

MEMORANDUM

From: Chief Officer, Environment & Technical **To:** Chief Officer Planning & Regulatory
Our Ref: ET/DC/P/2019/0877 **Your Ref:** MRJ/P/2019/0877
Date: 19th March 2020

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

TOWN AND COUNTRY (GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURE) ORDER 1995

Location: O. S Grid Ref: 386 493 Land at Oak Road, Wrexham Industrial Estate, Wrexham.
Development: Outline application with some matters reserved for proposed development of land for B1 light industrial and B2 / B8 industrial units including means of access and layout, illustrative strategic landscaping, with ecological, heritage and amenity mitigation zones.

I refer to your consultation /email dated 13/03/2020 including additional letter (Dated 02/03/2020) from Prime Transport Planning in respect of the above.

Access

The proposed development site is located on Oak Road which is an unclassified road subject to a 40mph.

Any proposed / existing accesses in this location would normally be required to provide visibility splays of 2.4 x 120m in both directions measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway in accordance with TAN 18 / DMRB Standards.

The previously submitted layout plan (Drg.No. P19014-001 E) indicated visibility splays of 4.5 m x 120m from the proposed access which is considered acceptable. I would recommend that all land required to provide these splays is dedicated to the Highway Authority for future maintenance.

Revised Site Plan Drg. No. 004 C

Access

Any proposed access will need to provide a minimum 7.3m wide access width with 15m kerb radii. However, this may need to be increased to accommodate a suitable pedestrian refuge across the access which accommodates the turning movements of a 16.5m long HGV.

The proposed access takes the form of a simple T-junction. However, based on the submitted TRICs data / traffic flows in the latest Technical Note, DMRB (CD123) would appear to recommend the provision of a right hand turning lane / ghost island.

The provision of a right hand turning lane will impact on the junction of Abbey Road and may affect the junction with Bryn Lane. In this instance a right hand turning lane will also be required for the Abbey Road junction.

The previously submitted Technical Note (Dated 14/02/2020) included Table 2.1 – Expected 2034 AADT Flows. The 2034 plus development flows were 1213 daily movements for the proposed site access and 4426 daily movements along Oak Road. I assume that these figures were produced by previously submitted specific floor areas for each factory unit with a defined proposed use ie/ B1 , B8. When compared with DMRB (CD123) Figure 2.3.1, the above figures indicate that a ghost island is required.

However, I understand that the submitted application now only requires comments on access and no longer includes layout which is a reserved matter. I understand that the applicant is not certain as to the proposed floor areas of each unit and its final use ie/ B1, B8 or even B2. Without this information it is not possible to assess the required access layout.

The applicant has indicated that standard priority controlled junctions are the predominant form of junction within WIE. However, existing junctions throughout the industrial estate vary with some being simple T junctions and some with ghost islands.

It would be considered preferable to access the site via a new roundabout located at the junction of Bryn lane / Oak Road rather than creating an additional access off Oak Road. However, I understand that the applicant does not have control of the required land in this location to deliver a junction of this nature.

I previously recommend the provision of a suitable pedestrian crossing / splitter island across the proposed access. The proposed crossing indicated on submitted layout plan (Drg. No. P19014-003B) is not considered suitable. This feature is simply a dropped kerb crossing with no pedestrian refuge. Revised swept path details will be required to demonstrate that HGVs can access the site without interfering with any revised pedestrian crossing facility in this location. The applicant appears reluctant to provide the above pedestrian crossing facility suggesting that the development will only result in low levels of traffic and low levels of pedestrian movements. However, the anticipated traffic movements previously submitted from the proposed development are significant ie/ 1213 daily vehicle movements. The applicant also appears reluctant to make any contribution towards improving bus services in this location.

Appropriate dropped kerb crossing points will need to be provided further along Oak Road in order to provide safe pedestrian access to the existing bus stop / shelter on the opposite side of the road. This requirement has been accepted by the applicant.

I would recommend that the existing vehicular access located opposite the Abbey Road South junction is permanently closed up and reinstated to full height footway construction..

The applicant will be required to enter into a s.38 / 278 agreement with the Council to carry out any access / footway works.

Safety Audits

I previously recommended that any proposed new access in this location will require Stage 1, 2 & 3 Safety Audits. I recommended that Stage 1 & 2 Safety Audits are submitted as part of any planning application to ensure a safe and satisfactory access can be provided.

A Stage 1 Safety Audit has been submitted with the application. This highlighted potential visibility issues with the uncontrolled proposed crossing points across Oak Road. The Auditors recommendations included re-siting of crossing points and possible removal of trees / vegetation along this section of Oak Road.

A Stage 2 Safety Audit would indicate at the planning stage whether it is feasible to provide a ghost island arrangement in this location.

The applicant has suggested that a Stage 2 Safety Audit is not required to determine if a particular form of junction is feasible. However, if the applicant is not prepared to provide a suitable plan indicating how an access incorporating a ghost island could be provided meeting the required DMRB standards in this location then it would be difficult to support the proposed development. I would recommend that this detail is provided.

Footpath links

I understand that it is proposed to provide footpath links from the development site to Oak Road and to the existing public footpath (PROW No. 19 – Abenbury). I would strongly recommend that you liaise with our Public Rights of Way Section on this matter – contact: Sean Hanratty on Tel: 01978 729761. Any proposed footpath links will need to be provided on a suitable layout plan.

The applicant has indicated that such details can be finalized / agreed following any reserved matters application. However, I would have thought that such detail would be viewed as access detail and would need to be agreed as part of this application.

Emergency Access / Cycleway Links

I previously recommend that a suitable emergency access is provided from the site onto Oak Road. Such an access could also accommodate appropriate cycleway provision to support Active Travel. Sufficient information has not previously been provided in terms of both emergency access provision and how cycleway links will be provided to existing cycleway infrastructure in this area. However, I understand that it is now difficult for the applicant to achieve as the reduction in the site area has resulted in there being only one part of the site that now has a frontage to the highway network, this being the point of the main site access.

The applicant has questioned the need for an emergency access. As the proposed estate road would not be adopted, I assume responsibility for providing such a feature would be the responsibility of the landowner. In this instance I would recommend that the applicant seeks advice from the Fire Brigade on any requirement for an emergency access. I understand that the applicant is attempting to contact the emergency services to discuss / agree this detail. I assume that any conclusion to this matter will need to be confirmed with the Planning Authority.

Layout (Reserved Matter)

Although layout is a reserved matter, I comment as follows:-

The submitted layout plan appears to indicate 2m wide footways on both sides of the internal estate road which is considered acceptable.

The proposed turning head is not laid out to adoptable standards. The proposed factory unit accesses appear to be laid out to a non-standard specification and appear to include trees planted within visibility splays. Based on the submitted layout, we would not wish to adopt such a layout. In this instance, the proposed internal estate road would need to be managed in perpetuity by a private management company.

Adequate parking and turning provision would need to be provided for each industrial unit in accordance with LPGN 16 requirements. A suitable layout plan indicating the proposed parking provision allocated to each unit in respect of Class B1 / B2 / B8 use will be required.

Public Transport Provision

Current public transport provision serving the industrial estate is poor. I would strongly recommend that you discuss the proposed development including potential funding for an improved bus service with our Public Transport Officer – Andrew Mytton on Tel: 01978 729760.

Our Public Transport Section have responded as follows:-

The £25000 per annum (for 3 yrs) requested for the development at Oak Road would fund a contribution to peak time only (a.m./p.m.) additional bus journeys (Mon-Fri) to this part of the Industrial Estate.

This may take the form of negotiation with the incumbent bus operator currently providing an hourly service to the central parts of Wrexham Industrial Estate, but deemed to be of excessive walking distance from the current route served. There is existing infrastructure within close proximity of the proposed site, that has previously seen a bus serve this part of the industrial estate, prior to the bus company ceasing trading.

The applicant appears reluctant to make any contribution towards improving bus services in this location. Our Transport Section (contact: Andrew Mytton) has recommended that a condition is included for the requested commuted sum.

Surface Water Drainage

A suitable scheme to dispose of highway surface water run-off within the site will need to be submitted and approved. This will need to be assessed / approved by our Flood management Officer – Neil Taunt.

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

Details of the how the new section of highway forming the access / bellmouth will be drained will need to be provided.

Proposed Lighting

Any proposed internal lighting scheme must not provide any disabling glare / distraction to drivers on the adjoining highway. This could be controlled by a suitable planning condition. The proposed development may well require additional lighting columns to illuminate the adoptable section of the new access. I would recommend that the applicant indicates this detail on a revised layout plan. I

would recommend that the applicant liaises with our Street Lighting Section – contact Paul Rogers on Tel: 01978 729673 on this matter.

This could be included as a planning condition should the application be supported.

Service and Delivery Management Plan (SDMP)

I would recommend that any proposed planning application includes a suitable Service and Delivery Management Plan including the following details:-

- Details of staff numbers employed, number of visitors per day, number of HGVs visiting site per day, maximum number of HGVs permitted on site at any one time.
- Statement that no parking or stacking of vehicles (ie/ either staff vehicles or HGVs) shall occur on the public highway. Details of how deliveries will be managed to avoid the above will need to be included in a SDMP.

This could be included as a planning condition should an application be supported.

Construction Traffic Management Plan - including details of contractor parking

In order to construct the proposed scheme, the applicant will need to submit a Construction Traffic Management Plan including details of contractor parking for further approval.

This could be included as a planning condition should the application be supported.

In conclusion, if layout is to be a reserved matter (ie/ no definite specific class uses and floor areas provided), then it is difficult to assess the necessary access requirements to serve the proposed development.

Supplementary Notes

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

Chief Officer, Environment & Technical