

Directorate of Environment & Regeneration
Flintshire County Council
County Hall
Mold
Flintshire
CH7 6NF
FAO: Emma Hancock
Re Planning Application No: 046818 relating to 'Compound Site' to the west of Broughton Retail Park in Broughton, Flintshire

I wish to object to the planning application for the erection of a 1347 m2 supermarket and a 467.2 m2 non-food retail outlet on the Green Buffer/Barrier Land to the west of the Broughton Retail Park opposite Carphone Warehouse (known as the 'Compound Site') lodged with Flintshire County Council by Aldi on 15 October 2009 on the following grounds:-

1) This area is designated as Green Buffer/Barrier Land.

2) This area was designated by Flintshire County Council as Green Barrier in the initial draft of the Flintshire Unitary Development Plan (UDP) however, representations for re-designation of this land to Brownfield for housing development were received from Development Securities PLC. The Welsh Office Inspector considered these representations and the re-designation of this land is currently at the beginning of the public consultation stage. The deadline for receipt of the Public Representations has just closed and Flintshire County Council now has to consider the public representations that have been made. This means that the considerations of Flintshire County Council to the public objections made will not have been considered before the end of the Consultation Period relating to this Planning Application made by Aldi Stores Ltd.

Therefore this area of land must be considered as Green Buffer/Barrier land for the purposes of consideration of the current planning application and as such a commercial development on this site is clearly contrary to the agreed land designation.

3) This planning application is obviously not in line with the representations made to the Welsh Assembly Inspector by Development Securities PLC requesting the re-designation of the 'Compound Site' for housing. Further more, as stated above, whilst the UDP has currently been recommended for acceptance in its entirety by Flintshire County Council the public consultation process has not been finalised and Flintshire County Council have still to consider the public objections to the re-designation of this site and reach a conclusion as to whether the land should remain as Green Buffer/Barrier or be re-designated for housing.

Aldi Stores Ltd were aware of the history of this area of land and the representations made by Development Securities PLC to the Welsh Assembly Inspector and have clearly demonstrated their complete disregard for land allocations both by purchasing of this area of land and by lodging their current planning application. Flintshire County Council should not permit developers to ignore the restrictions on areas of land as these are put there for good reason.

4) The terminology, 'Compound Site', used when referring to the Green Barrier land to the west of Broughton Retail Park opposite Carphone Warehouse is misleading as it suggests that planning permissions have been given for the use of the land as a compound and that it has been developed accordingly. This is not the case.

In 2007 Flintshire County Council granted permission for the Subcontractors engaged by Tesco to constructing the Mezzanine floor in the Broughton store to use the area of land for the erection of temporary prefab offices and the storage of vehicles and materials without holding any consultation with neighbouring residents.

Once residents became aware that the site was again being used by Subcontractors they made formal representations to Flintshire County Council about the land being used for this purpose.

Flintshire County Council failed to consult with residents over these various matters or the disturbance being caused to residents by the Sub-contractors using the site. Resident had

and do still have concerns about precedents being set by the use of land in this unorthodox manner.

Flintshire County Council told residents that they had not needed to consult neighbouring residents as the permission to use the site had only been granted on a temporary basis. Flintshire County Council also state that no precedents could be made from this use of the land as only temporary permission had been granted to the developers.

5) Aldi Stores Ltd have purchase this land in an attempt to circumvent a clause in the planning permission granted in 1998 by Flintshire County Council under planning application No:00242 for Phase 1 development of the Broughton Retail Park. This clause stated that Tesco would be the only retail outlet on the Broughton Retail Park who were allowed to sell food products (other than the various coffee shops). The area of land that has been purchased by Aldi lies outside the Broughton Retail Park boundary yet is directly adjacent to the Retail Park so an Aldi store built on this land would obviously be able to resource the retail customers visiting the Broughton Retail Park.

Would it not be more correct for Aldi Stores Ltd to challenge the permissions granted by Flintshire County Council with the monopolies commission rather than attempting to persuade Flintshire County Council to permit retail development on an area of Green Buffer/Barrier land?

6) Flintshire County Council have recently granted Development Securities planning permission to expand the Broughton Retail Park within the designated boundaries of the Retail Park and there are at present a number of empty units on the Retail Park. It would therefore seem reasonable for the public to expect Flintshire County Council to ensure that all the empty units on Broughton Retail Park are filled and that the recently agreed new commercial development sites within the Broughton Retail Park boundaries are fully developed before any consideration is given to permitting any retail development outside the Broughton Retail Park boundaries.

7) Broughton Retail Park is currently surrounded by link roads separating the commercial area of the Retail Park from housing. Agreeing to the planning application made by Aldi Stores Ltd would allow commercial developments to spill over into the residential area of Broughton.

8) If this development is permitted the original planning permissions granted to the developers of the Broughton Retail Park would have been ignored. The original planning permissions identified that a Green Barrier needed to be constructed between existing housing and the Broughton Retail Park to screen local housing from the disruption of the Broughton Retail Park. Indeed residents in existing housing were given large extension to their gardens of up to 40 feet and a planted bund was constructed at the end of these large gardens. Further housing was constructed on Simonstone Road after the completion of the Broughton Retail Park with the plans identifying that these houses would benefit from the same level of screening from the Broughton Retail Park by way of the planted earth bund and the area of land running between this bund and the link road. This is still to be accomplished by the Council.

If the 'Compound Site' is developed the original protection to housing built into the original planning permissions for the Broughton Retail Park will have been breached.

9) Currently the road networks around the Broughton Retail Park struggle to cope with the volume of traffic that visits, especially at certain times of the day when this is compounded by workers travelling to and from the Airbus factory and this is without the planned extension to the Broughton Retail Park, for which planning permission has already been given. Permitting Aldi to develop on the land directly opposite the main entrance to the Broughton Retail Park would further heighten the traffic problems in this area of Broughton.

10) Due to the current economic climate Development Securities PLC is not developing the new development sites they have secured within the Broughton Retail Park boundaries however these will be developed on the future bringing an increased number of visitors to the Broughton Retail Park. This will make the sole pedestrian crossing for Broughton

residents across the Broughton Retail Park Boundary Road even more inadequate and will put Broughton Resident's even more at risk when crossing the roads around Broughton. If the Aldi Stores Ltd development were permitted, any resident approaching the retail park from Chester Road would have to cross the entrance for the Aldi development to reach the traffic crossing. The installation of another traffic crossing nearer to Chester Road would not be practical as it would cause untold chaos to an already overloaded road network. I would ask Flintshire County Council to give serious consideration to the safety and welfare of Broughton residents.

11) A development of this nature would cause a great amount of disturbance to local residents not to mention the eyesore to the properties in the immediate vicinity of the development.

Noise disruption:

- There would be a significant increase in road noise in close proximity to housing.
- There would be constant noise from visitors to the store at all hours of the day, seven days a week
- The number of car parking spaces detailed on the Aldi planning application would mean that local residents would constantly be disturbed by manoeuvring vehicles at all hours of the day, 7 days a week. A large open car park like this would attract youngsters to the area after the stores/units had closed causing security risks and bringing noise to local residents throughout the day and night.
- The noise of extraction fans which would run constantly 24 hours a day.
- Reversing alarms of delivery lorries manoeuvring together with the associated noise from delivery bays which are shown on the plans as being directly adjacent to the existing houses. Any deliveries would take place outside store opening hours meaning that there would be no respite for local residents from noise emanating from this site.
- Noise throughout the day and late into the night from bottles and rubbish being put into skips which would be sited at the back of the developments close to houses.
- The current plans submitted by Aldi suggest that the 'earth bund' separating the residential area adjacent to the proposed development site is wider than it actually is at 26 Simonstone Road. This is completely misleading and is completely out of scale and has been done deliberately to give a false impression of separation there would be between the retail development and the residential area.

- The current deciduously planted earth bund was not designed as a barrier against noise from the current Retail Park let alone a retail development directly adjacent to the immediate housing estate and in the winter the deciduously planted earth bund fails to provide even a visual barrier as the trees all shed their leaves.
- The proposed site of Aldi development is quite simply too close to an existing housing development.

Eyesore

- Nearby housing would overlook the working areas of the store i.e. the extraction fans, the rubbish sites, the loading bays which would be set against the neighbouring residential properties.
- The existing earth bund to the area is planted with deciduous trees and therefore provides no screening in the winter
- Whilst the houses directly adjacent to the site have a gable end against the proposed development site this does not mean that the site cannot be seen from front or back windows of these houses and all the housing on the opposite side of the street looks directly onto the site in question.

12) The planning applications also refer to the construction of a non - retail outlet. It is difficult to make specific representations against this part of the application as it is so non specific.

However the issues of the status of the land and that any commercial developments of this land would be in direct contradiction to this equally valid for this part of the planning application as they are for the supermarket.

13) It is also relevant that Flintshire County Council have turned down a number of planning application for much smaller scale Commercial Developments on this area of land in the past.

14) The proposed development of retail and commercial properties so close to housing raises serious concerns for the safety for local residents and their properties, given that the only separation of the residential area from the commercial area and the large numbers of people it would attract would be a narrow earth bund.

Flintshire County Council's expectation for the area of land in question, on agreement to the planning permissions for Broughton Retail Park, was that the area would be landscaped a visually attractive entrance/exit to the Broughton Retail Park. I would ask that Flintshire County Council now take steps to ensure that this is achieved.

I would ask that Flintshire County Council now bring pressure on Aldi to withdraw their current planning application on this site and to purchase a site in the local area that has been designated for retail development.

The application must be withdrawn as it contravenes all of the above.

Plus

The "Health and Safety" factor behind any Hotel is always in doubt but in such a position next to residential property would certainly be a danger.

There is also extensive protected wildlife living in the area which it would be unlawful to damage.