

MEMORANDUM

From: Operational Manager Traffic & Transportation **To:** Chief Planning Officer
Our Ref: TH/DC/PP/2009/0945 **Your Ref:** MP/P/2009/0945
Date: 25th November 2009

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

TOWN AND COUNTRY (GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURE) ORDER 1995

Location: O. S Grid Ref: 340 501 62 Smithfield Road, Wrexham.

Development: Change of use to internal hand car wash and valet facility.

I refer to your consultation dated 19/11/2009 in respect of the above.

The proposed development site is located on Smithfield Road which is a busy unclassified road subject to a 30mph speed limit. However, I would estimate typical vehicle speeds at being around 25mph due to the existing traffic calming features in place along this section.

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.

It would appear that it is proposed to utilise the 2 no. existing access points fronting the site to exit the premises. The existing access point running alongside the western edge of the site is to be utilised as an "in" only.

Visibility from the existing centrally located access (exit) fronting the site is adequate in the easterly direction providing a splay in excess of 2.4 x 33m measured to the nearside edge. However, visibility in the westerly direction is inadequate providing a splay of approximately 2.4 x 27m measured to the nearside edge. Visibility is impeded in this direction by the existing boundary fence.

Visibility from the westerly access (exit) onto Smithfield Road is adequate in the easterly direction providing a splay in excess of 2.4 x 33m measured to the nearside edge. However, visibility in the westerly direction is inadequate providing a splay of approximately 2.4 x 21m measured to the nearside edge. Visibility is impeded in this direction by the existing boundary fence.

The proposed visibility splays from both access points have not been demonstrated on the submitted layout plan.

I would not normally support any proposed development that is likely to result in an increase in vehicle movements through these substandard accesses. Although the development site was previously operated as a motorcycle sales and workshop facility, the proposed car wash facility is likely to generate significantly more vehicle movements than were previously generated at this site.

There are double yellow lines in place fronting the development site along Smithfield Road. On the opposite side of the road are a number of residential properties which have no off street parking provision. This results in a significant number of vehicles being parked on the carriageway opposite the development site. This also results in vehicles travelling in the easterly direction having to cross the central white line. I understand that there is a significant on street parking problem generally in this area of the town.

Given the nature of the proposed development and the restricted size of the development site, there would only appear to be sufficient space to accommodate up to 3 no. vehicles alongside the western boundary of the site in order to queue and enter the premises.

A development of this nature is likely to attract a significant number of vehicles / customers whose vehicles are likely to back up across the public footway fronting the site interfering with pedestrian flows and adversely affect the free flow and safety of traffic on the adjoining highway.

The proposed access points are also located in close proximity to each other and are located directly opposite the junction with Oxford Street. The increased use of these access points in this location is likely to increase driver confusion and increase the likelihood of danger to road users including pedestrians.

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

I understand that it is proposed to employ between 6 and 10 staff at the development site. The submitted "Design & Access Statement" appears to propose staff parking for 2 vehicles to the rear of the premises and 1 space to the front of the premises.

The proposed parking arrangement has not been demonstrated on the submitted layout plan. However, there does not appear to be sufficient space to park any vehicles to the rear of the building. In terms of the existing hardstanding to the front of the building, this ranges from approximately 3.4 – 4.5m in depth which is considered inadequate to accommodate a vehicle clear of the highway (footway) should parking be arranged at 90° to the premises. This arrangement is also likely to impede visibility from the proposed access points. It would however appear possible to accommodate 1 no. vehicle to the front of the site provided it is parked parallel to the building. Any shortfall in parking provision at the development site is only likely to exacerbate the existing on street parking problems in this area of the town.

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

- 1. There is restricted visibility at the existing / proposed accesses and increased use would increase the likelihood of danger to road users.**
- 2. The traffic generated by the proposed development in this location would be incompatible with through traffic interests and a potential source of danger to road users and pedestrians.**
- 3. The proposed development does not make adequate provision for the parking of vehicles clear of the public highway.**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "M. Plan".

ppOperational Manager Traffic & Transportation