

# MEMORANDUM

---

**From:** Planning Control Manager                      **To:** Head of Environment and Planning  
**Our Ref:** EP/DC/PP/2018/0713                      **Your Ref:** MR/P/2018/0713  
**Date:** 14<sup>th</sup> September 2018

---

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990**

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

**Location:** O. S Grid Ref: 353 551 Oakdale, Pant Lane, Gresford, Wrexham.

**Development:** Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of 2 dwellings and access arrangement.

I refer to your consultation dated 28/08/2018 in respect of the above.

**Access**

The development site is located on Pant Lane which is a classified, residential road subject to a 30mph speed limit.

Assuming typical speeds of 30mph, any proposed / existing access serving the development site would normally be required to provide visibility splays of 2.4 x 43m in both directions measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway in accordance with Manual for Streets.

The existing access serving the development site is approximately 7m wide reducing to 3.3m wide at 5.2m behind the adjoining carriageway. The access is gated at this point.

Visibility from the existing access is inadequate in both directions providing splays of approximately 2.4 x 4m in both directions measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway. Visibility is restricted in the westerly direction in that the current visibility splay looks across the neighboring driveway and is impeded beyond this point by the existing boundary wall / fence. Visibility in the easterly direction is impeded by the existing hedgerow / trees fronting the existing property. Even if these obstruction were removed, a visibility splay of only approximately 2.4 x 28m could be achieved in this direction measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway. Visibility beyond this point is restricted in that the required splay would cut across 3<sup>rd</sup> party land (adjoining property Langside).

Even if the proposed shared access was re-located from the proposed westerly position to a more central position, it would not be possible to provide the required visibility splays. The applicant has not indicated the required / proposed splays on the submitted layout plan.

I would therefore not be able to support any proposed development that is likely to result in any increase in vehicle movements at the proposed development site.

## **Parking & Turning Provision**

Any proposed development of this nature would need to provide adequate parking and turning provision for both dwellings.

The property closest to the access appears to be 4 bedroomed and the property to the rear 5 bedroomed. LPGN 16 would normally require a maximum of 3 spaces for the 4 bed property and 4 spaces for the 5 bed property, LPGN 16 does not include garages as contributing to parking provision.

I would recommend that maximum parking provision is provide at the site given the geometry of this section of Pant Lane. The submitted layout plan does not adequately indicate the required parking provision or how all of the vehicles will turn on the site. However, adequate parking and turning provision could be achieved if the layout was modified.

I would therefore recommend that the application be **REFUSED** for the following reasons:-

1. **The proposed development does not make adequate provision for the parking and turning of vehicles clear of the adjoining carriageway.**
2. **It appears impracticable within the curtilage of the site to construct an access with Pant Lane which would provide sufficient visibility for vehicles emerging from the site.**

*Peter Douthwaite*

*PD* Planning Control Manager