
Penderfyniad ar yr Apêl

Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 12/07/21

gan **C MacFarlane, BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion Cymru

Dyddiad: 20/7/21

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12/07/21

by **C MacFarlane, BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Date: 20/7/21

Appeal Ref: APP/H6955/A/21/3274246

Site address: 2 Stansty Road, Wrexham, LL11 2ET

The Welsh Ministers have transferred the authority to decide this appeal to me as the appointed Inspector.

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Oliver Pritchard (Blue Column Properties Ltd.) against the decision of Wrexham County Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: WRR P/2020/0813 dated 24 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as change of use of property from 6-bed HMO to 7-bed sui generis use.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for change of use from 6-bed HMO to 7-bed HMO at 2 Stansty Road, Wrexham, LL11 2ET in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: WRR P/2020/0813 dated 24 November 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development shall begin not later than five years from the date of this decision.
Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
 - 2) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents: 1:1250 Location Plan, 1:500 Block Plan, 1:200 Site Plan, 1:100 Existing & Proposed Elevations & Existing Floorplans, 1:100 Proposed Floorplans.
Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved documents, plans and drawings submitted with the application.

Procedural Matters

2. Different versions of the site postcode are entered in the planning application and appeal forms. I have used that given in the application form.
 3. The description of development in the banner heading is taken from the application form, however, I have used a different description in the formal decision. This is taken from the appeal form and Council's decision notice, and more clearly defines the nature of the proposal.
-

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on highway safety, with regard to parking.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two-storey, detached dwelling located at the junction of Stansty Road and Railway Road. The surrounding area is predominantly residential, with a small number of commercial properties. Parking provision is a combination of on street and off-street spaces. With the exception of double yellow lines around the nearby junctions and a short section of Stansty Road to the south, the roads in the immediate area are not subject to any form of formal parking restriction.
6. Based on the Council's adopted Parking Standards Local Planning Guidance Note 16 (LPG 16), the proposal for a 7-bed HMO would generate a demand for 5 car parking spaces, compared to a demand of 4 spaces for a 6-bed HMO. Whilst the Council contends that the existing shortfall of 3 spaces should also be accounted for, resulting in an overall shortfall of 4 spaces, this level of provision was previously found to be acceptable when granting permission for the property's current use. In the absence of any substantive information to the contrary, I therefore consider the parking requirement to be for one additional space. In any event, any increased demand would not be accommodated within the site and would have to be met through on-street provision.
7. At the time of my visit, there was little to indicate that the area experiences a significant level of parking demand, with only a small number of cars parked along Railway Road and Stansty Road, and very limited numbers of vehicles travelling through Railway Road. However, I acknowledge that this may vary throughout the day and evening.
8. The appeal property is located within relatively easy walking distance of a range of shops, services and public transport, meaning residents would not necessarily be reliant on private vehicles to meet their everyday needs. As such, I consider it to be a sustainable location where, in accordance with LPG 16, a reduced level of parking provision may be appropriate.
9. Taking into account the requirements of LPG 16, the sustainable location of the appeal property, and the unrestricted nature of the surrounding roads, I consider that any additional on-street parking demand resulting from the proposal would be limited and would not cause harm to highway safety. The proposal would therefore comply with Policy GDP1 of the Wrexham Unitary Development, and LPG 16, which seek to ensure all development provides safe and convenient vehicle access to and from development sites, both on site and in the nearby locality, and appropriate levels of parking provision.

Other Matters

10. The application form indicates that the proposal would dispose of foul water to the mains sewer, and the Council have confirmed that sufficient capacity and appropriate consent exists at the relevant Waste Water Treatment Works to ensure the proposal would not exceed the permitted levels of phosphate discharge into the River Dee Special Area of Conservation (SAC) catchment area. I am therefore satisfied that the proposal would not result in any likely significant effects on the SAC's qualifying features and that no further assessment is required in this respect.

11. In reaching my decision, I have considered the duty to improve the economic, social, environmental and cultural well-being of Wales, in accordance with the sustainable development principle, under section 3 of the Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 (WBFG Act). I have taken into account the ways of working set out at section 5 of the WBFG Act and consider that this decision is in accordance with the sustainable development principle through its contribution towards one or more of the Welsh Ministers well-being objectives, as required by section 8 of the WBFG Act.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

Claire MacFarlane

INSPECTOR