

MEMORANDUM



From: Operational Manager Traffic & Transportation **To:** Chief Planning Officer

Our Ref: TH/DC/PD/2010/0113

Your Ref: P/2010/0113

Date: 17 March 2010

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

Location: O. S Grid Ref: 2860 5100 Maelor Buildings, Heol Maelor, Coedpoeth
Development: Extension to existing dental practice.

I refer to your consultation dated 15 February 2010 in respect of the above site.

The site is located near the junction of two busy classified roads known as Heol Maelor and Smithy Road.

The existing site has 5 consulting rooms for which the current LPGN 16 standard requires the provision of 10 parking spaces. Although the applicant suggests that there are 10 spaces provided within the site, it is considered that only 6 vehicles can park without causing obstruction to others. On visiting the site I noted that seven vehicles were parked haphazardly about the site, with one vehicle effectively restricting 4 of the others from reversing out of the site.

The existing access to the site suffers from severely substandard visibility in a southerly direction which is a cause for concern given the amount of traffic using the junction.

There is a Traffic Regulation Order in place on both Heol Maelor and Smithy Road preventing on street parking in the vicinity of the junction.

Due to the existing shortfall in parking provision patients use the Recreation Ground Car Park opposite the site and others park on the Smithy Road itself just beyond the existing parking restrictions. There is a very limited amount of available parking on Smithy Road as the dwellings numbered 4 to 7 have no off street parking provided. Furthermore any overspill of vehicles from the Clinic opposite tends to use any remaining space on Smithy Road.

Any patients using the Recreation Ground Car Park opposite must cross the A525 Heol Maelor to access the surgery. This road is extremely busy with a high usage by heavy goods vehicles and is not considered a safe means of access to the site. The car park is not under the control of the applicants and its future use cannot be guaranteed.

The proposed development will increase the number of consulting rooms to 7. Although the applicant suggests that it is possible to increase the number of parking bays to 13, most of these spaces are parked behind one another and the layout is not considered suitable. Furthermore the turning of vehicles within the site will be extremely difficult.

Consequently the increase in demand for parking spaces will cause increased pressure on the existing on street parking along Smithy Road and will intensify the number of people using the Recreation Ground Car Park; neither of which are considered to be a suitable substitute for the shortfall in off road parking at the development site.

Although the existing access is substandard in terms of visibility it is unlikely that there will be any additional traffic using the car park as there is simply no room to park any more vehicles.

The shortfall in parking provision causes vehicles to wait on the highway near the car park access while the driver assesses the chances of finding a car parking place on the site. This is considered unacceptable particularly with the access being so close to the main A525 junction.

I note that the applicant has submitted a travel plan to mitigate the significant shortfall in parking provision but I do not consider this overcomes the concerns raised above.

I recommend the application is refused for the following reason:

- The proposed development does not make adequate provision for the parking of vehicles clear of the public highway.
- The development would be likely to result in danger to road users by reason of additional vehicular use of a substandard access.

For Operational Manager Traffic & Transportation