

MEMORANDUM



From: Service Manager Environment **To:** Head of Environment and Planning
Our Ref: EP/DC/PP/2016/0698 **Your Ref:** SEH/P/2016/0698
Date: 8th August 2016

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

Location: O. S Grid Ref: 328 507 Unit A, Maesgwyn Road, Wrexham.

Development: Change of use from garage to carpet warehouse and retail and display of 2 no. signs.

I refer to your consultation dated 25/07/2016 in respect of the above.

The proposed development site is located on Maesgwyn Road which is an unclassified, residential road subject to a 30mph speed limit. However, I would estimate typical vehicle speeds at being around 25mph given the geometry of the road.

Any proposed / existing access in this location 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.

I would also recommend the provision of pedestrian visibility from any proposed access providing splays measured from the centreline of the vehicular access 2.4 metres back from the back edge of the footway to points 3.3 metres either side measured along the back edge of the footway. Within these splays there shall be no obstruction in excess of 0.6 metres in height above the level of the adjoining highway.

The required visibility splays from the proposed access have not been indicated on the submitted plans.

I understand that the building previously formed part of the Dave Benett Bodyshop which previously accessed directly onto Mold Road. This previous unit has now been sub-divided with the front section forming part of the new ATS unit. I understand that the existing / proposed building already has a permitted B2 Class Use.

It is considered that the existing building would have already generated a given number of vehicle movements associated with its previous use except that the traffic associated with the proposed development will now access via Maesgwyn Road as opposed to directly onto Regent Street. I assume that appropriate parking and turning provision would have been available for the previous business at this time.

Vehicles generally currently appear to park behind the 1.6m wide footway along the site frontage which is considered to be a potential source of danger to road users / pedestrians. I recommend that parking in this location is prevented by an appropriate scheme of landscaping / boundary treatment. Such a scheme would need to ensure adequate lateral and pedestrian visibility is provided / maintained.

Unit A previously had no vehicular access off Maesgwyn Road. However, I understand that a new 3.5m wide access (with roller shutter) has recently been constructed this year. This access is not currently used as a vehicular access but is used to store carpets etc. along with the majority of the unit.

I understand that 2 no. long wheel base transit like vehicles pick up carpets etc. each morning before leaving to visit customers. Such vehicles have to turn in the carriageway outside the premises which is not ideal.

In order to consider supporting the proposed development, a suitable access (minimum 4.8m wide) would need to be provided along with adequate parking and turning provision (for cars and long wheel base transit like vehicles) within the curtilage of site.

In terms of parking provision, LPGN 16 (Class A1 – Retail) would normally require 1 car space per 20m² gross floor space. Based on a gross floor area of 351m², a maximum of 18 parking spaces would normally be required at the site. However, fewer spaces may be considered acceptable given the sustainable location of the site.

Previous planning application ref: P/2014/0630 for the construction of a vehicular access off Maesgwyn Road at the site was refused at Planning Committee. However, a Planning Appeal following this decision was allowed on 19/02/2015 subject to a number of conditions as highlighted above. None of these conditions have been included with the current application.

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

1. **The proposed development does not make adequate provision for the parking of vehicles clear of the public highway.**
2. **The proposed development does not make adequate provision for the turning of vehicles within the curtilage of the development site.**
3. **The existing access is of insufficient width / design to serve the proposed development site.**

Supplementary Notes

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

Peter Outhwaite

By

Service Manager Environment