

WREXHAM COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE

MEETING OF 30 JULY 2012

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
2 – 21	RHO	P/2012/0210		√
22 – 31	GLY	P/2012/0216	√	√
64 – 69	HOL	P/2012/0365	√	
75 – 81	CHI	P/2012/0387		√
86 – 91	ROS	P/2012/0422		√

PAGES 2 – 21 RHO P/2012/0210

Former Griflex Site, Unit 14 Vauxhall Industrial Estate, Ruabon, Wrexham
Speaker: FOR – Adam Higgins (Representing Applicant)

Consultations

CCW: I have not received any further correspondence from the applicant or from CCW therefore the concerns expressed by CCW have **not** yet been addressed.

Applicant's submissions

The applicants strongly believe that there is a major unmet need for a convenience store and that the proposals will meet a significant part of that need. As such they dispute many of the concerns I have raised in my main report.

The applicants have requested that they be given further time to submit additional information to further demonstrate their case.

Observations

It is clear from my main report that I have a number of fundamental concerns about the development, in particular whether there it has been demonstrated that there is a need for a retail development of the size proposed.

Notwithstanding my concerns I believe it would be appropriate to **defer** a decision at this stage in order to:

- i) allow the applicants additional time to submit further evidence;
- ii) allow time for that evidence to be thoroughly reviewed; and
- iii) to consider whether the evidence addresses some or all of my concerns.

PAGES 70-74 WOR P/2012/0383

Applicant's submissions

The applicant's agent is concerned about main committee report for following reasons:

- i) The report states that it is unclear why tanks and ancillary equipment are essential to keeping of horses in the stables. Clearly they are not essential for keeping of horses and are intended to provide grey water for the whole site. It seems more sensible to attach this on to the already approved stable block which will have reduced impact to a separate structure;
- ii) It is misleading to state 'no reason why they could not be provided without also having to construct a large building to house them'. The whole building is not used to house these tanks only one small element. The applicant has looked at alternatives and has been advised that it is not possible to locate the tanks underground. If tanks were located above ground and not enclosed they would be far more visually intrusive;
- iii) Ask what other alternatives the Council would suggest.

Observations

In response to the above:

- By 'whole site' it is unclear whether the grey water will be used for all of the land used to keep horses on or whether it will also be used domestic purposes at no.6 The Elms. If the latter is the case then it would be preferable for the tanks to be housed within the domestic curtilage of the dwelling;
- It is interesting to note the applicant's agent has confirmed that the proposed storage space for the water tanks and other equipment are not essential for the keeping of horses;
- My main report questions the need for the additional floor space over and above the already approved stable. It is clear from the submissions made by the applicant/agent that this additional floor space is required to house the water tanks and other associated equipment referred to in my main report. My concerns are that the resulting size of the overall building is excessive and harmful to the rural landscape.

Recommendation

Remains unchanged.

PAGES 92-95 WRC P/2012/0427

Consultations

Caia Park Community Council: No objections.

Recommendation

Remains unaltered.

PAGES 96-104 ROS P/2012/0453

Consultations

Community Council: Does not support this application since it will probably mean additional occupancy of the property with an additional car in what will be a confined space.
Welsh Water: Recommend standards conditions (please see main report).
Environment Agency: Recommend an advisory note (please see main report).

Representations

4 further letters of objection received raising the following: