

APPENDIX 1: CASE OFFICER DELEGATED REPORT

THE SITE

The application site forms part of the curtilage of the dwelling Rose Cottage, no.33 Wynnstay Lane.

PROPOSAL

Outline planning permission is sought with all matters reserved for subsequent approval.

HISTORY

No recent history.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Within settlement. Policies GDP1, EC4, H2 and T8 apply.

CONSULTATIONS

Community Council:	Object on the grounds of increased traffic in a difficult location and support the objections and matters raised by the Highways department in their letter.
Local Member:	Agrees to delegated refusal
Highways:	Unable to support the development due to lack of adequate visibility and access width.
Public Protection:	Advise on measures to limit construction impacts.
NRW:	No objection
Welsh Water:	Recommend condition regarding drainage.
Site Notice:	Expired 11.12.18
Neighbours:	The owners/occupiers of 4 neighbouring properties notified 22.11.2018. 2 objections received expressing the following concerns: - Traffic; - Access is via an unadopted road; - Highway safety - Loss of trees; - Impact of detached garage; - Impact upon the character of the area.

SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Policy: The site lies within the settlement limit and is unallocated for development. The erection of a dwelling on the site accords with policy H2 subject to also complying with policy GDP1.

Paragraph 6.9 of the UDP provides the following advice which I will also have regard to

:

Attractive tree-lined, and/or low density residential areas (e.g. the Chester Road/Maes-y-Dre Road/Penymaes Avenue/Park Avenue neighbourhood in Wrexham, or the Wynnstay Lane/Stancliffe Avenue/Pistyll Hill/Hoseley Lane locality in Marford), must not be spoilt by insensitive developments which increase densities; constitute over-development; result in the loss of private or public open space; or detract from the general character of the area.

Character: The development would result in an increase in density of development however the application site is a substantial plot comparable to others in the area. Similarly the existing dwelling would still be a reasonable substantial plot – both exceeding 1000 sq.m in area. I therefore do not believe the increase in density would result in harm to the character of the area. The indicative details suggest a two storey dwelling. This would be broadly reflective of the scale of dwellings in the locality.

The Arboricultural Method Statement accompany the application indicates that that 11 trees are to be removed 1 category B/moderate quality – 6 category C/low quality trees, 4 category U. Whilst I note the concerns expressed, the development is unlikely to result in the loss of any high quality trees and there would be scope to secure the planting of new trees within the curtilage. Given that all matters are reserved, these are matters that could be considered in more detail at reserved matters stage. Nevertheless based on the details submitted, the loss of trees identified for removal in the AIA would not be detrimental to the character of the area.

Amenity: I am satisfied that the site can be developed with regards to the separation standards set out in LPG21 and that therefore the proposals will not adversely impact upon the occupiers of neighbouring occupiers by way of loss of light, privacy or by being overbearing.

Highways: The indicative plan demonstrates that it will be possible to provide adequate parking and turning for the development. The existing dwelling would also retain sufficient space for parking and turning.

The site is accessed via a shared private drive that serves the existing property as well 2 neighbouring properties. The driveway is typically 3.4m wide and cannot accommodate the simultaneous passage of two vehicles. The drive exits onto Wynnstay Lane adjacent to its junction with Pistyll Hill.

Highways have advised that visibility splays of 2.4 x 25m would be required for an access onto Wynnstay Lane, however the existing driveway has splays of 2.4 x 13m to the west and 2.4 x 6m to the east. Forward visibility of 25m for vehicles approaching from the south along Wynnstay Lane would also be required, whereas only 15m is achievable. In my opinion the driveway serving the site cannot safely accommodate the additional traffic generated by the development. The proposals therefore conflict with policy GDP1(d).

CONCLUSION

Due to the width of the driveway that serves the site as well as substandard visibility at the point of access from the driveway onto Wynnstay Lane the development will have a detrimental impact on highway safety and therefore conflicts with policy GDP1(d) of the Wrexham Unitary Development Plan.