

FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL
PLANNING COMMITTEE
LATE OBSERVATIONS
COMMITTEE DATE: 28th October 2020

Agenda No.	Application Number	Location	Consultee / Date Received	Observations
6.1	060220	New Brighton Road, New Brighton, Mold		
6.2	060855	Woodside Cottages, Bank lane, Drury	<p>MacBryde Homes (Applicant) 27th October 2020</p> <p>Councillor Peers 28th October 2020</p>	<p>Draft Unilateral Undertaking received to secure tenure of Affordable dwellings and to ensure that they are retained as such in perpetuity.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">***</p> <p>Following questions raised by local residents, the Local Member seeks clarification that a site notice was erected to confirm the amended plan, and to check whether two specific addresses are shown as having had a notification sent if applicable.</p> <p><u>Officers response:</u></p> <p>A full re-consultation was carried out on the 20th July 2020. This includes sending new consultation letters to all parties previously consulted (as well as anyone else who has expressed an interest on the site through the previously run consultation process). This included the two addresses mentioned.</p> <p>I can confirm that one of the addresses queried sent in a response to the amended details on the 10th August 2020.</p>

Agenda No.	Application Number	Location	Consultee / Date Received	Observations
6.3	061229	Marwin, Dolfechlas Road, Rhydymwyn	Cllr W O Thomas 23.10.20	I have a number of objections , This dwelling has had previous extensions, this application will take it over 150% which is well over our 50% policy. The new application is mainly on the front of the property, going well beyond the line of the existing dwelling , effecting their light.
6.4	060372	Brynsholyn, Cefn Road, Cilcain		
6.5	061154	Plas Aney, Ruthin Road, Mold	Mr Howard White Chair, Flintshire Footpaths Ctte, Ramblers Cymru 22 nd October 2020	I have seen the Officers Report prepared for the Sept 30th Meeting, and I am aware that application was deferred until next meeting on 28 October. I am pleased that the officers are recommending refusal on policy/Green barrier grounds, and I fully support the reasons given. There is however one aspect that seems to have been inadequately covered - that of "Active Travel". The application is a fully detailed submission and therefore detailed layout issues are relevant, even if refusal is proposed primarily on policy grounds. The layout makes no provision whatsoever for any form of Active Travel; indeed the layout would discourage it! (There is only a passing mention of "improving path 7") There are 2 clear "desire lines" for movement on foot/bicycle: 1. From the whole site to the Town centre/schools etc via Ruthin Road (north side pavement is an Active Travel route); 2. from the upper part of the site towards Lon Cae Del and then via footpath Mold 7 to Clayton road (for hospital, school, church etc). Neither of these is catered for: the only pedestrian exit is via the estate road at west (upper) end of frontage (even though there is an "obvious" route downhill towards the culvert over the stream and the old field gate in south east corner of site). (I appreciate point 2 above would involve land outside the

Agenda No.	Application Number	Location	Consultee / Date Received	Observations
				<p>application site, but in case of any re-submission this should be mentioned in the refusal now so it can be dealt with by land negotiation.)</p> <p>Welsh Government policy is currently favouring Active Travel, and this would seem to be a suitable application to include an additional reason of refusal that Active Travel provision is inadequate in current layout.</p> <p>In the event of an appeal this can then be considered by the Inspector.</p> <p><i>Officer Response:</i> <i>It is unreasonable to suggest that “The layout makes no provision whatsoever for any form of Active Travel ; indeed the layout would discourage it!” Active Travel requirements have been discussed with Streetscene colleagues and the developer during the preparation of the highway response.</i></p> <p><i>Provision of off-road cycle routes within the confines of residential development is generally not required; cycle use of slow speed residential roads being generally accepted. The development proposals include full footway provision and includes pedestrian and cycle linkages between cul-de-sacs running north/south on the western side of the site. The provision of an additional shared use link across the public open space to the south east of the site would marginally reduce travel distances for some but lack of such a route is considered insufficient justification to recommend refusal of the application.</i></p> <p><i>The existing footways alongside Ruthin Road, between the site and Town Centre, have been deemed appropriate for pedestrian use and are included on the map of existing Active Travel Routes. Footpath no.5 is identified on the Integrated Network Map as a pedestrian improvement route but there are no proposed cycle improvement routes in the vicinity of the site.</i></p>

Agenda No.	Application Number	Location	Consultee / Date Received	Observations
				<p><i>Footpath no.5 runs parallel to the eastern boundary of the site but as identified by Mr White, there is an intervening strip of land in third party ownership. This strip of land (that is not within the developer's control), prevents the provision of a direct access from the north eastern part of the site or the delivery of any significant footpath widening or other improvement work. Discussions with Streetscene colleagues suggest that the path is adequately surfaced; developer deliverable improvements are limited to the provision of street lighting.</i></p> <p><i>On account of the above, it is considered that there is little justification to include active travel provisions as a further reason to refuse this application. The reasons to refuse are set out clearly and have concentrated on the principle of development being wholly unacceptable in this location. These are the issues that any subsequent appeal would address, and any reason to refuse that are included within the notice that could be overcome by way of amendments would be removed and surrendered by the Council at the request of the Planning Inspectorate.</i></p>
6.6	061248	Spectrum Home & Garden Centre, Wrexham Road, Cefn-Y-Bedd		
6.7	061230	Lluesty Hospital, Old Chester Road, Milwr, Holywell	Holywell Town Council 21 st October 2020	<p>Please note the following comments from Holywell Town Council members –</p> <p>Members support this development in principle, subject to the necessary highways regulations being adhered to. Members also wish to stipulate that measures should be taken to secure the road safety for traffic and pedestrians along Old Chester Road which does not have the infrastructure currently to deal</p>

Agenda No.	Application Number	Location	Consultee / Date Received	Observations
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • garages are still used by residents • land is contaminated • overdevelopment of the site which would have a detrimental impact on living conditions of occupiers of existing dwellings • proposal does not meet identified demographics in locality and is no longer intended to meet the needs of Mostyn residents as initially advanced • inadequacy of access /egress to serve the development • conflict of interest in submission /determination of application by Flintshire County Council. <p>Response - Noted</p>
6.9	061489	300 Recycling, Deva Industrial Estate, Sandycroft		