
Penderfyniad ar yr Apêl

Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 27/09/16

gan Iwan Lloyd BA BTP MRTPI

Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion Cymru

Dyddiad: 19.10.2016

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27/09/16

by Iwan Lloyd BA BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Date: 19.10.2016

Appeal Ref: APP/H6955/A/16/3154187

Site address: Land adj Alyn View, Mold Road, Cefn y Bedd, Wrexham LL12 9UR

The Welsh Ministers have transferred the authority to decide this appeal to me as the appointed Inspector.

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Gould against the decision of Wrexham County Borough Council.
 - The application Ref GWE P/2016/0240, dated 7/03/2016, was refused by notice dated 27/04/2016.
 - The development proposed is detached dormer bungalow with associated car parking.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. This is the effect of the proposal on highway safety.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is land situated to the rear of Alyn View, Garden Cottage and Cherry Cottage located in the settlement of Cefn y Bedd. The appeal site access is a narrow driveway which obtains access from the A541 Mold Road. Mold Road is a busy carriageway linking Wrexham and Mold. The appellant owns the adjoining Cherry Cottage. The appeal driveway which would serve the proposed dwelling adjoins Cherry Cottage. A parking area on the appeal site has been laid out for 2 vehicles and is currently being used in connection with Alyn View accessed via the appeal driveway. A parking area for Cherry Cottage is situated to the rear of this property and is served by the same appeal driveway. Alyn View has 1 vehicle off-road parking space to the front of the house resulting in a reversing manoeuvre onto and along the wide pavement. Vehicles were observed to be parked on the wide pavement outside the collection of properties near the bend in the road.
 4. The driveway serving Cherry Cottage and the proposal site is less than 3m wide. The driveway begins behind the footway and is constrained in width due to the presence of walls either side. The dropped kerb is slightly wider than the driveway allowing one vehicle to pass up the drive with no space available to create a splayed turn into the site. The turn radius is therefore tight into the driveway and the busy carriageway is 40mph at this point. The appellant has created a parking area to the rear of Cherry Cottage due to the constrained layout for parking at the front of Alyn View. This
-

arrangement is likely to continue should the appeal be dismissed and the appellant points out that this would be no different to the parking and manoeuvring arrangements associated with the appeal, sharing the same driveway with Cherry Cottage.

5. Nevertheless, parking for Alyn View would be displaced to the front parking space should the appeal be allowed and there would be an increase in the flow of traffic as a result. That is; there would be a flow of traffic from the proposed development site, and from Cherry Cottage because it is in land use terms a separate residential dwelling, and from Alyn View having displaced its parking arrangements (2 vehicles) to the less than desirable situation of parking on the pavement and reversing from the front parking space onto the pavement area alongside this busy carriageway.
6. Secondly, vehicles meeting on the driveway are a possibility resulting in a driver waiting on the carriageway whilst another vehicle exits the drive. Although that situation may arise with the present arrangement it does not make it an appropriate and safe situation. This is because with traffic speeds of 40 mph there is a risk of vehicles having to break suddenly on the sloping approach to Cefn y Bedd should the driver encounter a vehicle stationed on the carriageway waiting to turn into the drive which is blocked by the exiting vehicle. I therefore consider there is an increased likelihood of sudden and unexpected breaking on the main carriageway giving rise to the possibility of rear end collisions. The Highway Officer refers to the heavily trafficked road with vehicles travelling up to and sometimes above 40 mph. The sight stopping distance in Planning Policy Wales Technical Advice Note 18: Transport, Annex B, Table A is 120m, where traffic speed is not known. The appellant refers to drivers having in excess of 105m to slow down and also time to observe a vehicle signalling to turn into the driveway. However, this is below the recommended sight stopping distance for the traffic speed restriction in place.
7. I consider the access arrangement for the proposed occupants of the development would not be desirable potentially coming into conflict with drivers who occupy Cherry Cottage. Although the appellant owns Cherry Cottage the pattern of movement of separate households created by the proposal and occupants of Cherry Cottage who all share a substandard access in width and turning radius would be a different scenario to that which presently exists. I consider that the proposed arrangement could give rise to a highway safety concern.
8. Notwithstanding the present arrangements for parking the proposal would in turn displace parking for the occupants of Alyn View and this adds to my concern in relation to highway safety where it would involve a reversing manoeuvre onto the pavement next to a busy carriageway. I do not consider that this arrangement would be safe, although it presently exists; given that the proposal itself increases the use of the single parking space to the front of the property, because the appellant would not be able to rely on the existing provision to the rear of Cherry Cottage which was created initially to overcome the problems with the inadequate parking to the front of Alyn View. The proposal would therefore worsen the situation which currently exists.
9. I note that local bus stops in the area provide no pull-in arrangement and buses would stop on this busy carriageway. Nevertheless, this arrangement and others mentioned do not present the same unsatisfactory situation as the appeal development, since the proposed land-use would be a permanent situation whereas buses and local bus stop provision has altered in the area over recent times and therefore do not present a permanent and continued risk to highway safety.

10. I therefore consider that the proposal would conflict with Policies GDP1 (d) and T8 of Wrexham Unitary Development Plan. I conclude that the proposal would harm highway safety.
11. Whilst I am aware there is a recognised shortfall in housing land supply this factor is not given considerable weight where the development would otherwise conflict with the development plan. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and national policies and the planning balance is against allowing the development.
12. For these reasons, the appeal should be dismissed.

Iwan Lloyd

INSPECTOR