

MEMORANDUM

From: Planning Control Manager **To:** Head of Environment and Planning
Our Ref: EP/DC/P/2018/1014 **Your Ref:** KH/P/2018/1014
Date: 12th December 2018

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990
TOWN AND COUNTRY (GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURE) ORDER 1995

Location: O. S Grid Ref: 336 511 46 and 46A Chester Road, Wrexham.

Development: Change of use from HMO to Wellness Centre including enlargement of existing car parking area.

I refer to your consultation dated 05/12/2018 in respect of the above.

Access

The proposed development site is located on Chester Road which is a busy classified road subject to a 30mph speed limit.

Based on speeds of 30mph, any proposed / existing access in this location would normally be required to provide visibility splays of 2.4 x 43m in both directions measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway in accordance with Manual for Streets.

Visibility from the existing / proposed access is inadequate in both directions providing splays of approximately 2.4 x 35m to the north and 2.4 x 23m to the south measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway. Visibility is impeded in the northerly direction in that the required splays would need to cut across 3rd party land. Visibility is impeded in the southerly direction by the existing trees fronting the development site. It may be possible to achieve the required visibility splays by re-locating the existing access to amore southerly position.

The existing / proposed access is only 3.5m wide and is gated at 2.5m behind the adjoining carriageway. The access cannot accommodate the simultaneous passage of 2 no. vehicles. I would normally recommend that any proposed shared access is a minimum width of 4.8m with no gates being erected.

No private surface water run-off is permitted to flow onto the adjoining highway. I would recommend that an Aco drain or similar is installed across the access to intercept any such run-off.

I would suggest that the applicant considers closing up the existing access (footway to be reinstated to full height – s.184 consent required) and a new centrally located access constructed (minimum 4.8m wide). It may well be possible to provide the required splays from such an access subject to the removal of the existing trees along the site frontage. I would recommend the applicant submits a revised layout plan indicating the above detail for further consideration.

Parking and Turning Provision

I understand that the development site currently comprises a House of Multiple Occupancy (HMO) which includes 5 bedrooms / 6 people. LPGN 16 would normally require a maximum of 4 parking spaces. The site currently provides around 4 parking spaces with turning.

In terms of the proposed Wellness Centre, LPGN 16 – D1 Use would require a maximum of 12 spaces. The submitted layout plan (Drg. No. ISA 375 P 201 Rev A) indicates the provision of 9 spaces in the proposed parking area to the front of the site.

The proposed level of parking provision represents a shortfall of 25% compared with maximum standards. Although the site is in a reasonably sustainable location, I am mindful of the existing on-street parking that occurs in the surrounding streets and any shortfall in parking provision may exacerbate existing demand for on-street parking.

I would suggest that the applicant considers the access improvements indicated above and reviews the parking / turning arrangements at the site. It would appear possible to provide a revised parking / turning area at the front of the site which could provide up to 10 parking spaces plus a minimum 6m clearance between for turning (ie/ 5 no. spaces either end of the site). I would recommend the applicant submits a revised layout plan indicating the above detail for further consideration.

Traffic Generation

The proposed development (Wellness Centre) is considered likely to generate significantly more vehicle movements than the existing HMO. I would normally not wish to support any proposed development that is likely to generate any significant increase in vehicle movements utilizing the existing sub-standard access. I assume that the property could also set up as doctors' surgery if permission is granted without a fresh application.

I would normally recommend that the application is REFUSED for the following reasons:-

1. There is restricted visibility at the existing / proposed access and increased use would increase the likelihood of danger to road users.
2. The proposed development does not make adequate provision for the parking of vehicles clear of the public highway.

However, if the applicant can demonstrate the suggested improvements at the site on a suitable layout plan then further consideration could be given to the proposed development. If the application is to be supported I would recommend that a suitable condition is included which prevents the premises being used as a Health Centre / Doctors Surgery, limits number of customers permitted on site at any one time and is controlled on an appointment only basis.

Peter Douthwaite

PD Planning Control Manager