

MEMORANDUM



From:	Chief Officer, Environment & Technical	To:	Chief Officer Economy & Planning
		FAO::	Jenni Perkins
Our Ref:	ET/DC/MZ/P/2024/0189 (Rev 2)	Your Ref:	P/2024/0189
Date:	30/08/2024		

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 12/08/24 in respect of the above.

Previously the LHA stated that there was insufficient information to be able to undertake a full assessment of the proposals from a highways perspective. Requesting clarification on the proposed floorspaces, further detail in relation to cycle parking, car parking information and visibility.

The existing use of the building is stated to be three separate commercial/retail units with approx. 153 sq m of floorspace, based on the Councils standard of 1 car parking space per 15 sq m of floorspace, 10 car parking spaces are required to meet the extant permission. The existing site has a rear car park and at present appears to be used by the hairdressers unit for a couple of staff car parking spaces 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.

The proposals look to increase the level of floorspace at the property by extending to create first floor accommodation. The proposals look to convert one of the ground floor commercial units to create a 1 bedroom flat, and to create 2 additional 1 bedroom flats at first floor level along with additional storage space. This increase in floorspace is calculated to require an additional 4 car parking spaces overall. Each two bedroom flat will require 1.5 car parking spaces to meet the Councils car parking standards and the additional storage space will require 3 car parking spaces according to the Councils car parking standards. A reduction of 1.5 car parking spaces overall from the previous information / proposals submitted.

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 proposals look to increase the required car parking at the site and yet no further parking is proposed. The applicant has indicated parking spaces on street as available parking but these can't be controlled or reserved for this sites 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 an intensification of 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 increasingly 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 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 but no details have been provided, a specification is required to ensure that cycle parking spaces provide a safe and secure facility.

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 intensification of a substandard access, the lack of forward visibility along the access road and from the site access and the lack of turning space within the rear area, especially considering the proposed use of the rear area by multiple residents and the existing steps to access the hair salon and a store. Vehicles manoeuvring in this area could compromise pedestrian safety.



Chief Officer, Environment & Technical