

MEMORANDUM

From: Service Manager Environment

To: Head of Community Well-being
and Development

Our Ref: ENV/DC/PP/P/2014/0392

Your Ref: SW/P/2014/0392

Date: 10th February 2015

Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Section 78 Appeal @ Land South of Lane End, Penley, Wrexham.

I am satisfied with my previous response made to this application (copy attached) and wish to inform you that I have no further comments to add.

Peter Douthwaite
PP Service Manager Environment

MEMORANDUM



From:	Interim Senior Service Manager	To:	Head of Community Well-being and Development
Our Ref:	ENV/DC/PP/2014/0392	Your Ref:	KH/P/2014/0392
Date:	16 th June 2014		

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

TOWN AND COUNTRY (GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURE) ORDER 1995

Location: O. S Grid Ref: 419 397 Land South of Lane End, Penley, Wrexham.

Development: Outline application for erection of 7 dwellings (4 detached, 1 detached bungalow and 2 semi-detached houses). Access and layout not reserved.

I refer to your consultation dated 04/06/2014 in respect of the above.

Access

The proposed development site is located off Lane End which is a narrow, unadopted lane. Access onto the A539 (Classified Road) is via a mini roundabout. This section of the A539 is subject to traffic calming and I would estimate typical vehicle speeds at being around 25mph.

Based on typical speeds of 25mph, visibility at the junction onto the A539 is considered adequate.

The proposed development site is located off Lane End which is a narrow, unadopted lane along which I would estimate typical vehicle speeds at being around 10 – 15mph.

The straight section of Lane End fronting the first 4 no. dwellings is approximately 60m in length varying between 3.9m at its northern end and 2.9m at its southern end and is unable to accommodate the simultaneous passage of 2 no. vehicles. I would normally recommend that a road serving this number of dwellings has a minimum carriageway width of 4.8m.

However, given the layout of the existing properties either side of Lane End, it would not appear feasible to provide an access road constructed to adoptable standards or even provide a carriageway width of 4.8m along this section.

I would therefore be unable to support any additional residential development served off this unadopted lane.

Lane End already serves 4 no. existing properties. However, there are 3 no. derelict properties at the southern end of the site which could be re-built to make a total of 7 no. dwellings. I understand that the 2 no. semi detached derelict properties have planning consent for reconstruction. However, given the condition of the 3rd derelict property, I understand that a fresh planning application would be required should this property be re-developed. I would recommend that any proposed application to re-develop this 3rd property includes a condition to provide a communal turning head at the southern end of Lane End.

The adjoining Maelor School also accesses onto the northern end of Lane End. There is also a pedestrian crossing point in this location just around the bend of Lane End which provides access to and from the school ie/ schoolchildren.

Given the restricted carriageway width of Lane End, it is likely that any conflict of vehicles as a result of cars attempting to pass each other on this bend is likely to result in vehicles reversing back across the pedestrian access point. This crossing point is used by pedestrians wishing to access the bus stop and by children being picked up by parents in the existing layby. This is likely to result in an increase in danger to both road users and pedestrians (particularly schoolchildren).

Parking and Turning Provision

The proposed dwellings only appear to be providing 2 parking spaces per dwelling (garages are not included as providing parking provision as detailed in LPGN 16). Given the relatively unsustainable location of the site, I would recommend that 3 parking spaces per dwelling are provided.

The proposed turning head would be considered a significant improvement in highway terms. However, I would recommend that the depth of the turning head fronting plot no. 4 is increased to 8m.

In conclusion, I would not wish to support any proposed additional development at this site (over and above the additional 3 properties, already benefitting from planning consent) which would result in an increase in vehicle movements along this section of Lane End.

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

The road providing access to the site is considered to be of inadequate width and junction layout to accommodate the increase in traffic likely to be generated by the proposed development and any increase in traffic would be considered to be a potential source of danger to road users and pedestrians.

Interim Senior Service Manager

[..\..\Planning App Scans\2014 Scans\P-2014-0392.pdf](#)

[..\..\Planning App Scans\2014 Scans\P-2014-0392 Info.pdf](#)

[..\..\Planning App Scans\2014 Scans\P-2014-0392 Add Response 1.pdf](#)

[..\..\Planning App Scans\2014 Scans\P-2014-0392 Add Info 1.pdf](#)