

# MEMORANDUM

---

**From:** Chief Officer, Environment & Technical      **To:** Chief Officer Planning & Regulatory  
**Our Ref:** ET/DC/PP/P/2022/0440      **Your Ref:** LA/P/2022/0440  
**Date:** 13<sup>th</sup> July 2022

---

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990**

**TOWN AND COUNTRY (GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURE) ORDER 1995**

**Location:** O. S Grid Ref: 430 445 Barnfields, Mulsford, Malpas, Wrexham.

**Development:** Two storey extension to garage to provide annexe accommodation and office space.

I refer to your consultation / email dated 13/07/2022 in respect of the above.

## **Access**

The proposed development site is located on Mulsford Road which is a rural, classified road subject to a 60mph speed limit. However, a speed survey was recently conducted along this section of Mulsford Road in respect of planning application ref: P/2019/0325 which determined 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds of 43.3mph for vehicles travelling in the westerly direction and 42.6mph for vehicles travelling in the easterly direction. These speeds would normally require the provision of visibility splays of 2.4 x 117m in the easterly direction and 2.4 x 114m in the westerly direction measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway in accordance with TAN 18.

Assuming such speeds to be comparable for this application, visibility from the existing / proposed access serving the development site is inadequate providing splays of approximately 2.4 x 4m in both directions measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway. Visibility is impeded in the easterly direction by the existing boundary wall and in the westerly direction by the existing boundary wall along with the required splay needing to cut across 3<sup>rd</sup> party land. I would suggest that the applicant considers carrying out improvements to this access to maximize the available visibility.

It would appear that the existing front boundary wall has been raised in height to approximately 1.3m. Previous images (Google Maps) dating back to 2009 appear to indicate a lower front boundary wall which appears to provide significantly better visibility. I assume that this is a matter for our Planning Enforcement Section to review. Ideally, the wall should be no higher than 1m above the adjoining carriageway level to maximize the available visibility from the access.

I would normally therefore be unable to support any proposed development that is likely to result in an increase in vehicle movements through this substandard access.

The existing access serving the development site is approximately 8m wide reducing to 4.1m. Gates are setback 5m behind the edge of carriageway. The access is capable of accommodating the simultaneous passage of 2 cars clear of the adjoining highway. The existing access is paved with hard bound materials for the first 5m behind the edge of carriageway.

### **Parking & Turning Provision**

There would appear to be adequate parking (for around 5 cars) and turning space within the curtilage of the development site.

**I would normally be able to support such a development if the dwelling was classed as an annexe. However, I understand that you cannot accept the development as an annexe but as a new dwelling within open countryside. On this basis, I would be unable to support the proposed development given the lack of visibility at the existing / proposed access.**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'R. K.', written in a cursive style.

Chief Officer, Environment & Technical