

The Planning Inspectorate
Crown Buildings
Cathays Park
Cardiff
CF10 3NQ

Arthur Griffin and Jeni Stanton, Cilnant Farm,
Llwynmawr, Llangollen,
LL20 7BD.
19th October 2016

Re: Planning Appeal, Cae Mor, Llwynmawr, LL20 7BE. Case APP/H6955/A/16/3154472 free-range egg unit.

Dear Sirs,

we wish to register our continuing concern about the planning appeal referred to above. Our main worry is that of visual impact in a scenic upland pastoral area, which is traditionally managed and in which the agricultural properties are of small scale. This development would be very much out of proportion, being the largest construction in the valley since Chirk Castle in 1295. A less happy time when planning issues were settled with might rather than reason. I hope I am right in thinking that we live in a more democratic era now, and that the voice of the populus has more weight, otherwise there would be little point in our writing this. In its defence, Chirk Castle serves to bring tourism income as well as significant employment to the area, while this project is likely to reduce visual amenity and reduce tourism income while providing a very minor contribution to local employment, which might indeed be a net reduction if it lessens the attractiveness of the area to tourism.

The building would be sited in a prominent, elevated and very visible spot. Much of the tree and hedge screening which the appellants mention is not under their control, so we cannot be rely on it always remaining in place.

This development is on a smallholding, formerly a farm, from which the owners sold the best land after they bought the property originally. The owners do not live on site, despite the fine listed farmhouse, which they have renovated to a very high standard. Therefore it cannot be called agricultural diversification, as Cae Mor is not what any sensible individual would call a working farm. Witness the lack of agricultural buildings, which were either demolished or converted by the owners. Additionally, agricultural diversification would involve non-agricultural income, as opposed to the proposed intensive agro-industrial development and activity. Intensive production is very market-sensitive, and to use a marginally viable site would seem an unnecessary gamble with the appellants' money and the area's unspoilt rural aspect. If granted, we would be greatly reassured if it were stipulated that the buildings be removed, and the site restored to its former state, in case the site proves to be agriculturally non-viable, rather than have it transform into an industrial complex in the future.

In summary, we consider that this development would harm an area which would thrive better from sustainable tourist income rather than financially risky, mass-production food enterprises on a marginally viable elevated, north-facing hillside. We would urge the appellants to find a more suitable site, one which is lower lying, with less wind, snow and rainfall, and which is flatter and easier to screen.

Yours Faithfully,