

Planning Application 060782 - Full Application - Regrading of Existing Agricultural Land at Nant-Y-Gro, Gronant								
NAME	DATE	TIME	CLARIFICATIONS SOUGHT BU COUNCILLORS	RESPONSE FROM CASE OFFICER	DATE	TIME	RESPONSE FROM COUNCILLOR	
Allport Mike	21/04/20	16.32	Subject to issues of contaminated land on site being satisfactorily resolved	Conditions are recommended to be imposed on any permission to address land contamination concerns	21/04/20	16.32	I support approval subject to issues of contaminated land on	
Attridge Bernie	22/04/20	15.27			22/04/20	17.04	I have no objections or questions to raise on either application and would vote in favour	
Bateman Marion	22/04/20	17.04	Reason how particular application reached business criteria to be deemed urgent for future applications	Both applications require committee determination as they exceed the density / site area thresholds within the council's delegation scheme of 15 No units / 2ha respectively. The applicant has provided sufficient evidence to address at least some of the criteria to prove its urgency for a decision. Please see attached table.				
Bithell Chris	21/04/20	18.2			27/04/20	14.12	Vote in favour of the officer's recommendation of the other application. No 060782 for the regrading of the land in Nant y Gro, Gronant.	
Butler Derek	22/04/20	14.15			22/04/20	14.15	Approves	
Cox Dave								
Davies-Cook Adele	22/04/20	14.02			24/04/20	23.25	I vote in favour of the officers recommendations.	
Dunbar Ian	22/04/20	17.38			27/04/20	10.56	Just to confirm I go along with the decision of the Officers for Approval	
Evans David	22/04/20	16.11			22/04/20	16.11	No objection	
Gay Veronica	23/04/20	15.43	I feel that if the necessary testing was done as a prior condition with the results found to be of an acceptable standard I believe this application can be granted and would be beneficial to the community	For confirmation the officer recommendation is to support the application subject to conditions.	27/04/20	17	In light of the concerns re the second planning application as my view has changed and I would not support the Officers recommendation to refuse as I feel the application should be approved	
Heesom Patrick	23/04/20 24/04/20	16.57 11.19	I am not sure that a principle of urgent need is made out	Both applications require committee determination as they exceed the density / site area thresholds within the council's delegation scheme of 15 No units / 2ha respectively. The applicant has provided sufficient evidence to address at least some of the criteria to prove its urgency for a decision. Please see attached table.				
Hughes Dave								
Hughes Kevin	22/04/20	11.14	7.08 the Council's Contaminated Land Officer raises concerns that we need to ensure material deposited is inert material. Should we perhaps include a condition that clearly states only material from the adjoining site is to be deposited at this particular site?	The land contamination officer has suggested the imposed condition relating to inert material. A further condition could be imposed to state "only material from the adjoining site can be deposited"	26/04/20	11	I would vote with officer's recommendations	
Jones Christine	22/04/20	16.28			27/04/20	10.48	I will vote with officer recommendations	
Jones Richard	21/04/20	18.22	What is the economic impact that is so great that a decision is required through these emergency powers	The decision has already been made that it need to be considered under the urgent process and we are now just consulting planning committee members about the merits of the applications themselves rather than the decision to deal with them on the urgent basis.  Both applications require committee determination as they exceed the density / site area thresholds within the council's delegation scheme of 15 No units / 2ha respectively. The applicant has provided sufficient evidence to address at least some of the criteria to prove its urgency for a decision. Please see attached table.	27/04/20	16.45	I am minded to vote in favour	

## Appendix 4

Lloyd Richard						24/04/20	20.09	Vote in favour of application 060782 under option c) the officers recommendation with the added condition if possible that only material from the adjoining site can be deposited on the land as suggested by Councillor Kevin Hughes
Mullin Billy						22/04/20	11.44	Approves

Peers Mike	23/04/20	14.34	<p>a) Please complete the reason for the Emergency Decision (the paragraph appears unfinished).</p> <p>b) The "Economic Impact to the developer" is quoted as one of the reasons. Wates Construction Ltd is a recognised business partner working with Flintshire County Council. Is a declaration of interest necessary, and is this working relationship a factor in determining that this application should be considered for urgent consideration by the planning committee?</p> <p>c) Section 5.1 of the officer report under Site History, advises a previous application (on this site) is 058304. Reading the report section 1.01 it implies that application 058304 relates to an adjacent site not the land subject to regrading in this application (060782). Please clarify if the site proposed to be regraded in this application is part of the site that was granted permission in August 2018, or not.</p> <p>d) Is the regrading of the land simply not a convenience to "get rid" of the waste from the existing construction site?. Is there any other reason to regrade the existing agricultural land other than use it to conveniently dispose of the waste from a Council partner?</p> <p>e) Please indicate why it is considered acceptable under policy (and which policy) under section 7.05.</p> <p>f) I concur with the concerns of the Council's Contamination Land officer under section 7.08. Rather than a planning condition, members should seek assurance of the impact of depositing the "waste" on the existing agricultural land before permission is granted.</p>	<p>a) Noted to be amended</p> <p>b) This application falls to be determined in accord with established planning policies as Wates are the partners working in conjunction with FCC to assist in progression of SHARP housing programme. It is not considered that a declaration of interest is required in these circumstances. The urgency in determination of the application is based on economic considerations primarily the need to secure the provision of the affordable units within specific timeframes to avoid loss of Welsh Government funding.</p> <p>c) The land to be regraded is adjacent to but does not form part of that forming the site for the residential development permitted under 058304</p> <p>d) The finished floor levels of the adjacent approved housing need to be carefully managed to protect the living conditions of existing and future occupiers. The intention to use the adjacent field which is in Council ownership has always been a consideration. It is a far more sustainable approach to distribute the soil on the adjacent site rather than extract the soil require it to be transported through the village for use elsewhere. Material only becomes waste when it is discarded. When material can be used within an overall scheme for which there is a planning permission, which including adjoining land and it is needed for those overall agreed levels, it is not a waste. In addition, this will significantly reduce vehicle traffic movement through the surrounding residential area, minimising the impact on the environment and local residents.</p> <p>e) A number of relevant policies to determination of this application are generically referenced in paragraph 6.01 of the report but the key site specific Unitary Development Plan Policies taken into account to support the application (subject to conditions) from a policy perspective are STR 10 - the development makes the best use of resources by minimising the production, transport and disposal of resources and waste based around the waste management hierarchy, this includes using the proximity principle, GEN1 - the development harmonises with the site and surroundings and L1 - the development maintains the character and appearance of the landscape.</p> <p>f) Whilst noting the response from the Council's Contaminated Land Officer the suggested condition has been agreed with same Contamination Officer who has agreed it would still provide the mechanism whereby deposit of the material is carefully controlled /managed.</p>	27/04/20	15.16	For Application 060782 I vote in favour of the Officers recommendation
Phillips Neville	22/04/20	14.24			27/04/20	11.32	I am minded to VOTE in FAVOUR of the Officers recommendation
Thomas Owen	23/04/20	13.04	<p>1) I see that the site is classified as improved grassland this doesn't tell us what grade it is now and how it was improved?</p> <p>2) When soil is removed from a building site a percentage will be clay and this will not improve the land, will it be graded.</p> <p>3) Is there a demand for this soil to be recycled and used to reinstate other sites or areas, these are questions that should be asked. If the question can be answered or there are policy that cover the removal of soil I will go with the officers recommendations.</p>	<p>1) There is no formal reference to the Agricultural Land Classification in the submitted documentation although it is understood that fertilisation has been undertaken to improve its quality over time. The proposal is to maintain this existing agricultural land value</p> <p>2) Material from the construction site will include both topsoil and clay. Stripping of topsoil will also occur on the grassland site. Officers have been advised that the contractor will ensure that reinstatement of the site is undertaken in a rational manner so that the replaced clay arisings are covered with replaced topsoil. This is to be secured by a suggested planning condition as referenced in the committee report</p> <p>3) Officers have been advised that there is no demand or requirement for the topsoil to be recycled on other sites.</p>	27/04/20	14.22	I vote in favour of the officers recommendations on application 060782 with the conditions The soil is screened before it is moved on to land
Wisinger Dave							