

MEMORANDUM

From:	Service Manager Environment	To:	Head of Environment and Planning
Our Ref:	EP/DC/PP/2017/0449	Your Ref:	MP/P/2017/0449
Date:	23 rd June 2017		

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

TOWN AND COUNTRY (GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURE) ORDER 1995

Location: O. S Grid Ref: 377 495 2 Coed Aben Farmhouse, Coed Aben Road, Wrexham Industrial Estate, Wrexham.

Development: Change of use from C3 (Residential Dwelling) to C2 (Residential Children's Home).

I refer to your consultation / email dated 13/06/2017 in respect of the above.

Access

The development site is located on Coed Aben Road which is a busy, classified, residential road subject to a 40mph speed limit. Coed Aben Road is one of the main arterial routes serving Wrexham Industrial Estate providing access to a significant volume of HGVs and cars.

Any proposed / existing access in this location would normally be required to provide visibility splays of 2.4 x 120m in both directions measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway in accordance with TAN 18.

Visibility from the existing access is adequate in the south easterly direction providing a splay in excess of 2.4 x 120m measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway. However, visibility in the north westerly direction is inadequate providing a splay of approximately 2.4 x 30m measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway. Visibility is impeded in this direction in that the required splay would need to cut across 3rd party land (ie/ no. 1 Coed Aben Farmhouse).

I would therefore not normally be able to support any development that is likely to result in any significant increase in vehicle movements utilizing this existing substandard access.

The existing access is approximately 3.8m wide and is gated at around 7m behind the adjoining carriageway. The access is paved with hard bound materials. As the access will become a shared access, I would normally recommend a minimum access width of 4.8m to allow 2 cars to pass simultaneously. Although, the existing access could be widened, it would appear that the applicant could only widen the access on the westerly side which would not address the issue of poor visibility in this direction.

Parking & Turning Provision

In terms of parking provision at the developments site, I comment as follows:-

I understand that there are currently 5 bedrooms at the property. LPGN 16 would normally require such a property to provide a maximum of 4 no. parking spaces. Although there is adequate space to provide parking for 4 vehicles, there is currently no provision for turning.

The submitted Design & Access Statement states that the property will be used to accommodate a maximum of 3 children. The children will receive at least 1:1 care ie/ 1 carer will care for 1 child. However, sometimes this may be 2:1 ie/ 2 carers to 1 young person, equating to a maximum of 6 carers / potentially 6 cars requiring parking. It is also stated that when one shift ends the next shift of carers (potentially 6 no.) will arrive at the property and discuss progress etc. before the first shift of carers departs. This could potentially result in 12 cars requiring parking at the property at any one time. I understand that additional visitors to the site may include social workers, therapists, education staff.

Based on the submitted information, there would appear to be potential for 12 cars or more to visit the site at any one time during the day requiring parking. However, there may be scope to provide adequate parking and turning provision at the rear of the site but this would require significant alterations to the current layout.

Traffic Generation

Based on the submitted information in the Design & Access Statement, it would appear that the proposed development has the potential to generate more vehicle movements than would currently occur at the family property. I would therefore not normally be able to support any development that is likely to result in any significant increase in vehicle movements utilizing this existing substandard access.

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

1. **There is restricted visibility at the existing access and increased use would increase the likelihood of danger to road users.**
2. **The existing access is of insufficient width to accommodate the simultaneous passage of 2 no. vehicles.**
3. **The proposed development does not make adequate provision for the parking and turning of vehicles clear of the adjoining carriageway.**

Supplementary Notes

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

Peter O'Connell