

From: Matthew Phillips
To: internet: martin.aston@bloorhomes.com
CC: internet: dmorris@morstonassets.com; Peter Douthwaite; planning_admin
Date: 04/02/2010 09:56
Subject: Gatewen - Highway comments P/2009/0735

Martin,

Having discussed the revised layout with Pete, the following highways issues need to be addressed:

i) Private driveways

They need to be a minimum of 4.1m wide for the first 5m back from an adopted highway;

Highways have some concerns over the length of private driveways in respect of refuse collection. The Council's policy is that refuse collection vehicles should be able to stop within 25 metres of any collection point.

Manual for streets also advises that residents should not be required to have to carry waste more than 30m to collection points (paragraphs 6.8.4 onwards). The layout may therefore need to be modified to ensure minimum distances to collection points as well as having designated collection points marked on the plans in locations where they won't obstruct highways or access points.

ii) Driveways - individual plots

There are some properties where the driveways are not long enough or wide enough. Where the driveway is immediately in front of a garage, the drive should be a minimum of 5.5m long. They appear to be around half a metre short in most cases.

In addition, where there are driveways within individual plots with 2 spaces alongside each other, the drive needs to be 5.5m wide to ensure pedestrians can also access the front of the house when two vehicles are parked on the driveway.

Parking for plots 21 and 22 are too close to the junction (as per previous highway comments).

Parking for plot 67 - would be better if the bays were at 90 degrees to the road.

Parking for plots 75 and 76 will obstruct the service strip

Driveways for plots 223 and 224

iii) Communal parking areas

There needs to be 6 metres behind the parking bays for plots 176-179 and plots 132-135.

iv) Turning heads

Concerned that these are not big enough to allow for a bin wagon to turn within them (swept path analysis would be useful either to prove or disprove this).

Turning area for plot 146 needs extending at the expense of one of the trees shown on the plan.

No provision for plot 140 to turn.

v) Build outs

These should be deleted - the road layout itself is likely to provide sufficient natural traffic calming.

To add some visual interest to the streets as well as encourage people to drive slower, some hard landscaping around key road junctions may be an alternative. This could include using a coloured block surface on the highway.

vi) Footpaths

The footpaths around all of the key road junctions, in addition to in front of plots 155-157 are unacceptable in that they do not take account of pedestrian desire line. There is also a concern that the landscaped areas will also obstruct visibility due to their location.

Obviously some rethinking will be required. I would suggest the following:

- footpaths follow the edge of the road in front of plots 21-22 and (subject to the issue with the driveways for these properties also being resolved) and area in front of those properties between the edge of the footway and the front of those properties is retained as landscaped open space (its edge being parallel to the front of those plots, but leaving sufficient room for a path to the front door). Such an arrangement would work better if the plots were types that could accommodate driveways alongside rather than in front however.
- in respect of plots 95-97 and 220-222, the footway follows the edge of the road with a landscaped area behind it, with its rear edge parallel to the front of the properties, retained and managed as open space. Again a pathway to the front of each of those properties would be needed.
- a similar area to that described above could also be created in front of plots 190 and 191,
- to compensate for the loss of some of the other smaller landscaped areas, I think it would be possible to create a landscaped verge in front of plots 54-58 and alongside plot 53, however you would need to substitute plots 55, 56 and 57 for types that could accommodate a driveway alongside rather than in front (possibly 3210 type and/or 4202 types). If the plots were also set a metre or so further back (it should be possible to do this without compromising separation distances to the plots behind them), and the footway runs parallel to the front elevations of those plots (within minimal front garden spaces), this would leave an area between it and the highway of between 2-5 metres depth that could be soft landscaped. In effect, the footway would take the most direct route. To maximise the amount of continuous landscaped areas, the accesses of each of the plots (with the exception of 54) would need to be paired. There would also be an opportunity to create a similar but smaller feature in front of plots 158-161. The landscaped areas would need to be managed as part of the open space provision and not part of garden areas.

vii) Visibility

Tree obstructs visibility for private drive serving plots 1-4

plots 23-28 - The position of the plots, their driveways, the layout of the road and the inclusion of trees is likely to impede visibility. In addition the driveway for plot 25 will impede visibility for the driveways of 26 and 27 because there is likely to be cars parking in the sight lines for the splay.

Tree obstruct visibility from private drives serving plots 40-43, 36-39 parking bays for 87-89.

Tree obstructs accesses plots 54, 91, 92, 94, 95, 155-158, 166, 187, 194-103, 107-198, 110, 111, 117, 119 204, 205, 231, 232.

Highways have also raised some concerns about how secure visibility will be when sight lines cross front gardens of properties.

I think that is everything. I have copied Pete into the email. If you have any enquiries about some of the technical issues I am sure he will be able to advise you further.

Regards

Matthew Phillips
Planning Officer
Wrexham County Borough Council
Telephone no. 01978 292473