

MEMORANDUM



From: Planning Control Manager

To: Head of Environment and Planning

Our Ref: EP/DC/P/2019/0039

Your Ref: SEH/P/2019/0039

Date: 8th February 2019

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

TOWN AND COUNTRY (GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURE) ORDER 1995

Location: O. S Grid Ref: 332 505 6 Grosvenor Road, Wrexham.

Development: Change of use of vacant dwelling into 4 no. self-contained flats (3 in the first floor and 1 in the second floor).

I refer to your consultation received on 25/01/2012 in respect of the above.

The proposed development site is located on Grosvenor Road which is a busy, classified road subject to a 30mph speed limit.

Assuming typical speeds of 30mph, any proposed / existing access in this location would normally be required to provide visibility splays of 2.4 x 43m measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway in accordance with Manual for Streets.

The development site appears to have 3 no. existing access points which lead to the parking area fronting the site which has approximately 28 no. parking spaces.

The northerly and central accesses are 3.0m wide and suffer from inadequate visibility providing splays of approximately 2.4 x 15m in both directions measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway. Visibility is impeded in both directions from these access points by the existing boundary walls fronting the site. Pedestrian visibility is also inadequate from these existing access points.

The most southerly access is 6.0m wide. This access provides adequate visibility in the south westerly direction but inadequate visibility in the north easterly direction providing a splay of approximately 2.4 x 40m measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway. Visibility is impeded from this access by the existing boundary wall fronting the site.

I would normally therefore not wish to support any proposed development that is likely to result in an increase in vehicle movements through these sub-standard accesses.

I understand that the proposed development site currently comprises 2 no. 3 bedroom flats with 2 dedicated parking spaces each. However, I understand that only the most southerly access is used to serve the existing flats and this will continue to be the case for the proposed 4 no. self-contained flats.

However, despite the poor access layout and inadequate visibility at these access points, the former Miners Institute would have had a significant previous traffic generation hosting a number of social events including vehicle movements associated with the bowling green and snooker rooms. I understand that the adjoining building is now used as a place of worship (mosque) and as a cultural centre. I understand that the building also includes a number of snooker rooms and a 3 bedroomed apartment for the caretaker.

I would therefore have no objections to the proposed apartments in respect of traffic generation.

In terms of parking provision, I comment as follows:-

The submitted layout plan (Drg. No. BB192-00 Rev A) indicates the proposed parking layout at the site which provides the following allocation of spaces:-

10 spaces	Allocated for the Dental Practice
12 spaces	Allocated to the Mosque & Cultural Centre
8 spaces	Allocated to the proposed 4 no. flats (2 parking spaces per flat).

Proposed spaces nos. 23 – 30 do not appear to be indicated correctly on the submitted layout plan. The spaces are shown as having very little clearance behind for maneuvering. In reality these spaces have sufficient clearance behind for turning. **Could you please ask the applicant to provide a revised layout plan indicating this detail.**

The provision of 8 spaces for the 4 no. flats is considered acceptable given the sustainable location of the site. However, the submitted plan indicates 4 spaces for flats 3 & 4 located between the central access and southerly access. Both access points have hatched yellow markings to keep parked vehicles clear of the access. However, there would only appear to be an available width of around 7.3m between these two accesses to provide parking spaces. A width of 9.6m would normally be required. The proposed spaces indicated in this location would encroach over the hatched marking and impede the existing access points which would be unacceptable.

I would suggest that the layout of the 3 existing spaces at 90 degrees to the boundary wall are maintained and a suitable alternative space is provided on this side of the car park that does not encroach on the existing access points. **Could you please ask the applicant to provide a revised layout plan indicating revised parking arrangements.**

I would recommend that all parking spaces are marked out with white lining materials.

I await the requested information.

Supplementary Notes

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

pltenDnther at

M

Planning Control Manager