

FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL
PLANNING COMMITTEE 27TH SEPTEMBER 2023

LATE OBSERVATIONS

Agenda No.	Application Number	Proposal & Location	Consultee & Date Received	Observations
6.1	FUL/000489/23 – KS1 – R	Full application - Use of hotel and installation of modular accommodation for a temporary period of up to 7 years as AASC Initial Accommodation Hostel at Northop Hall Country House Hotel, Northop Hall	Technical Note - Transport Assessment Addendum received – 25.09.23	<p>Highways Development Control Response:</p> <p>The premise upon which this statement is flawed is that it only relates to vehicular movements, more specifically, those undertaken by cars i.e. not pedestrians.</p> <p>A brief examination of the comparator sites used to generate trip generation for the hotel suggests that some are not comparable with application site. I do not believe that the site would have generated the level of pedestrian movement indicated by the TRICS data.</p> <p>The premise that vehicular traffic generation can be offset against pedestrian traffic generation is disingenuous. Chester Road is of sufficient width to accommodate vehicular movement whilst the footways do not appear to be. There are a number of locations, in close proximity to the site. where the footway is of insufficient width to provide for more than one person to make use of it at any one time.</p> <p>The application is lacking any form of information that relates to pedestrian trip generation for the proposed use. It is, however, evident that there will be a large number of young men housed on the site with little to do. It is therefore not unreasonable to expect that the Occupants of the site will seek to leave it, either</p>

Agenda No.	Application Number	Proposal & Location	Consultee & Date Received	Observations
			<p>Additional Rights of Way comments 26.09.23</p>	<p>individually or in groups at least once a day.</p> <p>Finally and crucially, no assessment has been made by the Agent of the footways and the ability of the network to accommodate safe pedestrian movement.</p> <p>Rights of Way Response: The agent has suggested a diversion of the public footpath which I have reviewed along with the applicant's comments suggesting temporary stopping up.</p> <p>While I appreciate the application has reviewed the comments and suggested an amendment, unfortunately it doesn't change the original comments. There is no legislation which allows for any route to be temporarily stopped-up (and/or diverted) for a period of 7 years. Any proposed diversion would have to be permanent under current legislation.</p> <p>Furthermore, if the applicant was to propose this as a permanent diversion, we would be objecting on the base of the design being unsuitable and less desirable than the current route.</p> <p>The proposed design would include two dog-legs on the path. These would be directly around the proposed siting of the units and would create blind spots and hiding places, with no natural surveillance.</p> <p>To confirm, we maintain our objection to the proposal at this location the basis that Public Footpath No. 39 would not be safeguarded, and no suitable alternative is feasible.</p>

Agenda No.	Application Number	Proposal & Location	Consultee & Date Received	Observations
			Neighbour comment 20.09.23	Neighbouring residents have requested the members attention is also drawn to planning application 058746 - Replacement of temporary marquee with permanent function suite catering for weddings, conferences etc. The application was refused for the following reason: The proposed extension, by reason of the intensity of the proposed facilities in this part of the site together with lack of inadequate supporting information relating to noise mitigation measures dealing with noise transference from the building and the likely levels of noise and disturbance from amplified music together with noise associated with the buildings users entering and exiting the building to the rear, would result in a significant and harmful reduction in amenity to residential properties adjacent to the site boundary contrary to the requirements of GEN1 General Requirements for Development and T2 Serviced Tourist Accommodation.
6.2	RES/000071/23 - CEM - A	Reserved Matters - Application for Approval of Reserved Matters following Outline Approval 061125 at Plot H4, The Airfields, RAF Sealand South Camp, Welsh Road, Garden City	N/A	<p><u>LPA Comments</u> At paragraph 2.01 suggested Condition 2 shall be amended from: Site levels shall be set at a minimum of 6.0m AOD To Site levels shall be set at a minimum of 5.37m AOD.</p> <p>This reflects the conclusion of the FCA as set out at paragraph 7.40 of the report.</p>
6.3	FUL/000506/23 - CEM - A	Full application - for B1 (b) (c), B2 and B8 employment space, with ancillary B1a office use; associated servicing and infrastructure		

Agenda No.	Application Number	Proposal & Location	Consultee & Date Received	Observations
		including parking; vehicle and pedestrian circulations; creation of new estate road; earthworks to create development platforms; landscaping; creation of drainage features; electrical substation; pumping station, and ecological works at Land at former Corus site, Northern Gateway, Garden City, Sealand		
6.4	FUL/000519/23 – RMH - A	Full application - Demolition of existing building and construction of new industrial units with associated external works at Unit 102, Tenth Avenue, Sealand		
6.5	General Matters - SCB	TPO 345 at Sunnybank, King Street, Mold	Drainage Inspection by A & R Services 22.09.23 (Resubmitted)	<p>A report submitted by the objector included the following assessment:</p> <p>“The purpose of the inspection to identify root invasion of the drains causing damage to property. The inspection was carried out visually above ground and using drain cameras below ground. These inspections showed significant damage to the driveway caused by the roots from the pine trees along with sand, soil and debris in the drain chambers. In my opinion, unless the trees are removed, this damage will increase due to the direction of travel of the roots and furthermore affect the foundations and drains to the property.</p> <p>Officers’ response: This report was very brief with the full text provided above. It was accompanied by two photos of drains that were not supported by a plan</p>

Agenda No.	Application Number	Proposal & Location	Consultee & Date Received	Observations
			<p>Email from Structural Engineer to objector 22.09.23</p>	<p>showing their location at the property. Despite referring to CCTV survey, no evidence is contained in the report that shows root damage, either to the driveway as stated, or the shows the further spread of roots towards the house. In fact, the report indicates that roots are not the cause of damage to the property at present. Given the lack of any definitive survey evidence of root damage, this late submission it is not considered to materially affect the TPO report's contents, considerations or its recommendation.</p> <p>Email to the objector from a structural engineer, the main points of which are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent of inspection limited to visual only, full invasive inspection still required • Cracking noted to external brickwork and corresponding cracks to internal tiled window sill; • Parkay floor to turret room in good condition but sloping to SW corner. Several potential causes for this movement, with most likely being presence of tree roots. • Presence of two large Corsican pines noted in proximity to turret room. Would appear to be the most likely cause. • We would recommend the removal of the trees; • Should you wish to progress this more detailed survey please call to discuss <p>Officers' response: This is not a structural survey of the building, the driveway, the drainage or the extent of the tree roots in relation to the property. The email acknowledges the need for an invasive survey and</p>

Agenda No.	Application Number	Proposal & Location	Consultee & Date Received	Observations
				<p>also refers to there being a number of potential causes, but then only discusses tree roots and does not refer to the other potential causes. Despite concluding that tree roots are the most likely cause, the lack of a full invasive survey means there is no evidence to support the conclusion reached. In these circumstances it is impossible to apply any weight to the email provided that should affect the confirmation of the TPO. Given the lack of any definitive survey evidence of root damage, this late submission it is not considered to materially affect the report's contents, considerations or its recommendation.</p>