

MEMORANDUM

From: Service Manager Environment **To:** Head of Environment and Planning
Our Ref: EP/DC/PP/2018/0083 **Your Ref:** PF/P/2018/0083
Date: 6th February 2013

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

TOWN AND COUNTRY (GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURE) ORDER 1995

Location: O. S Grid Ref: 343 508 79 Holt Road, Wrexham.

Development: Deletion of condition no. 2 of planning permission P/2013/0206 to allow the sale of hot food for consumption off the premises.

I refer to your consultation dated 06/02/2018 in respect of the above.

The proposed development site is bounded by Borrass Road to the north and Holt Road to the south which are both classified roads subject to a 30mph speed limit. However, I would estimate typical vehicle speeds along Borrass Road at being around 25mph given the existing traffic calming measures in place.

The development site is served by an existing 7.2m wide dropped kerb crossing. Visibility from this existing access appears adequate providing splays in excess of 2.4 x 33m in both directions.

Except for a short distance near to its junction with Holt Road, there are no parking restrictions along either side of Borrass Road. This results in a significant level of on-street parking on the western side of the road due to the lack of off-street parking facilities for the existing properties.

This results in vehicles travelling along Borrass Road in the north easterly direction typically having to straddle the centerline of the highway which is not ideal in respect of oncoming vehicles. Any proposed increase in vehicle movements through the existing site access is likely to increase the conflict of traffic movements close to the Holt Road / Borrass Road junction resulting in additional danger and inconvenience to all highway users.

I would therefore not wish to support any proposed development that is likely to result in an increase in vehicle movements through this existing access. The proposed development is considered likely to result in an increase in vehicle movements.

It is unclear from the submitted information as to the proposed public floor space of the café and the proposed parking layout at the site. However, there would appear to be limited parking provision available at the site (for up to 3 vehicles) and there does not appear to be adequate room to provide turning provision within the site for either cars or delivery vehicles.

LPGN 16 – A3 Use would normally require a maximum of 1 car space per 4m² public floor space. Based on an estimated public floor space of 24m², the proposed café would normally require a maximum of 6 spaces. A total of 3 no. parking spaces have been indicated on the submitted layout which is considered inadequate.

Based on LPGN 16 requirements, the proposed café is considered likely to result in an increased demand for parking at the site compared with its previous uses ie/ Chemist, Hairdresser. Any potential shortfall in parking provision at the site and/or restricted parking provision within the site is likely to result in vehicles parking along Borrás Road fronting the proposed development site which would only exacerbate the existing on-street parking problem in this location.

The use of adjoining car parks which are not under the ownership of the applicant cannot be taken into account as alternative parking provision as these are used by other businesses and cannot be guaranteed in perpetuity.

Hot food takeaways tend to attract a high proportion of car borne and short stay customers which, without essential accessible parking provision, can affect traffic flows and road safety. Often there is an increased occurrence of obstructed parking and interruption to the steady flow of traffic along the roads adjacent to the premises. Customers may be tempted to park for short periods to visit takeaway premises, often jeopardising the safety of other road users and pedestrians.

I understand that a previous application (ref: P/2000/0001) at the development site for a change of use to a hot food takeaway (A3 use) was refused and also dismissed on appeal for similar reasons as above.

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

1. **The proposed development does not make adequate provision for the parking of vehicles clear of the adjoining carriageway.**
2. **The proposed development does not make adequate provision for the turning of vehicles clear of the adjoining carriageway.**
3. **The establishment of a development of this nature in this location would be incompatible with through traffic interests and a potential source of danger to road users.**

Peter Douthwaite

fn Service Manager Environment