

MEMORANDUM

From: Service Manager Environment **To:** Head of Environment and Planning
Our Ref: EP/DC/PP/2017/0799 **Your Ref:** MP/P/2017/0799
Date: 9th October 2017

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

Location: O. S Grid Ref: 428 447 Land at Mulsford Farm, Sarn, Malpas, Wrexham.
Development: Proposed intensive poultry installation and all associated works.

I refer to your consultation dated 05/10/2017 including layout plan (Drg. No. RJC-MZ63-Huxley-01) in respect of the above.

Access

The proposed development site is located off Queensford which is a rural, classified road subject to a 60mph speed limit. I understand that a speed survey was recently conducted along this section of Queensford which determined 85th percentile speeds of 43.3mph for vehicles travelling in the westerly direction and 42.6mph for vehicles travelling in the easterly direction. These speeds would normally require the provision of visibility splays of 2.4 x 117m in the easterly direction and 2.4 x 114m in the westerly direction measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway in accordance with TAN 18.

Based on the above speeds, visibility at the junction of Mulsford Lane (unclassified) onto Queensford (classified) is inadequate providing a splay of approximately 2.4 x 56m in the north westerly direction and approximately 2.4 x 22m in the south easterly direction measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway. Visibility is impeded in both directions by the existing hedgerow.

It would appear from the submitted location plan (Drg. No. RJC-MZ63-Huxley-01) that the applicant owns the land to the east of the junction but does not own the land to the west. The applicant would therefore not appear to be able to improve visibility to the west at this junction.

Access to the development site is currently via Mulsford Lane through what was an existing field access. This access appears to have been widened significantly to around 15m and surfaced with loose bound materials with a stone track approximately 4m wide providing access to the development site. This access appears to have been formed without consent and encroaches onto the adjoining highway. Unbound material used to surface the access is currently spilling onto the road which is unacceptable. Our Streetscene Engineer and Planning Enforcement Section have been alerted to this situation.

If the proposed development is to be supported, I would recommend that this existing access is either permanently closed up or as a minimum reinstated to its previous condition as a simple field access.

However, Mulsford Lane itself is typically only 3m wide between the junction with Queensford and the site access. The site access is approximately 120m away from the junction. Given the narrow nature of the lane, it is impossible for 2 no. vehicles to pass simultaneously.

Swept Path details of a 16.5m long HGV have been provided which indicate that such a vehicle could access the site but would need to occupy almost the entire width of Mulsford Lane to reach the development site. I would consider the characteristics of the highway, along this section of Mulsford Lane to render it unsuitable for the size of vehicle proposed. The potential for highway conflict, possible hazard and damage to the roadside verges is likely to be significant and unacceptable.

Proposed Access

I previously recommended that the applicant considered constructing a new access to serve the development site directly off Queensford located to the east of the Mulsford Lane / Queensford junction. Such an access would be required to provide adequate visibility as detailed above and designed to cater for 16.5m long HGVs. The applicant would be required to enter into a s.278 agreement with the Council in order to construct such an access.

The submitted layout plan (Drg. No. RJC-MZ63-Huxley-01) indicates the construction of a new access directly onto Queensford as suggested. It is proposed to provide visibility splays of 2.4 x 118m in both directions measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway in accordance with TAN 18. The provision of the required splay in the north westerly direction would require the setting back of the existing hedgerow on the corner of the Mulsford Lane junction. This land appears to be under the control of the applicant.

I understand that there is an existing grain storage building (planning ref: P/2016/1158) located off the recently formed access off Mulsford Lane. However, I have no details of this application in respect of type of vehicles associated with the building and typical daily vehicle movements. **Could you please ask the applicant to provide this detail for further consideration.**

If the current application is supported, it would be considered beneficial to utilize any new access onto Queensford to serve this existing business and close up the recently formed access along Mulsford Lane. **I would recommend that this detail is indicated on a revised layout plan.**

Parking and Turning Provision

Adequate parking and turning provision would appear to be available within the curtilage of the development site.

However, I would recommend the submission of a suitable layout plan indicating specific parking and turning arrangements of cars / HGVs within the curtilage of the site. Appropriate swept path details will need to be submitted demonstrating how HGVs (16.5m long) will enter / park / turn / exit the site. Details of maximum number of vehicles likely to be on site at any one time and where they will park shall be provided.

Public Footpaths

Public footpaths nos. 4 & 14 are likely to be affected by the proposed development. I would strongly recommend that the applicant liaises with our Public Rights of Way Section to discuss the proposed development. Please contact Mr. Sean Hanratty on Tel: 01978 729761.

Existing Agricultural Building

I understand that there is an existing grain storage building (planning ref: P/2016/1158) located off the recently formed access off Mulsford Lane. However, I have no details of this application in respect of type of vehicles associated with the building and typical daily vehicle movements. **Could you please provide this detail for further consideration.**

If the current application is supported, It would be considered beneficial to utilize any new access onto Queensford to serve this existing business and close up the recently formed access along Mulsford Lane. **I would recommend that this detail is indicated on a revised layout plan.**

Traffic Movements

A recently conducted traffic count indicated an average daily two-way traffic flow of 268 vehicles along Queensford. HGVs totalled 6 no. equating to 2.2% of the overall flows.

I understand that there will be 7.6 crop cycles per year, each cycle lasting 48 days. Movements are as follows:-

Day	No. of Movements	Type of vehicle
1	6	HGV
2	4	HGV
4	2	HGV
8	4	HGV
20	4	HGV
31	2	HGV
35	2	HGV
36	8	HGV
37	4	HGV
38	2	HGV
40	2	HGV
42	8	HGV
43	8	HGV
44	16	Tractor & Trailer
48	2	HGV

I understand that bird removal (known as depopulation) at the close of the crop cycle is the most significant traffic event in terms of HGV movements. It is anticipated that there will be a maximum of 10 HGV movements between 02:00 and 07:00 during the night for a maximum of 30 days during the year. This would typically equate to a maximum of 2 HGV bird removal movements to / from the site per hour.

On 33 days out of the crop cycle there will be no HGV movements to/from the site. On a further 6 days of the crop cycle there will be an average of only 1 HGV visiting the site each day. On 4 days of the crop cycle there will be 2 HGVs visiting the site each day. On only 5 days of the whole crop cycle will there be more than 2 HGV visits per day.

The Environmental Statement suggests that a number of the HGV vehicle movements will take place between 02:00 – 07:00 in the morning which would potentially have a reduced impact given that fewer existing vehicles would be on the roads leading to the site. However, I assume that the Planning Department are likely to have objections to these delivery times given the noise impact on existing properties along the route. This may result in deliveries having to take place during the day when there are more vehicles on the highway network. This would increase the likelihood of vehicle conflict along this section of Mulsford Lane.

Vehicle Routing

It is proposed to route all HGV movements to / from the site via the A525 Hollybush junction. Although this route has sections where carriageway widths are less than 5.5m, this route would be considered the most appropriate route for larger vehicles if the proposed development is supported. I assume that this arrangement could be controlled by a suitable condition (ie/ Service & Delivery Management Plan).

I would recommend that the applicant reviews all pinch points on the route to the development site from the A525 Hollybush junction with a view to providing adequate localised widening / passing places. The existing bends fronting Mulsford Farm itself may well at times result in vehicle conflict. **I would recommend that the applicant provides appropriate swept path details of a 16.5m HGV negotiating these bends for further consideration.** There would appear to be scope to widen the carriageway in the vicinity of the bends to improve the passage of vehicles along this section. **I would recommend that the applicant indicates any potential improvements on a revised layout plan.**

Construction Traffic Management Plan - CTMP (including provision for contractor parking)

Given the location of the site, I would recommend the submission of a Construction Traffic Management Plan - CTMP (including provision for contractor parking) to be submitted / approved prior to commencement.

Such a plan will need to include details of the proposed daily construction related vehicle movements (ie/ both cars & HGVs) anticipated as a result of the development over the suggested 4 month construction period.

Details of wheel washing facilities, construction signage and any traffic management measures will need to be included.

Conclusion

Certain sections of the highway between the A525 Junction and the development site are of limited carriageway width and would struggle to accommodate the simultaneous passage of HGVs. Appropriate management of such HGV movements may well minimize any potential vehicle conflict along the proposed route.

Although anticipated movements may be considered to be acceptable (subject to time of day permitted) in respect of existing daily flows, I would recommend that the applicant reviews all pinch points on the route to the development site from the A525 Hollybush junction with a view to providing adequate localised widening / passing places.

I await the requested information.

Supplementary Notes

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

puthoo mwanfe

14

Service Manager Environment