

AnnS Jones

From: Matthew Phillips
Sent: 28 August 2014 12:56
To: planning_admin
Subject: FW: P/2014/0387 - Tan Yr Onnen

[Agent correspondence to the above](#)

From: christal planning [mailto:christalplanning@supanet.com]
Sent: 28 August 2014 12:56
To: Matthew Phillips
Subject: Re: P/2014/0387 - Tan Yr Onnen

Dear Matthew

Further to your email and our conversation this morning may I clarify the substance of the discussion and your requirements as follows:

Visibility - When we measured the visibility splays on site we looked at the line from the point that a driver would sit at the access before entering the highway because the line of the true back edge of the highway/footpath was in doubt. We measured twice - 25 m along the kerb edge of the highway in both directions and then 25 metres along the line of vision in front of the hedges to make sure that there was absolutely no restriction. The position of the centre of the shown splay at 4.4m from the corner of the eastern hedgerow is the point where visibility was seen to be at its maximum in both directions and avoiding the triangular land which is not in the highway.

I can arrange to redraw the splays from a point set 3.3m measured from the corner of the eastern hedgerow but before I do there is also the question about the reference to the adjoining driveway - I do not understand which driveway (of the adjoining property) is being affected – neither splay affects any driveway outside of the land in my clients ownership/control. Can you clarify?

Your italics advise that thou want the new drive to be reduced to a maximum width of 5.5. Is the reduction in width intended to incorporate a centralisation of the shared access or do you want it to remain running alongside the eastern boundary? I explained that our intent was to offer the new residents direct and straight access into the driveway but if you require it to be centralised then the line of driveway would have to include a minor curve within the first 10m.

The location of the private access into Tan yr Onnen can be relocated further up the private driveway although that would mean that the private drive is serving 6 units not 5 – we understood that 6 off a private driveway would necessitate the drive being finished to adoptable standards.

Ecology - In view of the comments relating to the location of the biosecurity prescriptions, location of the mitigation area, the ownership, management and wardening of this mitigation area and concerns about incidental killing we agreed that these could be dealt with by condition. My clients would be happy to accept a planning condition that sets the illustrative layout to one side in order for prescriptive planning conditions to be attached to an outline planning permission requiring the developer to submit all of the details before development commences/at the reserved matters stage. In any event it would be expected that the care and maintenance of the green space would become a joint responsibility of the residents of this development, whether in the position shown on the submitted layout or along the southern boundary. In similar cases I have known the LPA to use a planning condition requiring a mitigation area management plan to be submitted for approval and once approved would need to be adhered to for the lifetime of the development. This would make it easier for the LPA to pursue speedy enforcement action should it not be adhered to – the enforcement of a planning obligation could be extremely lengthy by which time there would be even more loss or harm to the mitigation area.

Trees - As yet you have not had the tree officer's comments – please let me know about any issues arising.

Determination – You and I are both on leave until mid September so changes to plans will await my return once the above points have been clarified. You have advised that your October Committee work is very heavy and whilst you may still be able to present it to October's Planning meeting if a delay to November assures us of a positive recommendation then so be it. IT would be very rewarding to get a planning permission as soon as possible though.

Best regards

Christine Williams

From: Matthew Phillips <Matthew.Phillips@wrexham.gov.uk>
Date: Thu, 28 Aug 2014 10:20:29 +0000
To: Christine Williams <christalplanning@supanet.com>
Subject: P/2014/0387 - Tan Yr Onnen

Dear Christine,

I apologise for not getting back to you sooner. Whilst I was hoping to forward all consultee responses about the amended plans this is not possible because our Tree Officer has been on leave so I still have not had his comments. Today is his first day back although I will remind him I am still waiting for a response, but rather than delay matters further I will set out the comments that I have had from Highways and from NRW, together with some of my own comments in italics:

Highways

The visibility splays indicated have not been shown correctly – splay line should be drawn from 2.4m back to nearside kerb edge.

In order to achieve the required visibility splays (both lateral & pedestrian) I would recommend that the centreline of the access is located 3.3m away from the hedge running along the eastern side of the driveway. Only from this point does it seem possible to achieve the 2.4 x 25m splay in the westerly direction without cutting across the driveway of the adjoining property.

The amendments have resulted in a slightly wider access. I am concerned that such a large opening and area of hard surfaced will detract from the appearance of the site. In order to enable vehicles to enter and leave the access simultaneously an access of 5.5 metres would be more than sufficient with the access road maintained that width for the first 10 metres.

To enable the access to be reduced in width, I would suggest that the location of the entrance to the existing dwelling is reconsidered. There would appear scope for the entrance to be sited adjacent to the parking/turning area.

Highways have requested a 2.0m footway across the site frontage. I do not intend to require this given that such a short section of footway is unlikely to bring any material benefits to pedestrian or highway safety in the absence of any proposals to widen the footways adjacent to the site.

Highways have also requested that the access road be 4.8 metre wide access road. Given the number of units and likely volume of traffic I do not intend to pursue this provided the width of the first 10 metres is no narrower than 5.5m.

NRW (Matthew Ellis) Comments:

A: Reasonable Avoidance Measures

1. In my view the submitted 'Reasonable Avoidance Measures' (RAMS) Scheme is in this case satisfactory in principle.
2. We note limited reference to biosecurity. We suggest the applicant provides further details in respect of biosecurity prescriptions

B: Mitigation compensation Area

3. We note the applicant has proposed a mitigation/compensation scheme. This is welcomed.
4. We note the location of the mitigation area. It appears to be isolated from the wider countryside.
5. We consider that the inclusion of this area within 'Public Open Space' is not compatible within this proposed 'green space'
6. No detail is provided in respect of the ownership, management and wardening of this mitigation area.
7. We note that issues in respect of incidental killing do not appear to have been effectively considered. For example, do surface water management systems include gully pots?

I think 6 could be addressed by planning condition and/or obligation although it would perhaps be useful to at least have some indication regarding the long term security of the mitigation area.

Regards

Matthew Phillips

Planning Officer/Swyddog Cynllunio

Community Wellbeing and Development/Adran Lles Cymunedol a Datblygu

Wrexham County Borough Council/Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol Wrecsam

Telephone/Ffôn: 01978 298780