

# Town and Country Planning Act 1990 Section 77 Flintshire County Council Planning Application by Welsh Development Agency

## WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS

The Case                      Conditions  
For                                      and  
Interested                      Agreements  
Persons

### 15.0    **Written Representations**

The material points  
were:

15.1 Some 100 written representations were submitted in respect of the application. All file references are to enclosures in Document INQ2. Some 142 letters of representation sent to Flintshire County Council in response to consultation/ publicity on the planning application are at Core Document 60.

15.2 **The Northwest Development Agency** supported the application (file ref.24). The WDA needed a portfolio of suitable sites to accommodate the needs of modern industry as well as to stimulate the economy with new investment and employment opportunities. Deeside had proved to be an attractive location for investment. The site had good access to the strategic road network, Manchester Airport and a concentration of higher education

institutions. The importance of public transport links was noted. The WDA was urged to investigate a new station on the Bidston-Wrexham line that would enhance links with Merseyside. The application site was of strategic significance and attractive for inward investment. It would complement strategic sites in the North West region and provide employment opportunities for the region's residents if appropriate public transportation links were established.

- 15.3 **Connah's Quay Town Council** welcomed the proposal as a means of improving employment prospects (file ref.2). **Sealand Community Council** had no objection to the application (file ref.3).

15.4 On balance, the **Countryside Council for Wales (CCW)** had no objection to the principle of industrial development (file ref.19). The application site was currently intensively farmed agricultural land the overall ecological value of which was considered to be generally low. The site did not directly impinge on any statutorily designated sites of landscape or nature conservation interest. However, the site was close to the internationally important Dee Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Special Protection Area and Ramsar Site as well as abutting the Inner Marsh Farm SSSI. In this regard, although the proposed deep lake, if appropriately managed, would undoubtedly have conservation interest, it would

not support many of the species for which the Dee was internationally significant. A series of shallow pools/scrapes would be preferred for feeding and roosting.

- 15.5 A number of issues that require to be addressed were identified by **CCW**. These included the need for a condition regarding a hydrological package; a comprehensive mitigation scheme for the water vole; and for securing and managing habitat in Wales to encourage corn bunting. In addition, mitigation proposed in respect of lapwing might not be adequate. All in all, a detailed management plan would be required and more consideration should be given to off-site planting measures. The implementation of a Sustainable Urban Drainage System would be

welcomed.

Suggestions were made in respect of the treatment of public rights of way.

- 15.6 **Cheshire County Council** was concerned (in Document INQ3, and at file refs.80 and 82) that the maximum height of the development would not comply with the terms of the Development Brief (Core Document 2). There would be an intolerable difference in relation to a building 23m in height. The roofline would be almost at the same level as Burton and Puddington. At Shotwick, the difference would be sufficient for the development to dominate the area. Distance from the site and the nature of intervening vegetation would by no means adequately address the severe degree of visual impact.

15.7 In terms of screen planting, 75% of the elevation of a building 23m in height would be open to views after 10 years. This would reduce to 25% at year 25. 50% of a building 10m in height would be screened after 10 years with total cover at 15 years. At 25 years, the screen planting could attain heights adequate to assist partial screening of the roof scape. Possible structures/ building heights greater than 10m would not sit comfortably on a transition type site such as the application site.

15.8 **Ellesmere Port and Neston Borough Council** objected (in Document INQ3) to the principle of the development. A green field site would be used when there were brownfield alternatives. In addition, there were detailed objections

on the grounds of the inadequacy of the proposed screen planting; the lack of provision for the management of landscaping and habitats; the absence of provision for access by sustainable means of transport from the Borough; and the visual intrusion that would be caused by buildings greater than 10m in height.

- 15.9 The former Ince Power Stations site of about 80 ha was a brownfield alternative site if a current proposal for a glass making and bottling plant failed to go ahead. The Roften Area Major Developed Site (14.5 ha) also had potential for employment development. In addition, there was the Stanlow Special Policy Area within which there was estimated to be some 143 ha of land available for development. Other highlighted sites



included Omega  
600 at Warrington;  
Daresbury Park,  
Runcorn; Basford  
East and West,  
Crewe; Wirral  
International  
Business Park; and  
Estuary Business  
Park, Liverpool.

15.10 **Chester City  
Council was  
concerned** (in Core  
Document 60) that  
the landscape  
elements included  
in the proposals  
were inadequate to  
safeguard the visual  
amenities of  
communities in  
Cheshire. The  
Council had been  
consistent in its  
view that even 23m  
high buildings and  
structures would  
have a detrimental  
impact on the  
amenity of  
neighbouring  
villages, which  
would not be  
overcome by the  
limited landscaping  
measures proposed  
by the applicant.  
The application, if  
permitted, should be  
subject to the  
strictest landscaping  
safeguards

15.11 The Flintshire  
Branch of the  
**Campaign for the  
Protection of  
Rural Wales** and  
the Chester District  
Branch of the  
**Council for the  
Protection of  
Rural England**  
submitted a joint  
objection (file  
ref.37). Shotwick  
Road should form  
the northern  
boundary for  
industrial  
development at  
Deeside. The land  
to the north should  
be designated for  
agricultural use;  
also as a Green  
Barrier or Green  
Belt. Similar points  
were made by the  
**Wirral Society** (the  
Wirral Committee  
of the CPRE: file  
ref.83).

15.12 Industrial  
development would  
pose threats of  
pollution or  
disturbance to the  
Dee estuary  
especially the  
nearby SSSI and  
special protection  
wetland. The raising  
of the land and  
other works would

severely disturb wildlife and could affect the area's hydrology. There would be a serious deleterious visual impact and totally inadequate mitigation measures. In addition, traffic congestion would be seriously exacerbated. There were considerable unused brownfield sites. It would therefore be premature to destroy this green field Grade 2 agricultural land on a purely speculative basis. The outcome of the Flintshire Unitary Development Plan would also be prejudiced.

- 15.13 **The Wirral & Cheshire Badger Group** objected to the proposals in principle. There was concern that the development could have a detrimental impact on the local badger population especially during the construction period. The site

presently served as a valuable buffer zone between the badgers to the northeast of the site and the Deeside Industrial Estate. It also provided foraging ground and dispersal routes for the badgers. If permission were granted, mitigation measures would be essential (file ref.97; see also Document WDA27).

15.14 **The Corus Colors Sailing Club** did not object, in principle, to the development. However, there was concern that the future need of the club might not have been taken into consideration (file ref.96: see also Document WDA24).

15.15 **Mr B S Barnacal**, a local ornithologist whose work had informed Mr Lowther's evidence, indicated that the development would be unequivocally detrimental to the success of both breeding and wintering birds (file

ref.32).

15.16 Individual objections had been submitted by a large number of residents of Burton, Puddington, Shotwick and other Cheshire villages. These objections, and those of the other third parties, were principally on grounds considered elsewhere in this report. The likelihood of noise, pollution and increased traffic were of particular concern. In addition, there was felt to be inadequate justification for the proposals. Village communities, agricultural land and the natural and built environments would be seriously harmed by the development