



The Planning Inspectorate
Crown Buildings
Cathays Park
Cardiff
CF10 3NQ

ARTHURS OF WREXHAM
Croesfoel Industrial Park
Rhostyllen
Wrexham
LL14 4EJ
Tel 01978 366333
Fax 01978 356001
www.arthurscars.co.uk

5 May 2017

Reference: H6955/A/17/3172919

Dear Sir/Madam

We write with regard to the appeal which has been made regarding Planning Reference P 2016 1058, which is for the installation of a 17.5m monopole supporting 3 no antennas, 1 no transmission dish, 3 no equipment cabinets, 1 no metre cabinet, and ancillary development including the installation of a 2.1m Palisade Fence to form a compound, on land to the rear of the Welsh MG Centre, Wrexham Road, Rhostyllen, Wrexham.

As the owners of the adjoining house and car showroom (53/55, Wrexham Road, Rhostyllen, Wrexham, LL14 4DW) we wish to object against this proposal in the strongest possible terms and support Wrexham County Borough Council in refusing this application.

We purchased this house and car showroom last year and have been making improvements with a view to using the showroom again, it has been empty for a couple of years, and we have also made improvements to the house which is now occupied.

Having personally visited our house and showroom on many occasions over the past few months we are surprised there was not a site notice on prominent display to advise us of the initial planning application and this matter has only been brought to our attention through receiving a letter from Wrexham County Borough Council advising there had been an appeal made against their refusal to grant planning consent for this development. If we had been made aware of the initial planning application we would have objected at that time.

We object to the application on a number of counts, as follows:-

1. The adverse visual impact it will have in this location with it overlooking our house, there are numerous references in the appellant's Statement of Case stating the nearest residential property is 97 metres from the appeal site. This is untrue as our house is adjacent to the Welsh MG Centre and in much closer proximity.
2. The adverse visual impact it will have for visitors and employees at our car showroom.
3. Although we have an adjoining car sales showroom we would have expected this mast to have been required to be situated in a commercial area rather than a residential area. We note there is an existing 'smaller' mast near to our main car showroom on Croesfoel Industrial Park, some 700/800 metres away. In our opinion this is a more suitable location for a monopole of this nature.
4. We note the Planning Officer had recommended the initial planning application was granted, but the planning committee members voted against the application. If the planning officer had spoken to us directly when considering his position he could well

have had a different view on this development, surely as being such close neighbours to this site this should have been seen as a pre-requisite prior to making any recommendation. As mentioned earlier the first we knew of this application was when we received the letter informing us of an appeal to the refusal to grant planning consent.

5. We would like to draw your attention to Section 3.48 in the appellant's Statement of Case, it says 'The landowner has ceased trading at this location and has not confirmed any interest in allowing a telecommunications installation to be installed at this site'. As the landowner we can categorically state we have not been approached by anyone at anytime with regard to a matter of this nature. The statement is blatantly incorrect. We know Mr Morris, who farms at Manor Farm (3.49) and which belongs to the National Trust, have they been contacted?

In summary and in lay man's terms we believe the planning refusal should be upheld because the erection of this monopole is visually out of keeping within this primarily residential area, it will also have a detrimental impact of the residents living in our house, and furthermore will negatively impact the working lives of employees at our car sales showroom, plus could ultimately affect the viability of the business if this monopole detracts customers from visiting our premises. There are numerous inaccuracies in the appellant's statement of case which in our opinion casts further doubt on the credibility of their appeal.

Please may we request a copy of the appeal decision letter when it is issued?

Yours faithfully

A black rectangular box redacting the signature of R N Williams.

R N Williams

Managing Director