

MEMORANDUM

From: Chief Officer Environment & Technical **To:** Chief Officer Planning & Regulatory
Our Ref: ET/DC/ P/2021/0123 **Your Ref:** MP/P/2021/0123
Date: 7th April 2021

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

CHAI AMLINELLLOL (POB MATER WEDI'I GADW HEBLAW AM FYNEDIAD) AM 2 ANHEDDAU **/ OUTLINE APPLICATION (ALL MATTERS RESERVED EXCEPT FOR ACCESS) FOR 2** **DWELLINGS** **LAND TO THE SOUTH OF TREM-Y-GLOG, LLANARMON, DYFFRYN CEIRIOG, WREXHAM** **LL20 7LD**

Grid Ref: E 315610 N 332822

I refer to your consultation / email dated 24/02/2021 in respect of the above.

Access

The proposed development site is located on Swch-Cae-Rhiw off the New Road (B4500). Swch-Cae-Rhiw is a classified road subject to a 30mph speed limit.

Any proposed / existing access in this location would normally be required to provide visibility splays of 2.4 x 43m in both directions measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway in accordance with Manual for Streets. We acknowledge the road is not busy and would accept a measurement to the centerline. We note there is no footpath provision for pedestrians

Plot 1

Visibility from the existing access serving Plot (1) is inadequate in both direction providing a splays of 2.4 x 14m (West) & 2.4 x 12m measured to the centerline of the adjoining highway. The road width outside Plot (1) is 3.2m, to increase these visibility splay consent from 3rd party land ownership and a S106 agreement would be required to satisfy the highway standards to maximize the visibility in both directions. It is also worth noting the adjoining boundary wall fence is approx. 1.5m high and associated (Trem-y-Glog) boundary wall fronting the highway is 0.9m high. The requirement from a visibility perspective is not to have anything with a height of more than 0.6m within the splays. A Telephone post and other utility services are located on the frontage of Plot 1.

Plot 2

Visibility from the existing access serving Plot (2) is inadequate in both direction providing existing splays of 2.4 x 13.7m (West) & 2.4 x 14.3m measured to the centerline of the adjoining highway. The road width outside Plot (2) is 4.8m The exiting width of the access is 4.7m we acknowledge this is acceptable for classification of a shared access/driveway, to increase these visibility splays consent from 3rd party land ownership and a S106 agreement would be required to satisfy the highway standards to maximize the visibility in both direction, East visibility would require the agreement from a 3rd party) (Trem-y-Glog) to lower the brick/stone boundary wall fronting the existing access. West there is an existing footway access for No. 5, consisting of concrete steps and a handrail. An existing established tree would, also require consideration and an ecology

assessment. The requirement from a visibility perspective is not to have anything with a height of more than 0.6m within the splays.

Parking &Turning Provision

Adequate parking and turning provision would need to be provided within the curtilage of the site for the proposed dwelling (Plot 1) the site as it fronts a classified road. I would recommend that parking at the site is provide in accordance with LPGN 16 maximum standards. Plot 2, shown on Access Plan HPT10991-003, appears to provide appropriate turning provisions. We would request updated plans to be submitted if the application is supported.

Any proposed development of this nature should provide turning within the curtilage of

Conclusion

We would be unable to support any proposed developments (Plot 1 & 2) from a highway perspective due to the substandard access layout proposals relating to the visibility splays.

If supported, any proposed access would need to be surfaced with hard bound materials for a minimum distance of 5m behind the adjoining highway with no gates being erected within 5m of the adjoining highway.

No private surface water run-off shall be permitted to flow onto the adjoining highway. An Aco drain or similar would be required across the proposed access to intercept such run-off.

Exiting services to be diverted/re-located

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

1. There is restricted visibility at the existing access and increased use would increase the likelihood of danger to road users.
2. The proposed development does not make adequate provision for the turning of vehicles clear of the public highway.
3. It is considered that the proposed access is inadequate for the purpose of the proposed development.
- 4.

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