

WREXHAM COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE

MEETING OF 5 MARCH 2012

ADDENDUM

REPORT OF THE HEAD OF COMMUNITY WELLBEING AND DEVELOPMENT

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
10 – 18	MAE	P/2011/0589	√	√
19 – 43	SES	P/2011/0750		√
47 – 54	GRE	P/2012/0889	√	√
112 – 115	WRR	P/2012/0078	√	

PAGES 10 – 18

Site of The Old Shop, Cadney Lane, Bettisfield, Wrexham

AGAINST: Peter Grayburn (Representing Neighbours)

FOR: Andy Hewitt, David Owen Associates (Agent)

PAGES 19 - 43

Maelor Creamery, Pickhill Lane, Cross Lanes, Wrexham

FOR: Mr Paul Rowe (Representing Applicants)

PAGES 47 - 54

Former Quarry and Woodland, off Pant Lane, Gresford, Wrexham

AGAINST: Mr Bellis Jones (Representing Neighbours)

FOR: Mr John Troth (Agent)

Proposal

Change of use of former closed quarry and woodland to public amenity.

The report incorrectly states the number of people that signed the petition. It was signed by 64 people.

Representations

One additional letter received from a neighbouring property raising the following points –
- having seen the indicative sketch plan the concerns regarding the car park remain.

Recommendation

Remains unchanged.

PAGES 112 - 115

57 Chester Road, Wrexham

AGAINST: Mrs C Hone (Neighbour)

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

PAGES 3-9 BRY P/2011/0040

Applicant's Submission

The agent confirms that the applicants are in the process of developing the requested management plan for the maintenance of the site. The intention remains to work with the Community Trust but to also give them the specialist support they require.

This will still take some time to fully conclude because of the third party involvements but we hope to have an outline plan in place within the next couple of weeks for comments, following which we will develop into a formal plan for approval. There is a willingness to enter into a financial bond, subject to agreement of terms.

With this in mind, he requests that the application is withheld until the April committee to allow us the appropriate time to conclude these issues.

Observations

There has been some progress to be some progress in resolving the issues and a further month deferment is not unreasonable given the applicants request.

Recommendation

A further month deferment is not unreasonable given the time taken already.

PAGES 44-46 CEF P/2011/0801

Observations

The application is in retrospect and Condition 01 is deleted.

Recommendation

As main report with the deletion of Condition 01.

PAGES 88-92 RUA P/2012/0066 (S)

Representations

2 objections received expressing the following concerns:-

- overshadowing/loss of light;
- brook could be piped to allow natural flow;
- access improvements not carried out;
- concern about potential access for emergency services;
- capacity of septic tank;
- the building site is a breach of health and safety procedures;
- covenant on land preventing it being developed;
- nowhere for children to play.

1 letter received making the following comments:

- *land grabbing going on – lane has got narrower, site expanded, builders placed materials adjacent to lane and fence moved outwards. Difficult for emergency access along lane;*

- stream filled in/blocked;
- covenant on land preventing it being developed;
- strong feeling the current approach to permissions is to allow developers to go ahead and pay lip service to views of local residents.

Observations

The issue of overshadowing/loss of light has been addressed in my main report. The other issues are not relevant to this application as they refer to matters of principle which cannot now be reconsidered, are matters that can only be considered if this was a full application for a new development, or, in the case of the safety of the building site and any covenants placed on the land, are not planning considerations.

Construction is still going on and the curtilage/gardens have not been formally laid out so it is not apparent that the developer is intending to extend the permitted curtilage of the dwelling.

The impact upon the stream is a matter for the Environment Agency.

Recommendation

I refer Members back to my main report.

PAGES 93-96 ROS P/2012/0069

Applicants submission

Amended tree information and block plan submitted detailing the position of the Root Protection Area for the holly tree.

Consultations

Welsh Water: Public sewer crosses the site.

Observations

Tree: The information is considered acceptable and the development will not have an adverse impact upon the existing holly tree subject to conditions to protect the tree during the construction phase.

Sewer: A building over agreement will need to be sought with Welsh water before the garage can be erected. Add informative to this effect.

Recommendation

Planning permission is Granted subject to the following additional conditions and informatives to those detailed in the main report.

Conditions

3. No equipment, machinery, plant or materials of any kind in connection with the development shall be brought onto the site until tree protection fencing and ground protection measures have been implemented in strict accordance with details which have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details should include specification and location for the fencing. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area fenced in accordance with this condition and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavations be made. R: To ensure the amenity afforded by the trees is continued into the future.
4. The tree protection fencing and ground protection measures approved in connection with condition no. 3 shall be kept in place until all external site works have been completed and

the removal of the fencing has been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. R: To ensure that the retained trees are adequately protected during development in the interests of amenity.

5. No part of the development shall commence until the design of the foundations for the proposed development within retained tree(s) Root Protection Areas, as specified by BS5837:2005 or as shown on a Tree Protection Plan have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Foundation design shall take into account the presence of tree roots. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the foundation design as approved. R: To ensure that hard surfacing does not cause harm to retained trees in the interests of visual amenity.
6. No part of the development shall commence until full details for the arboricultural supervision of tree protection measures and any ground works within retained tree(s) Root Protection Areas, as specified by BS5837:2005 or as shown on a Tree Protection Plan have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The supervisory works shall be carried out in strict accordance with the details as approved. R: To ensure the work is carried out to accepted arboricultural practices for the long term well being of the tree(s).

Informatives

The scheme of arboricultural supervision required in connection with condition no. 6 above shall make provision for a pre-commencement site meeting between the Local Planning Authority's Arboriculturist, the Developer/ Applicant/ Agent and their appointed Arboricultural Supervisor to agree matters of detail. It shall specify the frequency of arboricultural monitoring and reporting to the Local Planning Authority on the status of all tree protection measures throughout the course of the development and make provision for the submission and approval of a satisfactory arboricultural completion statement.

You are advised that the planning permission hereby granted does not authorise any building over, diversion, connection or other interference with any sewer, public or private, which crosses the site. You are advised to contact Welsh Water in this regard, prior to undertaking any groundwork in connection with the development. Should you be required to depart from the details hereby approved, you should contact the Council's planning department to seek further advice with regard to the submission of amended plans and / or a new planning application.

PAGES 97-105 ABE P/2012/0071

Representations

2 additional letters of objection expressing the following concerns:

- application document states it is unlikely locals will notice development. Object to this assumption – it is inaccurate;
- harmful visual impact/harm to countryside;
- mast illuminated in moonlight which reflects back towards residential properties;
- impact on wildlife;
- harmful impact of works to water treatment plan.

Applicant's Submission

The applicant's agent has advised me that it is their intention for a permanent mast to be sited in the same place as the original mast once the works to the water treatment plan have been complete.

Observations

The mast is around 180m from the nearest residential properties and is not constructed of highly reflective material. This distance and the materials the mast is made of are sufficient to ensure no direct impacts upon amenity.

The mast is already on site therefore its retention will have no significant or additional impacts upon wildlife.

Considering the impacts of the works to the water treatment plant are outside of the scope of this planning application. Some works have the benefit of planning permission already and cannot not be reconsidered, but many of the works are 'permitted development' and do not require planning permission from the Council.

Recommendation

I refer to the recommendation in my main report.

PAGES 106-111 WRC P/2012/0076

Applicants Submissions

A detailed site plan has been submitted. This had not been initially submitted and I had requested it to ensure it was clear where the exact location of the proposed building would be.

Consultations

Highways: No recommendations.

Observations

On the basis of the detailed site plan, which has clarified what is being proposed it is apparent that some of the details quoted in my main report are incorrect. The development comprises 2 spectators stands (one with seats one without) of 6.6m long x 2.9m wide x 2.8m high co-joined to form a single structure. The total length of this structure will therefore be 13.2m and it will have a floor area of 38 square metres.

Notwithstanding the above, I am satisfied that the remainder of the report is accurate in its assessment of the siting, design, visual impact, access and parking provision issues.

Recommendation

I refer to the recommendation in my main report.

PAGES 116-118 RHO P/2012/0083

Consultations

Public Protection: No comments

Highways: No comments

Recommendation

Remains unchanged.