

Planning Application 060006 - Full Application - Part amendment to layout previously permitted under 046067, to allow for the erection of 19 apartment units in 3 blocks at Flint Working Mens Club, Woodfield Avenue Flint																			
NAME	DATE	TIME	CLARIFICATIONS SOUGHT BY COUNCILLOR	RESPONSE FROM CASE OFFICER	DATE	TIME	RESPONSE												
Allport Mike	21/04/20	16.32			21/04/20	16.32	Support approval												
Attridge Bernie	22/04/20	15.27			22/04/20	15.27	I have no objections or questions to raise on either application and would vote in favour												
Basteman Marion	22/04/20	17.04	For future applications - Reason how particular application reached business criteria to be deemed urgent	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	<p>1) The previous permission was for 15 units. Four of these have already been built and now the applicants are asking for 19 units more on the remainder of the site, making a total of 23 as opposed to the original 15. Is this overdevelopment of the site since it is noted that in terms of density this amounts to nearly twice the density that HSG8 seeks to achieve on a 0.4 ha site.</p> <p>2) It also states that the proposed car parking provision will result in a shortfall of 3 spaces but does not actually state in the report how many spaces they are actually providing so we can better assess the possible impact of this shortfall.</p> <p>3) It is unclear to me how the blocks will be configured around the car park court (a diagram would be useful) and in relation to the units already built.</p> <p>4) Last but not least how many bedrooms will these apartments have and how will these be distributed in each of the blocks?</p> <p>5) The written statement from the developers say that the apartments will be affordable. How will that be secured? Are they for letting at affordable rents or for part sale or both? The photos in the appendices are pretty but I unclear about what they are aiming to show us.</p>	<p>1) Density Policy HSG8 sets a minimum density of 30dph on allocated sites within category A settlements, and the density of development it is acknowledged is nearly twice this figure. The acceptability of this scale of development has been judged not only in numerical terms, but taking into account its impact on existing character within this urban setting and separation distances relative to existing dwellings in proximity to the site.</p> <p>2) Car Parking Provision - The site layout proposes a total of 35 No parking spaces</p> <p>3) Site Configuration Members are able to view all plans via the website for each application. The block plan shows the configuration of the blocks of flats.</p> <p>4) Apartment Distribution</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Block A</td> <td>Block B</td> <td>Block C</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4 No 2 bedroom units</td> <td>4 No 2 bedroom units</td> <td>7 No 2 bedroom units</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2 No 1 bedroom units</td> <td>2 No 1 bedroom units</td> <td>TOTAL 7 No apartments</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL 6 No apartments</td> <td>TOTAL 6 No apartments</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>5) Tenure The site has been promoted as a General Market Affordable Housing Scheme for a mix of 1 / 2 bedroom units for first time buyers. The site benefits from registration on the Help to Buy (Wales) scheme, enabling buyers to secure a 20% shared equity loan from the government. The anticipated pricing will be under £100k. The number of units / site area fall under the thresholds for affordable housing to be secured under Policy HSG11, the applicant choosing to change the scheme from that previously proposed in light of market demand.</p> <p>Photographs Photographs are usually taken prior to Planning Committee however due to lockdown measures officers have been unable to photograph the site. The images from google street view are to try to give members an understanding of the site and the characteristics.</p>	Block A	Block B	Block C	4 No 2 bedroom units	4 No 2 bedroom units	7 No 2 bedroom units	2 No 1 bedroom units	2 No 1 bedroom units	TOTAL 7 No apartments	TOTAL 6 No apartments	TOTAL 6 No apartments		27/04/20	14.12	Thank you for the further information and clarification from the officer concerned which I asked for in relation to the planning application No. 060006 for the erection of 19 apartments in three blocks in Woodfield Avenue, Flint. On the basis of this further detail, and clarification I am now minded to vote in favour of the officer's recommendation.
Block A	Block B	Block C																	
4 No 2 bedroom units	4 No 2 bedroom units	7 No 2 bedroom units																	
2 No 1 bedroom units	2 No 1 bedroom units	TOTAL 7 No apartments																	
TOTAL 6 No apartments	TOTAL 6 No apartments																		
Butler Derek	22/04/20	14.15			22/04/20	14.15	Approve												
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	<p>1) Question re marking bays, how many are allocated to site?</p> <p>2) Only comments I can make regarding the community council, as none are not meeting at present so unless delegated powers cannot offer a response, plus will the community council be consulted/informed re the 106 agreement and asked for their input?</p>	<p>1) It is proposed that 35 No parking spaces to serve the development are provided within the site.</p> <p>2) The legal agreement is required to secure a commuted sum payment in lieu of on - site recreational provision. The community council would not be involved in this process as the agreement is between the council / applicant to secure the required monies</p> <p>No response has been received from the Community Town Council despite the Council being consulted in 2019.</p>	23/04/20	15.43	Support Officer decision, including 6 month clause												

Hession Patrick	24/04/20	11.19	1) I am not sure that a principle of urgent need is made out 2) The application for development at the Woodfield Av site (060006) in Flint raises questions both in that urgent needs context and also because the information available is inconsistent 3) The Woodfield site is an additional site use from a previous proposal which is arguably in conflict with the traffic issues in that area and not satisfactorily dealt with in the report. In this context there was objection from previous members about the impact on a valuable local footpath and these concerns remain. a) Request further such information before determination The report to members confirms a shortage of parking spaces b) The report does not contain any satisfactory traffic assessment with particular concern overlooked about significant traffic management changes in the wider area of the site c) The report advises a dwelling density double what is policy for the area. d) The report fails to advise on constraints about the footpaths in the locality previously a conditions advice in the earlier applications on 2009 e) The report fails to advise as to why a previous application (2008/9) which members were advised had failed to comply with conditions then allowed four dwellings on site gravely prejudicing any further development on site. f) Furthermore the time lag between the original site considerations and the current proposals requires explanation responses required	1) 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. 2) In respect of 060006 – See 1 (above) For clarification the proposal is for a total of 19 No 1 & 2 bed apartments 3) The Site at Woodfield Avenue (060006) previously operated as a working mens' club and this was a factor considered by Highways in support of the application for redevelopment of the site in 2014 for residential purposes. Consideration of this application has been re-assessed from a highway perspective, and there is no objection from the Highway Development Control Manager subject to conditions. For information there is no impact on any adjacent footpaths as part of the application. a) The report does acknowledge a shortfall of 3 No spaces but supports the development having regard to its sustainable urban location. b) The impact on the existing highway network has been considered by the Highway Development Control Manager. The scale of the development and existing highway configuration did not require the submission of a Transport Assessment. c) Policy HSG8 sets a minimum density of 30dph on allocated sites within category A settlements, and the density of development it is acknowledged is nearly twice this figure. The acceptability of this scale of development has been judged not only in numerical terms, but taking into account its impact on existing character within this urban setting and separation distances relative to existing dwellings in proximity to the site. d) there is no impact as part of this application on any footpaths in proximity to the site e) the four dwellings on the site frontage have been constructed relative to the previous permission for 15 No dwellings in 2014. The impact / relationship to these existing units has been carefully assessed recognising the need to provide adequate separation distances to maintain the living conditions of existing / proposed occupiers f) the time lag is explained by the fact that site has been acquired by the current applicant since the previous permission was commenced. In light of market conditions it is proposed to develop the site in a different form to that previously permitted.	27/04/20	16.35	In the above I have received the Advice from you and in terms of the proposals I am not of the view that the recommendation is supportable In general terms all such applications merit a fair consideration in terms of the proportionate need and its relevance to the planning policies which apply In this case the proposals are complex. They are in one sense being argued as a continuation of a previously approved development but it is clear that that is not the case. Moreover the latest information makes it clear that there is in fact here a new developer and that to all intents and purposes this is new application to be judged on its separate merits In deed the first application in 2008 appears to have been subsequently part approved without a committee presentation. It appears that the new application would probably not have succeeded as it now stands. It is accordingly arguably necessary that the changed circumstances for this development require a fresh judgement about its planning merits and its conformity to policy In this regard it is clear that these proposals for the development is of and for a more considerable impact for this catchment area. It significantly breaches density requirements and not misleadingly, nearly so as claimed, but over twice the policy advice, and given that this is now shaped into three blocks, the visual and appearance impact is wholly not in keeping with the catchment area. Moreover in this context the provision of adequate traffic infrastructure is ill conceived. There is clearly insufficient parking provision and poor provision for vehicle access to the occupants and their entries and doorways and dustbins uses In this regard the information provided with the applications lacks clarification over the floor plans for the blocks Some thoughts also have to be about the presentation to committee under the use of its urgency. FCC has under current WG guidance invoked special arrangements for dealing with applications but in this case this site has been under consideration for over ten years and WG has been clear that urgency on the grounds of non de termination does not apply. Commercial interests of speculators is not relevant In this context also I think members should see the details of the pre application engagement and copies of the file notes to be assured that this matter is in line with emergency policies. Noting also that the previous members representations were deeply concerned about local Rights of Way pathways through this site and these do not appear to have been addressed I accordingly do not feel able to support the recommendation and reserve the right to take the concerns further
Hughes Dave							
Hughes Kevin	22/04/20	11.14	Consideration to be given to include a bin store in the conditions should you feel it appropriate	There is no objection from an officer perspective to the imposition of a condition requiring bin store details to be submitted / approved as suggested. This will be included in any planning permission.	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, the applicant has provided	27/04/20	16.45	I am minded to vote in favour
Lloyd Richard					24/04/20	20.09	vote in favour of application 060006 under option a) the officers recommendation
Mullin Billy	22/04/20	11.44			22/04/20	11.44	Approve
Peers Mike	24/04/20	14.34	It would be useful if floor plans were provided with the application (and future applications presented to committee). Referring to this application on the Council's website, floor plans are shown under reference "Amended 03.02.2020 Floor Plans ..." and by clicking on the link the only floor plans that I can see are for only 15 apartments (not 19). (See attached Sheets) The representations from the developer, dated 17th April 2020, advises (in Paragraph 2) that "Flint is in dire need of 1 / 2 bed affordable apartments". Notwithstanding the floor plans only showing 15 apartments I see no 1 bed room apartments proposed in this application, that the developer is so concerned about. Perhaps the developer can be contacted and requested if he would be minded to propose a further amendment to include some 1 bed apartments (in lieu of some of the 2 or 3 bed apartments) based on the developers own concerns, and beneficial to the local community.	The case officer acknowledges and takes responsibility for not updating the relevant plans on the website. This issue is now being addressed and members will be able to view the amended plans on the website. It is confirmed that the proposal is for a total of 19 No apartments distributed as follows: Block A 4 No 2 bedroom units No 1 bedroom units TOTAL: 6 No apartments Block B 4 No 2 bedroom units 2 No 1 bedroom units TOTAL: 6 No apartments Block C 7 No 2 bedroom units 2 No 1 bedroom units TOTAL: 7 No apartments The site has been promoted as a General Market Affordable Housing Scheme for a mix of 1 / 2 bedroom units for first time buyers	27/04/20	15.16	For Application 060006 I vote in favour of the Officers recommendation
Phillips Neville	22/04/20	14.25			27/04/20	11.32	I am minded to VOTE in FAVOUR of the Officers recommendation (without comments)
Thomas Owen	23/04/20	13.04			27/04/20	14.22	I vote in favour of the officers recommendations on application 060006.
Wainger Dave							