

MEMORANDUM

From: Service Manager - Environment

To: Chief Planning Officer

Our Ref: TH/DC/PP/2011/0927

Your Ref: SJG/P/2011/0927

Date: 12TH January 2012

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

TOWN AND COUNTRY (GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURE) ORDER 1995

Location: O. S Grid Ref: 419 462 Land to rear of 1 Church View, Church Lane, Worthenbury, Wrexham.

Development: Erection of 1 no. 2 storey detached house with attached annexe (2 dwellings) detached garages and associated drainage and alterations to access.

I refer to your consultation dated 03/01/2012 in respect of the above.

The proposed development site is located on Church Road which is an unclassified road subject to a 60mph speed limit. However, I would estimate typical vehicle speeds at being around 25mph given the geometry of the road along this section.

Any proposed / existing access would normally be required to provide visibility splays of 2.4 x 33m in both directions measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway in accordance with Manual for Streets.

Visibility from the existing shared access is inadequate in both directions providing splays of approximately 2.4 x 15m to the north west and 2.4 x 18m to the south east.

Any proposed shared access would also be required to provide pedestrian visibility splays of 2.4 x 3.3m in both directions measured from the back of the footway in which there shall be no obstruction in excess of 0.6m in height.

Pedestrian visibility from the existing access is inadequate in the north westerly direction providing a splay of approximately 2.4 x 2m and 2.4 x 3.3m in the south easterly direction.

The existing access serving the development site currently appears to serve both Church View and School House including what appears to be a small-holding to the rear of the site. Public Footpaths nos. 7 & 12 also run through the development site and would need to be protected as part of any proposed development.

I understand that planning consent has already been granted (ref: P/2006/0258) to erect a single dwelling to the rear of Church View. This development was only supported based on proposed improvements to the existing substandard access. These improvements included widening of the existing shared access, improving pedestrian visibility splays and optimizing lateral visibility splays within site limits.

The submitted plan (Drg. No. W11/2130//02) indicating proposed access improvements indicates the provision of a 4.8m wide access and the provision of splays of 2.0 x 33m (minimum) to the north west and 2.0 x 25m to the south east measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway. However, the visibility splay in the north westerly direction has not been adequately demonstrated on the submitted layout plan.

However, having visited the site on 12/01/2012 it would only appear possible to provide the following visibility splays from the proposed 4.8m wide access:-

- Approximately 2.4 x 18m to the south east and 2.4 x 25m to the north west measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway.
- Approximately 2.0 x 25m to the south east and 2.0 x 56m + to the north west measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway.

Although, TAN18 / Manual for Streets does allow for a reduced "x" distance of 2.0m in some lightly trafficked and slow speed situations, this will mean that the front of some vehicles will protrude slightly into the running carriageway. The ability of drivers and cyclists to see this overhang from a reasonable distance, and to maneuver around it without undue difficulty, should be considered.

The section of carriageway immediately to the north west of the access is only 4.2m wide. If an "x" distance of 2.0m is accepted, any vehicle approaching the proposed access from the north west would need to move towards the centre of the carriageway to avoid any protruding vehicles coming out of the shared access.

Any vehicles travelling in the opposite direction from the south east at the same time would therefore be unable to simultaneously pass the oncoming vehicle due to the restricted carriageway width in this location. One of the vehicles travelling along Church Road would therefore have to stop to avoid collision. The existing 1.8m high boundary wall on the opposite side of the road directly opposite the shared access exacerbates such an event by reducing the available forward visibility should the oncoming vehicle travelling from the north west move over to the centerline of the road to avoid overhanging vehicles.

The relaxation of the "x" distance (setback) to 2.0m would not be considered acceptable in this instance.

Although the proposed development would be served off an unadopted access road, a development of this size would normally be required to provide a communal turning facility available to all users of the access road including delivery vehicles. Such a turning facility has not been demonstrated on the submitted layout plan.

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

LPGN 16 does not include garages as parking provision.

The existing property (Church View) currently appears to have parking provision for at least 5 no. vehicles (3 no. spaces if garage discounted). The proposed level of parking provision for this dwelling would appear to be 2 no. spaces given that there would appear to be a gate proposed across the driveway on the submitted layout plan. However, it is unclear as to how many bedrooms this property has to assess parking requirements. Could you please ask the applicant to clarify this point.

The proposed development appears to consist of 2 no. 3 bedroom properties, one of which being described as an annexe. However, I would normally expect an annexe to take the form of a small 1 bedroomed dwelling typically used by an elderly relative who is unlikely to use a car and therefore not generate any additional vehicle movements. I would therefore consider the proposed annexe to be a typical dwelling which could easily accommodate a family, require 3 no. parking spaces and generate around 10 vehicle movements per day.

In terms of parking provision, LPGN 16 would normally require a maximum of 3 no. spaces per dwelling. As garages are not included as parking provision, there would appear to be only 2 no. spaces proposed for each property which is considered inadequate. However, there would appear to be scope to provide adequate parking provision within the development site.

I would therefore not normally support any proposed development that is likely to result in an increase in vehicle movements utilising this substandard access. It is assumed that the proposed development has the potential to result in an increase in vehicle movements at the development site.

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

1. **There is restricted visibility at the proposed access and increased use would increase the likelihood of danger to road users and pedestrians.**
2. **The submitted layout plan does not indicate the provision of a suitable communal turning facility within the curtilage of the development site which could accommodate delivery vehicles**
3. **Parking provision within the curtilage of the proposed development site appears inadequate.**

pp. 
Service Manager - Environment

