

# Pecyn Cyhoeddus

Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol Wrecsam/ Wrexham County Borough Council  
Neuadd y Dref, Wrecsam. LL11 1AY  
Guildhall, Wrexham. LL11 1AY  
[www.wrecsam.gov.uk](http://www.wrecsam.gov.uk) [www.wrexham.gov.uk](http://www.wrexham.gov.uk)  
Cyfnewid Testun/Text Relay: 18001



Eich Cyf/Your Ref  
Ein Cyf/Our Ref  
Dyddiad/Date  
Gofynner am/Ask for  
Rhif Cyswllt/Contact No  
E-bost/E-mail

3 Medi, 2019  
Annette Sellwood  
01978 292242  
[annette.sellwood@wrexham.gov.uk](mailto:annette.sellwood@wrexham.gov.uk)

Annwyl Gyngorydd

## **Pwyllgor Cynllunio - Dydd Llun, 2 Medi 2019**

Rwy'n cyfeirio at yr Agenda ar gyfer y Cyfarfod uchod a ddosbarthwyd yn ddiweddar ac rwyf bellach yn amgáu y canlynol:

### **ATODIAD**

Yn gywir

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Sioned Wyn Davies'.

Sioned Wyn Davies  
Prif Swyddog Llywodraethu a Chwsmeriaid  
Chief Officer Governance & Customer



**WREXHAM COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**MEETING OF 2<sup>nd</sup> SEPTEMBER 2019**  
**REPORT OF THE CHIEF OFFICER PLANNING AND REGULATORY**

**ADDENDUM REPORT**

*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**

<i>Page Nos</i>	<i>Community</i>	<i>Planning Ref</i>	<i>Speaker Against</i>	<i>Speaker For</i>
13 – 29	WRA	P/2018/0675	√	√
37 – 45	WRO	P/2019/0144	√	√
53 – 58	CEF	P/2019/0249		√
69 – 74	WOR	P/2019/0327	√	
107 – 112	RHO	P/2019/0484		√

**Pages 13 – 29      WRA P/2018/0675**

**Divisional Police Headquarters, Bodhyfryd, Wrexham**

**SPEAKER(S)**      **AGAINST:**    Charlotte Green (Highway Consultant Rep ASDA)  
**FOR:** Chris Smith (Rep. Agent)

**Representations**

8 further representations received raising matters already addressed in the main report.

*3 further representations received raising matters already addressed in the main report.*

*1 representation received further questioning the validity of the Transport Assessment, in particular methodologies in relation to:*

- *Amended highway report was submitted 8 months ago leaving only a limited amount of time for neighbouring occupiers to assess the information;*
- *Queue modelling at the proposed site access and the impact of the development upon the safe operation of the existing roundabout and the neighbouring roundabouts;*
- *Accident data should be reviewed for a period of 5 years at the site access and surrounding roundabouts;*

- *Unrestricted delivery timings may cause on site conflicts to the detriment of pedestrian and highway safety;*
- *Trip generations should be reassessed against locations which are more representative of the location of the proposed development;*
- *Operation assessments should be validated against observed queue lengths so the council can have confidence in the likely impact of the development on the highway network; and*
- *The application should be removed from consideration until such time that these matters can be adequately addressed.*

## **Consultations**

Highways – response received relating to re-consultation process. No additional points made beyond the original response which is summarised in the main report.

## **Observations**

As mentioned in the main report, the applicant is seeking to provide a Unilateral Undertaking (UU) to provide a £3,500 contribution to the council to be spent on the upgrading of the Powell Road underpass lighting. A signed UU is unlikely to be received in advance of the Planning Committee hearing.

In the main report, I have stipulated that this contribution is not required to make the development acceptable in planning terms. I cannot justify that the without the contribution, the provision of the supermarket and café would be detrimental to pedestrian safety. If Members are minded to resolve to grant planning permission on the proviso that the UU is forthcoming, delegated powers are requested and this is reflected in my amended recommendation. If Members are minded that the UU is not required, the recommendation in the main report is to be relied upon.

*The revised response from Highways (dated 28.08.2019) has taken into consideration an additional Transport Assessment technical note provided by the applicant. Within this response Highways have stated that:*

*'The applicant has submitted a Transport Assessment and Technical Note (Dated 19/12/2018). The anticipated vehicle movements generated by the proposed supermarket and drive-through coffee shop are not considered likely to have any significant detrimental impact on the local highway network'.*

*My recommendation is based on the assessment of the submitted information by the council's highways engineer. Whilst the methodology used in the applicant's submissions has been questioned, I have no reason to believe that the council's Highways engineer has mis-interpreted the submissions and concluded accordingly.*

## **Recommendation**

Amend pending receipt of Unilateral Undertaking as follows:

## RECOMMENDATION

That the Chief Officer Planning & Regulatory be given delegated authority to GRANT planning permission upon receipt of a Unilateral Undertaking detailing the provision of a financial contribution towards the upgrading of lighting within the Powell Road pedestrian subway/underpass. The planning permission shall be subject to the conditions within the main report.

**Pages 37 – 45**      **WRO P/2019/0144**

**86 Erddig Road, Wrexham**

**SPEAKER(S)**      **AGAINST:**    *Richard Fogg (Local Resident)*

**FOR:**    *Andrew Shield (Applicant)*

## Observations

There is an error in the penultimate paragraph on page 42. The figures referred to in the paragraph are for rental houses rather than all rental accommodation. The corrected paragraph is set out below:

The above demonstrates that very few households living in rental accommodation in Wrexham have more than 2 vehicles, with a significant proportion of households in rental accommodation not having access to a vehicle or only have 1 vehicle per household. The average number of cars per household in rental accommodation in Wrexham ranges from **0.3 per dwelling** for properties with 1 room **to 1.5 per dwelling** for properties with 8 or more rooms with an overall average being **0.73 cars.**

For completeness the 2011 census data for rental houses is set out below:

<b>Accommodation Type by Tenure By Number of Rooms: Rented Housing</b>							
	<b>Total</b>	<b>No Car/van</b>	<b>1 car/van</b>	<b>2 car/van</b>	<b>3 car/van</b>	<b>4+ car/van</b>	<b>Average Number of Vehicles Per Household</b>
Car/Van Availability	100%	39.2%	44%	13.8%	2.4%	0.6%	0.8
1 room	100%	65.2%	26%	4.4%	4.4%	0%	0.5
2 rooms	100%	54.8%	39.5%	4.5%	1.2%	0%	0.5
3 rooms	100%	57.6%	37.9%	3.7%	0.6%	0.2%	0.5
4 rooms	100%	44.2%	45.3%	9.4%	0.9%	0.2%	0.7
5 rooms	100%	37.8%	45.7%	14.3%	1.9%	0.3%	0.8
6 rooms	100%	34.9%	44.4%	17.2%	3%	0.5%	0.9
7 rooms	100%	24.5%	41.8%	24.9%	7.3%	1.5%	1.2
8 or more rooms	100%	16.2%	35.7%	31.6%	11%	5.5%	1.5

## **Recommendation**

Unchanged

### **Pages 53 – 58      CEF   P/2019/0249**

***Land at Glaslyn, Plas Madoc, Acrefair, Wrexham***

**SPEAKER(S)      FOR: Rachel Taylor (Rep. Agent)**

### **Pages 69 – 74      WOR   P/2019/0327**

***1 The Elms, Tallarn, Green, Malpas***

**SPEAKER(S)      AGAINST: Michael Tait (Neighbour)**

### **Pages 107 – 112    RHO   P/2019/0484**

***Unit 10 Vauxhall Industrial Estate, Ruabon, Wrexham***

**SPEAKER(S)      FOR: David Haston (Rep. Agent)**

---

## **ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE SHOWN IN THE ORDER OF THE ORIGINAL AGENDA**

### **Pages 59 – 63      WRA   P/2019/0258**

***18 Clarke Road, Wrexham***

## **Representation**

*1 further representation received raising concerns already addressed in the main report. Additional points are made in relation to:*

- *Inconsiderate parking already occurs from parents dropping off children at nearby schools. This will exacerbate problems; and*
- *The proposal will have an impact upon property prices.*

## **Observations**

*I am satisfied that the impact of the development upon the local highway network has been addressed in the main report.*

*Property prices are not a material planning consideration.*

## **Recommendation**

*Remains unchanged.*

## **Consultations**

Local Member – Supports the comments made by the Community Council who raise concerns with the proposal. Use of Upvc windows is inappropriate in a significant building in an important location at the heart of the Town Centre Conservation Area. Retention of commercial use on ground floor and the conversion of the upper floors into residential accommodation to bring back life into the Town Centre are in keeping with the principles of the Town Centre Master Plan however there are a number of aspects associated with the proposal in addition to the use of unacceptable materials which need to be referred to in the refusal.

1. Over-intensive development providing poor quality residential accommodation and amenity. Spacing standards are below those set out in the Council's guidance, inadequate natural light entering some of the flats, conversion of the building into two flats would be preferable.
2. Lack of parking provision.
3. Refuse storage is accessed from the Overton Arcade which is gated and locked outside business hours. Access from the flats to this area is through the Fire Escapes shown on the plans which must be unacceptable.

## **Observations**

As specified in the Officer Report, the proposal involves replacement and insertion of 2 no. sky lights and 2 no. windows.

The Conservation Officer has stated that a specification for the roof lights will be required. Condition 3 specifying that these shall be 'conservation type' only is considered addresses this matter.

One of the windows to be replaced is already uPVC and the Conservation Officer states that whilst it would be preferable to replace with timber sash, the replacement style proposed is a better style than the existing.

Window WS10 specified in the submitted Window and Door Schedule is timber and it would not be acceptable to replace this with a Upvc alternative. Condition 4 specifies that a detailed specification of this window shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, prior to its installation. This is considered to address this matter.

## **Recommendation**

Remains unchanged.

## **Representations**

Additional information submitted by the applicant on 30/08/2019 in relation to bin storage for neighbouring properties and proposed bin storage put forward as part of this proposal.

## **Consultations**

Local Member – Supports the comments made by the Community Council who raise concerns with the proposal. Use of Upvc windows is inappropriate in a significant building in an important location at the heart of the Town Centre Conservation Area.

Retention of commercial use on ground floor and the conversion of the upper floors into residential accommodation to bring back life into the Town Centre are in keeping with the principles of the Town Centre Master Plan however there are a number of aspects associated with the proposal in addition to the use of unacceptable materials which need to be referred to in the refusal.

1. Over-intensive development providing poor quality residential accommodation and amenity. Spacing standards are below those set out in the Council's guidance, inadequate natural light entering some of the flats, conversion of the building into two flats would be preferable.
2. Lack of parking provision. There should be a requirement for developers in the town centre to make permanent arrangements for the provision of off-street parking spaces for residents or alternatively there needs to be a requirement for a S.106 Agreement to support the Council in providing and maintaining car parks.
3. Refuse storage is accessed from the Overton Arcade which is gated and locked outside business hours. Access from the flats to this area is through the Fire Escapes shown on the plans which must be unacceptable.

## **Observations**

### Conservation/Listed Building

As specified in the Officer Report, the proposal involves replacement and insertion of 2 no. sky lights and 2 no. windows.

The Conservation Officer has stated that a specification for the roof lights will be required. Condition 3 specifying that these shall be 'conservation type' only is considered addresses this matter.

One of the windows to be replaced is already uPVC and the Conservation Officer states that whilst it would be preferable to replace with timber sash, the replacement style proposed is a better style than the existing.



Window WS10 specified in the submitted Window and Door Schedule is timber and it would not be acceptable to replace this with a Upvc alternative. Condition 4 specifies that a detailed specification of this window shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, prior to its installation. This is considered to address this matter.

### Overdevelopment/Spacing Standards

The proposal makes efficient use of the upper floors of a building in a town centre location, providing 1 and 2 bed accommodation, in line with the principles of sustainable development.

It is not uncommon for flats in town centre locations to suffer from restricted levels of natural day light and some overlooking into neighbouring properties, particularly those in upper floors given the constrained nature of the site.

Whilst there would be a shortfall in the guidance between the side windows serving Flats 1 and 4 and their proximity to the facing wall of the neighbouring property to the east, these windows are already existing and as already mentioned, given the constrained nature of town centre buildings, a restriction in the amount of natural day light entering some town centre flats is to be expected.

Furthermore, there are 2 no. windows serving the main living accommodation within Flat 1 which is inevitably a better situation than if the Flat was served by 1 no. window only.

The main living area and bedroom serving Flat 4 are also each served by separate windows.

The rear windows serving Flats 3 and 5 have a relatively open outlook which is considered to be appropriate in the context of any overbearing impacts.

The submitted Proposed Floor Plan show the rear wall of No 31 (where Flats 1 and 4 are located) is blank.

I am unaware of any direct overlooking impacts which would occur between habitable windows serving the proposed flats and any habitable windows serving residential accommodation in the upper floors of neighbouring properties to the east of the site.

A search on the Council's mapping system appears to indicate that there is no planning history for the change the use of any of the upper floors in the neighbouring buildings to residential accommodation.

It should also be noted that to reduce the number of apartments could potentially involve a significant reconfiguration and alteration to the internal layout of the property, given the proposed retention of the original staircase.

Any significant alteration to the original internal layout of the building may have a subsequent impact on whether the proposed works would be acceptable to the listed

building and a balance must be struck between achieving acceptable impacts to residential amenities of occupiers and ensuring the special architectural and historic interest of the building is not adversely impacted upon.

The proposal would utilise vacant upper floors of a town centre location by providing 1 and 2 bed flats, which it is reasonable to assume would be relatively affordable and within walking distance of key services and facilities.

On the basis of the above, I am satisfied that the proposal broadly achieves a balance between provision of town centre housing and impacts to residential amenities of proposed occupants, whilst respecting the architectural and historic interest of this Grade II listed building. The proposal would comply with UDP Policies GDP1, EC7 and EC9.

#### Lack of parking provision

The site is in a highly sustainable town centre location, the Highway Authority raises no objection. The Council has no policy which requires contributions from developers to facilitate improvements/initiatives towards parking provision for residential development in town centre.

#### Refuse storage

Any access to refuse storage is a Building Regulations matter.

#### **Recommendation**

Remains unchanged.

#### **Pages 117 – 120 WRA P/2019/0514** **10 Ffordd Hooson, Wrexham**

#### **Consultation Responses**

Community Council – Raise concerns that the scale of the proposed works will result in an overdevelopment of the Plot.

#### **Recommendation**

Remains unchanged as set out in the report.

#### **Pages 121 – 125 BRO P/2019/0540** **Wycholme, Victoria Road, Brynteg, Wrexham**

#### **Representations**

Additional comment regarding the drainage at the property – The sewerage and grey water drainage flows across neighbouring land with no inspection covers on the application site. Concerned over liability should blockages or damage occur.

## **Recommendation**

The matter of drainage is one covered by building regulations who will ensure that the flow and access arrangements are acceptable. Damage or blockage will be a private matter between the residents. Recommendation remains unchanged.

**Pages 127 – 130 ROS P/2019/0574**

## **Representations**

Community Council - No objections

## **Recommendation**

Recommendation remains unchanged.

