

MEMORANDUM

From: Planning Control Manger

To: Head of Environment and Planning

Our Ref: EP/DC/P/2017/0623

Your Ref: SW/P/2017/0623

Date: 19th November 2018

Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Section 78 Appeal @ Land at Broad Oak Farm, Llyndir Lane, Rossett, Wrexham.

I refer to your consultation / email dated 16/11/2018 in respect of the above.

I am satisfied with my previous responses made to this application (copies attached).

Peter Douthwaite

PD Planning Control Manger

MEMORANDUM



From: Service Manager Environment **To:** Head of Environment and Planning
Our Ref: EP/DC/PP/2017/0623 **Your Ref:** MR/P/2017/0623
Date: 15th August 2017

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

TOWN AND COUNTRY (GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURE) ORDER 1995

Location: O. S Grid Ref: 367 584 Broadoak Farm, Llyndir Lane, Rossett, Wrexham.

Development: Change of use and conversion of barns to 13 no. residential units including part demolition, access and parking arrangements.

I refer to your consultation dated 07/08/2017 in respect of the above.

Access

The proposed development site is located on Llyndir Lane which is a classified road subject to a 60mph speed limit. However, a previously conducted speed survey along this section determined 85th percentile values of 33.2mph for vehicles approaching the development site from the north west and 32.6mph for vehicles approaching from the south east.

The farm appears to have 3 main points of access in addition to the existing access which serves the farmhouse itself. All existing access points suffer from inadequate visibility and do not meet the requirements of Manual for Streets. However, the most northerly access (approximately 2.9m wide, does not appear to be included in the application site. I assume that the buildings at the northerly part of the site also previously formed part of the former pig farm. I assume that any vehicle movements associated with these buildings / access are included in the traffic figures quoted in the Design & Access Statement. On this basis, this access (most northerly) would need to be permanently closed up. **Could you please provide further clarification on this element of the development site.**

Based on 85th percentile speeds of 33mph in both directions along this section of Llyndir Lane, Manual for Streets would normally require any proposed / existing access to provide visibility splays of 2.4 x 49m in both directions measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway. As determined speeds are less than 40mph, stopping sight distances detailed in Manual for Streets are considered acceptable.

The section of carriageway fronting the site appears to range between 3.9 – 5.2m in width. A minimum carriageway width of 5.5m with a 2.0m wide footway would normally be required in this location.

There would appear to be two main routes between the development site and the B5445 Chester Road where a limited number of community facilities can be reached ie. Bus stops, shops, schools, public houses etc. The shortest access route is via the unclassified road which runs past the Rossett Business Village. However, this route suffers from inadequate carriageway widths, limited passing places and cannot easily accommodate the simultaneous passage of 2 no. vehicles along

the majority of its length (approx. 800m). There is no footway provision between Llyndir Lane and the Rossett Business Village and the footway beyond this point is less than 2.0m in width.

This section of road (Lavister Lane) would benefit from an additional passing place located between the junction with Llyndir Lane and the Rossett Business Village access (ie/ Minimum length – 16m, minimum width 5.5m) where the carriageway narrows to around 3.2m.

The alternative access route from the development site to Chester Road is via Llyndir Lane. The Llyndir Lane / Chester Road junction is of inadequate width and Llyndir Lane itself typically suffers from inadequate carriageway widths including sections suffering from poor forward visibility and is considered unsuitable to serve any additional development which would result in a significant increase in traffic movements. There is no lighting or footway provision along this section of Llyndir Lane.

The nature of the proposed development would inevitably create increased pedestrian movements along both Llyndir Lane and the unclassified lane (Lavister Lane) which runs past Rossett Business Village. Given the inadequate carriageway widths, lack of lighting / footway provision and the inadequate level of visibility at the existing access points serving the development site, I would not normally wish to support any proposed development that would generate any additional vehicular and pedestrian movements along these lanes. If an application for additional residential development is to be supported at the site, I would recommend that any proposed development is limited to the existing levels of traffic generation which were previously experienced by the farm.

Llyndir Lane would benefit from an additional passing place located to the south of the farmhouse access (ie/ Minimum length – 16m, minimum width 5.5m) where the carriageway narrows to around 4.5m.

Could you please ask the applicant to provide a suitably scaled layout plan indicating the 2 no. suggested passing places. I would recommend that the applicant indicates the extent of land ownership either side of the development site. Previous planning application ref: P/2010/0510 at the development site proposed a new footway link between the development site and the Rossett Business Village. This footway was proposed behind the existing hedgerow and offered a significant improvement in terms of pedestrian safety. **Assuming the applicant still has control of this land, I would recommend that this footway is indicated on a revised layout plan.**

In order to carry out the recommended highway improvements, there would appear to be potential issues with the existing local land drainage network (ie/ ditches). WCBC does have a policy regarding culverting of watercourses, with a presumption against. If any works are required that will affect the local drainage network there will be the requirement for additional consent under Section 23 of the Land Drainage Act from WCBC as Lead Local Flood Authority. Although not detailed within the application, the diversion of any open watercourses would be preferential to the introduction of additional lengths of culvert.

TAN 18 recommends that housing developments should be provided in locations with good access by walking and cycling to primary and secondary schools and public transport stops, and by all modes to employment, further and higher education, services, shopping and leisure, or where such access will be provided as part of the scheme. TAN 18 requires layouts and densities, which maximise the opportunity for residents to walk and cycle to local facilities and public transport stops. However, it is considered that even when vehicles, pedestrians, cyclists arrive at either of the junctions from the development site with the B5445 Chester Road there are very few local facilities available.

The previously submitted Highways – Supplementary Note suggests that the farm previously generated approximately 206 two-way trips per week (412 movements), which spread over a 5.5 day working week equates to around 75 no. vehicle movements per day. This level of traffic generation would appear quite excessive for a farm and I cannot accept this suggested level of traffic generation without further detailed justification. However, on the assumption that the suggested level of traffic generation is accepted, it would still only equate to a very limited residential development which would still require additional highway improvements ie/ footways, carriageway widening, passing places.

No specific TRICS data appears to have been submitted which relates to similar relatively remote, rural sites in terms of the existing pig farm and proposed dwellings. **I would recommend that appropriate TRICS data is provided which reflects similar site characteristics. I await the requested information.**

Even if the proposed development was limited to existing / previous traffic generation levels, this would only equate to a maximum number of 7 no. dwellings (based on 10 - 11 vehicle movements per dwelling).

Site Layout (Drg. No. L04 Rev P2)

Access Improvements

The submitted layout plan indicates improvements to the wider central access, providing splays in excess of 2.4 x 49m in both directions measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway which would be considered acceptable. However, the required splay in the northerly direction appears to potentially cut across 3rd party land (as indicated on the submitted layout plan) and the full extent of the proposed splay has not been indicated in the south easterly direction. **Could you please provide further clarification on this element of the development site and explain whether the applicant has control of the land in this direction. The full extent of the proposed splays in both directions will need to be indicated on a revised layout plan.**

The provision of adequate visibility in both directions from this central access is reliant on providing an extended verge / footway in front of the existing buildings and widening the existing carriageway to an approximate width of 5.3 to 6.2m along the site frontage which is considered to be a significant improvement compared with existing access arrangements. I would recommend that the hatched areas fronting the site are constructed as footway.

In terms of the proposed southerly entrance shown as an "entrance in / one way only", I comment as follows:-

This arrangement would be difficult to control and any residents living in the courtyard nearest to Llyndir Lane are unlikely to travel through the rear of the site to exit at the more northerly access. I would therefore recommend that this access is closed up with a footway constructed across it possibly providing a pedestrian access to the site at this point. **I would recommend that this detail is indicated on a revised layout plan.**

Should the application be supported, the developer would need to enter into an agreement with the Council under Section 38 / 278 of the Highways Act 1980 in order to carry out the proposed highway improvements works.

Parking & Turning Provision

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

Given the remote nature of the site, I would recommend that any proposed parking provision complies with the maximum standards detailed in LPGN 16. LPGN 16 would require 35 spaces. The submitted layout plan (Drg. No. L04 Rev P2) indicates the provision of 35 spaces which is considered acceptable.

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

Any proposed development would need to provide adequate turning provision within the curtilage of the development site for both refuse wagons and those vehicles (ie/ delivery) likely to visit the site. The submitted layout plan indicates the turning of an 11.2m long refuse vehicle within the curtilage of the site which is considered acceptable.

In conclusion, the site is considered to be in an unsustainable location accessed by carriageways of inadequate widths and lacking in footway provision. However, if the application is supported, I would recommend that any proposed development is restricted to existing traffic generation levels previously experienced at the farm which based on the submitted information would only equate to a maximum number of 7 no. dwellings (based on 10 - 11 vehicle movements per dwelling). I would recommend that appropriate TRICs data is provided for further consideration which reflects similar relatively remote, rural sites in terms of the existing farm and proposed dwellings.

I await the requested information.

Notes to Applicant

- *Any proposed highway improvements shall 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.38 / 278 of the Highways Act 1980.*

You are advised that the Highway Authority will require such works to be completed to their satisfaction before they will formally adopt the relevant Highway works for public use and to be maintained at public expense. This will include the provision of a bond to cover the estimated value of such works.

The appropriate fees will become due to the Council when the Highway Authority approve the proposed works to be carried out

Supplementary Notes

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

Peter Douthett

PD Service Manager Environment

MEMORANDUM



From: Service Manager Environment **To:** Head of Environment and Planning
Our Ref: EP/DC/PP/2017/0623 **Your Ref:** MR/P/2017/0623
Date: 18th October 2017

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990
TOWN AND COUNTRY (GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURE) ORDER 1995

Location: O. S Grid Ref: 367 584 Broadoak Farm, Llyndir Lane, Rossett, Wrexham.
Development: Change of use and conversion of barns to 13 no. residential units including part demolition, access and parking arrangements.

I refer to email dated 13/10/2017 from Vectos in respect of the above.

Potential Access & Highway Improvements Drg. No. VN70889-SK02

The proposed limited footway improvements indicated behind the existing hedgerow would be considered inadequate. As previously discussed, I would recommend that this footway extends along Lavister Lane up to the access with Rossett Business Park.

The suggested existing passing places (ie/ viewport 2 & 3) are considered to be inadequate. As previously discussed, I would recommend that improved passing provision is proposed in these locations (ie/ minimum length 16m, minimum width 5.5m) including surfacing with hard bound materials to adoptable standards.

I would recommend that a revised layout plan is submitted indicating the above detail.

I have spoken with our Traffic Section in respect of suggested "Quiet Lane" style improvements along Llyndir Lane. Any proposed additional signage and road markings are not considered to have any significant benefit in highway safety along this section.

Site Access Arrangement

In order to clarify accurately what highway improvements (ie/ carriageway widening) are intended along the site frontage, I would recommend the submission of a more detailed scaled layout plan. Details will need to include existing carriageway widths and proposed carriageway widths (shown @ 5m intervals), proposed footway widths, existing and proposed verge widths, accurate plot of existing hedgerow and details / dimensions of existing / proposed verge drainage ditches.

Any proposed carriageway widths shall not represent a reduction from existing widths.

I understand that it is proposed to modify the most southerly access to provide visibility splays of 2.4 x 49m in both directions measured to the nearside wheeltrack. The provision of such splays would be considered acceptable. However, it needs to be demonstrated that providing these splays and providing a 5m wide carriageway in this location does not impact on the existing drainage ditch.

In order to carry out the recommended highway improvements, there would appear to be potential issues with the existing local land drainage network (ie/ ditches). WCBC does have a policy regarding culverting of watercourses, with a presumption against. If any works are required that will affect the local drainage network there will be the requirement for additional consent under Section 23 of the Land Drainage Act from WCBC as Lead Local Flood Authority. Although not detailed within the application, the diversion of any open watercourses would be preferential to the introduction of additional lengths of culvert. I would recommend that you discuss the above detail with our Flood Management Officer – Neil Taunt on Tel: 01978 729734.

Please clarify on a revised layout plan what width is proposed for the southerly access and any footway improvements on the southern side of this access in order to provide the required visibility splays.

I await the requested information.

Existing Farm Trips

The previously submitted Highways – Supplementary Note suggests that the farm previously generated approximately 206 two-way trips per week (412 movements), which spread over a 5.5 day working week equates to around 75 no. vehicle movements per day. This level of traffic generation would appear quite excessive for a farm and I cannot accept this suggested level of traffic generation without further detailed justification.

I understand that you have interrogated the TRICS database but there are no suitably comparable sites with similar characteristics to the former pig farm. However, I understand that the submitted vehicle movements were based on information recorded in a log / invoice schedule held by the farm in terms of deliveries to and from the site. **Could you please ask the applicant to provide a copy of these records to confirm the suggested movements.**

Proposed Residential Trips

The submitted TRICS data appears to include "Edge of Town" and "Neighbourhood Centre" locations. However, no raw data has been provided. The site is in a fairly remote location and would not be considered to be in an Edge of Town location. Either "Neighbourhood Centre" and / or "Free standing" would seem more appropriate.

The submitted TRICS information suggests 4.548 movements per day per dwelling. This would be considered to be particularly low given the remote location of the site.

I would recommend that further TRICs data is submitted that relates to the location / characteristics of the site.

Technical Advice Note 18 – Transport (TAN 18)

TAN 18 recommends that housing developments should be provided in locations with good access by walking and cycling to primary and secondary schools and public transport stops, and by all modes to employment, further and higher education, services, shopping and leisure, or where such access will be provided as part of the scheme. TAN 18 requires layouts and densities, which maximise the opportunity for residents to walk and cycle to local facilities and public transport stops.

However, it is considered that even when vehicles, pedestrians, cyclists arrive at either of the junctions from the development site with the B5445 Chester Road there are very few local facilities available.

If the application is to be supported, it would be considered beneficial in highway safety terms to provide the previously requested improvements. These would need to be delivered through a s.38 / 278 agreement.

Notes to Applicant

- *Any proposed highway improvements shall 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.38 / 278 of the Highways Act 1980.*

You are advised that the Highway Authority will require such works to be completed to their satisfaction before they will formally adopt the relevant Highway works for public use and to be maintained at public expense. This will include the provision of a bond to cover the estimated value of such works.

The appropriate fees will become due to the Council when the Highways Authority approve the proposed works to be carried out

Supplementary Notes

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

Peter Southwaite

Service Manager Environment

mp

MEMORANDUM



From: Service Manager Environment **To:** Head of Environment and Planning
Our Ref: EP/DC/PP/2017/0623 **Your Ref:** MR/P/2017/0623
Date: 8th November 2017

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

TOWN AND COUNTRY (GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURE) ORDER 1995

Location: O. S Grid Ref: 367 584 Broadoak Farm, Llyndir Lane, Rossett, Wrexham.

Development: Change of use and conversion of barns to 13 no. residential units including part demolition, access and parking arrangements.

I refer to email dated 06/11/2017 from Vectos in respect of the above.

Passing Place and Footway Link Proposals Drg. No. VN70889-SK04 Rev A

The lack of footway improvements as previously indicated behind the existing hedgerow providing a link to the Rossett Business Park would be considered unacceptable. As previously discussed, I would recommend that this footway extends along Lavister Lane up to the access with Rossett Business Park.

The suggested existing passing place (ie/ viewport 4) is considered to be inadequate. As previously discussed, I would recommend that improved passing provision is proposed in the previously identified locations (ie/ minimum length 16m, minimum width 5.5m) including surfacing with hard bound materials to adoptable standards.

I would recommend that a revised layout plan is submitted indicating the above detail.

Site Access Arrangement Drg. No. VN70889-SK03

In order to clarify accurately what highway improvements (ie/ carriageway widening) are intended along the site frontage, I would recommend the submission of a more detailed scaled layout plan. Details will need to include existing carriageway widths and proposed carriageway widths (shown @ 5m intervals), proposed footway widths, existing and proposed verge widths, accurate plot of existing hedgerow and details / dimensions of existing / proposed verge drainage ditches.

The submitted layout plan does not indicate all of the above detail to ascertain if adequate verge width will be retained and what affect the modifications will have on existing drainage ditches. **All details shall be annotated on a revised layout plan. Without this detail I will be unable to determine whether the suggested improvements are feasible.**

Any proposed carriageway widths shall not represent a reduction from existing widths. The existing carriageway width fronting the northerly access is around 5.9m, the submitted layout plan indicates an existing carriageway width of 5.29m which is incorrect. The existing carriageway width fronting the southerly access is around 5.2m, the submitted layout plan indicates an existing carriageway width of 4.61m which is incorrect.

I understand that it is proposed to modify the most southerly access to provide visibility splays of 2.4 x 49m in both directions measured to the nearside wheeltrack. The provision of such splays would be considered acceptable. However, it needs to be demonstrated that providing these splays and providing a 5m wide carriageway in this location does not impact on the existing drainage ditch. I have requested a site visit by our Flood Management Officer to assess any impact on the existing drainage ditches.

In order to carry out the recommended highway improvements, there would appear to be potential issues with the existing local land drainage network (ie/ ditches). WCBC does have a policy regarding culverting of watercourses, with a presumption against. If any works are required that will affect the local drainage network there will be the requirement for additional consent under Section 23 of the Land Drainage Act from WCBC as Lead Local Flood Authority. Although not detailed within the application, the diversion of any open watercourses would be preferential to the introduction of additional lengths of culvert. I would recommend that you discuss the above detail with our Flood Management Officer – Neil Taunt on Tel: 01978 729734.

Please clarify on a revised layout plan what width is proposed for the southerly access and any footway improvements on the southern side of this access in order to provide the required visibility splays.

I await the requested information.

Existing Farm Trips

The previously submitted Highways – Supplementary Note suggests that the farm previously generated approximately 206 two-way trips per week (412 movements), which spread over a 5.5 day working week equates to around 75 no. vehicle movements per day. This level of traffic generation would appear quite excessive for a farm and I cannot accept this suggested level of traffic generation without further detailed justification.

I understand that you have interrogated the TRICS database but there are no suitably comparable sites with similar characteristics to the former pig farm. However, I understand that the submitted vehicle movements were based on information recorded in a log / invoice schedule held by the farm in terms of deliveries to and from the site. **Could you please ask the applicant to provide a copy of these records to confirm the suggested movements.**

Proposed Residential Trips

The submitted TRICS data appears to include "Edge of Town" and "Neighbourhood Centre" locations. The site is in a fairly remote location and would not be considered to be in an Edge of Town location. The submitted TRICS information suggests 4.548 movements per day per dwelling. This would be considered to be particularly low given the remote location of the site.

Either "Neighbourhood Centre" and / or "Free standing" would seem more appropriate. The applicant has also provided additional TRICs information based on these two site categories. However, the applicant has indicated that these sites are not truly representative of Rossett in terms of access to larger urban centres and local facilities. This TRICS information suggests 7.108 movements per day per dwelling. If the proposed development was to be supported without adequate footway improvements but limited to existing traffic generation levels experienced by the farm then this would equate to around 10 – 11 dwellings.

Technical Advice Note 18 – Transport (TAN 18)

TAN 18 recommends that housing developments should be provided in locations with good access by walking and cycling to primary and secondary schools and public transport stops, and by all modes to employment, further and higher education, services, shopping and leisure, or where such access will be provided as part of the scheme. TAN 18 requires layouts and densities, which maximise the opportunity for residents to walk and cycle to local facilities and public transport stops.

However, it is considered that even when vehicles, pedestrians, cyclists arrive at either of the junctions from the development site with the B5445 Chester Road there are very few local facilities available.

If the application is to be supported, it would be considered beneficial in highway safety terms to provide the previously requested improvements. These would need to be delivered through a s.38 / 278 agreement.

Notes to Applicant

- *Any proposed highway improvements shall 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.38 / 278 of the Highways Act 1980.*

You are advised that the Highway Authority will require such works to be completed to their satisfaction before they will formally adopt the relevant Highway works for public use and to be maintained at public expense. This will include the provision of a bond to cover the estimated value of such works.

The appropriate fees will become due to the Council when the Highways Authority approve the proposed works to be carried out

Supplementary Notes

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

Peter Carmichael

14 Service Manager Environment