

Mr & Mrs M Rogers

Old Bank Buildings
5 Well Street
Cefn Mawr
Wrexham
LL14 3AE

10 April 2018

The Planning Inspectorate
Crown Buildings
Cathays Park
Cardiff

Your ref: H699/A/18/3198071

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing on behalf of

Martyn & Ellen Rogers	Old Bank Buildings
The owner	4 Cambrian Buildings
.....	3 Cambrian Buildings
Mark & Helen Brimfield	2B Cambrian Buildings

With reference to the appeal submitted by Robert Dewey, on behalf of Darren Smith, regarding the erection of a 3 bedroom property at 5 Bank Cottage, Waterloo Place, Cefn Mawr, Wrexham (planning ref: P 2017 0649), we wish to make the following representation and strongly object to the approval of the planning application, requesting that the refusal be upheld.

The area of land between the rear of our property, Old Bank Buildings, and the low boundary wall leading to the proposed development site, is currently the subject of legal action.

My wife and I own this land and the dwelling house on it (referred to as Bank Cottage, 5 Bank Cottage/s or simply, The Cottage).

The appellant's wife, Mrs Rebecca Smith, and her father, Mr Trevor Alan Watkin, are claiming Mrs Smith owns it. However, she only owns the bottom block paved area, ie the proposed development site.

On the initial application, the plans submitted indicated Mr/s Smith owned the entire site; the cottage, proposed site and indeed our property, Old Bank Buildings. We fail to believe this was a simple error but a deliberate act to deceive Wrexham Council planning department. This was acknowledged by Mr Philip Forster following our initial representation. It also caused my wife and I stress and inconvenience as we needed to prove ownership by way of producing our deeds and relevant documentation.

The development site (former drive area and garage for our property) was never intended to be divided up between our property and the proposed dwelling, as indicated by Mr Dewey, and cannot in anyway be described as a vacant site. Both claims are erroneous and a “play on words” to assist his appeal.

Mr Dewey suggests the resolve to Reason 1 (access) is to provide 2 parking spaces. This was always the intention, as per the proposed site plan received 02/08/2017. I fail to understand why, if it was refused, is he now using it as an argument in his appeal. Although I fully understand and appreciate Mr Dewey’s comments regarding the Highway Authority’s refusal recommendation, the width of the roadway must be taken into account. The issue is regarding another exit on to the roadway, not the added traffic. Please note, the derelict property, no.3 Cambrian Buildings, has recently been purchased and is currently undergoing complete renovation, resulting in an existing opening to the roadway now being in use.

The reference made to the proposed building materials is irrelevant as we are in a Conservation area and this would have to be adhered to.

The proposed build will be a complete invasion of our privacy, preventing peaceful enjoyment of our properties.

Mr Dewey makes reference to the oblique angle regarding the windows minimising any loss of privacy. It is stated that the suggested design is such that the gable ends are facing our existing buildings. This is purposely mentioned to help minimise any breach of privacy. However, 7 of the 10 windows proposed are sited in the gable ends!

In conclusion, the development of the existing garage into a residential property offers no benefit to the local area.

The reference made to the Council’s “gap sites” is totally irrelevant as this proposed site is not one of these; it is a drive area at the bottom of a garden.

There are no similar arrangements along Waterloo Place, whereby a house is built in another’s garden/drive.

The proposed dwelling would totally encroach on our privacy, prevent the peaceful use of our properties and simply be overcrowded.

Yours sincerely,

Martyn Rogers

Ellen Rogers

Mark Brimfield

Helen Brimfield

Owner No.4.

.....

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Godfrey, Sophie](#)
Subject: Re: H699/A/18/3198071. 5 Bank Cottage, Cefn Mawr, Wrexham
Date: 20 April 2018 10:17:00

Good morning Sophie

I have posted the signed hard copy of our objection letter today.

Just a few questions, sorry!

On the initial Planning Appeal Form, Mr Smith refers to the site address as 5 Bank Buildings which is incorrect.

He also claims this address of the site is the same as his address. This is incorrect unless this refers to the address of the initial application. Nobody lives at the site address and Mr Smith hasn't lived in the cottage since 2014.

The Press Advert states the site address is 5 Bank Place, this is incorrect and misleading and obviously prevents a true representation of the proposal.

Cambrian Buildings is made up of 5 properties, including ours, and only one was informed of the appeal and former planning application. 2 of the properties informed are not affected.

Mr Smith and Mr Watkin have continuously used various forms of address for the site and cottage.

This has been the case since we purchased Old Bank Buildings in 2014.

The site is Bank Cottage which is the former drive/garden area of our property, retained following the removal of the *building* from the original title in 2004.

Prior to our purchase and subsequent renovations, our property was formerly a Bank, shop and bedsits above. Each had its own postal address. The bedsits were 1 and 5 Bank Buildings, the Bank-LL14 3AE and shop-LL14 3AS. The entire *building* is now known as Old Bank Buildings.

This ambiguity and confusion has been used by the appellant and his family for their benefit, hence the site address of 5 Bank Buildings and previous reference to 5 Bank Cottage.

I fail to understand or believe these "errors" are genuine.

They are constant and, I believe, a deliberate attempt to mislead all parties involved.

I apologise for this email, but fail to understand how legal documentation can contain these inaccuracies.

Kind regards
Martyn

[REDACTED]

On Wednesday, April 18, 2018, 07:43, Godfrey, Sophie <Sophie.Godfrey@pins.gsi.gov.uk> wrote:

Good Morning Martyn,

Yes I can confirm the Inspector will take into account all information received by interested parties for the appeal. Your representation has been added to the appeal documents for their attention.

Many Thanks,

Sophie

From: Ellen Rogers [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 April 2018 16:19
To: Godfrey, Sophie
Subject: Re: H699/A/18/3198071. 5 Bank Cottage, Cefn Mawr, Wrexham

Hi Sophie just a quick question

Will the inspector be aware of our letter of objections

Kind regards

Martyn

[REDACTED]

On Tuesday, April 17, 2018, 14:37, Godfrey, Sophie <Sophie.Godfrey@pins.gsi.gov.uk> wrote:

Good Afternoon Mr Rogers,

Thank you for your representation on the above appeal. This appeal is proceeding by the Written Representations procedure, as such there will be no public meetings. The Inspector will carry out an un-accompanied site visit, so there will be no opportunity for any parties to talk to the Inspector on matters regarding the appeal.

Many Thanks,
Sophie Godfrey
Swyddog Achos/Case Officer
Yr Arolygiaeth Gynllunio/The Planning Inspectorate
Adeilad y Goron/Crown Buildings
Parc Cathays/Cathays Park
Caerdydd/Cardiff
CF10 3NQ
✉ Sophie.Godfrey@pins.gsi.gov.uk
☎ [03034445939](tel:03034445939)
<http://planninginspectorate.gov.wales/>
Twitter: [@PINSGov](https://twitter.com/PINSGov)
Mae cwsmeriaid wrth galon popeth a wnawn – gweler ein [Siarter Cwsmeriaid](#)
Customers are at the heart of everything we do – view our [Customer Charter](#)

Rydym yn croesawu derbyn gohebiaeth yn Gymraeg. Byddwn yn ateb gohebiaeth a dderbynnir yn Gymraeg yn Gymraeg ac ni fydd gohebu yn Gymraeg yn arwain at oedi.
We welcome receiving correspondence in Welsh. Any correspondence received in Welsh

will be answered in Welsh and corresponding in Welsh will not lead to a delay in responding.



Peidiwch ag argraffu hwn os nad yw'n angerrheidiol / Please do not print unless necessary

From: Martyn Rogers [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 April 2018 12:00
To: Wales
Subject: H699/A/18/3198071. 5 Bank Cottage, Cefn Mawr, Wrexham

Dear Sir/Madam

Please find attached a copy of a letter of objection, regarding the appeal to the refusal of a planning application at the above named property. Due to work commitments, the fully signed copy will follow as soon as possible via Royal Mail.

The original application was submitted on behalf of Mr Darren Smith, ref: P2017/0649.

Please be advised that we wish to attend any public meetings regarding the appeal and would be grateful if you would be kind enough to inform me of any relevant times and dates.

Kind regards
Martyn Rogers

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

Correspondents should note that all communications to or from the Planning Inspectorate may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for lawful purposes.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the system manager.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been scanned by Websense Email Security Gateway for the presence of computer viruses.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

Correspondents should note that all communications to or from the Planning Inspectorate may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for lawful purposes.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the system manager.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been scanned by Websense Email Security Gateway for the presence of computer viruses.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>
