

MEMORANDUM

From:	Chief Officer, Environment & Technical	To:	Chief Officer Planning & Regulatory
Our Ref:	ET/DC/P/2020/0784	Your Ref:	MRJ/P/2020/0784
Date:	5 th January 2022		

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

TOWN AND COUNTRY (GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURE) ORDER 1995

Location: Land to rear of 6 Church Road, Overton.

Development: Outline application (all matters reserved) for the erection of a single dwelling and detached garage.

I refer to your consultation / email dated 21/12/2021 including submitted Supporting Statement and email dated 29/12/2021 including the Appeal Decision dated 03/11/1994 in respect of the above.

Although all matters are reserved, I would make the following comments:-

Access

The proposed development site is located on Church Road which is a classified, residential road subject to a 30mph speed limit. Although vehicles approaching from the north may well travel up to 30mph, I would estimate typical vehicles speeds of 25mph for vehicles approaching from the south given the proximity to the junction with the A539.

Based on the above speeds, any proposed / existing access in this location would normally be required to provide visibility splays of 2.4 x 43m to the north and 2.4m x 33m to the south measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway in accordance with Manual for Streets.

Visibility from the proposed / existing access serving the development site is adequate in the northerly direction providing a splay in excess of 2.4 x 43m measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway. However, visibility in the southerly direction is inadequate providing a splay of approximately 2.4 x 10m measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway. Visibility is restricted in this direction in that the required splay would cut across 3rd party land.

I would therefore be unable to support any proposal that is likely to result in an increase in vehicle movements through this sub-standard access.

The submitted Supporting Statement (dated 15/12/2021) and Appeal Decision (dated 03/11/1994) suggests the following:-

- Use of a 2m setback distance not 2.4m
- Typical speeds of 20mph approaching from the south.
- Measuring the y distance (SSD) to the centerline of the adjoining highway.
- That overtaking is highly unlikely at this location for vehicles travelling from the south

Manual for Streets suggests that the use of a 2m setback distance could be considered where traffic speeds are low and the road is very lightly trafficked eg/ rural lane. I would not consider 25mph to be a low speed or Church Road to be particularly lightly trafficked. I would therefore consider the use of a 2m setback to be inappropriate in this instance.

I would not consider typical speeds to be 20mph for vehicles approaching from the south along Church Road in this location. The speed survey referred to in the previous Appeal Decision (dated 03/11/1994) is referred to as not clear in relation to the precise locations of the radar checks. The speed survey referred to is in excess of 27 years old and would not normally be accepted. A new survey would normally be requested.

Whilst we do not consider the traffic flow to be light, or typical speeds to be <20mph, the applicant may wish to undertake and submit a survey comprising of both traffic volume and speed, in order to support (or otherwise) their alternative assertions.

Measuring visibility to the centerline of the adjoining highway is only considered appropriate where there is a relevant traffic regulation order ie/ double white lines, a physical barrier preventing overtaking or the adjoining carriageway being less than 4.1m wide. In this instance, the required visibility splay should be measured to the nearside edge. The submitted report suggests that it is unlikely that any vehicles will be overtaking along this section. However, vehicles often park on the carriageway on the opposite side of the road and vehicles do therefore have to overtake. Vehicles parking on the street in this location has been witnessed on a number of occasions which is likely to be due to overspill from the existing public car park.

The existing access serving the development site is approximately 3.8m wide and is gated 5.3m behind the adjoining carriageway. I would normally recommend a shared access of this nature to be a minimum of 4.5m wide. However, an absolute minimum width of 4.1m could be considered acceptable based on the requirements of Manual for Streets. The submitted layout plan (Drg. No. CS/PD/02) indicates a proposed widening of the access to 4.5m by 6m which would be considered acceptable for a shared access.

Changes in circumstances since Appeal Decision (Dated 03/11/1994)

St Mary's School

St Mary's School is located at the northern end of Church Road. I understand that the school was built around 1985 but has been extended twice in 1995 and 1998. I understand that the school also includes a playcentre / nursery.

The existing car park serving the school appears to provide parking for approximately 10 cars. Typically 2 to 3 cars (assumed to be staff) appear to park along the access to the school encroaching on the footway. I assume as is the case with most schools, the existing parking provision is inadequate in respect of both staff and parents / visitors.

I understand that there is no off-site parking provided for the existing playcentre / nursery.

It would appear that a significant number of vehicles park along School Lane, some of which I assume are staff vehicles. This results in impeded two way flows along this section which is far from ideal. Having spoken with our Traffic section, it would appear that they receive regular complaints from residents in this area in respect of parked vehicles obstructing private driveways. I assume that this is a result of the lack of adequate parking provision for the school staff and parents during drop-off / collection times.

It is inevitable that during school / playcentre drop-off / collection times that the demand for on-street parking increases significantly. Whilst visiting the site on 16 & 17/10/2019, it is obvious that many parents / vehicles require on-street parking which results in a significant number of vehicles parking along this section of School Lane including indiscriminate parking on and around the junction of School Lane / Turning Street which is hazardous. Vehicles were also observed parking indiscriminately on the junctions of Old School Mews, St Mary's Avenue and on the "Keep Clear" markings near the school entrance.

The existing public car park to the south along Church Road appears to accommodate around 30 spaces. However, this car park appears to be intensively used throughout the day with very limited spare capacity for use by the school / playcentre. During previous site visits, this car park was typically close to capacity with only between 1 – 3 spaces being available. A number of vehicles were also observed parked either side of the car park access along Church Road who I assume could not find space within the car park. I assume that this car park is used by anyone shopping in Overton, people visiting the church and mainly people visiting the medical centre / pharmacy. The school has obviously expanded since the appeal decision in 1994 which will have resulted in increased traffic flows along Church Road / School Lane and increased parking demand.

Overton Medical Practice / Pharmacy

I understand that the original medical surgery was extended significantly in 2003 from 160m² gfa to 690m² gfa and incorporated a new pharmacy. Although there is a small car park serving the practice off the High Street, I would assume that the majority of patients using this facility travel along Church Road to use the public car park (30 spaces).

Given the significantly improved development and the number of patients using the facility, it is highly likely that trips to the practice / pharmacy have increased significantly since the previous Appeal Decision in 1994. This will have resulted in increased traffic flows along Church Road for those patients seeking parking.

Parking & Turning Provision

In terms of parking provision at the proposed development site, I comment as follows:-

The existing property (assumed 4 bedrooms) appears to provide parking for up to 4 cars on the driveway and 2 car spaces in the garage. Parking provision for the proposed property appears adequate providing parking for at least 3 cars.

I would recommend that any proposed dwelling provides appropriate parking provision in accordance with LPGN 16 requirements.

I would also recommend that adequate parking space is provided to allow vehicles to turn on site and exit in a forward gear. This could also take the form of a communal / shared turning facility for both properties.

In conclusion, it would be difficult to support the proposed development given the lack of adequate visibility at the proposed access based on current standards.

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

Chief Officer, Environment & Technical