

MEMORANDUM

From: Infrastructure and Planning Manager **To:** Chief Planning Officer
Our Ref: TH/DC/PP/2011/0121 **Your Ref:** SJG/P/2011/0121
Date: 28TH February 2011

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

Location: O. S Grid Ref: 328 497 5 Bersham Road, Wrexham.

Development: Change of use from residential dwelling to student house in multiple occupancy (HMO).

I refer to your consultation dated 21/02/2011 in respect of the above.

The proposed development site is located on Bersham Road which is a classified road subject to a 30mph speed limit. However, I would estimate typical vehicle speeds at being around 25mph given the traffic calming measures in place along this section.

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 which there shall be no obstruction in excess of 1.0m in height in accordance with Manual for Streets.

Visibility from the existing access is inadequate in both directions providing splays of approximately 2.4 x 5m in both directions measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway.

Any proposed / existing access would normally be required to provide 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 in excess of 0.6m in height. Adequate pedestrian visibility splays are not currently provided at the existing access.

Any proposed shared access would normally be required to be at least 4.1m wide for at least 5m behind the highway boundary to facilitate the simultaneous passage of 2 no. vehicles clear of the adjoining highway. The existing / proposed access is only 2.2m wide and is considered unsuitable to serve as a shared access. Access alongside the house is only 2.2m wide. I would normally recommend an access width alongside dwellings of at least 2.6m.

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

The existing property appears to have off street parking provision for up to 3 no. vehicles ie/ 1 in the single garage and 2 on the existing driveway. No turning provision is currently provided at the site.

For a development of this nature, LPGN 5 / LPGN 16 requires 1 car space per 2 bedspaces. The proposed parking and turning provision to the rear of the development site (4 no. spaces) would be considered adequate although access to them is considered inadequate. Access to the proposed parking space at the front of the property would appear difficult.

As the proposed development is likely to result in an increase in vehicle movements through this substandard access compared with typical movements generated by a single dwelling, I would not be able to support this application on highway grounds.

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

1. **There is restricted lateral visibility at the existing access and increased use would increase the likelihood of danger to road users,**
2. **There is restricted pedestrian visibility at the existing access and increased use would increase the likelihood of danger to pedestrians.**
3. **The proposed / existing access is less than 4.1m wide and is considered unsuitable to serve as a shared access.**



Infrastructure and Planning Manager