

# MEMORANDUM



**From:** Service Manager Environment

**To:** Head of Environment and Planning

**Our Ref:** EP/DC/PP/2017/1032

**Your Ref:** MP/P/2017/1032

**Date:** 10<sup>th</sup> January 2018

## **TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990**

## **TOWN AND COUNTRY (GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURE) ORDER 1995**

**Location:** O. S Grid Ref: 390 466 Maelor Creamery, Pickhill Lane, Cross Lanes, Wrexham.

**Development:** Application for removal of condition no. 14 of planning permission P/2014/0781 to allow the processing in the region of 1,000,000 birds per week.

I refer to your consultation dated 20/12/2017 in respect of the above.

The main access route to the development site would appear to be via the A525 / Pickhill Lane junction. The speed limit along this section has recently been amended to 40mph. I understand that a recent speed survey along this section of the A525 determined 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds of 40.5mph for vehicles travelling north bound and 41.5mph for vehicles travelling southbound. The speed limit along this section has recently been amended to 40mph.

Based on these determined speeds, TAN 18 would normally require the existing junction to provide visibility splays of 2.4 x 109m to the north and 105m to the south measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway in accordance with TAN 18.

Visibility from this existing junction is adequate in the north westerly direction providing a splay of approximately 2.4 x 150m measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway. Visibility in the south easterly direction is also adequate providing a splay of approximately 2.4 x 110m measured to the centreline of the adjoining highway. Visibility can be considered to the centerline of the road given the presence of double white lines.

It may be the case that larger HGVs accessing this junction (both in / out) may well need to encroach over the centerline of both Pickhill Lane and the A525-Whitchurch Road which is not ideal. Could you please ask the applicant to provide swept path details of a 16.5m long HGV entering and exiting this junction in all potential directions.

A summary of the previous / existing / proposed staff numbers & daily HGV movements at the site is as follows:-

| Use                  | Total Staff Numbers | Weekday Operational Vehicle Movements |
|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Historic             | 220                 | 22                                    |
| Approved Use         | 230                 | 26                                    |
| Current Approved Use | 150                 | 24                                    |
| Proposed Use         | 220-230             | 72                                    |

## Staff

In terms of the future operation of the site, I understand that staff numbers are likely to increase in line with numbers previously employed at the site (ie/ around 230 staff) when it operated as a creamery / cheese cutting / cheese packing facility.

Based on the previous minimal increase in HGV vehicle movements through the existing A525 / Pickhill junction, it was considered inappropriate to request any highway related improvements to this junction.

The total number of staff intended to be employed at the site in respect of planning application ref: P/2014/0781 was significantly less than previous staff numbers employed at the site. It was therefore considered that the overall daily HGV movements and staff movements combined would be less than previous / approved traffic generation levels at the site.

## Access

In terms of accesses serving the development site itself, I comment as follows:-

Pickhill Lane is a rural, classified road subject to a 60mph speed limit.

Any proposed / existing access would normally be required to provide visibility splays of 2.4 x 215m in both directions measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway.

There would appear to be 2 no. existing accesses serving the development site as follows:-

The main access serving the site (south western corner) is approximately 18m wide and is gated 4.3m behind the adjoining carriageway. I understand that all delivery vehicles (HGVs) and staff utilise this access. Visibility from this access is inadequate in both directions providing splays of approximately 2.4 x 60m to the south west and 2.4 x 180m to the north east measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway. Visibility is impeded in both directions given that the required splays would cut across 3<sup>rd</sup> party land.

I would therefore not normally wish to support any proposed development that is likely to result in any significant increase in vehicle movements utilizing this sub-standard access.

There would appear to be a second access at the north eastern corner of the site which I understand is rarely used. This access is approximately 7m wide and is gated 17m behind the adjoining carriageway. Visibility from this access is inadequate in both directions providing visibility splays of approximately 2.4 x 150m to the south west and 2.4 x 25m to the north east measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway. Forward visibility for vehicles approaching from the south west is also inadequate providing a stopping sight distance of approximately 110m. I assume that this access will be used as an "emergency access" only as previously conditioned as part of planning consent ref: P/2011/0750. There does however, appear to be some additional kerbing works taking place behind this gated access which might suggest that it is intended to use this access.

In terms of parking provision, I comment as follows:-

The proposed development site comprises a gross floor area of 14025m<sup>2</sup>. Based on LPGN 16 requirements, B2 General Industrial Use requires a maximum of 1 car space per 50m<sup>2</sup>. This equates to the maximum requirement of 281 spaces.

I understand that as the current operation of the site (including operational hours and shift patterns) is similar to previous operations at the site, and overall staff numbers are lower, the proposed level of parking provision (ie/ 150 no. spaces) would be adequate. There would also appear to be ample space within the site to cater for any future increase in parking demand. The proposed level of parking provision would therefore appear adequate for the proposed development.

However, it may be considered appropriate to impose a suitable condition stating that "*the permission shall not be for the benefit of the land but shall operate for the benefit of Maelor Foods, whilst they operate and occupy the site*".

Turning facilities for HGVs within the curtilage of the site appear adequate.

### **Traffic Generation**

Based on the information provided in the Transport Report, I comment as follows:-

In terms of the future operation of the site, I understand that staff numbers are likely to increase in line with numbers previously employed at the site (ie/ around 230 staff) when it operated as a creamery / cheese cutting / cheese packing facility. This will obviously result in a significant increase in staff vehicle movements through the existing main access compared with current movements.

I understand that the proposed increase in production (processing of 1,000,000 birds per week) will result in a total of 12 HGV movements per hour based on a 6 hour delivery window as opposed to 4 HGV movements per hour at present. This equates to a total of 72 HGV movements per day through the main access compared with 24 HGV movements per day which is considered significant.

The proposed increase in staff numbers to previously accepted levels leaves no spare capacity to offset the increase in HGV movements through this access with staff vehicle movements

I would therefore recommend that the application be **REFUSED** for the following reason:-

**There is restricted visibility at the existing access and increased use would increase the likelihood of danger to road users.**

However, if the issue of visibility can be overcome at the main access, then further consideration could be given to the proposed development.

### **Supplementary Notes**

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

**Note to Applicant**

*Public Right of Way no. 12 (Sesswick) runs alongside the south western boundary of the site and must not be interfered with.*

*per southwaste*

*on* Service Manager Environment