

MEMORANDUM



From:	Infrastructure Manager	To:	Head of Community Well-being and Development
Our Ref:	TH/DC/PP/2011/0751	Your Ref:	SJG/P/2011/0751
Date:	21 st October 2011		

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

TOWN AND COUNTRY (GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURE) ORDER 1995

Location: O. S Grid Ref: 373 419 Land to the rear of 2 High Street, Overton.

Development: Erection of dwelling and alterations to vehicular access.

I refer to your consultation dated 17/10/2011 in respect of the above.

The development site is located on the A539 Wrexham Road which is a busy classified road subject to a 30mph speed limit along this section. However, although typical vehicle speeds along this section of road are likely to be around 30mph for vehicles approaching from the west, I would estimate typical vehicle speeds at being around 15mph for vehicles approaching from the east due to the geometry of the road.

Any proposed / existing shared access in this location would normally be required to provide visibility splays of 2.4 x 18m to the east measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway and 2.4 x 43m to the west measured to the centerline of the adjoining highway in accordance with Manual for Streets. Visibility can be relaxed to the centerline of the adjoining highway in the westerly direction as vehicles are highly unlikely to overtake at this point given the geometry of the road.

Any proposed / existing access in this location 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.

Although the required visibility splays appear achievable from the proposed access, the submitted layout plan (Drg. No. J067/003 – Dated Aug 2011) does not indicate how either lateral or pedestrian visibility splays are to be provided. Please ask the applicant to demonstrate the required splays on a revised layout plan.

The existing access serving the development site is of restricted width (less than 4.5m). The proposed widening to 5.5m as shown on the submitted layout plan is considered adequate. The existing shared access / driveway is shared by no. 1, 2 & 3 High Street. At present this shared driveway is 3.9m wide and cannot support the simultaneous passage of 2 no. vehicles. However, the submitted layout plan appears to be proposing a reduced shared driveway width of 3.2m which is considered unacceptable.

I understand that planning consent was previously granted (ref: P/2008/0118) which provided an improved shared driveway width of 4.5 – 4.8m providing a minimum 6m clearance behind each proposed parking space for existing properties 1 & 2 High Street (Drg. No ref A/1/0 – Dated April 2008).

The previous application (ref: P/2011/0118) was supported on the basis that the shared access width was being significantly improved. Parking provision for 3 no. spaces for no. 1 High Street (with 6m clearance behind each space being provided) and 2 no. spaces for no. 2 High Street being provided. However, I understand that these 2 spaces are reliant on the demolition of part of no 2 High Street which is a listed building. I understand that listed building consent to demolish this part of the building has not been applied for.

The submitted layout plan (Drg. No. J067/003 – Dated Aug 2011) appears to indicate 2 no. parking spaces for the existing property (no. 2 High Street) on either side of the shared driveway. Both spaces are less than 2.4 x 4.8m and would not appear accessible due to the restricted space within the site. The space fronting no. 2 would be reliant on the demolition of part of the existing property which is listed.

In terms of parking provision for the proposed new dwelling, 3 no. spaces would be required (4 bedroom dwelling). I understand that there is currently an existing on street parking problem fronting the site whereby some residents including no. 2 High Street, park on the footway fronting the site which results in visibility being impeded from the existing access in the westerly direction. It is therefore considered appropriate to maximize parking provision at the development site.

The proposed 2 no. parking spaces running alongside the new dwelling have not been shown accurately and would require an overall length of 9.6m. The provision of these spaces would result in the second vehicle being only approximately 1.5m behind the boundary wall which would render the proposed turning head inaccessible. The proposed garage is also only 4.5m long which does not represent a standard parking space.

The proposed turning area for the new dwelling is inadequate. As previously recommended in preliminary discussions, the development site would need to provide a communal turning area which could be utilised by all existing vehicles / properties served by this private access. Such a communal turning facility has not been clearly indicated on the submitted layout plan.

If the applicant does not wish to provide a communal turning area which is likely to encroach on the area fronting the new dwelling, I would recommend as an alternative that a full 6.0m clearance is provided behind each of the existing / proposed spaces requiring the applicants boundary to be setback accordingly. In order to support this application, I would recommend the applicant submits a suitable revised layout plan demonstrating the above turning arrangements.

If suitable turning facilities are not provided for the proposed / existing properties, then these vehicles are likely to reverse onto the A539 Wrexham Road increasing the likelihood of danger to road users.

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

1. The required lateral and pedestrian visibility splays from the proposed shared access have not been demonstrated on the submitted plan.
2. The submitted plan does not demonstrate the provision of a suitable communal turning area or adequate turning facilities for use by the existing users of the private access road.
3. The proposed shared driveway is of inadequate width.
4. Parking provision for the existing property (no. 2 High Street) and the proposed dwelling is inadequate.

However, if the applicant were to 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.

Note to Applicant:

In order to widen the dropped kerb crossing outside the property including strengthening of the footway at the point of access, the applicant will need to apply for formal consent pursuant to Section 184 of the Highways Act 1980.



Infrastructure Manager

