Proposed Development at Pentre Meyrick 2014/00933/FUL

I wish to raise my objection on the following grounds;

The Proposed Development is contrary to policy Hous2. Affordable housing need has to be re addressed as there has been too much time lapse between the original planning consultations and now as prospective occupants has changed.

The planning application states there is no requirement for diversions, extinguishments and or creation of rights of way, I would question this as the current users of this unnamed track have paid for access across it to their properties, West House and Crosswinds Cottage, which has been maintained as per legal agreement for the last 26 years. Also the opening from the Ruthin Road to the access track would need to be widened; this gives rise to two points

1. There is an existing power cable and lamp post with wire support struts right on to one side of the opening within the natural hedge and extending into the grass verge.

2. The grass verge has Japanese Knotweed throughout which has been reported to the landowner and the council with no effort to safely remove it as per government guidelines National resources Wales have been contacted and a case has been made. Digging into this for ease of access and widening of the road risks spreading the Japanese Knotweed. If the same vehicles are used to clear the proposed site should the development go ahead without proper clearance then the Japanese Knotweed will spread to the land which the development will be built on, hence it would grow in the gardens.

Furthermore, Section 6 refers to “Public roads” and the erection of street lights. This will have a detrimental effect on wildlife, grass verges and infringe upon the residents of Nash View.

Section 16 of the planning application asks are there trees or hedges on the proposed development site? This is shown as NO. This is untrue as there are natural hedgerows, trees and well maintained grass verges adjacent to the proposed development, in fact part of these said grass verges, hedgerows and trees will be required to be removed in order for access to the proposed development. The natural boundary exists around the entirety of the field however the landowner has parcelled off a “kink” with wooden fencing, in the said field for the distinct purpose for the proposed development. Furthermore this entire field has always been classed as agricultural land. Section 15 of the planning application asks when did this use end? there is no date provided in the box. Arial Photos clearly show the field in its entirety before the man made erected fence was put up in late 2014.

As for the newly proposed speed restriction on the A48 at the local planning meeting the planning officer said at no time should any alterations to highways be made for the distinct purpose of developments, why then is there a plan to place a “puffin” crossing on an already dangerous road. A road which, when the new proposed development at the Darren Farm land is constructed it will create havoc as the A48 and the Pentre Meyrick to Ruthin road is a main feeder road to the M4 also ongoing developments at St Athan.. The amount of traffic will be immense and a “puffin” crossing will be of no benefit to anyone. Perhaps if planners and Hafodd Housing were to look at a practical solution for example, a roundabout which would naturally slow the traffic and then look at a safer crossing a life may be spared. The current path which leads around from Nash View past no. 1, the cottage is barley wide enough to walk let alone push a pram or a wheelchair.

As for the payment Hafodd has proposed to donate to the Green Links Bus service, what happens when the money ceases to flow and in turn so does the service? Does the council pick up the tab? Likewise with the school payment in what form, for what and for how long.

The very fact that the Highway authority have not thought of the safety of our small Hamlet for so many years and have never felt the need to reduce the speed limit or put a (puffin) crossing speaks volumes as to the importance of such a small hamlet. Likewise in order to ensure proposed new tenants, less able bodied persons, adults and children alike should when moving to a new development expect a safe play area, safe pathways to walk to and from school, cycle routes and other amenities. None of this currently exists at Pentre Meyrick. Local Authority, council or landowner has ever felt Pentre Meyrick warrants, or deserves this; it has never been a Hamlet of any significance to anyone other than the residents. In order for true sustainability to be achieved safety must be paramount but also an investment in the people not monetary gain. Common sense for all should now prevail.

As concerned rate paying residents we now hope that all objections, queries and comments are discussed in full and given the credence they deserve.