

MEMORANDUM

From: Service Manager Environment

To: Head of Environment and Planning

Our Ref: EP/DC/P/2016/0783

Your Ref: SW/P/2016/0783

Date: 16th January 2017

Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Section 78 Appeal @ 86 Erddig Road, Wrexham.

I refer to your consultation / email dated 12/01/2017 in respect of the above.

I am satisfied with my previous response made to this application (copy attached) and wish to inform you that I have no further comments to add.

petuorhwaite

petuorhwaite Service Manager Environment

MEMORANDUM

From: Service Manager Environment **To:** Head of Environment and Planning
Our Ref: ENV/DC/PP/2016/0783 **Your Ref:** KH/P/2016/0783
Date: 5th September 2016

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

TOWN AND COUNTRY (GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURE) ORDER 1995

Location: O. S Grid Ref: 332 497 86 Erddig Road, Wrexham.

Development: Variation of condition no. 1 by replacing the word "students" with the word "residents" and removal of condition no. 2 imposed under planning permission code no. P/2012/0185.

I refer to your consultation received on 22/08/2016 in respect of the above.

The proposed development site is located on the corner of Bath Road and Erddig Road which are both unclassified roads subject to a 30mph speed limit. However, I would estimate typical vehicle speeds at being around 20mph due to the geometry of the road

There are a significant number of residential properties in this area that have no off-street parking facilities. This results in a number of vehicles being parked on the carriageway in the vicinity of the development site and along the adjoining side roads.

LPGN 16 would normally require a maximum of 4 parking spaces for the original 5 bedroomed property. However, maximum standards would not normally be required for this property given its sustainable location. The property currently has no off-street parking provision.

The previously approved HMO (planning application ref: P/2012/0185) consisted of 8 no. bedspaces in 8 separate rooms. LPGN 5 would normally require 1 parking space per 2 bedspaces which would equate to a maximum requirement of 4 parking spaces.

It was therefore previously considered that the proposed development was unlikely to result in an increase in parking demand compared with its current residential use.

In terms of the current application, I comment as follows:-

I assume that the proposed property still comprises 8 separate bedrooms with 8 no. bedspaces. I assume that the proposed variation to the original consent still relates to a house in multiple occupancy (HMO) but with the option of accommodating students and / or simply residents. On the basis that the property still functions as a HMO, parking demand in respect of LPGN 5 / 16 guidance would not be considered likely to increase at the development site.

However, it may be viewed that non-students / residents are likely to be in full time employment and are more likely to own a car. In this instance, on-street parking demand at the site may well increase.

Supplementary Notes

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

Peter Oorkwante

fr Service Manager Environment