

MEMORANDUM

From: Operational Manager Traffic & Transportation **To:** Chief Planning Officer
Our Ref: TH/DC/PP/2010/0510 **Your Ref:** JS/P/2010/0510
Date: 24th June 2010

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990
TOWN AND COUNTRY (GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURE) ORDER 1995

Location: O. S Grid Ref: 367 584 Broad Oak Farm, Llyndir Lane, Rossett, Wrexham.

Development: Change of use and part re-development to form 24 no. dwellings, 24 no. work units and management offices together with associated access and landscaping.

I refer to your consultation dated 17/06/2010 in respect of the above.

The proposed development site is located on Llyndir Lane which is a classified road subject to a 60mph speed limit. However, a recently conducted speed survey along this section determined 85th percentile values of 33.2mph for vehicles approaching the development site from the north west and 32.6mph for vehicles approaching from the south east.

The submitted Transport Statement appears to be identical to the statement previously submitted with planning application ref: P/2008/1334. This refers to a proposed development of 24 residential units and 600m² of B1 employment space whereas the current application is for 21 no. dwellings and offices. I would suggest that the applicant clarifies this anomaly.

However, based on the submitted information, I comment as follows:-

The farm appears to have 3 main points of access in addition to the existing access which serves the farmhouse itself. All existing access points suffer from inadequate visibility and do not meet the requirements of TAN 18.

TAN 18 would normally require any proposed access to provide visibility splays of 2.4 x 90m in both directions measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway in which there shall be no obstruction in excess of 1.0m in height. The use of Manual for Streets in this location is not applicable. TAN 18 is based upon Manual for Streets and has been prepared by the Welsh Assembly Government for specific use in Wales, where Table B is only designed for roads in built up areas.

The provision of 2.4 x 50m splays as indicated in the submitted Transport Statement do not comply with the requirements of TAN 18 and are therefore considered unacceptable. In order to achieve these splays, it is proposed to construct a footway along the site frontage. It is then proposed to reduce the carriageway width along this section of Llyndir Lane to 5m which is considered unacceptable. A minimum carriageway width of 5.5m with a 2.0m wide footway would normally be required in this location.

There would appear to be two main routes between the development site and the B5445 Chester Road where community facilities can be reached ie. Bus stops, shops, schools, public houses etc. The shortest access route is via the unclassified road which runs past the Rossett Business Village. However, this route suffers from inadequate carriageway widths, limited passing places and cannot easily accommodate the simultaneous passage of 2 no. vehicles along the majority of its length (approx. 800m). There is no footway provision between Llyndir Lane and the Rossett Business Village and the footway beyond this point is less than 2.0m in width.

The alternative access route from the development site to Chester Road is via Llyndir Lane. The Llyndir Lane / Chester Road junction is of inadequate width and suffers from inadequate visibility in both directions. Current visibility at this junction is approximately 2.4 x 30m to the north east and 2.4 x 50m to the south west measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway. Manual for Streets would normally require such a junction to provide visibility splays of 2.4 x 56m in both directions measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway. Llyndir Lane suffers from inadequate carriageway widths and is considered unsuitable to serve any additional development which would result in a significant increase in traffic movements. There is no lighting or footway provision along this section of Llyndir Lane.

The nature of the proposed development would inevitably create increased pedestrian movements along both Llyndir Lane and the unclassified lane which runs past Rossett Business Village. Given the inadequate carriageway widths, lack of lighting / footway provision and the inadequate level of visibility at the existing access points serving the development site, I would not wish to support any proposed development that would generate any additional vehicular and pedestrian movements along these lanes. I would recommend that any proposed development is limited to the existing levels of traffic generation which were previously experienced by the farm.

The submitted Transport Statement suggests that the farm previously generated around 75 no. vehicle movements per day. This level of traffic generation appears excessive for a farm and I cannot accept this suggested level of traffic generation without further detailed justification. Even if this level of traffic generation were to be justified, it would only equate to a very limited residential / office development which would still require improvements to pedestrian facilities in this location.

The submitted Transport Statement suggests that an additional 110 trips per day would be generated by the proposed dwellings / work units. This level of additional vehicle movements is considered unacceptable even with the proposed highway improvements ie/ widening / passing places and footway provision. The submitted Transport Statement does not indicate whether the proposed work units will be restricted to those occupying the proposed dwellings in order to limit vehicle movements to and from the site.

In terms of the submitted TRICs data, I comment as follows:-

Although the submitted trip generation figures relating to the proposed office units appear typical, the submitted trip generation of 6.097 trips per day / per dwelling in a rural location would appear to be particularly low and I would question this figure. Such a low figure would be more representative of a flat / apartment in an urban location where there is less reliance on the use of the car. These figures have been further reduced on the assumption that residents / workers will not leave the site during lunch time.

In terms of the proposed layout of the development site, I comment as follows:-

The submitted layout plan does not demonstrate how delivery vehicles including refuse wagons will turn / maneuver within the curtilage of the site. I would recommend that the applicant submits further details (including a swept path analysis) indicating how such turning movements would be achieved.

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

There would only appear to be 25 no. proposed parking spaces for the dwellings, 6 visitor spaces and 21 no. spaces for the business units. The proposed level of parking provision would appear to be low and suggests a significant shortfall compared with LPGN 16 requirements. However, without further details of no. of bedrooms, allocated garages etc, it is not possible to fully assess the adequacy of the proposed parking provision.

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

1. **There is restricted visibility at the existing / proposed accesses serving the development site and increased use would increase the likelihood of danger to road users.**
2. **The establishment of a substantial development in this location would be incompatible with through traffic interests and a potential source of danger to road users.**
3. **The proposed development does not make adequate provision for the parking of vehicles clear of the public highway.**
4. **The submitted drawings do not demonstrate how delivery vehicles / refuse wagons will turn / maneuver within the curtilage of the development site.**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'M. J. L.', written in a cursive style.

Operational Manager Traffic & Transportation