

(Please note that I do not wish the Appellant to have sight of any personal details in this communication)



Appeal Ref: **H6955/A/16/3144761**

Planning Ref: **P/2015/0773**

25th July 2016

The Planning Inspectorate
Crown Buildings
Cathays Park
Cardiff
CF10 3NQ

Dear Sir/Madam,

**Re: Replacement of Existing Stable Building and Shed with
one Mobile Home, one Mobile Utility Structure and two Touring
Caravans,
together with associated parking
on Land East of junction of Tanyfron Rd with Southsea Rd,
Southsea, Wrexham**

We wish to oppose this latest Appeal regarding WCBC's refusal of planning permission for development of the above former grazing field (which has totally altered in appearance since five years of occupancy by the travellers and their extended family), again for the same reasons as stated in our letter to WCBC's Janet Sutherland of 15.11.2015 and which hopefully has been passed on to you, wherein we regarded the proposed development as unlawful due to the fact that Dr Murdoch (the traveller's legal representative) tried to state that the stable block was previously "developed" land, whereas Tim Belcher (Planning Inspector at the time) totally dismissed this statement (please refer to our previous letter and to Mr Belcher's historical statement of the site (see Appendix 4 of the First Hearing). Additionally, as previously mentioned, development of the above is contrary to Wrexham's adopted UDP policies: EC1, EC4, GDP1a, H9, PS2 and T8 and that the land falls outside the settlement limits. I would also note here that the above field, which I use to play on as a young boy and which gave me, and all my friends, the greatest pleasure, has **already been developed, unlawfully, beyond recognition**, even though three (one amended) Planning Applications, and two Appeals have been refused so far!

Again, as stated in our previous correspondence, apart from contravening the above policies, we would query if this is a reasonable dispersal of sites

within the North Wales area, with our village already being within a **one mile** radius of one official site (Ruthin Road) and two longstanding unofficial sites (Long Lane); if the occupant were to continually develop this field, as he has been doing already over the last five years, then we would have four travellers' sites on our doorstep.

The owner of the field has already chosen to erect 6ft high wooden fencing, with barbed wire topping it and so completely destroying our previously uninterrupted country view to the top of Solway Banks; we dread to think what effect a chalet, four times the size of the existing stable block (now exposed to all and sundry because of the cutting down of mature trees and hedgerows before even an application for planning permission was obtained) would have on our village only **9 yards** across the other side of the road!

Also, as in our previous correspondence, we would again query flooding issues as previously this field soaked up village flood water, but since occupation, and being tarmaced over, we have had two flooding incidents. Surely the addition of more concrete to accommodate the hard standing of the proposed chalet, plus an access road going round it (please refer to latest Drawing) is likely to have increased flooding issues.

We would be grateful, therefore, if you would kindly consider all the above points and comments, and sincerely hope that you will dismiss yet another Appeal against refusal of planning permission, and then perhaps we can all get on with our daily lives without all this time wasting and costly business.

Yours faithfully,

[Redacted Signature]