

MEMORANDUM



From: Infrastructure Manager

To: Head of Community Well-being and Development

Our Ref: TH/DC/PP/2011/0854

Your Ref: MP/P/2011/0854

Date: 6th December 2011

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

TOWN AND COUNTRY (GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURE) ORDER 1995

Location: O. S Grid Ref: 340 496 Site of Former Hightown Flats, Land West of Kingsmills Road, Hightown, Wrexham.

Development: Erection of 92 dwellings to comprise a mix of houses and flats, erection of community resource centre and formation of vehicular and pedestrian access.

I refer to your consultation dated 24/11/2011 in respect of the above.

The proposed development site is located on Brynycabanau Road and Nelson Street which are both unclassified roads subject to a 30mph speed limit.

Any proposed / existing access along Brynycabanau Road 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.

Assuming reduced speeds of 25mph along Nelson Street given the geometry of the road 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 terms of the submitted layout plan (Drg. No. 6791/L(9)01 Rev P8 – dated 05/10/2011) I comment as follows:-

The site consists of 2 distinct areas of development. The area of residential development to the south of the site consists of a mixture of houses and apartments and is served off a new access road off Nelson Street. The area of development to the northern end of the site consists of a mixture of houses / apartments and a community resource centre served off a new access off Brynycabanau Road. A number of dwellings are also proposed providing direct access onto Brynycabanau Road and Nelson Street.

In terms of the proposed development off Nelson Street, I comment as follows:-

Assuming typical speeds of 25mph along this section, I would recommend that the proposed access onto Nelson Street provides 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 proposed access appears adequate.

The proposed turning head at the end of the cul de sac would need to have a minimum 600mm wide service strip around its perimeter. The turning head does therefore not comply with current highway adoptable standards. The proposed gates at the ends of the driveways at plots 15 & 21 are not a minimum distance of 5m behind the adjoining highway and need setting back / removing.

The proposed 1.8m high brick retaining wall at the end of the turning head is likely to require structural approval for which an AIP (Approval in Principle) will be required.

The tactile paving indicated on the layout plan is incorrect. Tactile paving shall be a minimum of 1200 x 1200mm and shall be in line with back of the footway.

Parking provision for the site consists of 2 parking spaces for each house with 1 parking space provided for each apartment. This level of parking provision is considered acceptable given the sustainable location of the site.

Any proposed driveways that fall towards the estate road / adoptable highway shall be provided with an Aco drain or similar to prevent private surface water run off from flowing into the highway.

The proposed highway improvements along Nelson Street appear acceptable. Any submitted scheme (s.38 / 278) will need to include details of the re-construction of the carriageway and footways including proposed drainage details and a suitable scheme of street lighting.

In terms of the proposed development off Brynycabanau Road, I comment as follows:-

Assuming typical speeds of 30mph along this section, I would recommend that the proposed access onto Brynycabanau Road provides 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. In order to protect the required visibility splays, I would recommend that the footway on both sides of the access is widened / tapered accordingly.

I would recommend that any proposed access road in this location has a maximum gradient of 1 in 24 for the first 10m and a maximum of 1 in 12 thereafter. Could you please ask the applicant to confirm this on a revised layout plan.

Given the horizontal alignment of the access road, I would recommend that the applicant provides a swept path analysis of an 11m refuse wagon negotiating the proposed bend within the site. These movements should indicate minimal encroachment over the centerline of the carriageway.

The proposed turning head at the end of the cul de sac would need to have a minimum 600mm wide service strip around its perimeter. The turning head does therefore not comply with current highway adoptable standards. The proposed gates at the ends of the driveways at plots 7 - 10 are not a minimum distance of 5m behind the adjoining highway and need setting back / removing.

Any proposed retaining walls in close proximity to the proposed / existing highway are likely to require structural approval for which an AIP (Approval in Principle) will be required.

The tactile paving indicated on the layout plan is incorrect. Tactile paving shall be a minimum of 1200 x 1200mm and shall be in line with back of the footway.

Parking provision for the site consists of 2 parking spaces for each house with 1 parking space provided for each apartment. This level of parking provision is considered acceptable given the sustainable location of the site.

Parking provision for the proposed community resource centre appears acceptable assuming that the clinic is not open at the same time as the resource centre. The resource centre consists of a medical centre with 3 consulting rooms plus 1 no. treatment room, 158m² of business use (B1) on the first floor and 156m² of assembly and leisure on the ground floor. This would equate to the requirement for 8 no. spaces for the medical provision during the day with 6 for the business use. This then provides 14 spaces for the sole use of the community centre during the evenings.

Any proposed driveways that fall towards the estate road / adoptable highway shall be provided with an Aco drain or similar to prevent private surface water run off from flowing into the highway.

In order to provide improved pedestrian access off Brynycabanau Road to the proposed Community Resource Centre, I would recommend that a minimum 2.0m wide footway link is constructed off Brynycabanau Road between the proposed parking spaces for the centre.

I would recommend that the a 2.0m wide footway is provided along the entire site frontage along Brynycabanau Road. Any submitted scheme (s.38 / 278) will need to include a suitable scheme of street lighting.

The existing bus stops opposite no. 16 Brynycabanau Road will need to be re-located to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority.

The proposed development will result in modifications / removal of existing sections of adopted highway (including) footways. To enable this development to proceed, any of the affected sections of existing adopted highway will require a "Stopping Up Order". I assume that this can be carried out through s.247 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.

In terms of the submitted Landscape Plan (Drg. No. 02/180/01 v3 - Dated Oct 2011) indicating proposed footway links through the site, I comment as follows:-

I would recommend that the proposed 3m wide footpath through the central amenity area takes the form of a footway only (not cycleway / footway) given the difficulty to tie such a link to the existing cycleway running along Kingsmills Road. This footpath will require a suitable lighting scheme.

I would recommend that the 2 no. 2m wide footpath links running alongside plot nos. 10 & 39 are widened to 3m. These footpath links will each require a suitable lighting scheme. These footpath links will need to be maintained in perpetuity by a private management company which will also be required to maintain the proposed private parking areas serving the community resource centre and the apartment blocks.

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

The layout of the proposed development does not conform to current highway adoptable standards.

However, if the applicant can satisfactorily address the above issues then further consideration could be given to the proposed development.

Supplementary Notes

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



Infrastructure Manager

