

Ms M Allan
Canalbank House
Cadney Lane
Bettisfield
Shropshire
SY13 2LW

8 September 2023

Planning & Environment Decisions Wales
Crown Buildings
Cathays Park
Cardiff
CF10 3NQ

PRIVATE & CONFIDENTIAL

Dear Appeals Officer,

**I would like you to please note my strong objection to the following Section 78 appeal re:
Outline Planning Application - P/2022/0869 - land East of Cadney Lane Bettisfield Wrexham
- 9 detached houses**

I believe that this Planning Application lies outside the permitted building line/Unitary Development Plan as laid down by the WCBC and as such I think it should be refused at this appeal.

I am grateful to have the opportunity to be part of this appeals procedure. This outline Planning Application for the centre of our small village is in my opinion potentially very harmful and even potentially dangerous to the village! Also unless I am missing something it seems to be factually incorrect in various ways.

I think it is totally incorrect to suggest that such an application would benefit the village. The village is simply a group of mixed houses with virtually no infrastructure, so how would more houses benefit it? It would just mean that an additional 9 houses would actually add even *more* pressure and strain onto a village which has a very poor infrastructure (so poor in fact that it has been noted by WCBC).

Bettisfield village has no services and as such the infrastructure is almost non-existent, such as **no mains gas, no mains sewerage, no street lighting, barely any public transport, no shops, pub, school, etc, etc.** It is just a number of houses situated within the country, that's all! Also I think it should be noted that the small country lanes leading to and from the village are narrow and in a very poor state of repair and at times feel very dangerous and certainly not fit to walk along. I have two little dogs and it can totally feel like you take your life in your hands every day going for a dog walk! I just think that to consider increasing the number of private vehicles via this development would be seriously dangerous.

Mains Drainage: I suppose it would be comical if it was not so serious, that the author of the planning application seems to state that the village has mains drainage! **Clearly Bettisfield does NOT!** Frankly, we appear to have an almost daily septic tank emptying service within the village with the resulting noise and foul odour that accompanies such activity precisely *because* every household has a type of septic tank (or the like) installed, as there is **NO** mains drainage available here!

Watercourse: The application clearly states that there is no nearby watercourse... which I can't understand, as there is a deep open wet ditch almost immediately opposite the proposed site?

Run off Surface Water: As far as I could see, this was not mentioned at all in the application! Even though the application form asks this specific question, the applicant seems to have just decided NOT to answer the question... why? Especially considering that I myself would assume there would be a serious volume of water produced from this development, onto a part flood zone and onto a green field which slopes towards Cadney Lane, which if flooded would I think cut off part of the village.

'Infill'? The proposed development of 9 detached houses versus the existing housing numbers means that it would be an addition of approximately 6%. To me, this is *not* an infill but a sizeable increase to the housing stock within a small rural village, one that is already in dire need of major infrastructure improvements! Also, the rules state that building infill should be kept to 1/2 houses, which is way less than 9! The site also **lies outside of the unitary development boundary and therefore again I cannot see how it can be classed as infill, as it runs alongside an open agricultural field!** This is a line of 9 large detached houses and garages that stretches hundreds of yards and therefore I don't think it can be considered infill!

Planning Policy Wales - 9.3/9.32: Clearly states about infilling. As far as I can see, the proposed development does not fit the criteria. Also, I think the development fails to meet public transport issues.

Siting: Again, this development does not constitute an infill in my view, nor do I think is it in keeping with the established pattern of development as per the UDP *and* as far as I can see it also does not meet the criteria within the UDP policy!

Road Safety: I am very concerned about road safety as we have virtually no footpaths within the village. Obviously this means that people living within the new development would have to walk along the road on Cadney Lane, and worse still school children living at the new development would have to walk along Cadney Lane on the road itself to catch the school bus each morning. I think that this would be highly dangerous, as the lane is narrow and not in a good state of repair. Also it should be noted that there is **no** street lighting making walking even more dangerous, nor are there many proper verges meaning that pedestrians have no option but to just stand on the side of the road to allow traffic to pass. I think this is a serious accident waiting to happen.

No Regular Public Transport: Despite the authors of the planning application endeavouring to show otherwise, there really isn't what I would ever call a **daily/decent regular bus service (other than the school bus) at Bettisfield, making a car pretty necessary for journeys to and from the village.** So to add even more cars (via this development) would, I think, be a really bad idea, as it would presumably mean adding more pollution to our environment. Other than the school bus, at best we have one mini bus per week and this just to Wrexham - and this in the year 2023! I would guess that 99% of journeys to and from the village are via private car. For the applicant to suggest that there is a RANGE of transport to and from the village is rather mystifying to me, unless of course they are including private vehicles, which I assume they are not...?

Previous Failed Planning Applications: I have successfully raised objections to previous Planning Applications simply because I think the village cannot cope as it is, without adding to the population and vehicle numbers. This has also been strenuously and quite rightly noted by the authorities within the **WBC UDP** and also by **NRW, who have both clearly stated that the**

infrastructure is so weak within Bettisfield that NO further building should be allowed within the village!

Guidance Note 13: In my opinion this clearly shows the areas where this application fails to comply.

Policy PS4: In my opinion, the planning proposal totally fails on this policy, and I think Guidance Note 13 for the aforementioned describes quite clearly the areas where this is the case.

Ecology: The application states that there are no badgers within the vicinity, but I have seen badgers myself! I also have a photograph in my home of the village being flooded some years ago, where badgers apparently burrowed into the canal bank causing the collapse of the canal bank!

Protected Species: As far as European-protected Great Crested Newts are concerned, they live and thrive quite happily in Bettisfield! To say that none have been recorded since 1999 is incorrect, we have actually had a few within our garden! As have some other residents, some sightings of which have been reported to the ecology department at WBC.

Also it should be noted that the person carrying out the ecology report didn't as far as I could see mention that they had checked for GCNs at what I believe is the 'wrong' time of the year, i.e. very nearly into September. It is my understanding that the correct time to do such surveys of GCN population is March to June, which is the breeding season. We know this because we live alongside and want to look out for and help protect this endangered species.

The hamlet also hosts water voles, which I think are also a protected species. As far as I could see, the application mentions nothing of this.

Regarding both Fieldfare and Redwing, it is my understanding that both of these birds are present within Bettisfield and within the proposed development site. It should be noted that both these species are fully protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.

Planning Statement: To be honest, I do not agree with the description of the proposed development as an 'infill' as it would stretch for hundreds of metres (and in my view would be a massive blot on the landscape). **In my opinion the proposal goes against much of the UDP, as follows:**

- a. It is not near [good] public transport or pedestrian and cycle routes.
- b. I think it fails the design and layout.
- c. I do not see how it has particularly safe and convenient pedestrian and vehicular access to and from the development site, on-site or nearby.
- d. I do not see how it has personal or community safety at the heart of the development.
- e. I cannot see how it fits with safeguarding sites of nature conservation, i.e. GCNs, Water Voles, Redwing, Fieldfare.
- f. I can't see how it ensures that the development does not result in or is subject to flooding, in fact unless I am looking at it wrong, **two or three of the new houses are actually shown sitting within a flood zone according to the plan!!**

As stated earlier the only 'real' way of entering or leaving the village is by car as we have no regular daily public transport (other than the school bus). I really think we ought not to increase the number of private vehicles by allowing this proposal to go ahead, via this appeal.

Finally: Bettisfield is a small rural village with, to be honest, an appalling (lack of) infrastructure which in my opinion is incapable of sustaining any further increase in population. It is no more than a group of houses in a linear setting.

There is mainly only the same one way in and out of the village, as Northwood Road is so very bad many of us find it almost unusable, apart from for commercial and agricultural transport. There are virtually no public footpaths, thus making walking along Cadney Lane, etc. feel treacherous. Combined with **zero** street lighting I think it truly feels a dangerous place to walk along and there have been numerous near misses.

We currently have very few services/facilities within the village and I feel like it barely copes with the present number of residents. I simply do not see how it could cope with any additional influx.

Almost all people movement and consumer goods (including food) have to be brought in by private car and commercial vehicle.

In my opinion, I feel there are a number of inaccuracies within the application that is the subject of the appeal, such as:

● **Great Crested Newts: contrary to the idea they were last seen years ago, they've actually been seen recently by numerous residents on numerous occasions, in fact I think they seem to thrive in Bettisfield**

● Contrary to the application under appeal, badgers *have* been seen within the location and have history here

● It appears to state that the village has mains drainage when it does not

● I would strongly disagree with the idea that there is a decent bus service, as other than the school bus there is just one mini bus on a Monday only, for a two hour visit to Wrexham

● It appears to say no nearby watercourse, but unless I am missing something, there is a deep open wet ditch almost directly opposite the proposed site...?

Finally, UDP and Planning Policy Wales: Item number 9 within the applicant's conclusion states that the application is in compliance with the UDP & PPW, but I'm really not sure that this is the case, because for example:

● It states that the site has GOOD access to public transport, but I do not see how this is the case...?

● It states it has good pedestrian access, but I do not think it does

● It states that the development will add visual interest to locality, but I strongly disagree that it would do so

I hope that my comments/objection letter against this appeal stage will be read carefully as I feel passionately about Bettisfield. I would like to stress that I am not a NIMBY in any way but I just think that this proposed development is totally inappropriate on so many levels for this location.

Finally, could I please ask that you confirm you have received this letter from me, via the email address I am sending it from? Thank you.

Kind regards,

Ms M Allan