

For your information yesterday I forwarded my objection to this Appeal from my gmail account.

Unfortunately I could not attach my document.

However, I am the author of the attached document. It is clear Mrs Katherine Douglas attached the same document as we live in the same house and share the above email address. Thus our views are parallel and we both vehemently object to substantial development for reasons clearly stated in the document.

I would like to extend the invitation to visit Bettisfield if you are in any doubt as the significant detrimental impact this proposed development would have on the hamlet. I personally would be delighted to walk around with you and point out the significant impact.

I'm sure the tone of this message conveys the importance of this correspondence.

I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Regards Michele Edge

To the Planning Officer


The following points outline the reason and overwhelming evidence for the appeal being rejected.

Planning Appeal

I support the original WCBC REJECTION of the planning application dated 20/09/2022.

The overriding principle is that the Wrexham Unitary Development Plan currently in force clearly shows the land in question is OUTSIDE the development area and that Bettisfield is not suitable for ongoing development.

983152	Bettisfield General	Bettisfield	General Bettisfield	Object	Bettisfield is a very small hamlet with no street lighting, no mains gas, no mains sewerage and no services or facilities, it is simply a group of private dwellings. There is a serious lack of infrastructure and no further building, especially housing, should take place. The roads are in a poor state of repair and there is only one bus a week.
--------	---------------------	-------------	---------------------	--------	---



N.B. Approx site location shown in red

The appeal contains a number of incorrect and inaccurate statements including the following:

Planning Appeal – Appellant: Mr Richard Hall. Agent: Mr Rob Mills

1. Section E. Description of the proposed development.

- a. Applicant states: flooding is not an issue. However the original application from Mr Hall shows at least part of the site is at risk of flooding. Mr Hall is clearly contradicting himself here. This should raise concerns regarding not only this statement but other issues contained in his appeal.
2. **Section K. Appeal Site Ownership Details (part 2). Agricultural Holding Certificate.**
The Applicant states the land is ***not part of an agricultural holding***. However, this land which is part of a larger field (approx. 80 acres), all of which is currently used for growing a crop.

Planning Appeal Statement

This document contains inaccurate and misleading statements which misrepresent the facts. The main points are:

Statement claims: the site is 'central to the village set adjacent to the main highway and mirrors existing development on the opposite side of this principle highway'

Fact: Vcadney Lane is a narrow country lane with no through road' which filters out to rural footpaths. This clearly is not a main or principle highway.

The opposite side of the road has three dwellings which clearly is again a misrepresentation of a 'mirroring'.

Statement 'agrees with the Council's assessment that this is not a limited form of 'infilling'. However the appeal then contradicts itself by claiming 'It is properly represented as infilling development'. I would like to alert that his proposal is for nine houses which is outside the acceptable infilling development.

Statement claims: The development should '....be integrated with existing transport network to help reduce need to travel and encourage alternatives to the car'.

Fact: Residents of Bettisfield are 100% reliant on cars as there are NO facilities and NO other transport alternatives.

Five Year Housing Land Supply

The existing Wrexham Unitary Plan covers this factor and identifies Bettisfield as being unsuitable for any further development.

However the appeal then makes reference to other appeal decisions for guidance. I should point out that these other appeal decisions have no similarities to the Bettisfield Hamlet and in my opinion are irrelevant to the appeal.

Wrexham Unitary Development Plan: The land in question is ***OUTSIDE*** the designated development area and Bettisfield is classified as a 'Teir 5' Hamlet which is unsuitable for further development for reasons well known to the Council but to quote ' ***Bettisfield is a very small hamlet with no street lighting, no mains gas, no mains sewerage and no services or facilities, it is simply a group of private dwellings. There is a serious lack of infrastructure and no further building, especially housing, should take place. The roads are in a poor state of repair.*** '

Site Drainage. We have not received any information from the appellant regarding site drainage. However it is accepted by WBC that the drainage in the proposed area is already incapable of dealing with current high water table levels and rainfall.

It is extremely important that when considering this appeal you are aware the ownership of the drainage is not within the applicants responsibility. Therefore the applicant will be unable to carry out regular maintenance which is essential to prevent flooding to existing dwellings.

The above is a summary of my understanding of the appeal. It is possible there are other factors which I have not addressed however, any other factors will not change my objection of this appeal.

Given the above facts, I support Wrexham County Borough Councils rejection of the original planning application and therefore request the ***APPEAL BE REJECTED.***

I would be grateful if you would notify when the appeal decision is made.

Katherine Sarah Douglas

The Oaks

Cadney lane

Bettisfield

SY13 2LW