

# MEMORANDUM



**From:** Planning Control Manager

**To:** Head of Environment and Planning

**Our Ref:** EP/DC/PP/2018/0915

**Your Ref:** MP/P/2018/0915

**Date:** 6<sup>th</sup> November 2018

---

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990**

**TOWN AND COUNTRY (GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURE) ORDER 1995**

**Location:** O. S Grid Ref: 333 501 Central Buildings and Adjoining Land, Brook Street, Wrexham.

**Development:** Residential development comprising conversion of first and second floors of Central Buildings

I refer to your consultation dated 01/11/2018 in respect of the above.

**General**

The site is located within Wrexham Town Centre and is served by adequate footway provision and pedestrian crossing facilities.

There are a number of car parks nearby including St. Giles and Island Green. However, St. Giles is only a short stay car park and I understand that Island Green is relatively expensive for those wishing to park for long periods of time.

The proposed development site is located on the corner of Bridge Street and Brook Street which have the following characteristics:-

**Bridge Street**

Bridge Street is a busy classified road subject to a 30mph speed limit along which a traffic calming scheme is in place. However, I would estimate typical vehicle speeds at being around 25mph along this section given the existing traffic calming measures in place along this section and the proximity to the signalized Brook Street / Bridge Street junction.

Any proposed / existing access in this location would normally require 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 submitted layout plan (Drg. No. L24) indicates the provision of adequate visibility splays.

There is no existing access serving the site. However, it would appear possible to construct a suitable access to serve the site which could provide the required visibility splays. I would recommend that any proposed access is located at the southern end of the site (uphill) given the proximity of the signalized junction.

The submitted layout plan (Drg. No. L30) indicates a new 5.5m wide access with 6m kerb radii which is considered adequate to serve the proposed development site. However, I would recommend that the access takes the form of a dropped kerb vehicular crossing in the interest of pedestrian safety. **Please ask the applicant to indicate this detail on a revised layout plan.**

Given the busy nature of the footway fronting the development site along Bridge Street, I would recommend that any proposed access provides pedestrian visibility splays of 2.4 x 3.3m in both directions measured from the back of the footway in which there shall be no obstruction greater than 0.6m in height. However, these splays have not been indicated on the submitted layout plan (Drg. No. L24). **Please ask the applicant to indicate this detail on a revised layout plan.**

In order to improve access into / from such an access, I would recommend that a yellow box junction marking is installed on Bridge Street fronting the proposed access. I assume that such a feature would require a Traffic Regulation Order to permit enforcement. I would recommend that the applicant discusses this issue with our Traffic Section – contact Darren Green on Tel: 01978 729643. This will have the benefit of reducing the likelihood of any queuing issues back towards the signalized junction potentially caused by vehicles waiting to turn right into the car park of Bridge Street. **Please ask the applicant to indicate this detail on a revised layout plan.**

This section of Bridge Street has previously been subject to improvements utilising high quality paving materials and street lighting columns. Any proposed access in this location would need to utilise the same materials as existing to preserve the quality of this scheme.

This section of Bridge Street is subject to a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) preventing waiting / loading.

Adequate parking and turning provision shall be provided at the proposed development site in accordance with LPGN 16. The submitted layout plan (Drg. No. L30) indicates the provision of 19 no parking spaces. However, there only 4.8m clearance between spaces 1-9 and 10-16, not minimum of 6m as required by LPGN 16. **Please ask the applicant to address this issue on a revised layout plan.**

### **Brook Street**

Brook Street is a busy classified road subject to a 30mph speed limit. However, typical vehicle speeds could well be around 25mph along this section given the proximity to the signalized Brook Street / Bridge Street junction.

There is no vehicular access in respect of the existing Central Buildings site and no vehicular access is proposed.

Although there is an existing loading bay fronting the development site off Brook Street, this may not always be available when in use by delivery vehicles delivering to other premises in the vicinity.

A significant portion of Brook Street is subject to a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) preventing waiting / loading. However, there are a limited number of 30 minute waiting bays further along Brook Street and along Town Hill. However, these spaces are already heavily used by existing shop owners / customers / member of public.

## **Parking & Turning Provision**

### Central Buildings (Brook Street)

I understand that it is proposed to convert the upper floors at Central Buildings to 10 no. 1 bedroom apartments without any parking provision.

There are a number of car parks nearby including St. Giles and Island Green. However, St Giles is only a short stay car park and I understand that Island Green is relatively expensive for those wishing to park for long periods of time. Although there are a limited number of 30 minute waiting bays further along Brook Street and along Town Hill, these spaces are already heavily used by existing shop owners / customers / member of public.

This area of Wrexham Town Centre already suffers from significant on-street parking problems particularly along Lea Road, Bellevue Road and Jubilee Road. It is considered that without adequate parking provision, the proposed development will exacerbate this existing problem.

A planning application (Ref: P/2010/1052) was previously submitted for the conversion to 22 apartments at Central Buildings which was refused by the Planning Department. This was later appealed but dismissed by the inspector due to the lack of parking provision.

In terms of the current proposal, LPGN 16 would normally require a maximum of 1.5 spaces per apartment equating to the maximum requirement for 15 spaces. The submitted layout plan (Drg. No. L30) indicates the provision of 19 no parking spaces. However, it is unclear as to which apartments are being allocated a parking space and which are not. **Please ask the applicant to clarify this detail.**

### Bridge Street (Land south of central Buildings)

I understand that it is proposed to construct 28 no. 1 bedroom apartments with 19 no. parking spaces off a new access at the southerly end of the site. However, it is unclear as to which apartments are being allocated a parking space and which are not. **Please ask the applicant to clarify this detail.**

The submitted layout plan indicates a new 5.5m wide access located at the southern end of the site. This access appears to incorporate kerb radii and is gated approximately 12.5m behind the adjoining carriageway. **If the development is to be supported, then the developer will need to issue at least 2 fobs to activate the electric gates to each occupant that is allocated a parking space plus 2 fobs to the refuse collection department (WCBC).** This would need to be included as a planning condition.

I would recommend that any proposed access is a minimum width of 5.5m in order to accommodate the simultaneous passage of cars / refuse vehicles. Any gates should be set back an appropriate distance to accommodate a refuse wagon clear of the highway (back of footway). Any proposed access shall be surfaced with hard bound materials for a minimum distance of 10m behind the adjoining highway.

The submitted layout plan (Drg. No. L23) indicates swept path movements of an 8.75m long refuse vehicle entering, turning within the curtilage of the site and exiting the site. **Could you please ask the applicant to indicate the centerline of the adjoining highway (Bridge Street) on a revised layout plan indicating whether the vehicle encroaches over the centerline of the road when exiting the site.**

Consideration will need to be given to providing footways alongside the access into the rear car park for pedestrian movements.

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

The submitted layout plan (Drg. No. L30) indicates the provision of 19 no. spaces. However, it is unclear as to which apartments (38 no. total) are being allocated a parking space and which are not. There is only 4.8m clearance between spaces 1-9 and 10-16, not minimum of 6m as required by LPGN 16. **Please ask the applicant to address this issue on a revised layout plan.**

During recent discussion / meeting with the applicant and consultant, the issue of parking provision was discussed. I previously stated that if the applicant was to reduce the number of apartments and provide adequate parking (ie/ 1 parking space per apartment) and address the waste storage / recycling issues raised then further consideration could be given to the development. The applicant did state that circumstances had changed since the previous application / appeal and he was in a position to accept controlling allocation of parking spaces / apartments through a s.106 agreement in order to overcome our concerns in respect of reduced parking provision at the site. As part of such agreement, the applicant stated that as part of any lease agreement, he could control residents not allocated a parking space to non-car ownership.

If this arrangement could be secured through a suitably worded s.106 agreement then we would be more supportive of the proposed development. However, this detail does not appear to have been included with this application. **Could you please ask the applicant to provide further details in respect of the above.**

### **Transport Advice Note**

The TRICS data included in the Transport Advice Note includes data in respect of other private apartments located on "Edge of Town Centre", "Suburban Areas" and "Edge of Town" sites. However, I would not consider "Suburban Areas" and "Edge of Town" sites to be relevant to the proposed development site. I would recommend that these sites are removed from the analysis.

### **Managing Refuse Storage & Collection**

Having discussed the issue of waste storage and collection with the Waste / Recycling Section, I comment as follows:-

I understand that the proposed 42 apartments are likely to require typically 9 no. large 1100 litre bins for general waste and around 8 no. 240 litre bins for recycling purposes. The submitted Design & Access Statement / Transport Advice Note does not provide details of where this number of bins will be stored or how they will be emptied safely without causing an issue on the adjoining highway.

If the proposed development is supported, I would recommend that a condition is imposed requiring the submission of a waste / recycling management plan. As discussed above, the applicant will need to provide details of a suitable turning facility within the site for a refuse vehicle. It may be the case that smaller private refuse vehicles will need to service the site in lieu of larger Council refuse vehicles.

I would recommend that the applicant discusses the above issue with our Waste / Recycling Section.

### **Construction Traffic Management Plan**

If the application is supported, then I would recommend the following condition:-

*No part of the development shall commence until a Construction Traffic Management Plan including provisions for contractor parking has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the plan as is approved has been fully implemented.*

I would recommend that the applicant liaises with our Traffic Section (contact Darren Green on Tel: 01978 729643) to discuss any required traffic management measures.

### **Scheme for Surface Water Drainage**

A scheme of surface water drainage will need to be submitted for approval. I would recommend that the applicant contacts our Flood Management Officer – Neil Taunt (Tel: 01978 729734) to discuss.

I await the requested information.

### **Supplementary Notes**

The applicant's attention should be drawn to item nos. 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5 of the supplementary notes.



 Planning Control Manager