

MEMORANDUM



From: Operational Manager Traffic & Transportation **To:** Chief Planning Officer

Our Ref: TH/DC/PD/2009/0941

Your Ref: P/2009/0941

Date: 16 December 2009

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990.

TOWN AND COUNTRY (GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURE) ORDER 1995.

Location: O. S Grid Ref: 2840 5110 Land at Victoria Road, Coedpoeth

Development: Outline application for erection of 4 no. apartments and associated parking.

I refer to your consultation dated 18 November 2009 in respect of the above.

The development site has an existing access on to an unadopted road known as Victoria Road. The road width varies between 3.0 and 3.5m wide and is therefore of inadequate width to permit the simultaneous passage of two vehicles. The unadopted road serves as a well used pedestrian route into the village centre from Fron Las and other areas in the vicinity. There is no footway or street lighting provision on Victoria Road.

Visibility at the junction of Victoria Road with the A525 Ruthin Road is below Welsh Assembly Guidelines due to the location of the existing bus stop to the west obstructing sightlines in that direction.

Victoria Road already serves more than 5 dwellings. It is current Council policy that no more than 5 dwellings are to be served off an unadopted road. This limitation is imposed as it is considered that the volume of traffic generated by further development gives rise to additional danger to pedestrians, cyclists and road users generally unless minimum standards are met.

The site is currently used in connection with an electrical contractors business. There are a number of vehicles parked within the site compound but these appear to be disused and this is confirmed by the applicants design and access statement.

This statement acknowledges that the access is substandard but suggests that traffic generation from four flats will not intensify the use of Victoria Road because the electrical store is to close.

If the storage unit is being retained for those purposes albeit by a different user I can only assume the potential remains for generation of traffic and that there would be an increased traffic generation as a result of these proposals.

Regardless of this the potential generation of traffic from the four flats is likely to be greater than that of the current use of the site.

The proposed development of four flats will result in the existing access being relocated in a south westerly direction to serve the storage unit.

The relocated access will suffer inadequate visibility and given that the road width behind the access is only 3m it is unlikely that vehicles will be able to adequately manoeuvre out of the site.

I note that one of the neighbouring objectors is laying claim to ownership of part of the road needed to give access to the rear of the site. This being the case it would seem unlikely that the development can achieve a viable access to the site and presume that planning permission could not be granted.

There also appears to be some discrepancy what land the developer actually owns. The parking area on the submitted 1:250 plan shows a 4.8m long parking space with a 6.5m turning area behind. From visiting the site the land does not appear to be under the applicants control (the palisade fencing presumably encloses his land) ; and from the evidence of a recent planning application at no. 20 High Street (P/2008/1100) the land belongs to the neighbouring site and is used to park vehicles for that development.

Considering that the road is so substandard and that this development is likely to increase traffic generation I recommend the application be refused for the following reasons.

REASONS

- 1. The development site is accessed by an unadopted road that already serves more than 5 dwellings and further development would be contrary to current Council policy**
- 2. The site is accessed from the main road by means of a narrow unadopted road which is considered substandard in width, junction layout, footway and lighting provision to serve as a means of access to further residential development.**
- 3. There is restricted visibility at the existing access and increased use would increase the likelihood of danger to road users.**
- 4. Part of the access to the site appears to be under third party control with little prospect that access rights to cross this land will be agreed with the land owner.**

5. The proposed access to the store provides inadequate visibility on to
Victoria Road

JMFLN

For Operational Manager Traffic & Transportation