

Maes y Coed

Glyn Ceiriog

Llangollen

LL207NL

8th November 2017

The Planning Inspectorate

Crown Building

Cathays Park

Cardiff

CF10 3NG



Dear Sir/Madam,

Your reference H6955/A/17/3186100 – Land West of Cae Place Teg, Tyn y Cestyll Road, Glyn Ceiriog, Llangollen.

I refer to the appeal lodged by Mr and Mrs Howell with regard to Wrexham County Borough Council's (WCBC) decision to reject the application for the development of two detached houses and I am writing to ask that this appeal is refused. The basis of my argument is as follows: -

- a. This is the second appeal to the Inspectorate to reverse WCBC's decision to refuse planning. One of the reasons the Inspector refused the original appeal was the 'site is greenfield and is located outside any settlement limited and within a Special Landscape Area as defined Wrexham Unitary Development Plan (UDP). One reason for my objection is that nothing has changed. Whilst the applicant has changed the design of the property – the land is still outside any settlement.

The applicant points out that this application complied with Policy GDP1 – Housing in the Countryside. However, this policy is defined as 'the development of no more than two dwellings within a small gap within a well-developed built frontage'. This development in no way meets this criteria as it is not filling in but development behind existing development on an elevated site, which is well outside the village boundary.

- b. Should any development be approved outside the village boundary – then clearly this sets a precedent which would very quickly result in applications being made for developments on similar elevated sites outside the village boundary.
- c. There is locally no shortage of housing both for sale or to rent. Indeed, there is land within the village boundary with planning permission that could be developed.

- d. The applicant has submitted photographs to support his claim that the development would not have any visual impact. I would strongly dispute this as the photographs submitted are of properties that are well within the village boundary – filling in land that has been available for development or are replacement dwellings.
- e. The two properties in section 6 of the applicants' submission deemed to be 'immediately adjoining the site' are properties that are well below the proposed development.
- f. The applicant claims that the visual impact would be minimal. Again, I would dispute this as given the high elevation of the site compounded by the height of two houses would result in the development being visual from the whole village.

I do hope that the above comments will assist the Inspector in concluding that WCBC's decision this year and theirs and the Inspector's decision last year was the correct decision and will refuse this appeal.

Yours faithfully



Jean Davies