

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

## THE CASE FOR INTERESTED PERSONS

### THE CASE

### FOR

### BURTON

### MERE

### FISHERIES

### WRITTEN

### REPRESENTATIONS

#### 14.0 The Case For Interested Persons

The material points were:

14.1 County Councillor David Rowlands (Cheshire County Council) objected to the proposed development as the site was open countryside, providing a green buffer between Deeside and Cheshire. The application was premature, since the local plan had yet to be determined, and did not conform with the conclusions of the Local Plan Inspector. It did not accord with sustainable transport objectives, took good agricultural land, and development would exacerbate the flood risk in the Dee Estuary. (Mr Rowlands written representations are at file ref 23 in Document INQ2).

14.2 County Councillor Tony Cattermoul (Flintshire County Council) objected to the proposed development on three grounds. These were:

i) there was an adequate supply of employment land without this site. In the difficult local economic climate of the early 1990's there was the hope (rather than the expectation) of a larger incoming employer, such as a Japanese car company. The Second Alteration to the Structure Plan had a relevant policy (EMP9) dealing with major development projects but such land was additional to the foreseen need for employment land. This proposal could not provide a site for a major incoming use, (which was what it was always seen by members as providing) since it was to be

subdivided.  
Planning in  
Flintshire was  
development-led.

ii) the land should  
remain in  
agricultural use.  
Its Grade 2 status  
was not contested,  
and the proposed  
development  
would effectively  
use only a  
comparatively  
small proportion  
of the land taken.  
Its use would not  
comply with  
national planning  
policy.

iii) the land  
should be  
designated as  
Green Belt or  
Green Barrier,  
which was the  
most effective  
way to retain the  
land as a green  
and open area.  
The proposed  
development  
would be visually  
very intrusive,  
particularly as  
seen from the  
Cheshire villages.  
It was considered  
that the Members  
who had voted in  
favour of the

application in October 1999 had been unaware that buildings of 23m height were proposed rather than the 6m of the development brief.

- 14.3 County Councillor Patrick Heesom (Flintshire County Council) objected to the proposed development, which failed to reflect recent changes in planning policy particularly in relation to sustainability, and transportation (eg trunk roads review; Reduction of Road Traffic Act). Local Policy was set out in CSPFA, but there was no adopted local plan, and ADLP could have no weight when applied to this site: hence the proposal conflicted with the plan-led system. The Assembly's recently-announced package of transportation investment over the next 5 years produced no new money for the Deeside area. This site would be heavily car-dependant. It would use Welsh capital investment to benefit North-West England rather than Western Flintshire. The site was good agricultural land, visually prominent. Other sites existed, eg Opportunity Site 1, or at Wrexham (which had receive £3m towards improved access to its industrial estate).

