

MEMORANDUM

From: Infrastructure and Planning Manager

To: Chief Planning Officer

Our Ref: TH/DC/PP/2011/0187

Your Ref: MP/P/2011/0187

Date: 29TH March 2011

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

TOWN AND COUNTRY (GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURE) ORDER 1995

Location: O. S Grid Ref: 392 492 Premier Decorations, Oak Road, Wrexham Industrial Estate, Wrexham.

Development: Change of use of part of warehouse to A1 retail.

I refer to your consultation dated 15/03/2011 in respect of the above.

The proposed development site is served off Oak Road which is a classified road subject to a 40mph speed limit.

Any proposed / existing access would normally be required to provide visibility splays of 2.4 x 120m in both directions measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway in which there shall be no obstruction in excess of 1.0m in height.

Although visibility in the north westerly direction is adequate, visibility in the south easterly direction is inadequate being impeded by the existing wooden sign located on the corner of the access,. Visibility in this direction is approximately 2.4 x 17m measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway.

I would therefore recommend that the applicant submits a suitably scaled plan indicating how the required splays will be provided at the existing / proposed access.

In terms of parking provision, LPGN 16 would normally require the existing business / warehouse to provide 239 no. parking spaces (based on B8 usage). The proposed / existing factory outlet shop would normally require 20 no. spaces (based on A1 – non Food Retail usage).

There would only appear to be 15 no. existing parking spaces to the front of the building and I understand there are approximately 40 no. spaces available to the rear of the building. This would seem to suggest a significant shortfall in parking provision at the development site.

However, I cannot fully assess the application due to lack of information.

Please ask the applicant to provide a more detailed plan of proposed parking arrangements at the development site.

In the absence of the above I would recommend **refusal** for the following reason:-

1. There is restricted visibility at the existing access and increased use would increase the likelihood of danger to road users.
2. Inadequate information has been submitted to show that the proposal is acceptable in terms of parking arrangements



Infrastructure and Planning Manager