## FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE COMMITTEE DATE: 2<sup>ND</sup> OCTOBER 2019 THIRD PARTY SPEAKERS

Agenda No.	Application Number	Development / Location	Speaker	For	Against
6.1	060160	Land to Rear of 81 Drury Lane, Buckley.	Mr. Keig		V
6.3	060131	2 Ffordd Yr Hydref, Mold.	Mrs A. Edwards		V
6.4	059663	Lluesty Hospital, Old Chester Road, Holywell.	Mr. G. Prescott (Agent)	V	
6.5	060270	Land West of Smurfit Kappa, Maes Gwern, Mold Business Park, Mold.	Mr. K. Webster (Agent)	V	

## FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE LATE OBSERVATIONS

COMMITTEE DATE: 2<sup>ND</sup> OCTOEBR 2019

Agenda No.	Application Number	Location	Consultee / Date Received	Observations
6.1	060160	Land to the rear of 81 Drury Lane, Drury.	Third Party Consultees  – Received 27 <sup>th</sup> /28 <sup>th</sup> September 2019.	<ul> <li>ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE</li> <li>9 No. additional third party letters of objection received the main points of which can be summarised as follows:-</li> <li>No change in circumstances since refusal of previous application by Planning Committee in March 2019.</li> <li>Increase in Traffic Generation.</li> <li>Loss of high quality agricultural land.</li> <li>Demolition of existing property would have a detrimental impact on the character of the street scene.</li> <li>No evidence of housing need.</li> </ul>
6.1	060160	Land to the rear of 81 Drury Lane, Drury.	Agricultural Land Classification & Soil Policy Advisor (Welsh Government).	Wish to reiterate advice previously made in respect of 058489 in that the Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) Survey is an accurate reflection of the land quality on site being Best and Most Versatile (Subgraded 3A). Wish to re-iterate that, no evidence has been provided to warrant its release for development.
6.1	060160	Land to the rear of 81 Drury Lane, Drury.		CORRECTION TO REPORT Page 12 Housing Strategy Manager 30% affordable units represents 19 unit not 32 as specified.

6.1	060160	Land to the rear of 81 Drury Lane, Drury.		CORRECTION TO REPORT Page 16 Additional Guidance to be amended to read:- Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 13 – Outdoor Playing Space & New Development.
6.1	060160	Land to the rear of 81 Drury Lane, Drury		CORRECTION TO REPORT Page 19  Typographical error in paragraph 7.12 bullet point one should read 'enterprise' not 'exception'.
6.2	058968	Land to the rear of Park House, Broncoed Park, Mold.		UPDATE TO LOCATION PLAN  Amended plan attached to confirm the location and extent of application site boundary.
6.4	059663	Lluesty Hospital, Old Chester Road, Holywell	Third Party Consultee received 30 <sup>th</sup> September 2019	Additional Correspondence  1 no. additional third party representation received the main points of which can be summarised as follows:  - The site exit between proposed blocks D and E onto Old Chester Road is unsuitable for large vehicle use  - Old Chester Road is a very narrow highway  - Use of this access will impact negatively on the adjacent residential property  - Increased noise from increased traffic exiting from the hospital site.
6.5	060270	Smurfitt Kappa, Maes Gwern, Mold	Welsh Government - 24 <sup>th</sup> September 2019	Welsh Government as highways authority for the A494 trunk road does not issue a direction in respect of this application.
6.5	060270	Smurfitt Kappa, Maes Gwern, Mold	Public Protection – 24 <sup>th</sup> September 2019	Recommends the following condition to be attached to any permission:  The total noise level from the site shall not exceed 45 dBA LAeq (1hr) between 07.00- 23.00 hrs and 45 dBA

				LAeq (15 mins) between 23.00-07.00hrs at any nearby noise sensitive property.  This condition should be added to the report under paragraph 2.01.
6.6	060319	Land East of Vounog Hill, Penyffordd	Pollution control - 27 <sup>th</sup> September 2019	No adverse comments.
	060319	Land East of Vounog Hill, Penyffordd	10 x Third party representations 22 <sup>nd</sup> -27 <sup>th</sup> September 2019	Objections raised are covered by bullet points in report.
6.6	060319	Land East of Vounog Hill, Penyffordd	Councillor C Hinds 30 <sup>th</sup> September 2019	I feel there are too many developments in our village and this site is premature. There is the LDP in being and speculative planning should not be an option. This community has had its fair share of developments and it must stop as the infrastructure is not there for the community to be sustainable.
				Unfortunately I know it is not a planning policy but that area is the village's only green space for the winter. If you ask any resident that has lived here for years their families have used this space for sledging. It is where social cohesion really exists and it is lovely to see families together and with others.
6.6	060319	Land East of Vounog Hill, Penyffordd	Penyffordd Community Council 27 <sup>th</sup> September 2019	Since the last application the village has witnessed many changes:  Theoretical or infrequent social harm, traffic problems and drains issues Skewing of the social mix of our community by disproportionately building 4 bedroom houses No starter homes for working people to buy in Penyffordd, wrong mix of houses. Traffic issues Drainage issues

				<ul> <li>Recorded crime and anti-social behaviour has increased.</li> <li>New school was already over capacity on its first day.</li> <li>The construction of 186 houses on Chester Road is now well progressed. The construction of 32 houses on Hawarden Road is scheduled to start within weeks and the 40 houses on Rhos Road are expected to begin early next year. Right now, above all, we need time to allow infrastructure investment to catch up with development.</li> <li>The planning policy reasons for refusal of this application are well documented but we need to go further.</li> <li>Welsh government use phrases like 'place making', 'community cohesion' and 'wellbeing', but decisions at         <ul> <li>a national level, where they go counter to local knowledge and local authority recommendations, as well as community concerns, are inconsistent with national policy.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
6.6	060319	Land East of Vounog Hill, Penyffordd	Penyffordd Community Council 27 <sup>th</sup> September 2019	This development cannot be considered in isolation by the planning authority or the inspectorate, without due reference to the significant work and consultation already completed on the emerging Flintshire Local Development Plan, nor the local authority officer's recommendations in respect to this and the previous Application.
6.6	060319	Land East of Vounog Hill, Penyffordd	Ramblers Association 1 <sup>st</sup> October 2019	This site is outside the UDP settlement boundary and should only be developed if the housing need is considered to justify it, and the proposal is "sustainable". We welcome the fact that the proposal would retain the line of the existing public path, and would surface and light it, but we feel the layout could

6.6	060319	Land East of Vounog Hill,	Councillor David	go further in enhancing Active Travel in the area. In particular the development does nothing to connect the rather isolated development on Min Y Ddol to the village - we would suggest one or more path or cycle track links. Also residents of this development (and Min Ydol) will have to cross the main Vounog Hill to reach school and all village services. If a second traffic island is not feasible, then traffic calming should be considered or a new footway to village on east side of road (perhaps behind the hedge). We would request safeguarding conditions for the public path and appropriate conditions for street furniture (gaps or gates in preference to stiles). We would also ask that an alternative concession path is made available during construction work on public path line.  Re. Planning Application: JZB/060319, Land East
0.0	000313	Penyffordd	Williams	Of Vounog Hill, Pen-y-ffordd.
				Further to the above, in considering this application I would be grateful of you and committee considering the following points. I strongly object to this proposal on the following grounds and request the application to be dealt with at committee level, and consider that the application should be refused on the following grounds.  • The application is premature with the progress being made on the LDP with the land outside the current settlement boundary established under the current UDP.  • Such a proposal is inappropriate for the open countryside and will not only have a negative impact on the streetscene in this location, but will result in the loss of high quality agricultural land.  • The ward has accepted over and above the required housing allocation under the life of the developing LDP, with three applications approved on appeal for developments outside the settlement boundary. These

	<ul> <li>approvals have already resulted in approximately 30% growth of the village.</li> <li>The road infrastructure of the village is inadequate to accept further development and the proposed site access will add to the dangers in this location.</li> <li>Approval will have a negative impact on Education. All feeder schools are virtually full. The two most local high schools are over subscribed and the junior school is currently oversubscribed for nursery places.</li> <li>Public transport is insufficient to support more residents in this location, especially to medical centres that the ward does not have or transport to the nearest hospital.</li> <li>Amenities of the village are currently inadequate and there is a severe shortfall in public open space, especially adult &amp; youth open space that has over 5ha shortfall.</li> <li>Infrastructure with regards to drainage issues in particular will be unable to adequately support this proposal.</li> <li>Approval will have a negative impact on community wellbeing due to increase in population so urbanising and diminishing community spirit which is currently in decline. Speed of growth following the two large developments of the past five years does not facilitate community cohesion</li> <li>Approval will significantly impact on the volume of traffic using already congested roads in the village that will increase the issues regarding road safety in the proposed location and village in general due to increased traffic.</li> <li>The land is an historical sledging field and the only recognised one in the immediate area for young children. This will be an irreplaceable loss if the development is approved.</li> <li>Approval will increase flood risk within the village</li> </ul>
	currently subject to sewer overflows and flooding.  Overloaded sewage systems are a regular problem.

	If there is an inclination to approve this application during committee or on appeal, I am seeking the following assurances/conditions.  • Significant improvement be made to the proposals for access on to the development in excess to the normal widths and visibility splays. Volume of traffic will increase with this development and as a result, highway dangers will increase. The proposed access is at an unsafe and inappropriate position and if the scheme is to be progressed, this needs reviewing with local representatives prior to any decision being made.  • The proposal fails to provide adequate provision for open space, and if eventually approved, this provision needs to be significantly increased.  • If eventually approved the development will need to make allowance to support the growth by making provision for the broader needs of the community that has no doctors surgery, a lack of shops & general amenities and business and employment opportunities.  • The design of the properties be amended to include single story properties and an appropriate number of affordable and gifted properties be conditioned, with local purchase and letting policy be drawn up for any affordable/gifted dwellings.
--	---