

MEMORANDUM

From: Infrastructure and Planning Manager

To: Chief Planning Officer

Our Ref: TH/DC/PP/2010/1052

Your Ref: SJG/P/2010/1052

Date: 6TH January 2011

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

TOWN AND COUNTRY (GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURE) ORDER 1995

Location: O. S Grid Ref: 333 507 4 Brook Street, Wrexham.

Development: Change of use and alterations to former nightclub to provide student accommodation on first & second floors and conversion of roof space.

I refer to your consultation dated 20/12/2010 in respect of the above.

The proposed development site is located on the corner of Brook Street / Bridge Street which are both classified roads subject to a 30mph speed limit.

Both sections of carriageway in this location are subject to a traffic regulation order imposing no waiting / no loading at any time. However, there is an existing loading bay fronting the site along Brook Street which permits short term loading only.

The site has no off-street parking provision within the curtilage of the development site. 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.

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.

In terms of parking provision for the student flats, LPGN 16 would normally require 1 car space per two bedspaces which would equate to the requirement for 11 no. spaces.

Given the proximity of the proposed development site to the signalized junction of Brook Street / Bridge Street / St. Giles Way / Town Hill, it is considered that the lack of parking provision at the site will result in indiscriminate parking / waiting in this location which would be incompatible with through traffic interests and a potential source of danger to road users and pedestrians.

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 establishment of such a development in this location would be incompatible with through traffic interests and a potential source of danger to road users and pedestrians.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J. M. P. W.', is positioned above the title.

Infrastructure and Planning Manager