boost in particular to local agriculture.

### **Representations**

Two letters received from the owners of two (different) nearby properties requesting that their objections are **withdrawn**. The number of neighbour objections is therefore reduced to two.

### **Observations**

Points for clarification/corrections:

Page no. 63: The processing of 400,000 birds per week equates to 122 tonnes of poultry processed each day.

Page no. 64: The second paragraph under the heading 'Ecology' should read:

'Great Crested Newts (GCN) are present in the area however NRW have confirmed that the development will **not** have a significant impact upon their favourable conservation status.'

*The wording of condition 14 needs amending (see below).*

### **Recommendation**

*The wording of condition 14 should be amended as follows:*

*No more than 400,000 birds shall be processed each week at the site subject to this permission.*

### **PAGES 79–85 MIN P/2014/0851**

*Rowans, The Spinney, Old Road, Bwlchgwyn, Wrexham*

**SPEAKER:** *FOR – Stuart Hatherall (Agent)*

**PAGES 86-110 WRO P/2014/0868**

*Kingsmill Hotel, Kingsmills Road, Wrexham*

SPEAKER(S):                      *AGAINST – Bob Dewey (Representing Objector)*  
                                             *FOR – Steve Buckley (Representing Agent)*

**History**

6/22301            Proposed conservatory and toilet block extension with internal alterations and car park extension. Granted on 25 May 1994

**Consultations**

Adjacent Community Council - Objects to the granting of planning permission on the grounds that the visibility for access to, and egress from, the site is poor. Given the speed of traffic using the slip road from the A525 to Abenbury Road, and the amount of pedestrian movement in the vicinity particularly at school times, the development is prejudicial to highway safety. In addition, part of the site is also outside of settlement and whilst it may be used as car park this does not have the same impact as a built structure.

**Observations**

The concerns of the adjacent community council have been addressed in the main report. No new issues have been raised.

A further search of the plotting maps from the 1990s has revealed the relevant planning permission for the car park extension which was granted in 1994 (ref: 6/22303). Development Plans (Local Plan 2001 and UDP 2005) subsequent to the change of use of this land have not picked up on the changes on the ground as were allowed in 1994. The emerging LDP2 will properly reflect ground conditions in this location and take account of the extent of hard standing and this development should permission be granted.

The Applicant has requested a change to the delivery times as detailed on the agenda. I have no concerns in relation to local residential amenity or the usage of the site in terms of parking etc. Please see condition no.7 below.

**Recommendation**

Remains the same but with some amendments to the conditions to reflect changes to plans reference numbers and delivery times. Reasons remain unchanged.

7. No deliveries of goods to or collection of refuse from the retail unit hereby granted permission shall take place outside of the following times: 07:00 and 22:00 Mondays to Saturdays and 10:00 and 20:00 on Sundays, with the exception of the delivery of newspapers.

17. Notwithstanding the details on the approved plans and within three months of commencement of development, full details of a hard and soft landscaping scheme together with a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment and timescale for implementation of works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

18. The landscaping and boundary treatment scheme submitted and approved in connection with condition no. 17 shall be fully implemented in all respects within the agreed timescale and in strict accordance with the approved scheme.

19. The landscaping and boundary treatment scheme as carried out in connection with condition no. 18 shall be permanently retained. Any planting becoming severely damaged or seriously diseased, or is in poor physiological condition and/or are

removed without the written permission of the Local Planning Authority shall be replaced with trees or shrubs and within a timescale all to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

22. Prior to first use of the development the site shall be laid out in strict accordance with layout plan(s) No. 4216-P01 Rev G.

23. The vehicular parking and turning areas as shown on approved drawing(s) No(s). 4216-P01 Rev G shall be fully laid out, surfaced and drained prior to first use of the development. These areas shall thereafter be permanently retained and kept free of any obstruction, and made available solely for the parking and turning of motor vehicles at all times.

**PAGES 111–116 PEN P/2014/0895**

*Land Between Idoma and 1 Bryn Cottages, Penylan, Ruabon, Wrexham*

**SPEAKER:** *FOR – Stuart Hatherall (Agent)*

**Representations**

1 letter objection making the following representations:

- i) the amended application does not justify altering the Planning Authority's decision;
- ii) the major change is the position of the building;
- iii) it would result in over development in a manner out of keeping with the frontage of this country lane. Using the envisaged driveway as a building plot would create an inappropriate and unjustified precedent;
- iv) the amended proposals would be more visually obtrusive;
- v) the effect on the road would cause problems, especially at peak times of agricultural activity when large farm machinery has no alternative but to use the road;
- vi) the amended application does nothing to justify withdrawing previous objections.

**Observations**

Representations received are discussed in the main report. No new matter raised.

**Recommendation**

Remains unchanged.

**PAGES 117-120 BRN P/2014/0919**

**Consultation Response**

*The Community Council have withdrawn their objection to the application.*

**Recommendation**

*Remains unchanged.*

**PAGES 121-127 BRN P/2014/0920**

**Consultation Response**

*The Community Council have withdrawn their objection to the application.*

### **Recommendation**

*Remains unchanged.*

### **PAGES 146–150 COE P/2014/0956**

*13 High Street, Coedpoeth, Wrexham*

**SPEAKER:** *FOR – Stuart Hatherall (Agent)*

### **Representations**

1 objection to the amended plans making the following representations:

- Cannot see an internal staircase – have they removed it? If not, why can the internal staircase not be used for access to the residential area?
- Assuming the applicants do not want residents coming through the shop, their intention is to have access through the staircase at the back of the property;
- Loss of privacy, rights and security;
- There is only access for maintenance, cleaning, repairs and bin collection. There are no vehicular or pedestrian rights.
- I do not want my rights eroded by default or custom. This could easily happen and there would be an increase in traffic and pedestrians, who would be strangers, lack of privacy and noise. I have small children.
- Request the decision be delayed whilst the two parties involved have discussions.

### **Observations**

The issues of amenity and rights of access are dealt with in the main report. I do not consider it necessary to delay the decision whilst the objector discusses access issues with the applicant as this is a private matter.

### **Recommendation**

*Remains unchanged.*

### **PAGES 151–154 OVE P/2015/0010**

*5 The Mill, Station Road, Overton, Wrexham*

**SPEAKER:** *FOR – Arabella Richfield (Applicant)*

---

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

### **PAGES 68-78 ABE P/2014/0845**

### **Representations**

Additional substantial objections received from a planning consultant representing three nearby food industries, detailing the potential impact of development upon their operations.

### **Observations**

Given the significant ecological constraints on the Industrial Estate, the Council's ecologist has expressed concerns with the deficiencies in the submitted documents in respect of ecological issues. The applicants submitted additional information on Friday 27 February 2015. Given the importance of the wildlife issues the application

should be deferred to allow adequate time for these matters to be fully considered along with the additional representations received.

**Recommendation**

That the application is deferred for further consideration.

**PAGES 131-134 CHI P/2014/0935**

**Consultation response**

A further detailed response received from the highway authority stating that there are no objections on highways safety grounds and recommending conditions to ensure that parking and turning is kept clear, visibility splays are maintained and suitable drainage is secured.

**Observations**

Matters relating to the suitability of this proposal on highway safety grounds are discussed in the main report.

**Recommendation**

Remains unchanged.