

MEMORANDUM

From: Service Manager Environment

To: Head of Environment and Planning

Our Ref: EP/DC/P/2016/0707

Your Ref: SW/P/2016/0707

Date: 16th January 2017

Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Section 78 Appeal @ 10 Earle Street, 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.



 Service Manager Environment

MEMORANDUM

From:	Service Manager Environment	To:	Head of Community Well-being and Development
Our Ref:	EP/DC/PP/2016/0707	Your Ref:	PF/P/2016/0707
Date:	5 th August 2016		

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

TOWN AND COUNTRY (GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURE) ORDER 1995

Location: O. S Grid Ref: 334 498 10 Earle Street, Wrexham.

Development: Change of use from Class 3 (Dwelling) to Use Class C4 (HMO).

I refer to your consultation received on 25/07/2016 in respect of the above.

The proposed development site is located on Earle Street which is an unclassified road subject to a 30mph speed limit. However, I would estimate typical vehicle speeds at being around 20mph due to the geometry of the road

A number of residential properties in this area have no off-street parking facilities. This could result in a number of vehicles being parked on the carriageway in the vicinity of the development site and along the adjoining side roads. However, there is a layby on the opposite of the road to the site which can accommodate around 5 no. cars.

LPGN 16 would normally require a maximum of 3 parking spaces for the existing 3 bedroomed property. However, maximum standards would not be required for this property given its sustainable location. The property currently has no off –street parking provision.

The proposed HMO consists of 4 no. bedrooms. I assume that bedrooms 2 & 4 could possibly accommodate 2 bedspaces each whereas bedrooms 1 & 3 are more likely to only have a single bedspace each given their size, equating to a maximum of 6 bedspaces.

LPGN 5 would normally require 1 parking space per 2 bedspaces which would equate to a maximum requirement of 3 parking spaces.

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

I would therefore have no objections to the proposed development on highway grounds.

Supplementary Notes

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

peter dothwante

PM Service Manager Environment