GOODWIN
PLANNING SERVICES
CHARTERED TOWN PLANNERS
& DEVELOPMENT CONSULTANTS

PROPOSED CONVERSION AND ALTERATIONS TO STABLES TO PROVIDE ANCILLARY DOMESTIC LIVING ACCOMMODATION, ART STUDIO AND ERECTION OF STORAGE BUILDING

AT

CEDAR HALL, THE GREEN, GRESFORD, LL12 8RG

PLANNING STATEMENT

BY

GOODWIN PLANNING SERVICES LTD

TEL: 07767358703
EMAIL: s.goodwin@goodwinplanning.com

OUR REF: SG-1712-ST2

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Goodwin Planning Services have been instructed to submit a planning and listed building consent application for the conversion of a stable building to ancillary domestic living accommodation, art studio and erection of a storage building at Cedar Hall, The Green, Gresford.

1.2 This Statement assesses the proposals against relevant planning policy. It is in 5 sections as follows:

1. Introduction
2. The Proposals
3. Planning History and Material Considerations
4. Assessment Against Planning Policy
5. Conclusions.

1.3 This Statement is based on the following submitted plans:

- Site Location Plan (9001-P1).
- Existing Site Plan (9002-P1).
- Proposed Site Plan (9010-P1).
- Existing Floor Plans and Elevations (2001-P1).
- Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations (2010-P3).
- Existing Sections (2201-P1).
- Proposed Sections (2210-P2).
- External Openings Schedule (3110-P1).
- Floor Plans and Elevations of Proposed Outbuilding (9011-P10).

1.4 The application is also accompanied by the following statements and reports:

- Design and Access Statement by JPH Architects
- Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Bat Report by Eco-Scope
- Heritage Impact Assessment by Richard K Morris & Associates.
- Green Infrastructure Statement by Eco-Scope.
- Structural Report by JPS Structural Engineers.

2. THE PROPOSALS

2.1 The proposals are described in detail in the separate Design and Access Statement. In summary, they involve the conversion of an existing stable block and courtyard to provide accommodation ancillary to the use of the main house (Cedar Hall). Cedar Hall and the stables were both listed as Grade II in 1996. A detailed description and assessment of the physical alterations to the building and courtyard and an assessment of their impact are set out in the separate Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) and are not therefore repeated here. However, the HIA concludes that the proposals are well-designed, sympathetic to the historic character of the building and proportionate in their scale, massing and material palette. It states that, overall, the proposals will have limited impact on the external fabric of the stables and that the proposed internal changes are well considered and necessary for the adaptive reuse of the building. It states that, whilst there will be a degree of change to the listed building these changes are not considered to equate to harm.

2.2 In this section we concentrate on the uses proposed for the building. The works are intended to provide ancillary accommodation for the applicant's daughter.

2.3 On the ground floor the proposals will provide a kitchen/dining room, WC, entrance lobby, living room and utility room. At first floor it will provide an art studio, bathroom and a single bedroom. The existing outbuilding contains one toilet which will be removed as part of the new scheme.

2.4 The current use of the building is already ancillary to the main house and within the curtilage of the main house. The proposal therefore involves changing from one ancillary use to another so we do not believe the

proposed use of the building ought to be an issue (particularly as the same use has been previously approved as detailed in section 3 below). The physical works to the building require Listed Building Consent and the new outbuilding requires planning permission.

3. PLANNING HISTORY

3.1 Planning Permission was granted on 21st January 2008 for the conversion and internal alteration of the building to provide domestic living accommodation, art studio and store including anew garden walls and a tennis court under application reference P/2007/1396. Listed Building Consent was granted for the same development in May 2008 under reference P/2007/1397.

3.2 Condition 8 of the planning permission required a photographic survey to be submitted to the Council before development took place. Confirmation was given that the photographic survey was submitted in fulfilment of the condition (see **Appendix 1**). Condition 1 required the development to commence within 5 years of the grant of planning permission

3.3 The approved plans included the provision of two toilets (one including a shower) at ground floor level with a new foul drain to drain into the existing septic tank to the property (see **Appendix 2**).

3.4 We attach at [redacted] a Statutory Declaration from the previous owners which confirms that work on implementation of the planning permission commenced in the early part of January 2013 by the excavation of a trench and the installation of the foul sewer, with inspection chambers, to the new WC position in the stables. The Statutory Declaration confirms these works were completed before 20th January 2013 and were therefore undertaken before the 5-year period for commencement expired.

3.5 The Statutory Declaration confirms these works were inspected by the Council's Building Control Department and an invoice for that inspection dated 22nd January is included.

3.6 These works therefore constituted a material start to the development within

the 5 years. The planning permission has therefore been lawfully commenced and is still capable of completion.

3.7 Listed Building Consent was later granted for an amendment to P/2007/1397 to include internal alterations, new windows and rooflights. This was approved on 4th September 2014. There was no request for an amendment to the corresponding planning permission which presumably reflected the Council's agreement that P/2007/1396 had already been lawfully commenced.

3.8 The implications of this are that there is already a planning permission for the conversion of the stables to ancillary accommodation to the main house which includes the provision of a bathroom (with shower and toilet) and a separate toilet which remains open to the applicants to complete. The proposals therefore include the provision of one bathroom with WC and a separate WC so there is no increase in toilets above the approved and part implemented fall-back scheme.

3.9 A subsequent planning application and listed building application (P/2021/0780 and P/2021/0779) for conversion of the stables with significant extensions were refused by the Council on 22nd December 2021.

3.10 Prior to purchasing the property in 2025 the applicants engaged in pre-application discussions with officers of Wrexham Council to seek their views on the proposals. This included a site meeting with planning and conservation officers and a detailed written response to the proposal. [redacted]

3.11 This acknowledged that the acceptability of the principle of use of the building as ancillary accommodation to the main house had been established by the previous permission, stating "*Little has changed since*

then in terms of local planning policy and, provided that the building can be shown to remain in a structurally sound condition and capable of conversion, I would have no objections to the proposed change of use in principle which would accord with UDP policies GDP1, H3 and EC1." In terms of protection of the River Dee and Bala Lake SAC from increased pollution levels it advised that "*given that this application is for the creation of ancillary accommodation, the use will not in my view increase nutrients to the SAC. As such a formal application could be screened out as not harmful to the SAC. The application would therefore likely comply with UDP policies EC6 and EC14".*

3.12 In relation to the impact on the listed building the pre-application response was supportive of the principle stating "*The scheme is very similar to the earlier approval under P/2007/1396, and I raise no objection in principle. As set out in the supporting information, the proposals would secure a long term use for a building that is currently vacant and used only for occasional storage. This would help ensure ongoing maintenance and investment, supporting its conservation into the future"* and *"Overall, I am supportive of the scheme and consider the proposed ancillary use—without infilling the stable courtyard—to be a sympathetic approach to a nationally significant building. I welcome the retention of features such as the historic stable divider within the new staircase and the groom's fireplace. Subject to the concerns above being fully addressed and justified, I am confident that a favourable outcome can be achieved at listed building application stage to comply with policy EC9*." However, it highlighted a few areas where further consideration would be required (namely justification for alterations to first-floor levels, impact on the carriage entrance and the impact of fully glazing the carriage entrance. The scheme has been amended to reflect these comments by removing the proposed snug and replacing it with a link to minimise floor alterations, and retention of the carriage entrance gates with an internal glazed screen behind hidden from external view. The implications of these changes from the pre-application submission are

set out in detail in the Design and Access Statement and Heritage Impact Assessment. However, these changes demonstrate that the applicant has been flexible in preparing the finally submitted scheme and has responded appropriately to the issues raised by the Council's Conservation Officer during the pre-application consultation.

4. ASSESSMENT AGAINST PLANNING POLICY

4.1 The Local Development Plan has been withdrawn as of March 2026 on the direction of the Welsh Government and that the LDP therefore no longer forms part of the development plan for Wrexham. The development plan therefore comprises Future Wales: the national plan 2040 and the Wrexham Unitary Development Plan (UDP) adopted in 2005 to cover the period from 1996 to 2011. The site is shown as lying within the Green Barrier and within a Conservation Area. The main property (Cedar Hall) and the stables are Grade II listed.

4.2 Policy GDP1 sets out a set of general principles to be met by all development. The pre-application response confirmed that, the principle of the change of use complies with policy GDP1. We believe the proposals meet the principles set out in the policy as follows:

- The development does not extend the building and respects its scale, design and layout, uses appropriate materials and accords with the character of the site.
- The proposal raises no community safety issues.
- The scheme has used appropriate design techniques with appropriately qualified architects to work on heritage buildings and also with the assistance of a Heritage Consultant.
- There are no pedestrian or vehicular access issues as the property will remain as one dwelling and there are no changes proposed to the access arrangements.
- The property is already a dwelling so locational accessibility is not relevant. Even if it were, the site is readily accessible to services and facilities in Gresford.
- There will be no adverse impacts on amenity through pollution of

water, land or air. In terms of water and the current phosphates issue the existing building contains one WC. The proposal includes one bathroom and a separate toilet. This is the same as the previously approved and part implemented scheme referred to above which could still be completed. The toilets will drain to the existing on-site septic tank. There will therefore be no additional risk of phosphate pollution than the extant permission for a similar development which represents a material fall-back position.

- Public services are already available at the site.
- The site is not within a site of nature conservation value.
- There will be no additional risk of flooding as the proposal utilises the existing buildings on site and the store is proposed to be located on the site of a previous building.
- There would be no implications for the Welsh language.
- There would be no impact on economic, social or environmental well-being of the area.

4.3 Policy EC1 indicates that within Green Barriers planning permission will be granted for developments which maintain the openness of the Green Barrier and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. The proposals utilise an existing building and propose a small store on the site of a previous building within the curtilage of a dwelling. They will therefore maintain openness and have no conflict with the purposes of Green Barriers (there will be no coalescence, no encroachment into the countryside, no impact on the setting of an urban area or village and no impact on urban regeneration). The proposal is therefore consistent with policy EC1 as acknowledged in the pre-application response.

4.4 Policy EC7 requires new buildings, alterations or additions to buildings within a Conservation Area to reflect the design and character of the area as a whole and the form, scale, detailing and materials of existing

buildings. The proposals achieve precisely this as set out in the HIA and reflected in the conservation comments at pre-application stage that "*I considered that the proposed development would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area and that the proposed development would comply with UDP policy EC7*".

4.5 Policy EC9 requires alterations or additions to listed buildings and development within the curtilage of listed buildings to respect the setting and character of the listed building or structures. The proposals have been designed to retain the character of the stable block, its courtyard and the previous layout of buildings on the site. This is addressed in more detail in the HIA which demonstrates compliance with policy EC9. It is also reflected in the conservation comments at pre-application stage that *"I am confident that a favourable outcome can be achieved at listed building application stage to comply with policy EC9"*.

4.6 Policy H3 deals with the conversion of buildings outside settlement limits to residential use. The explanation to the policy is clear that it is intended to be applied where new dwellings are being created (paragraph 6.10). As the proposal is to use the building for ancillary accommodation to the main house, no new dwelling is created and policy H3 is not therefore relevant.

4.7 Policy EC6 indicates that measures to improve the biodiversity value of sites will be supported. The Green Infrastructure Statement confirms that the proposal will deliver a net benefit for biodiversity and therefore the proposal is supported by policy EC6. Policy EC14 seeks to protect controlled waters from adverse impact. As set out above, the proposals are for ancillary accommodation only and do not increase the number of toilets compared to the extant permission and the drainage proposals are unaltered. The pre-application response acknowledged the scheme would not increase nutrients into the Sac and could be screened out as not harmful

to the SAC. It acknowledged compliance with policy EC14.

4.8 The proposal, therefore, accords with the relevant policies of the development plan.

4.9 Future Wales: The National Plan 2040, which also forms part of the development plan, is a strategic document which does not set out development management policies for small scale schemes. There is nothing in the document that would indicate a decision contrary to the policies of the UDP should be made.

4.10 As the proposal accords with the relevant policies of the development plan, and has followed the recommendations at pre-application stage, we believe it should therefore be supported by the Council.

5. CONCLUSIONS

5.1 The proposals involve the conversion and alteration of an existing stable building within the curtilage of a listed dwelling to ancillary accommodation for the applicant's daughter.

5.2 A very similar scheme has already been granted by the council and lawfully commenced and it is therefore open to the applicant to complete that development. The proposal, therefore, involves minor changes to the detailing and internal layout of the building to facilitate this updated scheme.

5.3 The applicants entered into pre-application discussions with the Council prior to purchasing the site and prior to submitting this application. The pre-application response was supportive of the proposals in principle and made some recommendations on how to improve the scheme from a heritage impact perspective. The recommendations in relation to the alterations to the building have been reflected the alterations made to the proposals since receipt of the pre-application response as set out in the Design and Access Statement and Heritage Impact Assessment.

5.4 The proposal accords with the relevant policies of the development plan. There are no other material considerations we are aware of that would suggest a decision should be made contrary to these policies. In our view the proposals ought to be supported by the Council.