

MEMORANDUM



From:	Service Manager Environment	To:	Head of Environment and Planning
Our Ref:	EP/DC/PP/2017/0143	Your Ref:	SEH/P/2017/0143
Date:	23 rd February 2017		

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

TOWN AND COUNTRY (GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURE) ORDER 1995

Location: O. S Grid Ref: 410 539 The Cottage, Cross Street, Holt, Wrexham.

Development: Erection of two storey 3 bedroom detached dwelling and construction of associated gardens, parking and turning areas for the proposed dwelling and nos. 4 and 5 Cross Street.

I refer to your consultation dated 10/07/2015 including layout plan (Drg. No. RB/PD/00) in respect of the above.

The proposed development site is located on Cross Street which is an unclassified, residential road subject to a 30mph speed limit. However, I would estimate typical vehicle speeds at being around 25mph along this section given the geometry of the road.

Any proposed / existing access would normally be required to provide visibility splays of 2.4 x 33m in both directions measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway in accordance with Manual for Streets.

Visibility from the existing shared access is adequate in the northerly direction providing a splay in excess of 2.4 x 33m measured to the nearside edge. However, visibility to the south is inadequate providing a splay of approximately 2.4 x 24m measured to the nearside edge. Visibility is currently restricted in this direction as the required visibility splay cuts across 3rd party land (Belvedere).

The submitted layout plan indicates splays from the proposed access of 2.4 x 33m in the northerly direction measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway which is considered adequate. However, it would only appear possible to provide a splay of approximately 2.4 x 21m measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway from the widened access in the southerly direction. Visibility is restricted in this direction as the required visibility splay cuts across 3rd party land (Belvedere). The provision of this splay is reliant on any shrubs / vegetation along the frontage of no. 4 Cross Street being maintained at no greater than 1.0m above the adjoining carriageway. Although full visibility is not achievable from the proposed access, the site was previously occupied by a small holding which could well have generated a similar level of vehicle movements to the proposed development. On this basis the reduced visibility splay would be considered acceptable.

The existing shared access is 4.5m wide but is served by dropped kerbs which are only 3.6m wide and cannot currently accommodate the simultaneous passage of 2 no. vehicles. Any proposed widened access would need to extend the dropped kerbs accordingly for which s.184 consent would be required.

The submitted layout plan indicates an access width of approximately 4.8m reducing to only 2.6m at around 3.8m behind the adjoining carriageway. Such an access would be unable to accommodate the simultaneous passage of 2 no. vehicles clear of the adjoining highway. I would normally recommend a minimum access width of 4.8m through to the rear parking area in the interests of highway safety. However, given the overall potential improvements in terms of off-street parking and provision of communal turning facility at the site, I would have no objections to the proposed access arrangements in this instance.

I would recommend that the proposed shared access is surfaced with hard bound materials for at least 5m behind the adjoining highway with no gates being erected within 5m of the highway boundary.

No surface water shall be permitted to flow from the development site onto the adjoining highway. An Aco drain or similar shall be constructed across the access to intercept any such run off.

In terms of parking and turning provision at the site, I comment as follows:-

It would appear that the applicant has control of both no. 4 & 5 Cross Street and is able to accommodate off-street parking provision for these properties within the curtilage of the development site. **However, the proposed driveways / parking areas only appear to be 4.5 – 4.6m wide.** Double parking bays should be a minimum of 4.8m x 4.8m.

The proposed shared turning area / circle needs to be a minimum of 10m diameter. **The turning circle indicated on the submitted layout plan only appears to be 8.5m in diameter which is considered inadequate.**

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

1. **The proposed parking bays do not comply with LPGN 16 requirements.**
2. **The proposed turning circle / area is of insufficient size.**

However, if the applicant were to satisfactorily address the above issues then further consideration could be given to the proposed development.

Supplementary Notes

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

Note to Applicant:

The applicant will need to widen the extent of the dropped kerb outside the property and will need to apply for formal consent pursuant to Section 184 of the Highways Act 1980. Please ask the applicant to contact Jo Giles on Tel: 01978 729670 to arrange for this consent.

Peter Cornthwaite

PM Service Manager Environment