

Cerys Jones

From: Matthew Phillips
Sent: 17 February 2017 09:58
To: planning_admin
Subject: FW: CONSULTATION - GENERAL LETTER - App ref P/2017/0044

Highways comments

-----Original Message-----

From: Peter Douthwaite
Sent: 17 February 2017 09:57
To: Matthew Phillips
Cc: David Williams
Subject: RE: CONSULTATION - GENERAL LETTER - App ref P/2017/0044

Matthew

We are concerned what is actually planned for the medical centre. Is it a doctors surgery which could potentially generate significant amounts of traffic? If we don't know the end user then we don't know what the traffic generation / distribution is likely to be.

Forgive us if we sound a bit suspicious but you will no doubt be aware that there is a preliminary application in to build more new offices behind the existing site. (I understand its from the same developer) This could clearly be of detriment to the highway in the vicinity of the site where the roads are already at capacity. I'd hope by now that you will have realised that the department have serious concerns over the ever increasing number of developments that are being granted planning permission in relatively close proximity to this site.

We are not looking to refuse the application, we would simply request that the developer gives us some idea what his intentions are for the site; they must presumably already have an end user otherwise why would they apply for a change of use?

It may not be necessary to undertake PiCADY assessments for this application if we were given some clarity over the proposed use of the site.

We would also like some information from him as to what car parking they have control of. If you have that information then it would be helpful if it was shared with us.

As a key consultee within the planning application process, our requests for further information to enable us to provide you with an informed and comprehensive response should be taken seriously.

Pete

-----Original Message-----

From: Matthew Phillips
Sent: 14 February 2017 11:39
To: Peter Douthwaite
Cc: David Williams
Subject: FW: CONSULTATION - GENERAL LETTER - App ref P/2017/0044

Pete,

Is this response really proportionate to the development we are dealing with?? The unit is a 371 sq.m B1 office that is being changed to a 371 sq.m medical centre (class D1).

Pedestrian provision to the site is no worse than it is to unit 4, which is a day care nursery so falls within the same use class as the proposed use. Pedestrians would only have to use a relatively short section of shared access road. If the matter is considered critical then I will contact the applicant to determine if they are able to provide a dedicated pedestrian footway. This is something we could condition.

I have discussed the parking issue with the applicant already, mainly because it appeared they had over provided for the unit. However I understand the existing parking spaces and extended parking area are to be used by this unit and unit 3. The applicant doesn't own unit 2 as far as I am aware, and parking for unit 4 is self-contained. The applicant is going to provide plans showing how the parking spaces are allocated between units 1, 2 and 3 at present and how the spaces will be allocated in future if the change of use occurs. As long as there is no loss of spaces for unit 2 (which I understand there won't be) then provided there are enough spaces for units 2 and 3 to accord with LPG16, then as far as I am concerned, the scheme is fine.

My main concern with the response is the comments about traffic generation - in particular the suggestion that the proposed use will generate significantly more traffic than the existing use. The request for detailed traffic generation figures seems to be excessive for what is a relatively a minor change of use. Is there any evidence D1 uses generate significantly more traffic than B1 uses? Even if total daily trips are more, I'd have thought that traffic to/from a medical centre would be far more likely to be distributed throughout the day compared to an office, where traffic movements are more likely to be concentrated at peak times i.e. the times the road network in the vicinity of the site has capacity issues. In any case surely the key test is whether the proposed use will materially increase traffic on nearby roads. Given that there are literally 1000's of square metres of B1 and D1 uses in the vicinity of the site, I can't see how that will be the case.

I don't intend to consult Welsh Government (Trunk Roads) because no part of the application site falls within the A483 consultation zone and unless I am advised otherwise, it is unlikely to materially increase traffic using the Mold Road and/or Ruthin Road junctions onto the A483.

Can you confirm that if the applicant does not provide the traffic generation figures that the Highways response would be to recommend refusal and that this is something you'd be prepared to defend at appeal?

Matthew

-----Original Message-----

From: highwaysplanning

Sent: 14 February 2017 09:36

To: Matthew Phillips

Subject: RE: CONSULTATION - GENERAL LETTER - App ref P/2017/0044

Response attached.

-----Original Message-----

From: Cerys Jones

Sent: 20 January 2017 15:50

To: highwaysplanning

Subject: CONSULTATION - GENERAL LETTER - App ref P/2017/0044

Please find attached document