

Mrs Catherine G W Allan
Canalbank House
Cadney Lane
Bettisfield
Whitchurch
Shropshire
SY13 2LW
Email: [REDACTED]

08/09/2023

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

Private & Confidential

Dear Appeals Officer,

Planning Appeal - P/2022/0869 East of Cadney Lane Bettisfield Wrexham

I wish to object to the above planning application at the Appeals stage and thank you for the opportunity to do so.

I live in Bettisfield it is a small rural linear village (hamlet) of approximately 150 mixed houses. The first thing to say is that in my opinion this proposed development is far too large for this intended location, the developer states that this is an infill project that will enhance the village but I feel this is utter nonsense, these proposed 9 houses would simply add to an overloaded village, and be completely out of character. Also I believe that the proposed site for the new houses is outside the development boundary ie Unitary Development Plan if this is the case it seems to me it cannot be classed as infill it would simply be a very long ribbon of nine houses running along a large length of Cadney Lane therefore not an infill.

The proposed development is currently what seems to be a well used agricultural field, right up to the hedgerow and Cadney Lane.

Planning Policy Wales

9.3 & 9.32.

Clearly describes infilling of property but in my opinion this proposed development DOES NOT fit the criteria and also fails to meet public transport issues.

It is my understanding that infill is usually used for one or maximum two houses but certainly not nine and not stretching for such a large distance as along Cadney Lane from the Hawthornes to Bank House (Cadney Lane is no more than a small country road, with almost no paths and zero street lighting).

As a small village, it has been stated by both WCBC and NRW that Bettisfield is totally starved of any infrastructure and that this being the case NO future building should take place. Both these official bodies got this so right! Our village is so backward in terms of facilities and infrastructure that it beggars belief... we essentially do not have any.

UDP 1996/2011

I believe the planning application fails the UDP as follows and should therefore be refused at the appeals stage:

1. Fails scale and design layout.
2. Fails on personal and community safety.
3. Fails on not having safe and convenient pedestrian and vehicular access to and from the development, onsite or nearby.
4. Fails due to not being near to sufficient public transport or pedestrian and cycle routes.
5. Fails due to not safeguarding nature conservation, such as the European Great Crested Newt, Water Voles and various protected birds.
6. Fails as part of the development appears to fall within the flood zone contrary to the UDP.

Other hamlets are luckily able to take infrastructure for granted such as schools, street lighting, mains gas, mains sewerage, proper footpaths, shops, pubs, regular daily bus service etc Bettisfield has **NONE** of these things. Put simply we have to haul everything, goods and people, in and out of the village via car as there is NO regular daily bus service (other than the school bus obviously). I believe this proposed development would only exacerbate this already stretched situation to breaking point, particularly as nearly all vehicles have to pass over a very tight humped canal bridge, which is single track only.

For the outline planning application being appealed to highlight 'public transport' is I feel an exaggeration as the village has ONE small bus journey per week only, whereas I feel the application endeavours to describe this as something of a hub of activity. One bus journey per week does not constitute a great transport link for the applicant to suggest that there is a range of means of transport seems pretty inaccurate to me.

GCNs

Regarding the Ecology report I can't understand what the author states, as happily we do most certainly have the European protected Great Crested Newt within our locality. In fact we have had them in our garden as have other residents and some of these sightings have been photographed and reported to WDBC Ecology Department. To be honest, it seems to me that this shows how much time and effort has *not* been spent actually checking out the ecological state of the village, because to state that only one GCN has been seen since 1999 is simply not accurate.

Badgers

Badgers are also occasionally seen within the village and to say otherwise is a not accurate, in fact the land our house sits on was under deep water when badgers apparently breached the canal bank some years ago... the whole area was flooded and we have photographic evidence of this. This obviously goes against the applicant's statement that no historical records of badgers exist.

Other

I am aware of the term NIMBY ("not in my back yard"), I certainly hope I do not fall into that category... it is simply that we as a village cannot cope as it is without adding to our problems. Our narrow country lanes, especially Cadney Lane, were never designed to cope with the traffic that it has to endure and to endeavour to walk (or in my case, [REDACTED]) from one end of Cadney Lane to the other is at times a matter of taking one's life as it is so dangerous, especially as we have no street lighting throughout the village and almost no footpaths or decent grass verge along the entirety of the proposed site.

Whilst there is a through road in the village one side is almost unusable and a lot of villagers do not use it because of its shocking state (this is the road leading to Northwood), which means that in effect we really only have only one road to enter and egress the village, piling even more pressure onto Bettisfield village the main users of Northwood Road are agricultural and commercial vehicles.

There may be no natural ponds immediately nearby but there are certainly private residential ones. Also however, there is a large open wet ditch immediately opposite the proposed site which the ecology part of the planning application appears to have missed, but which I feel it's important Appeals officials are made aware of.

It is also worth mentioning that the planning application related to this appeal indicates that the village has mains drainage **this is totally inaccurate as the entire village is totally devoid of mains drainage!!!**

The planning application related to this appeal states that the proposed development is not a risk to flooding... but then appears to go on to show a number of their planned new houses actually within the flood zone!

There seems to me to be no real sensible plan shown for dealing with the substantial surface water in an area that has NO main drainage despite the question being asked of the applicant on the official application.

The application related to this appeal states quite clearly that foul water will be pumped into nearby bio disc and then discharged into a nearby water course **BUT** earlier in the report it suggests that there is **NO** nearby water course how does this make sense?

To Conclude:

Bettisfield is a small rural hamlet, simply put it is a group of houses and practically nothing else. This proposed development would add pressure onto an already overloaded situation... I cannot emphasise enough the damage I feel that this development would do. This as stated is not about NIMBYism but about things such as the welfare and safety of adults and children, e.g. we simply cannot have children put in more danger (due to increased vehicles) ten times a week by having to walk along the Lane to and from the school bus collection point, nor can we further endanger residents having to traverse along Cadney Lane having to dodge even more private cars and commercial vehicles.

In my opinion this would NOT be an infill, for the size of our village it is a substantial development, which I feel would stretch our minimal resources to absolute breaking point and goes totally against the **NO MORE BUILDING in Bettisfield statement from both WDBC and NRW. The local authorities have on this occasion got this so right.**

Infrastructure is something most people take for granted... we in Bettisfield do not have this luxury as we do not really have any.

For the applicant to state within their conclusion that the planning application complies with both the UDP and also Planning Policy Wales is very baffling to me, because as far as I can see it clearly does not:

1. It states that the site has good access to public transport unless I am missing something, it does not!

2. It states that there is good pedestrian access there is not, there are almost no public footpaths along the Lane.

3. It states that the development will add visual interest to the locality I disagree, it is no more than a very long thread of detached houses thus actually removing the current lovely agricultural views.

Finally:

I believe the planning application related to this appeal lies outside of the Unitary Development Plan - building line as set out by WCBC, and as such should not be permitted on that basis.

Please accept this planning appeal letter of objection/comments.

Thank you for taking the time to read it and may I ask for confirmation of its receipt.

Yours faithfully,

Catherine Grace Wilson Allan