

MEMORANDUM

From: Planning Control Manager **To:** Head of Environment and Planning

Our Ref: EP/DC/P/2018/0974 **Your Ref:** SEH/P/2018/0974

Date: 12th March 2019

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

Location: O. S Grid Ref: 347 495 Unit 6, Whitegate Industrial Estate, Wrexham.
Development: Change of use from Class B8 and B2 to Class D2 Use for Leisure and Sporting Activities (Indoor Trampoline Park).

I refer to your consultation / email dated 07/03/2019 in respect of the above.

Access

The proposed development site is located on Whitegate Industrial Estate which I understand is managed by the WCBC Asset Management Section. Whitegate Industrial Estate is accessed off Whitegate Road which is an unclassified road subject to a 30mph speed limit.

Parking Provision

The applicant has indicated that the total proposed floor area being converted to Class D2 Use is approximately 1450m². Based on LPGN 16 – D2 Use, the proposed development would require a maximum of 1 car space per 15m² gross floor space equating to a maximum requirement of 97 spaces.

Previously, I understood that the applicant had secured a private parking area from the Council at the rear of the site which was capable of accommodating approximately 100 cars. The provision of such a car was considered acceptable subject to appropriate surfacing and marking out of spaces with white lining material. The proposed car park was considered ideal given its close proximity to the development site and existing pedestrian / footway provision. However, I understand that this option is no longer being considered. As an alternative, I did suggest utilizing the hard standing area for a car park located just off the bend to the south of Unit 6. However, I was advised that this land is intended for other future units.

The Asset Management Section have now offered two alternative parking areas which the applicant could use. These are indicated on submitted plans (Drg. Nos. 26/626/1 & 26/626/2).

Car Park A Drg. No. 26/626/1

This car park is located to the south of Unit 6 and is indicated as providing approximately 37 spaces. Pedestrian access to Unit 6 from this car park is poor. I would suggest that additional footway provision is provided at the entrance of the car park and alongside Unit 13 in the interest of pedestrian safety.

Although this car park does not currently appear to be in use, it is unclear as to whether this car park provides parking for other existing units on the industrial estate. Although, other units on the estate may be currently unoccupied, this may result in a shortfall in parking provision when they are occupied in the future.

I previously requested a plan showing all of the existing parking spaces on the industrial estate including details of the gross floor areas of all the existing units and their permitted uses under LPGN 16. This would enable an assessment to be made of the adequacy of parking on the industrial estate. This information has not been provided.

Car Park B Drg. No. 26/626/2

This car park is located to the west of Unit 6 and is indicated as providing approximately 20 spaces. Pedestrian access to Unit 6 from this car park is reasonable but still involves crossing of internal roads that are used by commercial / industrial vehicles which is not ideal.

I was under the impression that this car park was used by those people visiting unit 30 which I understand was the former ITEC training centre which has since closed. A recent aerial image on Google Maps (2019) indicates this car park being occupied by 27 vehicles which suggests that it may still be required by other units on the estate.

I understand that access to Unit 6 will be at the rear of the building on its eastern side. If this is the case, then those visiting the site by car are considered likely to park as close to the building as possible for convenience. This will inevitably conflict with parking provision for the adjoining units which were all occupied during a previous site visit. The proposed 2 no. parking areas are not considered to be ideally located to serve the proposed development particularly given that young children will be visiting the site. **However, I assume that the responsibility of safe routes to the facility, signage and parking management will ultimately lie with our Asset Management Section.** It is considered unlikely that any potential shortfall in parking provision at the site will impact on the adjoining highway but may cause an issue within the estate itself. **However, I assume that any potential parking issues within the industrial estate will be the responsibility of our Asset Management Section.**

I understand that anybody visiting Unit 6 on foot can utilise the existing gated pedestrian access on the northern boundary of Unit 2.

In conclusion, the applicant appears to be providing a total of 57 spaces between the two car parks which represents a 41% shortfall in parking provision compared with LPGN 16 maximum requirements. If it is accepted that the proposed parking provision is adequate and is not used / associated with other units on the estate, then I would raise no objections on highway grounds.

Supplementary Notes

The applicant's attention should be drawn to item nos. 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5 of the supplementary



 Planning Control Manager