

Flintshire LDP hearings written submission

ID 1230363

I am writing this representation for the hearing on 15<sup>th</sup> April regarding matter 12, HN1.8 Ash Lane Development, specifically addressing the coalescence of the settlement boundaries of Hawarden and Mancot. If this issue is better addressed in a different section please advise me of this and I can adjust the representation so it is heard most appropriately.

Dear Inspector

In regard to coalescence of neighbouring residential areas I feel that the response the council planners have submitted is simplifying the point and disregarding a large area.

The council's response to the original representations on this issue is as follows:

"The settlements of Hawarden and Mancot are already joined as reflected in the adopted UDP. The settlement boundary for Hawarden includes the main (or historic core of the village) and the part of the village between the railway line and Gladstone Way. It also includes the development on the east side of Gladstone Way including Park Avenue and Kennedy Drive. The settlement boundary between Hawarden and Mancot runs from the west of Paddock Way, the northern end of Park Avenue and the rear gardens of properties on Brookleigh Avenue to join Cottage Lane. The two settlements are already coalesced and have been for several decades."

This area of Upperdale of Hawarden reaches Mancot at the very tips of these adjacent areas. Please see Figure 1 + 2 taken from the Ordnance Survey Explorer Map 266.

The tips of these areas reach each other with the back gardens of the west side of The Paddock bordering 2 back gardens of north east Park Ave. There are 5 back gardens of south Brookleigh Ave houses backing onto a public fenced footpath which is the boundary line. Four Harwarden houses of Kennedy Drive have back gardens that go up to that footpath or a Brookleigh Ave house garden. There is no road access through the boundary line, only a public footpath next to the White Bear and Cottage Lane around the outside of the residential properties. Figure 3, 4 + 5.

Please compare this to Figure 6 showing the amount of coalescence present with the Ash Lane development completed. This completely joins the residential housing areas off Ash lane, Mancot Lane and through to all of the east side of Park Avenue and the top end of Gladstone Way. There is certainly no distinction between areas after this development.

It seems to be against the purpose of the council's policy to avoid coalescence to state that it can be disregarded as a point of disagreement because these areas

are already coalesced when it is only a very small section within these large areas of discussion. The Ash Lane development significantly affects the separate nature of the residential areas.

The other aspect is comparison of the housing style and different urban character. I disagree with the councils response. The houses of the Upperdale region of Hawarden, are substantially older, larger properties, detached or semi detached with significant gardens and front gardens with drive ways. In the area affected by this development there are some that were built in the early 1900s. In comparison, the houses of Mancot are smaller properties including affordable housing estates, mixed terraced and semidetached with much less garden and less presence from the roadside. They are also considerably newer.

I would recommend a visit to the 2 areas to realise their quite distinct characters further.

This all demonstrates that the Ash Lane development is not appropriate for the local area causing significant coalescence of 2 separate residential areas which have quite distinctly different urban characteristics. There was not enough local knowledge or awareness in the creation of the Flintshire LDP. As such it makes this development part of the LDP unsound in regards to these issues.

Yours sincerely

Edward Flook




Figure 1




Figure 2



Figure 3




Figure 4




Figure 5




Figure 6