

MEMORANDUM

From: Service Manager Environment **To:** Head of Environment and Planning
Our Ref: EP/DC/PP/2016/0719 **Your Ref:** PF/P/2016/0719
Date: 10th August 2016

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

TOWN AND COUNTRY (GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURE) ORDER 1995

Location: O. S Grid Ref: 330 468 Smithy Cottage, Sontley Lane, Sontley, Wrexham.

Development: Extension and conversion of existing stable block to form 1 no. dwelling and construction of new access.

I refer to your consultation dated 08/08/2016 in respect of the above.

The proposed development site is located on Sontley Lane which is a classified road subject to a 60mph speed limit. However, I would estimate typical vehicle speeds at being around 30mph given the geometry of the road along this section.

Assuming speeds of 30mph, any proposed / existing access in this location 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.

Access Serving Existing Dwelling

Visibility from the existing access 7.3m wide access is inadequate in both directions providing splays of approximately 2.4 x 7m in both directions measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway.

Visibility is restricted in both directions by the existing boundary walls / hedgerow.

Adequate parking and turning provision is provided within the curtilage of the property.

Proposed Access to Serve Converted Stable Block (Dwelling)

I assume that the any vehicles visiting / associated with the existing stable block access the site via the existing access serving the main dwelling (Smithy Cottage).

The proposed access indicated on the submitted layout plan does not indicate proposed visibility splays onto Sontley Lane. However, it would only appear possible to provide splays of approximately 2.4 x 31m in the northerly direction and 2.4 x 19m in the southerly direction measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway. Visibility is impeded in the northerly direction by the existing hedge / tree(s). Visibility is impeded in the southerly direction by the existing boundary wall.

I would not wish to support any proposed development that is likely to result in any increase in vehicle movements at the development site utilizing either the existing or proposed access.

The proposed access only appears to be approximately 2.7m wide. I would normally recommend a minimum access width of 3m.

The proposed parking spaces are less than 2.4m wide and 4.8m deep and do not comply with LGPN 16 requirements. Turning provision appears inadequate / restricted at the site. However, there would appear to be scope to provide adequate turning provision by losing some of the proposed garden area.

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

1. **It appears impracticable within the curtilage of the site to construct an access onto Sontley Lane which would provide sufficient visibility for vehicles emerging from the site.**
2. **The proposed access is of inadequate width.**

Peter Oortwants

Mr

Service Manager Environment