

MEMORANDUM



From:	Chief Officer, Environment & Technical	To:	Chief Officer Economy & Planning
		FAO::	Sharon Holman
Our Ref:	ET/DC/MZ/P/2024/0231	Your Ref:	P/2024/0231
Date:	30/07/2024		

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

NEWID DEFNYDD ADEILAD O UNEDAU DIWYDIANNOL I GAMPFA / CHANGE OF USE OF BUILDING FROM INDUSTRIAL UNITS TO GYM UNITS 27 - 29 ABENBURY WAY WREXHAM INDUSTRIAL ESTATE WREXHAM

Grid Ref: E 337336.02 N 350408.25

I refer to your consultation with additional information in respect of the above.

It is the LHA's understanding that the proposals are for the change of use of building from industrial units to gym, three units are proposed to be used within the Wrexham Industrial Estate on Abenbury Way.

The proposed unit is stated to be 1248 sq m of gross floor area in size. Planning Policy Wales Technical Advice Note 18 for Transport sets out that for a leisure facility over 1000 sq m of gross floor area that a Transportation Assessment should be provided. Therefore the applicant has submitted a Transportation Assessment for review.

Local Planning Guidance Note no 16 sets out the required car parking and cycle parking within Wrexham. For D2 Assembly and leisure uses there is a requirement for 1 car parking space per 15 sq m and 1 cycle parking space per 150 sq m gross floor space. Therefore on the basis of the floorspace proposed the provision of 83 car parking spaces are required and the provision of 8 cycle parking spaces should be provided. The design of cycle parking spaces should be Sheffield stands for short stay parking and should be 750mm high, 700mm long and set at least 250mm into the ground, they should be spaced a minimum of 800mm apart and be no closer than 500mm to a building or blank wall.

For long stay cycle parking for staff developers should provide more secure parking facilities in the form of cycle cages or lockable bicycle shelters. Alternatively secure compounds within buildings may be acceptable providing that they are located at ground floor level and are accessible. All cycle parking areas should be located in well lit areas that are overlooked from the building they serve.

The submitted TA details that 32 car parking spaces are proposed for the use but the LHA is concerned that the proposed car parking spaces do not all fall within the designation of the units 27-29 specified. The TA has detailed parking being provided by Unit 30 and Unit 33 (with the provision of an additional 20 car parking spaces increasing the proposed car parking upto 52 at off-peak times). The LHA is concerned that these car parking spaces could not be secured should there be a

change of operator at Units 30 and 33 and as there are no ways to formally strict the opening hours. Therefore any parking provision needs to either be on site or off-site (and close by) on land under the applicants control. A site visit was undertaken by the LHA and high levels of parking were noted on-street in the vicinity of the site and therefore concern remains that the shortfall from parking could exacerbate the existing parking pressures in the vicinity of the site.

The proposals indicate the provision of 10 cycle parking spaces which would appear to meet the car parking standards, although these are proposed in a short stay arrangement which would not be attractive for staff to use who will need secure long stay provision, further clarification is required to this end.

The TA details a survey of similar sites via the TRICS system which has been used to indicate the level of trip generation at the site leading to a car parking accumulation exercise. There is concern that the submitted data is older than ten years, the default cut off for TRICS in 2015 and it appears this has been overridden in this case, but it is not clear why. The submitted information also indicates that two sites have been discounted as they're not deemed to be representative, therefore the assessment includes just four sites, which is a small sample which gives the LHA some concerns over the robustness of the data assessments undertaken and how representative this is.

The data submitted does indicate a peak in users within 5-6pm which corresponds to visits on the way home from work, with a peak accumulation of 33 vehicles. No details have been provided in relation to on-street parking within the vicinity of the site.

The LHA previously requested information regarding servicing at the site, although it is anticipated that the servicing requirements may not be extensive, clarification is required about the arrangements and how they will be undertaken.

Technical drawings are supplied in the rear of the TA which indicate 25 standard car parking spaces provided within the site frontage extents alongside 2 disabled car parking spaces. The dimensions shown meet the Councils required car park dimension standards and there are adequate aisle widths and circulation space for the disabled spaces.

There is an area marked out for motorcycles but no secure locking points are detailed, this would be beneficial.

Five Sheffield stands are shown on the frontage which appear to meet the Councils standards for short stay cycle parking, but these are not appropriate for long stay parking for staff and therefore further provision within the building should be made for staff.

In terms of access on foot, the proposed access would be through the car parking aisles which does not provide a designated safe route in terms of access for all. There are two different access points to the building, a main entrance and a 24 hour entrance, both accessed from aisles within the car park.

In its current form the LHA is concerned that the proposals constitute a large shortfall from the required car parking standards and the proposed car parking that is not under the direct control of the applicant is not acceptable. There are concerns that visitors in the peak hour of 5-6pm will visit on their way home from work and there will be inadequate car parking provision to provide for them, at a location that is currently experiencing high levels of on-street car parking, the proposals could further exacerbate this and compromise highway safety in the vicinity of the site.

The proposals also do not provided dedicated and safe access for pedestrians, secure cycle parking for staff or secure motorcycle parking points within the site.

There are also concerns over the trip generation and car parking accumulation data provided which might not provide a robust indication of what may occur at the site.

Therefore in its current form the LHA is unable to support the application.

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of several loops and a long horizontal stroke.

Chief Officer, Environment & Technical