

MEMORANDUM



From:	Chief Officer, Environment & Technical	To:	Chief Officer Economy & Planning
		FAO::	Jenni Perkins
Our Ref:	ET/DC/MZ/P/2024/0189 (Rev 4)	Your Ref:	P/2024/0189
Date:	19/02/2025		

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

TROSI UNED FASNACHOL YN 1 RHANDY AC ESTYNIAD LLAWR CYNTAF I GREU 2 UNED BRESWYL YCHWANEGOL A CHYFLEUSTER STORIO / CONVERSION OF COMMERCIAL UNIT TO 1 NO APARTMENT AND FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION TO CREATE 2 ADDITIONAL RESIDENTIAL UNITS AND STORAGE FACILITY

24 MAES ISAF JOHNSTOWN WREXHAM
Grid Ref: E 330426.86 N 346342.12

I refer to your additional information email dated 20/12/24 in respect of the above.

The submitted information details that a unit in the building was previously used as a paper shop and generated a large number of trips to the site including passing trade until six years ago.

The submission also states that the proposed first floor storage area has been removed and will be integrated to provide cupboard storage within each flat.

The applicant states that that the permitted A1 use would generate significantly more traffic to the site than the proposed use and that the car parking requirements for an A1 shop use are similar to the proposed 3 bedroom flats. The applicant states that there were 3 staff on duty at any one time and that they all parked to the rear of the building. The applicant also states that there were significant numbers of car bound customers utilizing the two roadside laybys within 25m of the site. In terms of servicing they state that a minimum of three of more deliveries per day were undertaken by transit van utilizing the rear car park to offload goods.

In terms of the access the applicant accepts that the arrangement is below current design standards but states that it was operated effectively for a number of years to adequately serve three A1 shop premises and that the traffic generation from each shop unit is potentially far greater than for 3 one bedroom flats and that a potential reduction in traffic and a reduction in pedestrians means less likelihood of an accident occurring on the access.

Whilst the LHA appreciates the additional information and clarification, as previously stated the existing situation currently results in staff for the hairdressers using the rear car park, which results in a low level of trips throughout the day and vehicles tend to be accessing and egressing at a similar time and not against each other and therefore there are few vehicular conflicts or vehicles requiring simultaneous access and egress. Whilst it is appreciated that the vacant unit could be brought back into use, it is not felt that the rear car park could accommodate any further parking

and therefore the LHA doesn't feel that the existing arrangements would change extensively if that was the case. Trip generation was never raised as a concern previously on the proposals, but the intensification of the use of the rear car park and a substandard access road and access that doesn't provide simultaneous access and egress is the issue. If staff from the previous shop had parked in the rear car park this would have been easy to manage as the staff knew each other and could manage access / egress times to reduce conflicts. When the car park is proposed to be used by different residents or businesses this is much more difficult to manage and there is likely to be an increase in vehicular conflicts.

No clarification was previously given about how this would affect the parking arrangements for the hairdressers and how this will be managed. The latest submission confirms that the staff at the hairdressers will no longer park in the rear car park.

The proposals indicate that 3 car parking spaces are to be located in the rear area, however, despite a turning area being shown it is considered that the current arrangement does not provide sufficient turning space for large cars and furthermore, the location of the two sets of rear steps could potentially impede maneuvering space and jeopardize pedestrian safety. The submission indicates that the rear parking spaces will be allocated one each per flat and therefore these spaces and the access to these spaces will need to operate independently. The rear pedestrian steps would not be in use by the residents but by the businesses so these conflicts remain and the LHA's view on these arrangements is unchanged.

The applicant has indicated parking spaces on street as available parking but these can't be controlled or reserved for this site specific use. However, It is considered that there is some available on-street parking space within the vicinity of the site which could be available to be used by residents or visitors to the site.

The LHA is concerned that the proposals would result in a greater number of independent parties using the current vehicular access which is not wide enough to allow simultaneous access and egress and that the north east corner of the building restricts visibility from the car parking area to the vehicular access. This is an issue as the proposed parking needs to work independently if it is to be used by different residents or businesses. The existing access to the rear car park is just 3.5m wide and therefore is not wide enough to support simultaneous access and egress which requires a minimum of 4.1m width.

As stated previously, a visibility splay of 2.4m x 25m in both directions from the site access the nearside kerbline is required. The visibility splays shown do not extend to the nearside kerbline and cannot provide the full vehicular visibility splay due to the neighbouring fence. The previous use of staff parking would generate less movements than those associated with three residential flats and therefore despite the trip rates being overall lower for the proposed use class, it is likely to result in increased trips to and from the rear car parking area.

The LHA is also concerned about the intensification of the vehicular access from a pedestrian safety perspective. Children could be walking at the rear of the footway with limited visibility of traffic travelling down the access road due to the high neighbouring boundary fence. The LHA has raised this with the enforcement team and apparently the fence did require planning permission to be installed at this height but due to the time that has elapsed since installation that enforcement action can no longer be taken.

The Councils standards set out requirements of 1 cycle parking space per 150 sq m of commercial floorspace and 2 cycle parking spaces per flat, provided in a safe and secure communal arrangement. Therefore the provision of 8 cycle parking spaces are required overall. A bicycle store has been indicated that is stated to store upto 10 bikes, the proposed store type is deemed acceptable, however there is concern that access and egress would need to be by the vehicular access which would not be recommended due to the poor forward visibility.

No details of refuge storage have been provided, clarification is required.

On the basis of the information supplied the LHA cannot support the proposals on highways grounds. Concerns remain over the increased number of different users of a substandard access that does not provide adequate width for simultaneous access and egress, in addition to the lack of turning space within the rear area, especially considering the proposed use of the rear area by multiple residents and the existing pedestrian steps to access the hair salon and a store. Vehicles manoeuvring in this area could compromise pedestrian safety.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'J. J. J.', written in a cursive style.

On behalf of Chief Officer, Environment & Technical