

MEMORANDUM

From:	Service Manager Environment	To:	Head of Environment and Planning
Our Ref:	EP/DC/PP/2017/0202	Your Ref:	KH/P/2017/0202
Date:	16 th March 2017		

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

TOWN AND COUNTRY (GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURE) ORDER 1995

Location: O. S Grid Ref: Land to the rear of Skeabost, 6 Church Road, Overton.

Development: Outline application for the erection of a single dwelling and detached garage.

I refer to your consultation dated 15/03/2017 in respect of the above.

Access

The proposed development site is located on Church Road which is a classified, residential road subject to a 30mph speed limit. Although vehicles approaching from the north may well travel up to 30mph, I would estimate typical vehicle speeds of 25mph for vehicles approaching from the south given the proximity to the junction with the A539.

Based on the above speeds, any proposed / existing access in this location would normally be required to provide visibility splays of 2.4 x 43m to the north and 2.4 x 33m to the south measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway in accordance with Manual for Streets.

Visibility from the proposed / existing access serving the development site is adequate in the northerly direction providing a splay in excess of 2.4 x 43m measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway. However, visibility in the southerly direction is inadequate providing a splay of approximately 2.4 x 10m measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway. Visibility is restricted in this direction in that the required splay would cut across 3rd party land.

I would therefore be unable to support any proposal that is likely to result in an increase in vehicle movements through this sub-standard access.

The existing access serving the development site is approximately 3.8m wide and is gated 5.3m behind the adjoining carriageway. I would normally recommend a shared access of this nature to be a minimum of 4.5m wide.

The existing driveway leading to the development site is approximately 3m wide and cannot accommodate the simultaneous passage of 2 no. vehicles. I would normally recommend a shared access of this nature to be a minimum of 4.5m wide or at least provide a suitable passing place. The submitted layout plan indicates the provision of a 3.9m x 10m passing place which would be considered inadequate.

Parking & Turning Provision

In terms of parking provision at the proposed development site, I comment as follows:-

The existing property (assumed 4 bedrooms) appears to provide parking for up around 4 cars on the driveway and 2 car spaces in the garage. Proposed parking provision for the existing property appears adequate providing parking for at least 3 cars.

The proposed property (minimum 4 bedrooms) appears to provide parking provision for at least 3 cars which is considered adequate.

However, I would recommend that adequate space is provided to allow vehicles to turn on site and exit in a forward gear. This could take the form of a communal / shared turning facility for both properties. Such detail should be indicated on a revised layout plan.

However, I would recommend that the application be **REFUSED** for the following reasons:-

1. **There is restricted visibility at the existing access and increased use would increase the likelihood of danger to road users.**
2. **The proposed shared access is of insufficient width.**
3. **The proposed development does not make adequate provision for the turning of vehicles within the curtilage of the site.**

peter Dartnall

PM

Service Manager Environment