

SITE



PROPOSAL

The application seeks full planning permission for the construction of 2 no. dwellings.

HISTORY

None relevant.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Within Gresford Settlement Limit as identified on Map 3 INSET 4. UDP policies GDP1, EC4, H2.

LPG 07 – Landscape and Development, LPG 16 – Parking Standards, LPG 21 – Space Around Dwellings.

CONSULTATIONS

NRW: No objection subject to additional information submitted in regards to drainage and conditions to secure ecological mitigation.

Welsh Water: No objection subject to a condition to ensure no surface water and/or land drainage shall be allowed to connect directly or indirectly to the public sewerage network.

Highway Authority:	Objected to the application based on the original submitted information. On the basis of the additional information received by the agent on 15th October, Highway Authority continue to object to the application, recommending refusal. There is restricted visibility at the site access with Pant Lane, which would result in unsafe means of vehicular access onto the highway. To achieve the visibility would require a S.106 Agreement with third parties.
Public Protection:	No objection. Informatives recommended to mitigate construction noise, burning of waste and dust management.
Ecology:	No objection.
Trees:	No comments received at the time of writing.
Community Council:	Concerns were raised about the lack of parking for the dwelling that this will create, causing cars to potentially be parked on the roadway. It was also felt important to provide screening at the front. Primarily the concerns were around the appropriateness of the proposal, given that the properties nearby are all bungalows.
Local Member:	Objects to the application and requested that the application be determined at Planning Committee. October 25th 2018 – Confirms that the application can be determined via delegated authority.
Site Notice:	Expired 21.09.2018.
Neighbours:	6 no. representations received, 5 objecting to the proposal and 1 stating that whilst they are not opposed to development of the land, further consideration needs to be given as to the overall proposal. A petition against the development with 29 signatures has also been received. Concerns raised include overdevelopment, loss of privacy, overbearing impacts and loss of light to neighbouring properties, increase in noise, dust and disturbance, the dwellings would be in close proximity to the neighbouring properties, no consultation with affected residents, adversely impact on character and appearance of the area, highway safety implications, the LDP has not been adopted and there are no existing policies to

determine the application, increase in overlooking, there is no boundary treatment shown for all sides of the application site, existing street lighting and pavements are already inadequate for pedestrians – the proposed development would exacerbate, information submitted in the application is inaccurate.

SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Principle: The application site is located within Gresford Settlement Boundary as identified on Policy Map 3 INSET 4.

The proposal would involve demolishing the existing dwelling and replacing it with 2 no. dwellings.

Wrexham UDP Policy H2 supports residential development on unannotated land within settlement limits, subject to compliance with Policy GDP1.

The principle of development is acceptable.

Design and Layout: The development would comprise of one dwelling located on the site of the existing one with a second located towards the rear of the site.

The dwellings would be relatively contemporary in design and appearance and provided material samples are secured by condition, is appropriate given the mix of architectural styles on the locality.

Whilst the erection of a dwelling on the site of the existing one will broadly reflect the pattern of the development in the locality, the dwelling located to the rear of the site constitutes tandem development that is significantly at odds with the character of the wider locality.

Whilst the set back, size and design of plots varies in the development, in the vicinity, dwellings typically front onto the highway. Planning Policy Wales (paragraph 9.2.13) advises against tandem development. Furthermore, Technical Advice Note 12: Design advises that the design of housing layouts should reflect local context (paragraph 5.11.3), and that generally, every effort should be made to orientate dwellings so that they front existing roads and spaces (paragraph 5.11.4). The proposals in respect of the rear plot therefore conflict with national planning guidance as well as GDP1 (a).

Residential Amenity: Relevant spacing standards to neighbouring properties are considered to be appropriate and would comply with Local Planning Guidance Note 21 in terms of the relationship between the proposed dwellings and habitable rooms located in adjacent properties.

Notwithstanding the above, it is considered that the plot located towards the rear of the site will give rise to a degree of overlooking of no.3 The Conifers from its first

floor windows that currently does not occur, to the detriment of the standard of privacy afforded to the occupiers of the neighbouring property.

Access and Car Parking: Highway Authority originally objected to the proposal based on inadequate visibility at the site access.

The agent submitted additional information to overcome the concerns raised on 15th October.

The Highway Authority have provided further comments in relation to the additional submitted information.

The visibility splay required at the site access is 2.4 x 43m either side of the site access. Visibility at the existing access is already restricted in both directions, measuring approximately 2.4 x 4m in both directions, measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway.

Visibility is restricted in the westerly direction in that the current splay looks across the neighbouring driveway and is impeded beyond this point by the existing boundary wall/fence.

A search on the Council's system confirms that the boundary treatment across the frontage of Edgecroft does not have planning permission. The owner of the property has been made aware of this. Nevertheless, this application is determined on the basis of the existing circumstances and a future planning application for a boundary treatment across the frontage of the site would be determined on its own merits.

To achieve the westerly visibility splay, the applicant would need to enter into a S.106 Agreement with the owners of Edgecroft and Dunholme (the neighbouring properties in question) to ensure there is no future obstruction within the westerly splay. A proposal for a S.106 Agreement has not been submitted as part of the application.

Visibility in the easterly direction is impeded by the existing hedgerow/trees fronting the existing property. If the hedgerow/trees were removed, a visibility splay of 28m could be achieved, which would still fall short of the required 43m.

Visibility beyond the 28m point in the easterly direction would cut across third party land, which would require a S.106 Agreement to ensure the splay is kept free of obstruction in perpetuity. No such agreement has been put forward with the application.

The Highway Authority therefore recommend refusal given it is impracticable within the curtilage of the site to construct an access with Pant Lane which would provide sufficient visibility for vehicles emerging from the site. The proposal would conflict with UDP Policy GDP1 (d).

Ecology: No objection raised from the Ecology Officer or NRW.

Trees: No comments received to date from the Tree Officer.

CONCLUSION

The proposal, by virtue of the siting of a dwelling to the rear of the site, will give rise to an unacceptable form of tandem development that is at odds with the general pattern and character of development in the area as well as resulting in a loss of privacy of the occupiers of an adjacent dwelling, thus conflicting with UDP policy GDP1(a) and (f).

In addition there is restricted visibility at the site access with Pant Lane, which would result in unsafe means of vehicular access onto the highway. To achieve the visibility would require a S.106 Agreement with third parties and this has not been submitted to accompany the application. The proposal would therefore also fail to accord with UDP Policy GDP1 (d).