

MEMORANDUM



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

Our Ref: TH/DC/PP/2009/0799 **Your Ref:** SJG/P/2009/0799

Date: 17th November 2009

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

Location: O. S Grid Ref: 349 546 Former Cottage Antiques, High Street, Gresford, Wrexham.
Development: Conversion and extension of existing flat and shop to provide 2 one bedroom flats and shop.

I refer to your consultation / email dated 16/11/09 including revised layout plan (Drg No. S024/08) in respect of the above.

The existing site appears to comprise of a redundant antique shop incorporating a 2 bedroomed flat above. The existing access serving the development site is located at the north western end of the site off the High Street. The existing access is approximately 3.8m wide and suffers from inadequate visibility in both directions. Visibility from the existing access is approximately 2.4 x 3m in both directions measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway. For typical vehicle speeds of 25mph, 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 accordance with Manual for Streets.

The submitted layout plan (Drg. No. S024/08 – Dated August 2009) indicates a visibility splay from the proposed access of 2.0 x 33m in the north westerly direction. However, visibility from any proposed shared access should be measured from a setback distance of 2.4m in accordance with Manual for Streets. This splay also appears to cut across 3rd party land (ie/ nos. 1 & 2 Chapel Cottages) which I assume is not under the control of the applicant. This splay is also not shown to the nearside edge of the carriageway but is the middle of the oncoming lane which is considered unacceptable. Assuming that the applicant has no control of the adjoining properties, then the actual visibility splay in the north westerly direction from the proposed access would only be around 2.4 x 4m measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway.

Parking and turning provision at the proposed development site appears adequate for such a development.

The proposed footway fronting the development site providing a continuous link between the existing footway along Chester Road would be of significant benefit to pedestrians including schoolchildren who attend the nearby school.

However, any proposed development which would result in an increase in traffic movements at the development site would not be supported on highway grounds. The proposed development appears to indicate the retention of a shop with a reduced floor area and 2 no. new 1 bedroomed flats. Such a development is still likely to result in an increase in vehicle movements through a substandard access.

In terms of the existing parking provision at the development site, there only appears to be sufficient space to accommodate 3 no. cars. There is currently no turning facility available at the development site. I understand that the existing parking provision is for the occupants of the flat above the shop and any visitors to the shop would either walk to the premises or park elsewhere in the village. I understand that the shop has never had any off street parking provision within the curtilage of the development site and has therefore never generated any traffic through this substandard access.

In order to support a development at this site, the existing access would need to remain in its current location. No additional traffic movements must be generated and if the shop remains then no off street parking provision shall be provided for this shop within the curtilage of the site served off the High Street. You may wish to consider converting the existing shop / flat to a single dwelling or demolishing the shop / flat and erecting a new dwelling, both options being served off the existing access.

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

1. **There is restricted visibility at the existing / proposed access 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.**



19 Operational Manager Traffic & Transportation