

MEMORANDUM

From: Chief Officer, Environment & Technical **To:** Chief Officer Planning & Regulatory
Our Ref: ET/DC/P/2021/0168 **Your Ref:** SEH/P/2021/0168
Date: 20th April 2021

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

TOWN AND COUNTRY (GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURE) ORDER 1995

Location: O. S Grid Ref: 358 551 10 Wynnstay Lane, Marford, Wrexham.

Development: New boundary Wall in Retrospect.

I refer to your consultation / email dated 14/04/2021 in respect of the above and request for additional comments which refer to the submitted Access Appraisal (Feb 2021).

The proposed development site is located on Wynnstay Lane which is an unclassified, residential road subject to a 30mph speed limit. However, I would estimate typical vehicle speeds at being around 20mph given the geometry of the road.

Any proposed / existing access in this location would normally be required to provide visibility splays of 2.0 x 25m in both directions measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway in accordance with Manual for Streets. A reduced setback (x distance) has been accepted in this instance given the access serves a single property and typical speeds are likely to be around 20mph. This detail has been included in the submitted Access Appraisal.

Visibility from the modified access is inadequate in both directions providing splays of approximately 2.0 x 6m in both directions measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway. Visibility is impeded in both directions by the recently constructed boundary wall fronting the site.

The original property previously appeared to provide significantly more visibility across its frontage (westerly direction) given the low dwarf wall and low shrubs fronting the property. The previous access was not gated and the slope of the driveway is likely to have assisted with visibility onto Wynnstay Lane. It would therefore appear that previous available visibility from the original access in the westerly direction would have been in excess of 2.0 x 33 measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining carriageway. The available visibility in the easterly direction would only appear to have been approximately 2.0 x 7m given its proximity to the adjoining property (no. 12).

The current access is approximately 4.1m wide. Any proposed gates are normally required to be setback at least 5m behind the adjoining highway so a car can sit clear of the adjoining highway. The recently erected sliding gates only appear to be setback approximately 2.2m behind the edge of carriageway. This is likely to result in vehicles waiting to turn onto the driveway having to wait along Wynnstay Lane whilst the gates open which is far from ideal.

The submitted Highways Appraisal refers to there being no injury accidents in the vicinity of the site. The report also refers to MSF2 paras 10.4.2 & 10.5.9 which refers to consideration of accident data and potential for accepting reduced visibility splays (y distance).

In this instance, consideration has been given to accepting typical speeds of 20mph despite the site being within a 30mph speed limit based on the geometry of the road. This has relaxed the required SSD / y distance from 43m to 25m. The normal setback / x distance of 2.4m has also been relaxed to 2m in this instance.

Rofft CP School is in close proximity to the development site. There is an existing on-street parking problem in this location which I assume is due to the lack of adequate parking at the school. Parents and staff typically park along Wynnstay Lane and onto Stancliffe Avenue throughout the day. Given the geometry of the road and the close proximity to the Rofft CP School, it is considered necessary to minimize the risk to pedestrians and road users in this instance by maximizing visibility and setting gates back a minimum of 5m behind the adjoining highway.

The above comments are consistent with comments previously made by the Highway Authority in respect of planning applications ref: P/2007/1350 (12 Wynnstay Lane) & P/2015/0665 (14 Wynnstay Lane).

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

1. **The new boundary walls have significantly reduced the available visibility from the access .**
2. **The proposed gates are less than 5m behind the adjoining highway.**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'R. Khan' or similar, written in a cursive style.

Chief Officer, Environment & Technical