

MEMORANDUM

From: Planning Control Manager **To:** Head of Environment and Planning
Our Ref: EP/DC/PP/2018/0761 **Your Ref:** KH/P/2018/0761
Date: 4th October 2018

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

Location: O. S Grid Ref: 389 455 Chapel House, High Street, Bangor on Dee, Wrexham.
Development: Extension to existing Doctor's Surgery / Dispensary.

I refer to your consultation dated 12/09/2018 in respect of the above.

The proposed development site is located on the High Street which is subject to a 30mph speed limit. However, I would estimate typical vehicle speeds at being around 25mph given the geometry of the road along this section.

Assuming speeds of 25mph, any proposed / existing access would normally be required to provide visibility splays of 2.4 x 33m in both directions measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway in accordance with Manual for Streets.

The existing shared access serving the development site suffers from inadequate visibility in both directions providing splays of approximately 2.4 x 12m to the north east and 2.4 x 28m to the south west measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway. Visibility is impeded in the north easterly direction by the existing boundary wall fronting the site. However, adequate visibility could be achieved in this direction by lowering the existing boundary wall. Visibility in the south westerly direction is restricted in that the required splay would need to cross 3rd party land.

I would normally not support any proposed development that is likely to result in an increase in vehicle movements through this sub-standard access. The proposed development is considered likely to increase vehicle movements through this existing shared access.

The existing shared access / private driveway is approximately 5.5m wide reducing to 3.1m approximately 16m behind the adjoining carriageway. The access currently appears to provide access to Chapel House itself and 6 further dwellings known as School Mews.

In terms of parking provision at the development site, I comment as follows:-

The existing properties known as 1 – 6 School Mews appear to have very limited parking provision with only 2 out of the 6 properties having an integral single garage. Nos. 1 & 2 also have a single driveway each but are considered inadequate in length at 3.9m. Nos. 3 – 6 do not appear to have any off street parking provision. I assume that any vehicles associated with these properties have to park along the access road itself which is not ideal.

In terms of parking provision for the medical surgery (D1 – use), LPGN 16 would normally require 2 no. spaces plus 1 car space per 25m² gross floor space. In terms of the existing surgery gross floor area (68m² gfa), this would equate to the requirement for a maximum of 5 no parking spaces. The proposed extension would appear to result in an overall gross floor area of 149 m². This would equate to the requirement for a maximum of 8 no parking spaces.

The submitted layout plan (Drg. No. SIT01) does not indicate any parking provision at the site. The dimensions of the site appear very restricted and it would not appear possible to accommodate adequate off-street parking provision at the site in accordance with LPGN 16 requirements.

The existing shared access / private driveway has no formal turning head. The proposed development is only likely to exacerbate the lack of turning space available by additional vehicles attending the surgery parking along the existing access road.

Given the sub-standard layout of the existing shared access road, lack of visibility, inadequate level of existing / proposed parking provision, I would not be able to support the proposed development on highway grounds.

I would therefore recommend that the application be **REFUSED** for the following reasons:-

1. **There is restricted visibility at the existing 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 adjoining carriageway.**
3. **The proposed development does not make adequate provision for the turning of vehicles clear of the adjoining carriageway.**

Peter O'Sullivan

PM Planning Control Manager