

MEMORANDUM

From: Chief Officer, Environment & Technical **To:** Chief Officer Planning & Regulatory
Our Ref: ET/DC/PP/P/2022/0002 **Your Ref:** SJG/P/2022/0002
Date: 6th April 2022

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

TOWN AND COUNTRY (GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURE) ORDER 1995

Location: O. S Grid Ref: 459 353 Land east of Nags Head, Bettisfield, Wrexham.

Development: Erection of 4 dwellings.

I refer to the email from HSP Consulting dated 29/03/2022 including the following plans /details in respect of the above:-

- Drg. No. MS-HSP-00-00-DR-C-500 Visibility Splay
- Drg. No. MS-HSP-00-00-DR-C-501 Visibility Splay with Highway Boundary Records
- Drg. No. MS-HSP-00-00-DR-C-502 Proposed Upgrades to Internal Access Road
- Traffic Counts / Speed Survey Results

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.

The submitted layout plan (Drg. No. MS-HSP-00-00-DR-C-501) indicates a splay in the northerly direction of 2.4 x 52m measured to a point 1m in from the kerb. The splay is also indicated as cutting across 3rd party (Orca House) which is unacceptable.

Visibility can be permitted / relaxed to the nearside wheel-track in this instance. However, this is taken as being a maximum of 0.5m off the kerb and not 1m as indicated on the submitted plans. I would normally therefore recommend that the applicant provides a revised layout plan indicating this detail.

Visibility from the proposed 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. In addition, a scheme of traffic calming measures (including scheme of street lighting) were previously recommended along the site frontage in order to achieve the required visibility splays from the proposed access in accordance with Manual for Streets. The above measures would be subject to a public consultation process. Any proposed off site works would require the applicant to enter into a s.278 agreement with the Highway Authority.

No details of proposed traffic calming measures have been submitted with this application.

I understand from our Traffic section that they will be implementing a TRO shortly to reduce the prevailing speed limit from 60mph to 30mph along this section. This will be subject to a public consultation process but is not guaranteed to succeed. **If the proposed residential development is to be supported, I would recommend that the applicant awaits the outcome of the public consultation and discusses potential traffic calming measures with our Traffic Section to overcome the lack of visibility in the northerly direction.**

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 latest layout plan (Drg. No. 2441 / F19– Dated March 2022) indicates 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 **turning heads** within the development site, I comment as follows:-

Any proposed turning heads 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 revised plans include provision for a turning head. Swept path details

have been submitted indicating the movements of a refuse vehicle, fire tender and car accessing the site. **However, could you please ask the applicant to provide separate plans / swept path details for inbound and outbound movements for clarity.**

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

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, 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).

Could you please ask the applicant to provide a revised layout plan indicating the proposed number of driveway parking spaces afforded to each plot (including no. of bedrooms), annotating proposed driveway dimensions / parking spaces accordingly for further assessment.

Electric Vehicle Charging Points

I am not aware of any current requirements for such facilities on a development served by an unadopted estate road.

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.

It may therefore 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.

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

Chief Officer, Environment & Technical