

MEMORANDUM

From: Planning Control Manger

To: Head of Environment and Planning

Our Ref: EP/DC/P/2017/0623

Your Ref: SW/P/2017/0623

Date: 24th January 2019

Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Section 78 Appeal @ Broad Oak Farm, Llyndir Lane, Rossett, Wrexham.

I refer to your consultation / email dated 09/01/2019 in respect of the above.

I am satisfied with my previous response made to this application (copy attached).

Peter Dosthwaite

PD Planning Control Manger

MEMORANDUM

From: Service Manager Environment **To:** Head of Environment and Planning

Our Ref: EP/DC/PP/2017/0623 **Your Ref:** MR/P/2017/0623

Date: 8th November 2017

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

Location: O. S Grid Ref: 367 584 Broadoak Farm, Llyndir Lane, Rossett, Wrexham.
Development: Change of use and conversion of barns to 13 no. residential units including part demolition, access and parking arrangements.

I refer to email dated 06/11/2017 from Vectos in respect of the above.

Passing Place and Footway Link Proposals Drg. No. VN70889-SK04 Rev A

The lack of footway improvements as previously indicated behind the existing hedgerow providing a link to the Rossett Business Park would be considered unacceptable. As previously discussed, I would recommend that this footway extends along Lavister Lane up to the access with Rossett Business Park.

The suggested existing passing place (ie/ viewport 4) is considered to be inadequate. As previously discussed, I would recommend that improved passing provision is proposed in the previously identified locations (ie/ minimum length 16m, minimum width 5.5m) including surfacing with hard bound materials to adoptable standards.

I would recommend that a revised layout plan is submitted indicating the above detail.

Site Access Arrangement Drg. No. VN70889-SK03

In order to clarify accurately what highway improvements (ie/ carriageway widening) are intended along the site frontage, I would recommend the submission of a more detailed scaled layout plan. Details will need to include existing carriageway widths and proposed carriageway widths (shown @ 5m intervals), proposed footway widths, existing and proposed verge widths, accurate plot of existing hedgerow and details / dimensions of existing / proposed verge drainage ditches.

The submitted layout plan does not indicate all of the above detail to ascertain if adequate verge width will be retained and what affect the modifications will have on existing drainage ditches. **All details shall be annotated on a revised layout plan. Without this detail I will be unable to determine whether the suggested improvements are feasible.**

Any proposed carriageway widths shall not represent a reduction from existing widths. The existing carriageway width fronting the northerly access is around 5.9m, the submitted layout plan indicates an existing carriageway width of 5.29m which is incorrect. The existing carriageway width fronting the southerly access is around 5.2m, the submitted layout plan indicates an existing carriageway width of 4.61m which is incorrect.

I understand that it is proposed to modify the most southerly access to provide visibility splays of 2.4 x 49m in both directions measured to the nearside wheeltrack. The provision of such splays would be considered acceptable. However, it needs to be demonstrated that providing these splays and providing a 5m wide carriageway in this location does not impact on the existing drainage ditch. I have requested a site visit by our Flood Management Officer to assess any impact on the existing drainage ditches.

In order to carry out the recommended highway improvements, there would appear to be potential issues with the existing local land drainage network (ie/ ditches). WCBC does have a policy regarding culverting of watercourses, with a presumption against. If any works are required that will affect the local drainage network there will be the requirement for additional consent under Section 23 of the Land Drainage Act from WCBC as Lead Local Flood Authority. Although not detailed within the application, the diversion of any open watercourses would be preferential to the introduction of additional lengths of culvert. I would recommend that you discuss the above detail with our Flood Management Officer – Neil Taunt on Tel: 01978 729734.

Please clarify on a revised layout plan what width is proposed for the southerly access and any footway improvements on the southern side of this access in order to provide the required visibility splays.

I await the requested information.

Existing Farm Trips

The previously submitted Highways – Supplementary Note suggests that the farm previously generated approximately 206 two-way trips per week (412 movements), which spread over a 5.5 day working week equates to around 75 no. vehicle movements per day. This level of traffic generation would appear quite excessive for a farm and I cannot accept this suggested level of traffic generation without further detailed justification.

I understand that you have interrogated the TRICS database but there are no suitably comparable sites with similar characteristics to the former pig farm. However, I understand that the submitted vehicle movements were based on information recorded in a log / invoice schedule held by the farm in terms of deliveries to and from the site. **Could you please ask the applicant to provide a copy of these records to confirm the suggested movements.**

Proposed Residential Trips

The submitted TRICS data appears to include "Edge of Town" and "Neighbourhood Centre" locations. The site is in a fairly remote location and would not be considered to be in an Edge of Town location. The submitted TRICS information suggests 4.548 movements per day per dwelling. This would be considered to be particularly low given the remote location of the site.

Either "Neighbourhood Centre" and / or "Free standing" would seem more appropriate. The applicant has also provided additional TRICS information based on these two site categories. However, the applicant has indicated that these sites are not truly representative of Rossett in terms of access to larger urban centres and local facilities. This TRICS information suggests 7.108 movements per day per dwelling. If the proposed development was to be supported without adequate footway improvements but limited to existing traffic generation levels experienced by the farm then this would equate to around 10 – 11 dwellings.

Technical Advice Note 18 – Transport (TAN 18)

TAN 18 recommends that housing developments should be provided in locations with good access by walking and cycling to primary and secondary schools and public transport stops, and by all modes to employment, further and higher education, services, shopping and leisure, or where such access will be provided as part of the scheme. TAN 18 requires layouts and densities, which maximise the opportunity for residents to walk and cycle to local facilities and public transport stops.

However, it is considered that even when vehicles, pedestrians, cyclists arrive at either of the junctions from the development site with the B5445 Chester Road there are very few local facilities available.

If the application is to be supported, it would be considered beneficial in highway safety terms to provide the previously requested improvements. These would need to be delivered through a s.38 / 278 agreement.

Notes to Applicant

- *Any proposed highway improvements shall 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

Supplementary Notes

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

Service Manager Environment