

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.

Recommendation

That the application be **Deferred**.

PAGES 22 – 31 GLY P/2012/0216

Spring Hill Farm, Spring Hill Farm Road, Selattyn, Wrexham

Speakers: *AGAINST – David Andrews (Local Resident)*
FOR – Steve Bembow (Representing Applicant)

Consultations

Highways: No objections to traffic details subject to a condition requiring a construction traffic management plan.

Recommendation

Remains unaltered.

PAGES 64 – 69 HOL P/2012/0365

Unit 1 Former ROC Office, Borrass Road, Borrass, Wrexham

Speaker: *AGAINST. – Jean Roberts (Local Resident)*

PAGES 75 – 81 CHI P/2012/0387

Bryn yr Eos, Whitehurst, Chirk, Wrexham

Speaker: *FOR – John Williams (Agent)*

PAGES 86 – 91 ROS P/2012/0422

Side garden area adjoining Alyndene, Chester Road, Rossett, Wrexham

Speaker: *FOR – Cameron Robson (Representing Applicant)*

Representations

Clarification of Local Member comments which were not fully reported in the main report in error. Objects on the following grounds:

- The negative impact upon the two adjacent Grade II listed buildings;
- If the argument for the previous application was that the size is appropriate to the neighbouring property, then the size and character of this application is inappropriate.

Community Council: Object on the following grounds:-

- It will have a negative impact on the aspect of the Church
- It will not be in keeping with the surrounding buildings
- It will not be in the scale of the surrounding buildings
- It will have a negative effect on the Conservation area

RECAP: The development is within the conservation area and by its new nature, would not complement the area; the proposed development is very close to the bus stop and would cause a significant danger to traffic on this part of the road, a significant loss of wildlife habitat and the loss of an ancient tree.

CCW: Does not object.

Applicant submission

Amended plan submitted detailing the inclusion of a chimney to the south western elevation of the building.

Observations

The issues raised by the Local Member and Community Council are discussed in full in the main report. The proximity to the bus stop has been assessed as acceptable by highways as not to cause harm to highway safety. The site is not considered to be of significant wildlife value and the proposal will be required to provide protection for trees on site by condition.

The inclusion of the chimney to the scheme is considered to balance the appearance of the proposed dwelling when compared to the existing dwellings within the street scene.

Recommendation

That the Head of Community Wellbeing and Development be given delegated authority to grant planning permission subject to the following conditions and any others that may be deemed necessary, upon the receipt of a favourable consultation response to the submitted tree report and upon the expiration of a period of reconsultation in relation to the amended plans and no further significant issues being raised.

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

PAGES 42-49 RHO P/2012/0332

Applicant's Submission

The agent points out that the revised proposal is now for car parking for 2-3 cars and not 3-4 cars as per the original proposal.

PAGES 50-60 LLA P/2012/0333

Observations

I am making minor alterations to planning conditions 05, 16 and 21. The conditions now read as follows:-

Condition 05: A mechanical road sweeper shall be on site while HGVs are using the site during construction works and used to remove any excess deposits of mud and debris.

Condition 16: The landscaping scheme submitted and approved in connection with condition number 15 shall be fully implemented in all respects within the agreed timescale and in strict accordance with the approved scheme unless otherwise agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.

Condition 21: The tree protection fencing and ground protection measures approved in connection with condition number 20 shall be kept in place until all external works have been completed and the removal of the fencing has been approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Recommendation

My recommendation remains as the main report subject to the minor changes to the above conditions.

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:

- The houses dominate the skyline and adding a third storey in the loft would exasperate the problem;
- Loss of privacy/overlooking in contravention of Article 8 of the Human Rights Act;
- Increase in occupancy of the dwelling will be dangerous in terms of the impact upon highway safety;
- Construction vehicles parking off the site;
- The development does not complement the nearby conservation area;
- Significant loss of wildlife;
- Loss of ancient tree;
- Highway safety because of the bus stop close to the site.

Observations

Most of the issues raised above have been addressed in the main report. In addition, the proposed ground floor and dormer roof extension will not lead to any loss of wildlife habitat or existing trees on site, and the appearance of the nearby conservation area will be unaffected by the alterations to the design of plot 1.

Recommendation

Additional condition and reason:

25. Notwithstanding the details shown on the elevation plan and the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, there shall be no openings of any kind in the elevation of the garage facing East. (Reason: To avoid conflict with the approved scheme of vegetative screening (hedge) along the brook directly behind to the rear of the garage).

PAGES 108-115 WRO P/2012/0494

Consultations

Highways: No objections on the basis of no function suite.

Recommendation

As main report.

