

# MEMORANDUM



---

**From:** Chief Officer, Environment & Technical    **To:** Chief Officer Planning & Regulatory  
**Our Ref:** ET/DC/P/2021/0276    **Your Ref:** P/2021/0276  
**Date:** 7<sup>th</sup> May 2021

---

## **TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990**

## **TOWN AND COUNTRY (GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURE) ORDER 1995**

**Location:** O. S Grid Ref: 379 512 Holt Lodge Farm, Hugmore Lane, Francis Lane, Holt, Wrexham.

**Development:** Use of land as commercial fishing pool, erection of toilet block and formation of car park.

I refer to your consultation / email dated 08/04/2021 in respect of the above.

### **Access**

The development site is located on Francis Lane which is a narrow, rural, classified road subject to a 60mph speed limit. However, I would estimate typical vehicle speeds at being around 30mph along this section given the geometry of the road.

Assuming typical speeds of 30mph, Manual for Streets would normally require any existing / proposed access to provide visibility splays of 2.4 x 43m in both directions measured to the centreline of the adjoining highway in which there shall be no obstruction in excess of 1.0m in height. Visibility can be relaxed to the centerline of the adjoining highway given the restricted carriageway width along this section.

The submitted layout plan (Drg. No. RJC-MZ618-04) appears to indicate a 6m wide access providing splays of 2.4 x 25m measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway. The proposed splays are considered inadequate. **I would recommend that the applicant provides a revised layout plan indicating splays of 2.4 x 43m in both directions measured to the centreline of the adjoining highway.**

There would appear to be an existing gated field access along this section which is intended to be improved to serve the proposed development. The existing field access is approximately 3.7m wide and is gated 2.4m behind the adjoining highway. The access is unsurfaced.

The submitted layout plan (Drg. No. RJC-MZ618-04) appears to indicate a 6m wide access with gates setback 2.4m behind the adjoining carriageway. I would recommend that any proposed gates are setback a minimum of 5m behind the highway boundary. I would recommend that any proposed access is surfaced with hard bound materials for a minimum distance of 5m behind the highway boundary.

No private surface water run-off shall be permitted to flow onto the adjoining highway. An Aco drain or similar will be required to intercept any private surface water run-off.

**I would recommend that the applicant provides a revised layout plan indicating the above details.**

As Francis Lane is particularly narrow (typically 2.9m wide) for the majority of its length, it would seem reasonable to require the applicant to construct a passing place to facilitate the passage of 2 no. vehicles. Without such improvements, the existing highway verges are more likely to be damaged.

I would recommend that a suitable passing place is provided in the verge directly opposite the proposed access. I would recommend that such a passing place is 16m in length and provides an overall carriageway width of 5.5m. The applicant would be required to enter into a s.278 agreement with the Highway Authority in order to carry out these improvements.

There are existing drainage ditches either side of the carriageway fronting the development site. **I would recommend that further details are provided indicating how the widened access will be constructed to protect the existing ditches from flooding.**

**I would recommend that the applicant submits a revised layout plan indicating the above improvements.**

### **Signage**

I would recommend that a suitable passing place sign (Welsh over English) is provided for the proposed passing bay. I would recommend that the applicant liaises with our Traffic Section (contact Darren Green – Tel: 01978 729643).

### **Traffic Generation**

Given the narrow nature of Francis Lane, I would not normally support any proposed development that is likely to result in any significant number of additional vehicle movements. However, if the proposed development can be limited by a suitable condition which only permits a limited number of cars / visitors to the site at any one time possibly by appointment only along with provision of a suitable passing place then it would seem reasonable to support such a development. I would assume that the majority of visitors / trips to the site are likely to be staggered throughout the day.

### **Parking & Turning Provision**

The submitted parking and turning details appear acceptable. The submitted layout plan indicates 14 no. spaces which would seem to suggest that the proposed facility would generate limited vehicle movements. It would seem reasonable to support such a development if this level of parking / attendance was controlled by a suitable condition.

I await the requested information.

### **Supplementary Notes**

The applicant's attention should be drawn to item nos. 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5 of the supplementary notes.

**Note to applicant**

*The proposed access and passing place should be constructed to a standard suitable for adoption by the Council for future maintenance at the public expense and the developer will need to enter into an agreement with the Council under s. 278 of the Highways Act 1980.*

*You are advised that the Highway Authority will require such works to be completed to their satisfaction before they will formally adopt the relevant Highway works for public use and to be maintained at public expense. This will include the provision of a bond to cover the estimated value of such works. The appropriate fees will become due to the Council when the Highways Authority approve the proposed works to be carried out*

**Supplementary Notes**

The applicant's attention should be drawn to item nos. 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5 of the supplementary notes.

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

Chief Officer, Environment & Technical