

MEMORANDUM



From:	Infrastructure and Planning Manager	To:	Head of Community Well-being and Development
Our Ref:	TH/DC/PP/2011/0675	Your Ref:	SEH/P/2011/0675
Date:	29 th September 2011		

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

TOWN AND COUNTRY (GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURE) ORDER 1995

Location: O. S Grid Ref: 338 499 Former Gas Works Site, Rivulet Road, Wrexham.

Development: Submission of reserved matters pursuant to outline planning permission no. P/2009/0969 (Design, appearance, landscaping, access and layout).

I refer to your consultation dated 21/09/2011 in respect of the above.

The proposed development site is located on Rivulet Road which is an unclassified road subject to a 30mph speed limit.

Rivulet Road is subject to a traffic regulation order in the form of double yellow lines along both sides of the road with a limited no. of on street parking bays being available on the opposite side of the road limited to 30 minutes waiting.

In terms of the submitted layout plans (Drg. Nos. 383 003 & 383 004 – Dated July 2011), I comment as follows:-

The proposed / existing access is considered to provide adequate visibility providing splays of at least 2.4 x 56m in both directions measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway in accordance with Manual for Streets. However, I would recommend that these splays are indicated on a revised layout plan.

The proposed main access road into the development site serves 55 dwellings and would normally require a minimum carriageway width of 5.5m with 2.0m wide footways either side. The proposed access only appears to be 4.8m wide with 1.8m footways which is considered inadequate. No dropped kerb tactile crossing points have been indicated across the proposed access in line with the back of the footway.

The proposed turning head fronting the proposed shared accommodation (plots 51 – 55) is considered inadequate and does not comply with our adoptable standards. This turning head is only approximately 6.2m x 12.5m deep. The required depths are 8m x 13.5m for a 5.5m wide access road.

The proposed alignment of the main access road only appears to indicate a 10m centerline radius which is considered inadequate. A centerline radius of 20m would normally be required for such a layout. Such a centerline radius would normally be required in order to provide adequate forward visibility across the bend and to minimize the need for larger vehicles ie/ refuse wagons to encroach onto the oncoming lane. The proposed alignment would result in larger vehicles having to use the majority of the oncoming lane to negotiate the bend which is considered unacceptable. I would recommend that the alignment of main access road is amended in order to provide adequate forward visibility (stopping sight distance of 25m based on assumed speeds of 20mph) and to minimize the encroachment of larger vehicles onto the oncoming lane. These splays shall be indicated on a revised layout plan. I would recommend that the applicant submits appropriate swept path analysis details for the proposed estate road (assuming a 11.3m long refuse wagon) for further approval.

The proposed dry emergency pedestrian access route linking the development site to Salop Road only appears to be 2.0m wide. I would recommend that this link is increased to 3.0m wide and takes the form of a shared footway / cycleway with appropriate safety barriers at either end. I assume appropriate safety railings will be provided between this footway link and the river which runs through the site. The proposed link terminates in the proposed private car park which is considered unacceptable. I would recommend that this footway link terminates at the end of the turning head fronting the proposed shared accommodation.

In terms of the proposed shared surface road, I comment as follows:-

The proposed shared surface road serves 14 no. dwellings. Any proposed access road serving this number of dwellings would normally require a minimum carriageway width of 4.8m and 1.8m service strips either side of the road. The proposed access road only appears to be 4.5m wide and does not indicate the provision of 1.8m service strips either side of the road. I would recommend that the access road is at least 4.8m wide with 2.0m wide footways either side of the road given the number of proposed driveways.

The proposed access road would normally require minimum 6m kerb radii. This has not been indicated on the submitted layout plan.

The proposed turning head off the shared access road is of inadequate size and does not comply with our adoptable standards. This turning head is only approximately 6.4m x 11m deep. The required depths are 8m x 12.8m for a 4.8m wide access road.

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

I understand that the proposed dwellings are as follows:-

31 no.	2 bedroomed apartments
17 no.	3 bedroomed houses (Type A)
4 no.	3 bedroomed houses (Type B)
3 no.	4 bedroomed houses (Type C)

Total No.55

LPGN 16 would normally require the provision of a maximum of 130 parking spaces for such a development. However, only 83 spaces are proposed representing 64% overall provision. There would appear to be no provision for cycle stands / shelters within the site.

Although the development site is considered to be in a sustainable location and is well served by public transport. The proposed shortfall (36%) in parking provision needs to be justified. I would therefore recommend that the applicant submits a suitable interim residential travel plan for further approval prior to commencement of works with a final travel plan being submitted within 12 months of occupation for further approval.

It may be considered appropriate to request a commuted sum in lieu of any agreed shortfall in parking provision.

In terms of surface water drainage, I understand that Welsh Water will be adopting the proposed system serving the development site which will discharge into an existing Welsh Water drain running along Rivulet Road.

Any proposed retaining walls within the development site that have the potential to impact on the adjoining / proposed highway(s) are likely to require structural approval from our Infrastructure and Planning Manager – Jonathan Plant (Tel: 01978 729672). I would recommend that the applicant contacts Mr. Plant to discuss.

The current application proposes a reduced number of dwellings (55 no.) compared with the previously submitted planning application (ref: P/2006/1035 – For 153 no. dwellings and 5 no. retail / commercial units) which was supported in principle with the potential to generate a significant number of vehicle movements.

It is not considered necessary to request a Transport Assessment for the current application. However, if the proposed development were to exceed 60 no. dwellings, then I would recommend that a detailed Transport Assessment be provided.

I would 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 and Planning Manager

