

MEMORANDUM

From: Chief Officer, Environment & Technical **To:** Chief Officer Planning & Regulatory
Our Ref: ET/DC/P/2021/0555 Res(3) **Your Ref:** SB/P/2021/0555
Date: 8th December 2023

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

CODI ANNEDD / ERECTION OF DWELLING **20 SMITHY ROAD COEDPOETH WREXHAM**

Grid Ref: E 328591 N 351193

I refer to your consultation dated 11/06/2021 in respect of the above and provide additional information to support the application.

Access

The proposed development site is located off a shared private driveway off Smithy Road. Smithy Road is a classified, residential road subject to a 20mph speed limit. Based on typical speeds of 20mph, any proposed / existing access would normally require visibility splays of 2.4 x 25m in both directions measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway.

Visibility from the existing shared access is adequate in the north westerly direction providing a splay in excess of 2.4 x 25m measured to the nearside edge. However, visibility in the south easterly direction is only approximately 2.4 x 19m measured to the nearside edge. Visibility in this direction is impeded by the existing vegetation / hedge which appears to belong to no. 19 Smithy Road. However, I have reported this issue to our Streetscene Section who should be able to ensure that this vegetation is cutback so as not to overhang the adopted highway.

The existing unadopted, shared access is approximately 5.1m wide and can accommodate the simultaneous passage of 2 cars. The access is surfaced with hard bound materials. No private surface water run-off is normally permitted to flow onto the adjoining highway. An Aco drain or similar would normally be required to intercept any such run-off. The access currently has no means of intercepting private surface water run-off.

The existing shared driveway is relatively steep. I would recommend the applicant provides details of the existing access gradient.

Inclusive Mobility Guidance suggests that gradients should not exceed **1 in 20**. (A slope steeper than this is generally defined as a 'ramp'). Even if a pedestrian route has no slopes in excess of 1 in 20, it is important that there are level sections, or 'landings', at regular intervals. Gradients steeper than 1 in 20 can be managed by some wheelchair users, but only over very short distances. Even over these short distances the maximum gradient used should be no more than **1 in 10**. As a general rule, however, **1 in 12** should be the absolute maximum.

I understand that the occupiers of the two bungalows at the top of the shared driveway own the whole unadopted road including small turning head. I understand that the occupiers of nos. 19 & 20 only have a limited right of access over the access up to their single parking spaces and are not permitted to use the existing turning head. I also understand that the boundary wall off the private drive for no. 19 & 20 cannot be altered.

If the above information is correct, then I assume that the proposed development could not be delivered / supported.

Parking & Turning Provision

The access currently provides access to 4 existing properties. The 2 bungalows at the top of the driveway appear to have 2 spaces each if their single garages are included plus use of a small turning head.

I understand that nos. 19 & 20 appear to have a single parking space each but are not permitted to use the existing turning head.

I would normally recommend that a development of this nature provides at least a medium sized turning head as a minimum to allow delivery vehicles to turn within the curtilage of the site.

The private shared access is only approximately 5.1m wide. LPGN 16 requires a minimum clearance of 6m so cars can reverse and turn out of a parking space. If the existing boundary walls cannot be modified along with this limited width, turning provision would not comply with current standards.

Conclusion

Based on the above issues, it would appear difficult to support the proposed development.

Supplementary Notes

The applicant's attention should be drawn to item nos. 1, 3, 4 & 5 of the supplementary notes.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'K. Smith', is written over a horizontal line.

Chief Officer, Environment & Technical