

Hearing Submission for Matter 12 New Housing Development Proposals re Ash Lane Mancot/Hawarden

Colin Randerson, Hawarden Resident

Dear Inspector,

Together with Mr Rowlinson I submitted an objection to the FCC LDP as part of their consultation process, which you will have observed. Please accept the following as my hearing submission for matter 12 of the Independent Inspection of Flintshire LDP.

1) Settlement Hierarchy As discussed at the hearing on Matter 4:

- a. FCC confirmed that there did not exist any data analysis of the settlement audit to place settlements into tiers;
- b. no criteria were produced or signposted at the hearing to aid the objective and transparent placing of settlements into tiers;
- c. & }v(]œu]v šZ Z œ]vP šZ š šZ (]v]vP • }(šZ µ]š Z Á œ • ššo u v š •]vš} š] œ • [X E} À] v }(• µ Z œ v l]vP %œ } • • Á documentation for the LDP nor at the hearing;
- d. FCC described the process of assigning settlements into tiers as requiring the experience of a planner v they evidenced this by stating that the reason Hawarden was in tier 2 was that it possessed a v À]o o P this is qualitative feature did not form any aspect of the data that were collected for any settlement as part of the settlement audit; v }µ o œ P µ šZ š E}œ šZ}‰ Z • Z with boutique shops not too dissimilar to Hawarden, but this is classed as 3 settlement.
- e. The • ššo u v š µ]š (}œ , Á œ v]v o µ • • œ À] %œ }À] • }v u % v š œ Á]šZ íi }œ u }œ • Z}‰ • _V , Á œ v Z • ñ • Z}‰ • U ò](šZ (]P µ œ]v Æ • • }(íi ^• Z}‰ • _odisZ estate agents, Fairbalors] End Wellness centre would need to be included
- f. The audit service provision map displays the site of the proposed Ash Lane development as Big Mancot (OS Map), not Hawarden

The above approaches transform that which a reasonable person could justifiably expect to be an objective and transparent process into a subjective and inconsistent process and as such, results in the misplacing of Hawarden and no doubt other settlements - in the settlement tier hierarchy

In Summary the above data would indicate that either:

- i. Hawarden has been misplaced and should be in tier 3, if this were the case then the scale of the proposed Ash Lane development would be in excess of the LDPs own growth figures and national guidance; or
- ii. Hawarden should be in tier 2 if this were the case then FCC should be a facilitator of the development of suitable commercial premises as part of the LDP; even if the view is taken that Hawarden has been correctly assigned to tier 2, the scale of the development is such that it warrants being tied to tier 2 settlement, šZ • Z > v •]š Á}µ o v š } (]v • ^u}œ u } Z}µ •]vP Á o}‰ u v š _

2) Brownfield Sites t County Hall, MoldAs part of the consultation process, submissions were sought for alternative sites, and as such, I had highlighted that County Hall, Mold was signposted as green (ie •] š } u % o] • Á] š Z š Z } μ v] o [• W Œ (Œ Œ ^ š Œ š P Ç v u Ç Z À % } š v • μ i š š } • š] • (š } Œ Ç š Z v] o • • • u v š _

3) Is the site deliverable?

There are a number of areas of concern highlighted in the Statement of Common Ground document for the Ash Lane site (SOCG003-HN1.8-Ash-Lane-Hawarden)

- a. This represents an area of disagreement between the
% CE 0.007 cu

