

FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL
PLANNING COMMITTEE
LATE OBSERVATIONS
COMMITTEE DATE: 5th August 2020

Agenda No.	Application Number	Location	Consultee / Date Received	Observations
6.1	061316	Queensferry Campus, Chester Road West, Queensferry	Amendment to report Ramblers Association 17 th June 2020	<p>Recommendation to be altered to read:</p> <p>“To grant planning permission subject to the conditions at para 2.01 of the report and subject to no further adverse comments being received prior to expiry of the requisite statutory period from the date the site notices were erected on site”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal will require significant diversion and upgrading of Public footpath 14 t a shared cycle path which will form part of the Active Travel Integrated Network (INM) - leg SH2/10(0). • If part of a public path is going to be upgraded to a shared cycle route a "cycle path Conversion Order" will be required for the existing section, as well as a diversion/creation order for the new section. • Existing public path (south of buildings) will be kept open until the new "route" is available to north, near the new "Community Hub". Since the path is so well used now, this is absolutely essential. Suggests that a "Grampian style pre-condition" is appropriate, worded on the lines of "No fencing, gates or other obstruction to public passage of existing path 14 shall occur until a new shared use public cycle path has been provided..... (to eg

Agenda No.	Application Number	Location	Consultee / Date Received	Observations
				<p>"standard of DE032/ in accord with drawing.....").....and brought into public use."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Masterplan shows a "hatched section" marked "new public path", but this is discontinuous, and not appropriate anyway - it is to be cycle path and should be a "diversion" for whole length. • "Gate plan and schedule" show K-barriers are proposed at each end of path. I think this is likely to be an extremely popular and busy cycle and walking path at school times, and a single K-barrier is likely to become a "bottleneck" for walkers while cycles negotiate it. Suggests there may need to be separate "gaps"/barriers for both walkers and cyclists to permit free flow. <p>Officer commentary on consultation response:</p> <p>These responses was received during the consultation period but was omitted from the report in error.</p> <p>The diversion of the footpath (and as mentioned in the report possible upgrade to a shared foot and cycle path) is required to facilitate the development and whilst retaining this important route through the site. The diversion of the path and any other work upon it will require consent through separate legislation apart from Planning. This will be undertaken as soon as the planning permission is secured. The Ramblers have suggested a condition protecting the route of footpath 14 until the new diversion is available. The Planning statement mentions that this will</p>

Agenda No.	Application Number	Location	Consultee / Date Received	Observations
			<p>Natural Resources Wales 30th July 2020</p> <p>Councillor Roy Elwyn Roy Jones- Shotton Town Council 4th August 2020</p> <p>Public Rights of Way 5th August 2020</p>	<p>be the case (para 6.5.29) but I consider that a condition would be acceptable to safeguard this.</p> <p>Requests that the following conditions be imposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submission of a Biosecurity Risk Assessment prior to development • If contamination found during construction then remediation strategy submitted, approved then carried out. <p>The Application Form the question about Rights of Way it states, Diversion Extinguishment, are needed. I would object to the Extinguishment of the Public Rights of Way 9 & 14 as they are needed by the Public. I would also object to Diversion Orders which make Public Footpaths 9 & 14 Substantially Less Convenient to the Public.</p> <p>As the application runs over two communities, each path has two different numbers but are essentially single footpaths on the ground. These are:</p> <p>308/9/10 – Public Footpath No. 9 in the Community of West Saltney 303/14/10 – Public Footpath No. 14 in the Community of Hawarden</p> <p>308/11/10 – Public Footpath No. 11 in the Community of West Saltney 303/12/10 – Public Footpath no. 12 in the Community of Hawarden</p>

Agenda No.	Application Number	Location	Consultee / Date Received	Observations
			<p>Matt Georgiou 5th August 2020</p>	<p>The development requires diversions of the public footpaths named above. No development can take place until these footpaths have been diverted.</p> <p><u>In response to The Ramblers Association's comments.</u></p> <p>Generally agree with these comments, a footpath diversion would be required under TCPA, without which the footpaths can not be fenced off. A new diverted route will need to start and end in the same locations as the existing footpath and so the proposal is not adequate in its current state, it would need to extend beyond both car parks in a safe manner.</p> <p><u>In response to Cllr Roy Elwyn Jones' comments.</u></p> <p>Agree that an extinguishment would not be satisfactory as it is a well used route. A diversion would be required for development to take place. The diversion would need to start and end on the line of the existing footpath for it to not be less convenient.</p> <p>“To grant planning permission subject to the conditions at para 2.01 of the report and subject, in the opinion of the Chief Officer Planning Economy and Environment, to no adverse comments being received prior to expiry of the requisite statutory period from the date the site notices were erected on site”.</p>
6.2	060247	Chester Road, Penymynydd	<p>Penyffordd Community Council 4th August 2020</p>	<p>Please could you forward these two points to committee members in lieu of my statement:</p> <p>1. Please do not approve this application without obtaining details of the proposed pumping station - specifically the design, noise specification, HGV access and landscaping.</p>

Agenda No.	Application Number	Location	Consultee / Date Received	Observations
			<p>Cllr David Williams 04th August 2020</p>	<p>2. You should be aware that the largest building on the site, for affordable homes, is relocated to the highest part of the site where the level differences with existing residents is greatest. Is this necessary or reasonable?</p> <p>Redrow have been selling houses off this unapproved plan for over 7 months now, they have no respect for the LPA and process.</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>Item 6.2. 060247 – Request for deferral</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I requested a site visit and Committee decision in my response to the Consultation in October. This could have been arranged before lock down. • I was asked to withdraw my request for a site visit and committee decision in case members refused the application. The fact that this is being considered now is unacceptable given the issues that have existed for the past nine months. I have had two days to deal with this matter that nobody has contacted me about since January. • The planning department considers photographs will be sufficient to view the problems. I disagree. The true impact can only be appreciated by physical viewing and a site visit is essential to fully appreciate the problems. • The scheme has resulted in raised ground levels where new building have encroached on existing ones and closer than statutory guidance requires. The impact is a severe loss of privacy for

Agenda No.	Application Number	Location	Consultee / Date Received	Observations
				<p>neighbours. Negotiations for new fencing are currently under discussion. More will follow if this is approved!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case office and enforcement dispute claims of not building to plan so I request an accompanied check be carried out. • More houses along the site will be impacted in the same way if this is approved and we are concerned about the pumping station and the impact of raised site levels for neighbours. • Nobody is disputing the comments of the statutory drainage body or Inspectors comments. The crux of this is that no design of the pumping station has been consulted on. The structure and function should be subject to this process and has not been. • The pumping station is currently responsible for noise pollution! The comments in the report at 7.13 are a matter of opinion! Resident who live near this pumping station would strongly disagree. • Cond 16 states. <i>No development shall take place until a detailed scheme for the disposal of foul drainage has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The detailed scheme shall identify a suitable point of connection to the public sewer and any necessary improvement within the public sewerage network. No more than 19 dwellings shall be occupied until the agreed scheme has been completed. The developer has continued to build despite conditions not being discharged.</i> • <i>It is also noted that. "In order to discharge this condition, the Applicant has put forward two</i>

Agenda No.	Application Number	Location	Consultee / Date Received	Observations
				<p><i>options. These being via pumped and gravity solutions.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A gravity solution going in a direction away from the village would be acceptable to the community.
6.3	061338	Ysgol Glanrafon, Bryn Coch Lane, Mold	<p>Dwr Cymru/Welsh Water 30/07/20</p> <p>3rd Party Response 30/07/20</p> <p>3rd Party Response 31/07/20</p>	<p>In response to the amended scheme, Welsh Water confirm that there is no objection to the proposal subject to the imposition of a condition with respect to foul flows to be discharged to the public sewerage system at a designated manhole. The condition is omitted from paragraph 2.01 of the committee report, I therefore draw members attention to include the imposition of such a condition should planning permission be approved.</p> <p>With respect to the amended scheme, the objecting party continues to raise the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Visual and residential amenity - Loss of 3 mature trees at the end of the vehicular entrance - Highway safety <p>Further to the amended scheme, the objecting party continues to raise concerns with respect to highway safety, on street parking problems and increased traffic congestion as a result of the proposed development.</p>
6.4	060961	Nant Y Gain, Cilcain	Applicants agent Lettings information 31 st July 2020	<p>Nant y Gain Vocational rentals</p> <p>Bramble Lodge</p> <p>06 April 2019 2 Nights 15 April 2019 4 Nights 03 May 2019 7 Nights 24 May 2019 3 Nights</p>

Agenda No.	Application Number	Location	Consultee / Date Received	Observations
				<p>14 June 2019 7 Nights</p> <p>Badger Lodge 25 May 2019 3 Nights 31 May 2019 7 Nights 14 June 2019 7 Nights</p> <p>Bramble Lodge 28 October 2019 4 Nights 01 November 2019 7 Nights 18 November 2019 4 Nights 29 November 2019 3 Nights 27 December 2019 7 Nights 03 January 2020 3 Nights</p> <p>Badger Lodge 24 November 2019 7 Nights 12 December 2019 7 Nights 28 December 2019 3 Nights 05 December 2019 3 Nights</p> <p>Bramble Lodge 17 January 2020 3 Nights 14 February 2020 3 Nights 21 February 2020 3 Nights 09 March 2020 3 Nights 16 March 2020 4 Nights 20 March 2020 3 Nights 23 March 2020 4 Nights 03 April 2020 7 Nights 17 April 2020 4 Nights</p>

Agenda No.	Application Number	Location	Consultee / Date Received	Observations
				<p>15 May 2020 3 Nights 28 September 2020 4 Nights 27 November 2020 7 Nights 23 December 2020 5 Nights 03 September 2021 7 Nights</p> <p>Badger Lodge 31 January 2020 3 Nights 20 February 2020 3 Nights 24 February 2020 4 Nights 28 February 2020 3 Nights 15 May 2020 3 Nights 23 December 2020 5 Nights</p>