

Dated: 05/07/2019

Kapil and Rohini Gargh
3 The Conifers
Off Pant Lane
Gresford LL12 8HU

To

The Planning Inspectorate
Crown Buildings
Cathays Park
Cardiff
CF10 3NQ

Reference: Case APP/H6955/A/19/3227191

Dear Sir

We understand that Mr Stephen Mckinlay has appealed against the planning permission that was previously refused by the Wrexham County Borough Council.

After having reviewed the details of the case statement made by Adrian Thompson, on behalf of Mr S Mckinlay, for the proposed re-development at Oakdale, Pant Lane, Gresford, Wrexham, We, Kapil Gargh and Rohini Gargh, residents of 3 The Conifers, Pant lane, Gresford, strongly object to the appeal application and would request you to protect us from almost a encroachment in our private residential space.

We live right adjacent to the proposed development site and are writing to request you to refuse this planning appeal application on the following grounds:

1. We share a long boundary with the proposed development. The proposed is site directly adjacent and **overlooks all of our garden and 3 of the 4 bedrooms**. The proposed development represents overdevelopment of this area and will result in a significant and total loss of privacy and peaceful enjoyment to my family at the 3 The Conifers. **The proposed dwelling will be visually overbearing to us.**

The width of our garden to the boundary is already short. The proposed development area is the only area around our property that gives openness on one our boundaries, rest being all occupied from all sides. This will constrict our dwelling to the extent that we would almost be suffocated from the proposed development. The separation distances between the proposed property and my property is also insufficient: and also the adjacent properties, we being most affected by the same.

Response to point 11.20: We totally reject that the proposed development will not affect the daylight: There are number of tall trees already at the rear of the rear garden space, being part of the large woodlands at the back, and the development will make the situation unbearable. **The proposed site of development with a large structure as Oakdale house will not only be visually overbearing to us, but it will block all air and sunlight to our back garden and the bedrooms and also to the rooms at the ground floor.**

Response to point 11.21: We have measured the distances: At the nearest point the two buildings, corner to corner is **NOT 11 metres apart as they mention in the report: It is 7.5 meter to our fence**. And if the proposed distance from our fence to the new large Oakdale house is 1.3 metres at its nearest point, **then the corner to corner distance is only 8.8**

metres. Further, the distance does not increase to 17 metre from our north wall: from the north wall the **distance to our fence is 11 metres; and so unless the proposed large 2 storey house is 6 metres from our boundary (which is not) it would not be 17 metres.** Further based on above, the distance between the nearest points between the nearest windows to 3 the conifers **would be much less than 13 metres.**

2. **Response to point 11.18:** The rearmost point of the house is 1.3 metres to our boundary: that is still very close and will have a significant impact to the residential amenity as a result of overlooking and reduction of daylight and loss of openness to the property.
3. Mr Mckinlay does not live at the Oakdale house and perhaps visits occasionally: **The only reason, and the fact is, that the bungalow has been bought by him solely for the purpose of commercial gains with him having no links to the neighbours or the local community.** In fact we have been made aware that at the time of purchase, the property was not sold to two other interested purchasers, as he had said he would reside at Okadale and not redevelop it.
4. About 18 months back, a 10-12 feet large mature hedge, which had been there for the last 20 years, along the perimeter of our boundary with Okadale, was removed by Mr Mckinlay, without any discussion with us, leaving us with a 6 feet fence which we had to increase the height by putting some trellis on the top pf the fence to improve our privacy. This big hedge between his and our property **was cut by him without any consideration for our privacy, only intention being to redevelop it at a future date.** Not once has he made contact with us to assess the impact that the redevelopment of a large 2 storey house will have on us. We are not against redevelopment of the site, for example another bungalow at the site, away from our boundary, but a large 2 storey house, that also so near to our house at the site would **totally affect our living, restriction of daylight and loss of privacy and is PURELY FOR COMMERCIAL REASONS.**
5. The structure and design of the Oakdale house is not in keeping with the character, scale and design and materials of surrounding dwellings in the area, which mostly has mostly got bungalows. The proposal contravenes paragraphs 124, 125 and 127(c) of the revised National Planning Policy Framework (July 2018) which requires new development to be sympathetic to local character and history including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting. This type of design would be much better suited in a town centre/city centre location rather than a small rural village.
6. **There is a substantial increase in the footprint of the land in question from a 1 modest bungalow to two large 4 plus bedroom two storey properties.** The proposal is significantly larger in scale than the existing development and the impact on visual amenity would be so great that the development is not in the public interest. While to renovate or improve or to increase a footprint of an existing bungalow or house is a welcome development, a disastrous precedent to allow this new development with increased number of dwellings, and that too, building two storey house on a land where there is only one bungalow, could lead to altering the beautiful character of Gresford village in long term as other residents may want to construct more houses on their land for financial considerations. People with spare land at their bungalow can start asking for permissions for a big house...it would wrong to say that this will have no meaningful interaction with the public realm.
7. **They say in their submission: 7.6:** The Oakdale house, to the rear, will not be readily visible to the public: are we not part of public..? It is like saying that we will get the front of the

development fine and let us do an even more extensive development at the back because it affects only a few households..?

8. **7.22:** Tandem development has been supported elsewhere: 99.99% of properties in the area **do not** have tandem development. The only one application they have sited is also a **bungalow and not a large two storey house** as they propose to build.
9. There are several other points like

11.17: Referring Maes Y Pant to as a local green area: It is almost an insult to the local community by referring this to as a local green space: Maes y Pant is an attractive 70 acre forested area set in the villages of Gresford and Marford near Wrexham run by the local communities, who welcome visitors on site. Again this goes on to show that the applicant has no links to the local community, his only consideration being a commercial one.

6.3 b) Pant lane is lightly trafficked: It is NOT: there are number of cars from visitors of Maes Y Pant coupled with restricted visibility that make the road situation on this lane precarious: Addition of two large dwelling will result in further loss of safety on this lane: If accidents start happening in future in the local community, **from present near misses on a daily basis**, as direct result of continued over-development of the area, with one precedent setting the stage for the next development, **then we would only have ourselves to blame for the potential loss of life.**

There is **Preservation order** on all the trees surrounding the proposed redevelopment site and overhanging it.

It would seem to us that the applicant thinks that apart from him, the thinking of all residents in the local area, the Wrexham Council, and the Highways is flawed. He has shown this by his UNILATERAL actions, systematically from the start: buying the Bungalow by saying to the sellers that he will live in it and not redevelop but doing the contrary on both these counts, cutting the big hedge without any consideration to our privacy or consultation with the neighbours, decision to build two large two storey houses without consideration of the neighbours, the local community or the character of the village, putting in planning permission without any consultation with the neighbours or the local community, not accepting the decision of the Wrexham Council, not considering the safety of the local people and the highway authority decision, ignoring the large number of people who have signed a petition to stop this large overdevelopment purely for commercial gain, commission own reports to support his own agenda without any consideration to the will of the local people.

I will leave it your expert judgement and humbly request you to refuse the Planning Application appeal. You are invited to visit our home to verify that these objections are valid and severely affect us in a way described above.

Yours sincerely

Kapil

Rohini

Dr Kapil Gargh
Dr Rohini Gargh