

Dear Sirs

**Re: Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of two dwellings and access arrangement –
Planning Reference: P/2018/0713**

I write further to a letter received from Wrexham County Borough Council on 13th June 2019 confirming that an appeal has been filed under the above planning reference number. I have reviewed in detail the Appeal documentation submitted and would now like to make a number of additional submissions to the Inspector:

(1) There has been no consultation to date by the Applicant, Mr Mckinlay or any of his team of advisors with any of the local residents about this development which is unsatisfactory given the significant impact of the proposed residential development. This is against the both spirit of and the letter of what the Planning System seeks to achieve.

(2) It is established that the previous owners of Oakdale sold the property to the Applicant for a lower price than two other prospective purchasers because the Applicant provided a legal undertaking confirming that he would not develop the site for planning purposes. The Application Site is registered at HM Land Registry under title number CYM665764 where the transfer documents can be publically obtained.

(3) The northern boundary of the application site is bounded by woodland and established trees which has a blanket Tree Preservation Order in force. However, there is no acknowledgement of this fact by the Applicant in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment & Method Statement submitted. The proposed development is detrimental to these established, high quality trees that form the peripheral boundary.

(4) In accordance with local and national planning policy, the development should respect the local character of the surrounding area and achieve a sense of space through appropriate layout and design which the proposed two dwellings do not.

(5) The proposed dwellings should also be of a scale and type appropriate to its proposed location and they do not make a "positive contribution" to the appearance of the locality as asserted by the Applicant in paragraph 5.3 of their Statement of Case.

(6) In paragraph 6.3 of the Statement of Case states that Pant Lane is "lightly trafficked" and refers to it being a purely residential road. The Statement fails to acknowledge that it is a link road to the surrounding villages and towns and it is a popular route in a built up area which experiences high levels of traffic which will substantially increase once the site in Llay which was recently granted planning permission for a 400 dwelling residential scheme will be completed together with a new Aldi store at Llay off the B5445. Development on this extensive site has already commenced.

In addition, at paragraph 11.7 of the Statement of Case the Applicant refers to Maes y Pant as a "local green space" in support of their claim that Pant Lane consists of purely residential traffic. Maes y Pant is a 67.5 acre woodland area which supports hundreds of dog walkers who travel from Chester, Wrexham and the surrounding areas. It is also a site used for agricultural and wildlife conservation use and it is a community asset of ecological value home to a number of species and habitats. In addition, it has numerous nature trails, organised fitness activities and is used by a number of schools for many educational activities all year round. It also provides panoramic views of the area and is attracting an increasing number of visitors to Gresford. Therefore, the Applicant's assessment of the highway impacts on Pant Lane is significantly flawed. The highway impacts of this development have not been adequately mitigated against by the Applicant. In addition, there are no traffic calming measures on Pant Lane.

(7) I note that the Applicant instructed a company referred to as Highway Planning Services to carry out traffic modelling. I am informed by Darren Green of Wrexham Highway Authority that although he was aware of the traffic survey being undertaken by the Applicant he has not seen any results or been requested to view or comment on them by the Applicant or Highway Planning Services. The traffic report indicates that 85 per cent of the traffic is travelling at 28mph therefore 15 per cent are exceeding the 30mph speed limit. The position of the measuring equipment was placed on Pant Lane just beyond Pant Olwen which is a link road to the Wrexham/Chester main road (B 5445). If as

claimed by the Applicant that Pant lane is purely for residential use then it is a fact that 90 per cent of the Dwellings and the population of Pant lane would not therefore pass over the recording equipment as they would travel along Pant Olwen, therefore given the speeds of the vehicles recorded it can be asserted that 95 per cent of users are using Pant Lane as a link road or passage to Maes Y Pant.

(8) There is an existing boundary fence positioned on the Application Site but prior to the Applicant acquiring the site there was a twelve foot high mature laurel hedge approximately two metres wide that extended all along the boundary of my property, no 2 The Conifers and the boundary of no 3 The Conifers which retained a level of privacy between properties. This hedge was subsequently removed in its entirety by the Applicant and therefore the application site is not adequately screened.

(9) In response to paragraph 11.9 of the Statement of Case there has been a substantial increase in pedestrian traffic along Pant Lane in recent years and the absence of a footway to one side significantly increases the risk of danger to the public. It is one of the principal routes to the Rofft Junior School in Marford. In addition, both the Rofft and Gresford Junior schools use Maes y Pant for nature walks and conservation activities and as previously stated there are increasing number of dog walkers and professional dog walking businesses operating from the Chester area who use this popular community facility.

(10) The revised site plan does not take into account all of the boundary aspects including the full extent of my garden or the fact that a 12 feet mature laurel hedge has been removed along the boundary leaving only a 6 foot high fence. This will impact significantly on my residential amenity causing a reduction of light, increased overshadowing to the garden area and this will have a detrimental effect on visual amenity to my property and that of my neighbours.

In summary, I do not consider that the proposal represents a sustainable form of development. The site is situated in an inappropriate location for the scale of the development proposed. The Inspector is invited to consider the arguments above when assessing the planning balance. There are alternatives site available within the Borough that could accommodate the proposal and significant harm arises from this scheme as a result of the conflict with the Development plan as set out in the Officer's reasons for refusal. There are no material considerations that justify a departure from the development plan in accordance with section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

I would be grateful if you could kindly acknowledge safe receipt of this email.

Yours faithfully,

Mr & Mrs M. Jones

2 The Conifers, Pant Lane, Gresford, Wrexham, LL12 8HU