

MEMORANDUM

From:	Chief Officer, Environment & Technical	To:	Chief Officer Planning & Regulatory
		FAO::	Rhian Chitty
Our Ref:	ET/DC/PP/P/2023/0551	Your Ref:	P/2023/0551
Date:	08/09/2023		

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

ADEILADU 4 ANNEDD / ERECTION OF 4 DWELLINGS

LAND TO THE REAR OF EATONFIELD CLOSE BETTISFIELD WHITCHURCH WREXHAM

Grid Ref: E 346025.32 N 335362.7

I refer to your email / enquiry dated 31/08/2023 including the following plans / details in respect of the above. These plans were previously submitted and responded to (see comments below) via a preliminary enquiry (ref: PRE/2022/0018) prior to submitting this application:-

- **Drg No. BS-HSP-00-00-DR-C-215 Rev P01
Existing Access Arrangement Dimensions**
- **Drg No. BS-HSP-00-00-DR-C-214 Rev P01
Upgraded Access Arrangement Dimensions**
- **Drg No. BS-HSP-00-00-DR-C-213 Rev P01
Proposed Visibility Splays**
- **Drg No. BS-HSP-00-00-DR-C-216 Rev P01
Car Vehicle Tracking**
- **Drg No. BS-HSP-00-00-DR-C-217 Rev P01
Delivery Vehicle Tracking**
- **Drg No. BS-HSP-00-00-DR-C-218 Rev P01
Large Refuse Vehicle Tracking**
- **Drg No. BS-HSP-00-00-DR-C-219 Rev P01
Small Refuse Vehicle Tracking**
- **Drg No. BS-HSP-00-00-DR-C-220 Rev P01
Delivery Vehicle Tracking**

- **Drg No. BS-HSP-00-00-DR-C-221 Rev P01**
Fire Tender Vehicle Tracking

Access

The proposed development site is located on a classified road subject to a 60mph speed limit. However, a recent speed survey carried out between 11-17/03/2022 determined 85th percentile speeds of 34.3mph for vehicles travelling southbound and 37.9mph for vehicles travelling northbound. Based on these speeds of, any proposed / existing access would normally be required to provide visibility splays of 2.4 x 52m in the northerly direction and 2.4 x 61m in the southerly direction measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway in which there shall be no obstruction in excess of 1.0m in height in accordance with Manual for Streets.

Visibility from the existing access is inadequate in the north westerly direction providing a splay of approximately 2.4 x 25m measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway or approximately 2.4 x 28m measured to the nearside wheel-track (0.5m in from kerb). Visibility is impeded in this direction given the geometry of the road along this section and any splay would appear to need to cut across 3rd party land.

Visibility in the southerly direction appears adequate providing a splay in excess of 2.4 x 120m measured to the nearside edge / nearside wheel-track of the adjoining highway.

Based on previous discussions in respect of previous planning applications ref: P/2007/0494 & P/2007/0493, in order to provide a safe means of access to serve any proposed development of this size / nature would require the implementation of Traffic Regulation Order to reduce the prevailing speed limit from 60mph to 30mph along the site frontage. I understand from our Traffic section that the consultation process to reduce the prevailing speed limit to 30mph is nearing completion and will be concluded shortly. **I would recommend that you liaise with our Traffic Section on this matter.**

Upgraded Access Arrangement Dimensions Drg No. BS-HSP-00-00-DR-C-214 Rev P01

The proposed access arrangements indicated on the submitted layout plan appear acceptable to serve the proposed development. However, the full extent of the estate road has not been indicated.

Proposed Visibility Splays Drg No. BS-HSP-00-00-DR-C- Rev P01

If the proposed 30mph speed limit is implemented it would appear possible to provide visibility splays from the re-aligned access of 2.4 x 43m in both directions measured 0.5m in from the edge of carriageway ie/ nearside wheeltrack which would be considered acceptable. However, the required splay in the northerly direction does appear to need to cut across the top of the 400m high boundary wall belonging to Orca House. Providing the height of this wall can be retained at a suitable height to facilitate visibility in perpetuity and controlled by appropriate planning legislation should modifications be proposed in the future, it would be reasonable to assume that adequate visibility in this direction could be provided ie/ if an application was submitted to modify this wall then I assume that we could object should it impede visibility from the development site access or the driveway itself.

Internal Layout

The proposed access road would potentially serve 4 no dwellings plus the 4 no. town houses previously constructed at the front of the site (planning ref: P/2009/0971) equating to a total of 8 no. dwellings.

For a development serving up to 24 no. dwellings, our current adoptable standards normally require an access road width of at least 4.8m with either 2.0m wide footways either side or 1.8m service strips either side.

The applicant has previously constructed a non-standard access to serve the 4 no. town houses which forms part of the proposed access to the current application. This access has inadequate kerb radii and the geometry of the road is non-standard. The access is approximately 6.8m wide at its junction with the classified road reducing to around 4.5m at approximately 16m behind the main road which would normally be considered inadequate to serve the proposed development.

Beyond this point, the previous layout plan (Drg. No. 2441 / F19 Rev A) indicated a proposed shared carriageway width of 6m. I understand that the applicant is proposing 1.2m of this access road to incorporate a 1.2m strip for pedestrians marked out with a textured or coloured surface treatment which would appear acceptable. Driveways require a minimum 6m clearance behind for turning provision (cars).

In terms of the **turning head** within the development site, I comment as follows:-

Any proposed turning heads normally need to be able to accommodate the turning movements of an 11.2m long refuse vehicle. Given the non-standard layout of the site, the estate road would not be considered suitable for adoption and would need to be maintained by a private management company in perpetuity. The latest submitted plans included provision for a turning head which can accommodate the turning movements of an 8.6m long fire tender and an 8 long delivery vehicle. Swept path details have previously been submitted indicating the movements of an 11.2m and 7.9m long refuse vehicle, 8m long delivery vehicle and car maneuvering within the site which appear acceptable.

As our waste / recycling vehicles do not normally enter private access roads, I assume that any waste / recycling services would need to be dealt with by a private company. I would recommend that the applicant discusses this issue with our Waste Strategy Officer – Catherine Golightly on Tel: 01978 729693. I understand that you have discussed / agreed a suitable bin store with our Waste Strategy Officer whereby collection is proposed from the main road. **Any proposed bin store facilities will need to be detailed on a revised layout plan. If the above waste collection arrangements are considered acceptable, then an internal turning head capable of accommodating an 8.6m long fire tender and 8m long delivery vehicle would be considered acceptable**

In terms of **parking provision** within the development site, I comment as follows:-

Parking provision at the site will need to comply with LPGN 16 / WCBC Standard Driveway Requirements. LPGN 16 excludes garage spaces when considering parking provision. Given the unsustainable location of the site, it would be considered appropriate to provide parking provision for each plot in accordance with maximum requirements.

LPGN 16 requires 6m clearance behind spaces to facilitate turning.

In order to accommodate 4 car spaces for each dwelling, I would recommend that a double width driveway is a minimum of 5.6m wide and minimum of 9.6m deep (if no garage) or 10.3m deep (if garage provided). The proposed parking arrangements were previously indicated on submitted layout plan (Drg. No. 2441/D04 Rev B) which appeared adequate.

Highway Surface Water Drainage

There are significant existing problems with the drainage of surface water in this location which is exacerbated by poor ground conditions / high water table in this area.

I assume that the applicant will require SABs consent for this development.

Public Transport

I have spoken with our Transport Section (contact: Andrew Mytton) who have advised that there is no standard bus service serving Bettisfield. There is only a single return trip once every Monday to Wrexham provided by a 16 seater accessible service bus.

Sustainability

The development site is located on a remote, rural, classified road along which there is limited footway provision. There are no local facilities / services available. It may be considered that the proposed development site is in an unsustainable location and does not support the opportunity for residents to walk safely to local facilities and public transport stops.

The proposed development may not be considered to meet the requirements of the settlement policies detailed in TAN 18. These policies require residential developments to provide safe walking and cycling routes to local facilities and public transport stops.

A recent similar development for 9 dwellings at Happy Days Coaches, Mill Lane, Bronington (Planning Ref: P/2021/0137) was dismissed at appeal with significant weight given by the inspector in respect of the unsustainable location of the site.

In conclusion, it would be difficult to support the proposed development for the reasons highlighted above.

Latest Submission (P/2023/0551)

Layout

I assume that the details / plans (listed above) previously submitted have been replicated and are relevant to the latest submitted plans but with differing drawing nos. The previous comments above are therefore relevant to the current application.

One significant change that has recently occurred in respect of this development is the reduction in the speed limit along Bettisfield Road from 60mph to 30mph. This has provided the opportunity for the existing access onto Bettisfield Road to be modified to provide the required visibility splays (ie/ 2.4 x 43m in both directions in accordance with Manual for Streets).

Any proposed modifications to the existing access will require the developer to enter into a s.278 agreement with the Council to carry out the works.

If the application is supported, given the non-standard layout of the site, the site will need to be managed in perpetuity by a private management company.

Waste Collection / Recycling

I would recommend that you confirm approval from the WCBC Waste Section in respect of the bin storage facilities / location and proposed servicing from the main road (not internal access road). Contact details are as follows:-

*Senior Waste Strategy Officer – Gabrielle Povey on Tel: 01978 729640
Waste Strategy Officer – Catherine Golightly on Tel: 01978 729693*

Highway Surface Water Drainage

There are significant existing problems with the drainage of surface water in this location which is exacerbated by poor ground conditions / high water table in this area.

I assume that the applicant will require SABs consent for this development.

No private surface water shall be permitted to flow from the development site onto the adjoining highway. An Aco drain or similar will be required to intercept any such run-off. Submitted plan Drg. No. (1549/01 Rev P5) indicates this detail.

Public Transport

I have spoken with our Transport Section (contact: Andrew Mytton) who have advised that there is no standard bus service serving Bettisfield. There is only a single return trip once every Monday to Wrexham provided by a 16 seater accessible service bus.

Sustainability

The development site is located on a remote, rural, classified road along which there is limited footway provision. There are no local facilities / services available. It may be considered that the proposed development site is in an unsustainable location and does not support the opportunity for residents to walk safely to local facilities and public transport stops.

The proposed development may not be considered to meet the requirements of the settlement policies detailed in TAN 18. These policies require residential developments to provide safe walking and cycling routes to local facilities and public transport stops.

A recent similar development for 9 dwellings at Happy Days Coaches, Mill Lane, Bronington (Planning Ref: P/2021/0137) was dismissed at appeal with significant weight given by the inspector in respect of the unsustainable location of the site.

In conclusion, it would be difficult to support the proposed development for the reasons highlighted above.

Supplementary Notes

The applicant's attention should be drawn to item nos. 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5 of the supplementary notes.

Note to Applicant

The proposed access / footway works should be constructed to a standard suitable for adoption by the Council for future maintenance at the public expense and the developer will need to enter into an agreement with the Council under s.278 of the Highways Act 1980.



Chief Officer, Environment & Technical