

3 Rackery Hall Mews
Rackery Lane
Wrexham
LL12 0QB

1 February 2010

The Planning Inspectorate
Crown Buildings
Cathays Park
Cardiff
CF10 3NQ

Your Ref: H6955/A10/2121027

Dear Sir | Madam,

In respect of the above appeal, we would like to add the following comments for your consideration in this matter. Rackery Hall Mews is development of converted farm outbuildings standing in the curtilage of a very handsome farm house built around 1700. The Hall has recently been subject to very sympathetic and impressive renovation by new owners.

The protection afforded to the Halls' converted outbuildings by the Curtilage Listing and Removed Development Rights, has up until now, protected not only the Hall, but all residents who have bought into a rural development of real character, as opposed to a property on a modern housing estate.

All properties on the development were all sold with very clear restrictions to protect the outward appearance of the development, to ensure that the character and extent of the properties remained unchanged. As the first purchasers of property No1 and latterly No2 (both 1 & 2 are now one dwelling), the owners submitting this appeal would have been fully aware of these restrictions when making both purchases.

Although this appeal is for one wall, there has been substantial additional development on this particular property, that has had both retrospective and planning consent refused. The wall is only a small part of the work that has already been completed. The conversion of properties one and two into one dwelling had no impact on the outside appearance of the development. It's the recent additions that are a very real threat to the character of the development.

Ultimately, the outcome of this one appeal will set a benchmark for other recent planning applications from the same household. This one appeal is the tip of the iceberg.

To reject this appeal would not change the development at all. In fact, every resident will be left with exactly what was originally purchased, a character property on a unique development with restrictions that protect and prevent it changing into something far less appealing.

To uphold this appeal will change the development completely for everyone. Without the continued and ongoing protection of Removed Development Rights, the development is in real danger of becoming a bric-a-brac of architectural styles. The understated charm and character that makes the development so attractive, will be lost.

We feel strongly that the Planning Department have got their decision to refuse this application right. Your support of them in this matter will empower and motivate them to continue to protect properties of historical interest and their surrounding environment.

Yours



J L Armstrong-Smith



Dr J Thompson-Hehir