

MEMORANDUM

From: Chief Officer Environment & Technical **To:** Chief Officer Planning & Regulatory
Our Ref: ET/DC/P/2020/00120 **Your Ref:** MP/P/2020/0120
Date: 3rd July 2020

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

Location: O. S Grid Ref: 340 555 Ivy Cottage, Singrett Hill, Llay, Wrexham.

Development: Use of building as dog grooming salon (in retrospect).

I refer to your consultation / email dated 24/06/2020 in respect of the above.

Access

The proposed development site is accessed off the B5373 Gresford Road which is a classified, rural road subject to a 40mph speed limit. Although typical speeds of vehicles travelling from the south are considered likely to be 40mph, I would estimate typical vehicle speeds of vehicles traveling from the north at around 35mph given the geometry of the road.

Based on the above speeds, any proposed / existing access in this location would normally be required to provide visibility splays of 2.4 x 105m in the northerly direction and 2.4 x 120m in the southerly direction measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway in accordance with TAN 18.

Visibility from the existing access is inadequate providing splays of approximately 2.4 x 82m in the northerly direction and 2.4 x 23m in the southerly direction measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway. Visibility is impeded in both directions by the existing vegetation / trees.

Submitted layout plan (Drg. No. 10102.02Adsj) indicates visibility splays which are significantly short of current highway standards and are not measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining carriageway.

I would therefore not normally be able to support any proposed development that is likely to result in any significant increase in vehicle movements given the lack of adequate visibility. The applicant has indicated that the proposed business may generate 24 vehicle movements per day which is considered to be significant.

The existing access is approximately 11m wide reducing to 4.1m at a distance of 5m behind the edge of carriageway. The access would be considered to be a shared access for which I would normally recommend a minimum width of 4.8m for a distance of 5m behind the adjoining highway. The applicant has not offered to widen the existing access.

Traffic Generation

The applicant has stated that the proposed business may generate an additional 24 vehicle movements per day which is considered to be significant.

.

Parking & Turning Provision

Parking & turning provision at the site appears adequate.

I would therefore 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 existing access is considered to be of inadequate width to serve as a shared access.

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 blue ink, appearing to read 'Kulend', with a small arrow pointing upwards from the start of the signature.

Chief Officer Environment & Technical