

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Wales](#)
Subject: Fwd: Planning application P/2016/0712 - Land at the Bungalow, Darland Lodge, off Darland Lane and Gamford Lane, Rossett, Wrexham
Date: 16 May 2017 19:34:54
Attachments: [planning.docx](#)

Dear Mr Sir / Madam

I wish to make you aware of a number of strong objectives that I have with regard to the proposed development of 47 houses on a greenfield site designated as Green Barrier and special landscape area in Rossett. As an immediate neighbour to the site I am of the view that proposed development will have serious impact on our standard of living. The lane and field in question have had serious flooding issues for several years which are unresolved, the narrow lane, which is a rat-run from Holt to Chester, has had several accidents involving pedestrians, cyclists and cars. My family's lives will be affected as our home directly overlooks the site. I have read the planning application and statements with interest and conclude there are a number of points of objection. Our specify objections are as follows:

1. Ground stability and drainage.

Wrexham Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011 Policy EC12 5.15 Development proposals within areas of flood risk are not only at risk of flooding, but may also exacerbate existing or create new flooding problems on other land or property through reductions in flood plain storage capacity or by impeding flood flows. Flood alleviation measures can only reduce the risk of flooding and can never eliminate the risk. For these reasons, development within land at an unacceptable risk of flooding will not be permitted.

Wrexham Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011 Policy EC13 Development which would result in an unacceptable adverse impact on the water environment due to additional surface water run-off will not be permitted.

Wrexham Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011 Policy 5.18 Development on green field sites usually results in an increase in the amount of impermeable land. This can alter the natural water cycle as rates and volumes of surface water reaching a surface watercourse generally increase. Drains and sewers generally convey surface water from impermeable areas directly, or via a sewerage system, to a watercourse.

I believe that the proposed development is a direct contravention of these policies. Wrexham Senior Flood Management Officer, Neil Taunt states that “a notable portion of the site is identified as being at risk of surface flooding as defined on NRW’s updated flood map for surface water. We also hold a number of reports of flooding associated with the highway network along Gamford Lane adjacent to the proposed site. The proposed site layout does indicate a number of properties located within this area of flood risk.” Mr Taunt concludes “I request the application be refused as it has not been demonstrated the flood risk can be acceptably managed”.

Natural Resources Wales (letter dated 10/8/16) confirms the site is at risk of surface water flooding and that the development would increase rapid surface run-off. In accordance with section 8 of TAN 15, in all zones, development should not increase flood risk elsewhere. The Design & Water statement states that “surface water run off drainage will be managed on site” however there is no evidence to show that the site could be suitable for infiltration and there are no obvious water courses on site. Gareth Thomas (Planning Liaison Officer) recommends the developer should ensure that run off from the proposed development is reduced or will not exceed existing run off rates.

Welsh Water (letter dated 5/8/16) from the Development Control Officer confirmed that the developer has failed to address how the surface water run-off drainage system would operate successfully and concludes that no development shall commence until a drainage scheme has been submitted and approved by local planning authority.

Our house backs on to a ditch/stream on Gamford Lane where it meets an inadequate drainpipe causing flooding. The situation has been exacerbated due to the most recent development in the area (Pippin Lane) blocking drainage in the local neighbourhood. The Council has been unable to find a sustainable solution so the vicinity is regularly flooded and, given wetter winters and flash floods, we live in fear for the state of our health and our property. The inability of the Council to be able to deal with Pippin Lane’s developers and come up with a solution makes me wary of this applicant’s promises.

The proposed site regularly becomes waterlogged and a small lake often appears, heralding a period of flooding down Gamford Lane towards Darland Lane. The area is prone to fairly frequent surface water flooding and nearby river flooding (River Dee) so I was shocked to read that the applicant “does not assess this site within an area at risk of flooding” and that it “will not increase the flood risk elsewhere”.

2. Detrimental impact on residential amenities

Wrexham Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011, Policy PS2 Development must not materially detrimentally affect countryside, landscape/townscape character, open space, or the quality of the natural environment.

Wrexham Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011, Policy PS3 Development should use previously developed brownfield land comprising vacant, derelict or underused land in preference to the use of greenfield land, wherever possible, particularly so where greenfield land is of ecological, landscape or amenity value, or comprises agricultural land of grades 1, 2 or 3a quality.

Wrexham Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011, Policy EC1 5.1 Within Green Barriers, development will only be granted planning permission if it is for agriculture, forestry, essential facilities for outdoor sport and recreation, cemeteries and other uses of land which maintain the openness of the Green Barrier and do not conflict with the purpose of including land within it.

Wrexham Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011, Policy GDP1 Ensure that development does not result in, or is subject to, flooding, soil erosion, landslides or contamination, either on or off the site.

We believe that the proposed development is a direct contravention of these policies. The site is designated agricultural, grazing, greenfield site and is a special landscape area.

The planning submission boasts that the development “will enhance the general appearance of the area”. I disagree totally. The proposed site falls within an area designated as Green Barrier and special landscape. It is agricultural grazing land where local children visit the lambs each spring. Losing attractive countryside for a housing estate will not enhance Rossett, but will cause irreversible environmental damage and add to the issues listed above that residents on Gamford and Darland Lanes are having to deal with.

The application states that “due to the discreet nature of the site location, effects on the character would be limited”. I disagree. If you allow this development to go ahead on agricultural land, and allow the elimination of hedgerows, it will not only cause irreversible damage to

the landscape and nature of Rossett, but will add to surface water flooding.

3. Need to avoid town cramming

Wrexham Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011, Policy GDP2 Where the capacity of infrastructure, including community facilities, is likely to be deficient as a consequence of new development, a planning agreement/obligation will be negotiated whereby the developer provides the additional capacity either on or off-site, and/or provides funding for the Council to provide the additional capacity itself. Requirements will be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed.

Wrexham Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011, Policy GDP2 4.6 Changes in population resulting from new housing can exert pressure on the availability of school places. Locally, there is an increasing mismatch of education demand and supply. Generally, school capacity surpluses exist in both rural and urban villages where development is severely constrained by environmental, topographical, infrastructure, or marketing constraints.

Wrexham Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011, Policy EC2 Development on agricultural land of grades 1, 2 or 3a will only be permitted if it does not lead to the irreversible loss of that land.

Wrexham Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011, Policy EC2 5.3 The County Borough contains large tracts of high quality agricultural land generally concentrated around Wrexham, Gresford/Marford, Rossett/Burton, Holt and along the River Dee flood plain. Generally, the incidence of high quality agricultural land coincides with locations where development pressures are greatest. High quality agricultural land cannot readily be replaced and should not be irreversibly built upon unless there is no other lower quality site available.

We believe that the proposed development is a direct contravention of these policies. Both local schools are full to capacity with no room for expansion at St Peters, resources at the doctors surgery are stretched to an unacceptable level, the water treatment centre has almost reached its capacity and this development will be of no benefit to existing residents. In the contrary, its capacity will erode part of the countryside and be very hazard on the country lanes.

Natural Resources Wales (letter dated 10/8/16) states that the ***“proposal is within or may affect a Landscape of Outstanding / Special Historic Interest”***. ***“Chapter 6 of Planning Policy Wales (PPW) states that it is a material consideration in the planning process and must be given due regard when reaching a determination”***.

4. Loss of privacy and overlooking

Wrexham Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011, Policy EC4 Development proposals should provide for the conservation and management of hedgerows, trees, orchards, woodland, wildlife and other natural landscape and water features, and include new planting in order to enhance the character of the landscape and townscape.

I object to the demolition of hedgerows in order to create a T junction access to a large estate. The hedgerows in Rossett are of great importance and contribute to the character of the local area. Cutting them will cause environmental damage. The T junction access directly opposite our bedrooms will be detrimental to our health and an invasion of our privacy. The Human Rights Act (in particular Protocol 1, Article 1) states that I have a right to peaceful enjoyment of my home, land and surroundings (protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8).

5. Highway safety and access

Wrexham Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011, Policy PS4 Development should maintain the existing settlement pattern and character and be integrated with the existing transport network to help reduce the overall need to travel and encourage the use of alternatives to the car.

Wrexham Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011, Policy GDP1 Ensure safe and convenient pedestrian and vehicular access to and from development sites, both on site and in the nearby locality.

The application paints an idyllic picture of children walking safely to school, quoting “Gamford Lane offers good visibility”. This is totally misleading and would be further from the truth when vehicles from 47 households are added to the equation. An entrance to Darland High School was created on Gamford Lane for access to a new building several years ago. This access is not suitable for schoolchildren and no footpaths are present as the lane is too narrow and curved.

The application presents the development as being

“opposite Darland School”. While this is geographically correct, the only safe route into Darland (by foot or by car) would be ¼ mile.

It also refers to “a short walk to nearest bus stop on Darland Lane”. No such bus route exists. The nearest bus stops are on Chester Road.

There is only one footpath which starts on the other side of the road opposite the current site entrance on the corner of Gamford Lane and Darland Lane (this contravenes planning laws with a telegraph pole in the middle).

Speed bumps have been introduced to slow traffic down on this stretch but it is still deemed as too dangerous for pedestrians (by local residents) and has been the site of numerous crashes and scrapes.

The access to the site would be directly opposite our house and is totally unsuitable for the number of vehicles. Due to such restricted visibility, narrow lane, lack of footpaths, it would be a death trap.

The application informs that “the increase in the number of vehicles will not unduly affect the amenity of neighbouring properties”. I disagree with this statement – not only for the reasons above (adding to the dangers on Gamford Lane) but also because of the siting of the access to the development (directly opposite our house). Not only would there be increase pollution and noise from cars increasing and decreasing in speed at the junction, but also car headlamps would shine directly at our bedrooms on leaving the site.

6. Non-compliance with other council planning policies/government planning guidance

I’m not an expert but the application appears to contravene the following policies (or my understanding of them):-

***Planning Policy Wales Edition 8, January 2016:
Chapter 4*** by failing to:-

“Contribute to the protection and improvement of the environment, so as to improve the quality of life, and protect local and global ecosystems. In particular, planning should seek to ensure that development does not produce irreversible harmful effects on the natural environment and support measures that allow the natural heritage to adapt to the effects of climate change.”

Minimise the risks posed by, or to, development on or adjacent to unstable or contaminated land and land liable to flooding. This includes managing and seeking to mitigate the consequences of climate change (see 4.5.4 and 4.5.5) by building resilience

into the natural and built environment (Chapters 5,12 and 13)."

Like a lot of local residents we are very disappointed that the information meeting regarding this development has been postponed by the agents until after the 31st August deadline for objections. We would respectfully request that you keep us informed on this proposed development. This is an opportunity for you to protect the countryside in Wrexham and take actions to help your residents.

I believe the proposal to contravene this guidance as it is to the detriment of the quality, character and amenity value of the area, as outlined in the points above.

In conclusion I would be grateful if the council would take my objections into consideration when deciding this application. I would welcome the opportunity to meet with a representative of the planning department at our home to illustrate our objectives at first hand.

Yours sincerely

Phil Griffiths

Broad Oaks, Rossett LL12 0FA

Tel:

Mob

Email:

Sent from my iPad

Fao: Mr Philip Forster, WCBC Planning Case Officer

Cc Mr Hugh Jones, WCBC Councillor

28th August 2016

Planning application P/2016/0712: Land at the Bungalow, Gamford Lane

Dear Mr Forster

I wish to make you aware of a number of strong objectives that I have with regard to the proposed development of 47 houses on a greenfield site designated as Green Barrier and special landscape area in Rossett. As an immediate neighbour to the site I am of the view that proposed development will have serious impact on our standard of living. The lane and field in question have had serious flooding issues for several years which are unresolved, the narrow lane, which is a rat-run from Holt to Chester, has had several accidents involving pedestrians, cyclists and cars. My family's lives will be affected as our home directly overlooks the site. I have read the planning application and statements with interest and conclude there are a number of points of objection. Our specify objections are as follows:

1. Ground stability and drainage.

Wrexham Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011 Policy EC12 5.15 Development proposals within areas of flood risk are not only at risk of flooding, but may also exacerbate existing or create new flooding problems on other land or property through reductions in flood plain storage capacity or by impeding flood flows. Flood alleviation measures can only reduce the risk of flooding and can never eliminate the risk. For these reasons, development within land at an unacceptable risk of flooding will not be permitted.

Wrexham Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011 Policy EC13 Development which would result in an unacceptable adverse impact on the water environment due to additional surface water run-off will not be permitted.

Wrexham Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011 Policy 5.18 Development on green field sites usually results in an increase in the amount of impermeable land. This can alter the natural water cycle as rates and volumes of surface water reaching a surface watercourse generally increase. Drains and sewers generally convey surface water from impermeable areas directly, or via a sewerage system, to a watercourse.

I believe that the proposed development is a direct contravention of these policies. Wrexham Senior Flood Management Officer, Neil Taunt states that "a notable portion of the site is identified as being at risk of surface flooding as defined on NRW's updated flood map for surface water. We also hold a number of reports of flooding associated with the highway network along Gamford Lane adjacent to the prosed site. The proposed site layout does indicate a number of properties located within this area of flood risk." Mr Tuant concludes "I request the application be refused as it has not been demonstrated the flood risk can be acceptably managed".

Natural Resources Wales (letter dated 10/8/16) confirms the site is at risk of surface water flooding and that the development would increase rapid surface run-off. In accordance with section 8 of TAN 15, in all zones, development should not increase flood risk elsewhere. The Design & Water statement states that “surface water run off drainage will be managed on site” however there is no evidence to show that the site could be suitable for infiltration and there are no obvious water courses on site. Gareth Thomas (Planning Liaison Officer) recommends the developer should ensure that run off from the proposed development is reduced or will not exceed existing run off rates.

Welsh Water (letter dated 5/8/16) from the Development Control Officer confirmed that the developer has failed to address how the surface water run-off drainage system would operate successfully and concludes that no development shall commence until a drainage scheme has been submitted and approved by local planning authority.

Our house backs on to a ditch/stream on Gamford Lane where it meets an inadequate drainpipe causing flooding. The situation has been exacerbated due to the most recent development in the area (Pippin Lane) blocking drainage in the local neighbourhood. The Council has been unable to find a sustainable solution so the vicinity is regularly flooded and, given wetter winters and flash floods, we live in fear for the state of our health and our property. The inability of the Council to be able to deal with Pippin Lane’s developers and come up with a solution makes me wary of this applicant’s promises.

The proposed site regularly becomes waterlogged and a small lake often appears, heralding a period of flooding down Gamford Lane towards Darland Lane. The area is prone to fairly frequent surface water flooding and nearby river flooding (River Dee) so I was shocked to read that the applicant “does not assess this site within an area at risk of flooding” and that it “will not increase the flood risk elsewhere”.

2. Detrimental impact on residential amenities

Wrexham Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011, Policy PS2 Development must not materially detrimentally affect countryside, landscape/townscape character, open space, or the quality of the natural environment.

Wrexham Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011, Policy PS3 Development should use previously developed brownfield land comprising vacant, derelict or underused land in preference to the use of greenfield land, wherever possible, particularly so where greenfield land is of ecological, landscape or amenity value, or comprises agricultural land of grades 1, 2 or 3a quality.

Wrexham Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011, Policy EC1 5.1 Within Green Barriers, development will only be granted planning permission if it is for agriculture, forestry, essential facilities for outdoor sport and recreation, cemeteries and other uses of land which maintain the openness of the Green Barrier and do not conflict with the purpose of including land within it.

Wrexham Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011, Policy GDP1 Ensure that development does not result in, or is subject to, flooding, soil erosion, landslides or contamination, either on or off the site.

We believe that the proposed development is a direct contravention of these policies. The site is designated agricultural, grazing, greenfield site and is a special landscape area.

The planning submission boasts that the development “will enhance the general appearance of the area”. I disagree totally. The proposed site falls within an area designated as Green Barrier and special landscape. It is agricultural grazing land where local children visit the lambs each spring. Losing attractive countryside for a housing estate will not enhance Rossett, but will cause irreversible environmental damage and add to the issues listed above that residents on Gamford and Darland Lanes are having to deal with.

The application states that “due to the discreet nature of the site location, effects on the character would be limited”. I disagree. If you allow this development to go ahead on agricultural land, and allow the elimination of hedgerows, it will not only cause irreversible damage to the landscape and nature of Rossett, but will add to surface water flooding.

3. Need to avoid town cramming

Wrexham Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011, Policy GDP2 Where the capacity of infrastructure, including community facilities, is likely to be deficient as a consequence of new development, a planning agreement/obligation will be negotiated whereby the developer provides the additional capacity either on or off-site, and/or provides funding for the Council to provide the additional capacity itself. Requirements will be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed.

Wrexham Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011, Policy GDP2 4.6 Changes in population resulting from new housing can exert pressure on the availability of school places. Locally, there is an increasing mismatch of education demand and supply. Generally, school capacity surpluses exist in both rural and urban villages where development is severely constrained by environmental, topographical, infrastructure, or marketing constraints.

Wrexham Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011, Policy EC2 Development on agricultural land of grades 1, 2 or 3a will only be permitted if it does not lead to the irreversible loss of that land.

Wrexham Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011, Policy EC2 5.3 The County Borough contains large tracts of high quality agricultural land generally concentrated around Wrexham, Gresford/Marford, Rossett/Burton, Holt and along the River Dee flood plain. Generally, the incidence of high quality agricultural land coincides with locations where development pressures are greatest. High quality agricultural land cannot readily be replaced and should not be irreversibly built upon unless there is no other lower quality site available.

We believe that the proposed development is a direct contravention of these policies. Both local schools are full to capacity with no room for expansion at St Peters, resources at the doctors surgery are stretched to an unacceptable level, the water treatment centre has almost reached its capacity and this development will be of no benefit to existing residents. In the contrary, its capacity will erode part of the countryside and be very hazard on the country lanes.

Natural Resources Wales (letter dated 10/8/16) states that the *“proposal is within or may affect a Landscape of Outstanding / Special Historic Interest”*. *“Chapter 6 of Planning Policy Wales (PPW) states that it is a material consideration in the planning process and must be given due regard when reaching a determination”*.

4. Loss of privacy and overlooking

Wrexham Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011 Policy EC4 Development proposals should provide for the conservation and management of hedgerows, trees, orchards, woodland, wildlife and other natural landscape and water features, and include new planting in order to enhance the character of the landscape and townscape.

I object to the demolition of hedgerows in order to create a T junction access to a large estate. The hedgerows in Rossett are of great importance and contribute to the character of the local area. Cutting them will cause environmental damage. The T junction access directly opposite our bedrooms will be detrimental to our health and an invasion of our privacy. The Human Rights Act (in particular Protocol 1, Article 1) states that I have a right to peaceful enjoyment of my home, land and surroundings (protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8).

5. Highway safety and access

Wrexham Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011, Policy PS4 Development should maintain the existing settlement pattern and character and be integrated with the existing transport network to help reduce the overall need to travel and encourage the use of alternatives to the car.

Wrexham Unitary Development Plan 1996-2011, Policy GDP1 Ensure safe and convenient pedestrian and vehicular access to and from development sites, both on site and in the nearby locality.

The application paints an idyllic picture of children walking safely to school, quoting *“Gamford Lane offers good visibility”*. This is totally misleading and would be further from the truth when vehicles from 47 households are added to the equation. An entrance to Darland High School was created on Gamford Lane for access to a new building several years ago. This access is not suitable for schoolchildren and no footpaths are present as the lane is too narrow and curved.

The application presents the development as being “opposite Darland School”. While this is geographically correct, the only safe route into Darland (by foot or by car) would be ¼ mile. It also refers to “a short walk to nearest bus stop on Darland Lane”. No such bus route exists. The nearest bus stops are on Chester Road.

There is only one footpath which starts on the other side of the road opposite the current site entrance on the corner of Gamford Lane and Darland Lane (this contravenes planning laws with a telegraph pole in the middle).

Speed bumps have been introduced to slow traffic down on this stretch but it is still deemed as too dangerous for pedestrians (by local residents) and has been the site of numerous crashes and scrapes.

The access to the site would be directly opposite our house and is totally unsuitable for the number of vehicles. Due to such restricted visibility, narrow lane, lack of footpaths, it would be a death trap.

The application informs that “the increase in the number of vehicles will not unduly affect the amenity of neighbouring properties”. I disagree with this statement – not only for the reasons above (adding to the dangers on Gamford Lane) but also because of the siting of the access to the development (directly opposite our house). Not only would there be increase pollution and noise from cars increasing and decreasing in speed at the junction, but also car headlamps would shine directly at our bedrooms on leaving the site.

6. Non-compliance with other council planning policies/government planning guidance

I’m not an expert but the application appears to contravene the following policies (or my understanding of them):-

Planning Policy Wales Edition 8, January 2016: Chapter 4 by failing to:-

“Contribute to the protection and improvement of the environment, so as to improve the quality of life, and protect local and global ecosystems. In particular, planning should seek to ensure that development does not produce irreversible harmful effects on the natural environment and support measures that allow the natural heritage to adapt to the effects of climate change.”

Minimise the risks posed by, or to, development on or adjacent to unstable or contaminated land and land liable to flooding. This includes managing and seeking to mitigate the consequences of climate change (see 4.5.4 and 4.5.5) by building resilience into the natural and built environment (Chapters 5,12 and 13).”

Like a lot of local residents we are very disappointed that the information meeting regarding this development has been postponed by the agents until after the 31st August deadline for objections. We would respectfully request that you keep us informed on this proposed development. This is an opportunity for you to protect the countryside in Wrexham and take actions to help your residents.

I believe the proposal to contravene this guidance as it is to the detriment of the quality, character and amenity value of the area, as outlined in the points above.

In conclusion I would be grateful if the council would take my objections into consideration when deciding this application. I would welcome the opportunity to meet with a representative of the planning department at our home to illustrate our objectives at first hand.

Yours sincerely

Phil Griffiths

Broadoaks, Rossett LL12 0FA

Tel:

Mo

Ema