

The Planning Inspectorate

Further information on us and the planning appeal system can be found on our website www.planning-inspectorate.gov.uk

For official use only
(Date received)

PLANNING INSPECTORATE

18 MAR 2015

COMMENTS ON CASE

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable for it. This can be found in the notification letter attached. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender. Your comments can also be made on-line at

www.planningportal.gov.uk.

This form will be published on the Planning Portal, please do NOT sign it. This is to ensure that all personal data is protected in line with the requirements of the Data Protection Act 1998.

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Case Reference:

H6935/A/14/2229577

Address of site

LAND AT PONT ADAM CRESCENT
RUABON, WREXHAM

Postcode
(if known)

LL14 6EE

SENDER DETAILS

Name

JOHN V. WILLIAMS

Acting On Behalf Of

(leave blank if writing on
your own behalf)

ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?
(Neighbour, Councillor, Owner, Tenant)

NEIGHBOUR.

What kind of representation are you making?

REJECT THE APPEAL.

Having lived in Pont Adam for over forty-five years, I would respectfully ask that you give consideration to the safety of the school children who traverse this road (B5097) to school in all weather, it being the only route to and from their homes on the other side of the village, they do not conform to a measurable pattern when making this journey, these children act without thought for consequences and turn the roadway into an extension of the playground.

Re, Technical Note 1.

Attention is given to the number of accidents to children recorded, and of them just being knocked over by the vehicles wing mirrors etc.

I can confirm from personal experience that many more incidents and near misses occur on this road than ever get reported, remember the traffic is moving through groups of school children who at times are running, fighting, kicking balls, riding bikes etc. both in the roadway and on the pavement (if a pavement exists) and generally conducting themselves unlike normal pedestrians.

It would be insane for motor vehicles to travel at an excessive speed under these circumstances so fortunately most incidents, so far, are minor and because the fault usually lies with the injured party it is rarely reported. The possibility of a more serious accident occurring is obvious and any increase in traffic would only *increase the risk*.

The local highways authority recognising the problems with this road have introduced a number of methods to reduce the speed of the traffic, 20 & 30 mph speed limits, speed humps and other traffic calming devices, however despite this because of the geometry of the road, it has not prevented numerous traffic collisions from occurring and some of the walls and bridges still bear the scars.

The so called "TRICS" trip rates provided were not obtained using their recommended procedures, the survey was targeted to give an unrepresentative result, with 30% of students (and their parents vehicles & school buses) missing, it being EXAMS week.

I note a grudging acceptance, of what is blatantly obvious, "that the B5097/Church Street is restricted in width and in sections forward visibility is a concern". In other words it does not comply with today's recognised safety standards, and therefore by definition, consideration should be given to reducing *not increasing* the amount of traffic on it.

Any planned increase in traffic would be detrimental to road safety.

To agree that this is a road not compliant with today's expected safety standards in regard to its width and forward visibility, without a continuous pavement, and with children being "CLIPPED" by cars, and then have the audacity to state there are no highway safety issues on this route, defies comprehension.

If any proof was required of the total lack of understanding of the situation the following observations are also made "Accordingly there should be no need for pedestrians to be walking within the carriageway" and basically The development will not give rise to any material increase in traffic levels!

If the initial statement is correct, where do they expect the pedestrians to walk if no pavement exists? If the later observation is genuinely believed why then are the developers providing garages and parking places on the proposed site, if they don't believe ANY vehicles will use them?

How many times do we have to state the obvious School children and traffic are best kept apart, under the prevailing circumstances this is not possible.

Summary

If the existing B5097 does not comply and cannot be made to comply with modern safety standards, why is consideration being given to planning an increase in the traffic using it?

How many accidents is an acceptable number?

This road, because of its natural geometry is difficult enough to negotiate in good weather and in winter conditions can be extremely dangerous.

In places this road lacks any footpath and pedestrians are required to walk in the road.

At certain times of the day the village schoolchildren have to walk along this route going to and from the school.

If you add to this the complication of having to transport, that proportion of the 700 pupils who do not walk to school, pupils who are picked up & dropped off by parents, or a school bus etc. it is not difficult to realise the anxiety felt by locals when additional traffic numbers are being planned.

If the rightful authorities and a large number of people expressing genuine concerns for the safety of the local schoolchildren are to be ignored, and the Development Company's opinion that no material increase in traffic numbers will result from this development is believed, then my belief in due process with fair and unbiased adjudication has proven to be incorrect.

With respect after due consideration of the exceptional circumstances that exist, and the increased risk involved in providing access to this site, *without even considering the extra traffic the contractors vehicles would contribute.*

I strongly request that you reject the appeal.