

# MEMORANDUM

---

**From:** Chief Officer, Environment & Technical    **To:** Chief Officer Planning & Regulatory  
**Our Ref:** ET/DC/P/2018/0009    **Your Ref:** MP/P/2018/0009  
**Date:** 18<sup>th</sup> December 2019

---

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

**Location:** O. S Grid Ref: 406 534 Land at Wrexham Road, Holt, Wrexham.

**Development:** Application for approval of reserved matters pursuant to outline planning permission P/2013/0823 - Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale for residential development and formation of multi-use games area including details of noise assessment and attenuation, existing access closure and internal and external boundary treatments.

I refer to the email from MacBryde Homes dated 13/12/2019 including revised site layout plan (Drg. No. WRHLT-SP01 Rev K) in respect of the above.

## **Access**

The proposed development site is located on the B5102 Wrexham Road which is a classified road subject to a 30mph speed limit. Although, typical speeds may well be 30mph for vehicles approaching from the south west. I would estimate typical vehicle speeds at being around 25mph for vehicles approaching from the north east given the location of the existing flat topped kerb to kerb crossing across Wrexham Road.

Based on these speeds, any proposed access in this location would normally be required to provide visibility splays of 2.4 x 56m to the south west and 2.4 x 33m to the north east measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway in accordance with Manual for Streets.

The provision of the required visibility splays from the proposed access has been indicated on the revised layout plan.

I would recommend that the existing access serving the small car park off Wrexham Road is permanently closed up and reinstated as footway.

I would recommend the construction of a 2.0m wide footway along the entire site frontage in the interest of pedestrian safety. Dropped kerb crossing points will be required on both sides of Wrexham Road at the western end of the site frontage. The submitted layout plan indicates the required 2m wide footway along the site frontage but does not include the recommended crossing points across Wrexham Road. **Please ask the applicant to indicate this detail on a revised layout plan.**

I assume it is the intention that the proposed estate road / footways will be constructed to adoptable standards and offered for adoption.

Any proposed access road serving up to 24 dwellings will need to be 4.8m wide with either 2.0m footways either side or 1.8m service strips. The submitted layout plan demonstrates the above detail.

Appropriate turning heads constructed to adoptable standards will be required within the curtilage of the developments site.

Parking provision within the proposed development site shall comply with the requirements of LPGN 16.

## Layout

I would like to raise the following observations:-

|                                            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|--------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <u>Visibility</u>                          | <p>All visibility splays need to be indicated at all internal junctions – ie/ 2.4 x 25m measured nearside edge (20mphj design speed) for proposed shared access serving Plots 17 -24.</p> <p>The proposed splay indicated in the south easterly direction cuts across the garden and driveway of plot 16 and visibility could therefore be impeded by parked vehicles at plot 16 This is because the 2.4m setback is taken from back edge of the footway whereas it should be taken from the back edge of the carriageway.</p> <p><b>Please ask the applicant to amend this detail.</b></p> |
| <u>Main Access</u>                         | <p>Rumble strip needs moving towards main access just off kerb radii to accommodate dropped kerb crossing points behind located away from driveway serving plot 1. Dropped kerb crossing points need to comprise 3 no. 400mm x 400mm buff concrete tactiles, 1 row deep.</p> <p>2m footway acceptable on western side of estate road.</p> <p>1.8m wide service strip on eastern side of estate road is considered acceptable.</p> <p>Main turning head at end of estate road o/s plots 9 / 12 is considered acceptable.</p>                                                                 |
| <u>Side Road</u><br><u>(Plots 17 – 24)</u> | <p>Driveways must comply with WCBC Standard Details (see attached detail). Could you please ask the applicant to annotate the required driveway dimension for each plot on a revised layout plan?</p> <p>Turning head is too small (see standard turning head details – medium sized delivery vehicle).</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| <u>Side Road</u><br><u>(Plots 7 – 9)</u>   | <p>Driveways must comply with WCBC Standard Details (see attached detail). Could you please ask the applicant to annotate the required driveway dimension for each plot on a revised layout plan?</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| <u>Plots 10 – 11</u>                       | <p>Driveways must comply with WCBC Standard Details (see attached detail). Could you please ask the applicant to annotate the required driveway dimension for each plot on a revised layout plan?</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |

## Parking Provision

Parking provision within the proposed development site shall comply with the requirements of LPGN 16. LPGN 16 does not include garage spaces as contributing to parking provision.

Based on LPGN 16 requirements, the proposed development would require a maximum of 72 spaces. The submitted layout plan appears to indicate the provision of 55 spaces which represents a shortfall of 24% compared with maximum standards. The proposed level of parking provision may result in some on-street parking within the estate. However given Welsh Government policy on parking and previous planning appeal decisions on car parking standards I consider that a recommendation for refusal on the grounds of inadequate parking is unjustifiable.

However, I would request that a revised layout plan is provided indicating individual, annotated driveway dimensions compliant with WCBC Standard Details (see attached detail).

## Footway / Cycleway Link

I would recommend that the proposed footpath link at the rear of the site onto Francis Lane takes the form of a 3m wide shared footway / cycleway incorporating appropriate signage, barriers and lighting. Having re-considered the layout of the public open space, I would recommend that the proposed footway / cycleway is accessed approximately half way along the turning head (opposite main estate road) providing a link to the MUGA to the south and a link to existing pedestrian access on Francis Lane diagonally opposite Millfield. An additional link between the MUGA and the access onto Francis Lane should be provided behind the existing hedgerow effectively forming a triangular footway / cycleway arrangement. Dropped kerb crossing points will need to be provided across Francis Lane between the proposed cycleway link and footway opposite. **Please ask the applicant to amend this detail on a revised layout plan.**

The above detail will need to be included in the required s.38 agreement.

Could you please ask the applicant to provide a revised layout plan addressing the above issues? I **await the requested information.**

## Supplementary Notes

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

## Note to applicant

*The proposed internal access road including footways 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.38 / 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*

*Peter D. Anwante*

*HP* Chief Officer, Environment & Technical

