



Bernard P & Michele S Winstanley
Kirkham House
High Street
Brymbo
Wrexham
LL11 5BL

7th April 2018

The Planning Inspectorate
Crown Buildings
Cathays Park
Cardiff
CF10 3NQ

Dear Sir or Madam

**RE: Government Ref/Planning Inspectorate Ref: H6955/A/18/3195522
Wrexham Planning Ref: P/2017/0319 (Section 78 Appeal)
Demolition of Existing Structure and Erection of 9 Affordable Homes/Apartments
with associated parking and access – English Methodist Chapel (Engedi), High
Street, Brymbo**

We are writing to object to the appeal made on this local planning application.

First of all, the developer does not appear to know the name of the Chapel that they are demolishing. The English Methodist Chapel is still in operation in Brymbo and has not been sold and is not, to our understanding currently for sale. The property to which this planning application refers is the "Engedi" the Welsh Presbyterian Chapel. Perhaps the developer should be informed that they are using the incorrect name.

We believe the Education Levy is extremely important for the local area, and as all recent and future developers must comply with this levy, we cannot see anything about this particular development that would convince us that an exception should be made on this occasion.

There is a real need for a new school in the village and we assume that "affordable housing" means housing for families, although we fail to see that these two bedroom apartments can actually be classed as suitable for families. However as "affordable housing" and with two bedrooms, then the assumption that children may be in residence would therefore mean that the developer should in fact be responsible for the education levy.

We have previously objected to this development due to parking issues which will clearly arise if these nine apartments are allowed to go ahead as originally planned. It is clear that the developer does not meet parking standards as specified in LPG16 (two parking spaces

for each 2 bedroomed apartment). Parking is already difficult on High Street, and this development would cause serious problems for existing residents.

The height of the building along with the size would severely affect residents in 1 Gwalia.

While we understand the developer's financial concerns regarding profitability outlined in the Appeal, perhaps a smaller development of houses similar to those on Gwalia would result in smaller number of residences and hence a smaller education levy fee. It should not be that a developer's costs are reduced to the detriment of the education system.

We hope you will take these comments into consideration when reviewing this Appeal.

Yours faithfully


Bernard P Winstanley


Michele S Winstanley