

MEMORANDUM

From: Network and Infrastructure Manager

To: Head of Community Well-being
and Development

Our Ref: ENV/DC/PP/2012/0219

Your Ref: SJG/P/2012/0219

Date: 16TH April 2012

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

TOWN AND COUNTRY (GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURE) ORDER 1995

Location: O. S Grid Ref: 341 511 49 Park Avenue, Acton, Wrexham.

Development: Change of use to house in multiple occupancy.

I refer to your consultation dated 26/03/2012 in respect of the above.

The proposed development site is located on Park Avenue which is an unclassified, residential road subject to a 30mph speed limit.

Any proposed / existing access would normally be required to provide visibility splays of 2.4 x 56m in both directions measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway in which there shall be no obstruction in excess of 1.0m in height in accordance with Manual for Streets.

Visibility from the existing access is inadequate in both directions providing splays of approximately 2.4 x 20m to the north east and 2.4 x 8m to the south west measured to the nearside edge of the adjoining highway. Visibility is impeded in both directions by the mature trees located in the verge along this section of Park Avenue. There is also a telegraph pole located in the verge adjoining the access which also impedes visibility from the access in the south westerly direction.

Any proposed / existing access would normally be required to provide pedestrian visibility splays of 2.4 x 3.3m in both directions measured from the back of the footway in which there shall be no obstruction in excess of 0.6m in height. Adequate pedestrian visibility splays are currently provided at the existing access.

Any proposed shared access would normally be required to be at least 4.5m wide for at least 5m behind the adjoining carriageway to facilitate the simultaneous passage of 2 no. vehicles clear of the adjoining highway. The existing / proposed access is only 3.0m wide and is considered unsuitable to serve as a shared access.

In terms of parking and turning provision at the development site, I comment as follows:-

I understand that the existing property is 4 bedroomed. There would appear to be adequate parking available for the existing use with at least 3 spaces being available to the front of the property and space for a further 2 vehicles alongside the dwelling.

I understand that the applicant wishes to provide up to 6 bedrooms within the property but only proposes single occupancy in each room. I understand that a condition could be imposed to restrict the number of people living at the property. Based on LPGN 5 / LPGN 16 requirements, such a development would normally require 1 parking space per 2 bedspaces. This would equate to 3 no. parking spaces being required. This level of parking provision is available at the property. However, if all occupants of the house were to own a car, then parking and turning provision at the site would be considered inadequate. Where several vehicles under separate ownership are parked at such a development, it is important that adequate parking and turning provision is provided to enable each individual vehicle to access the site without being blocked in by other vehicles.

As the proposed development is likely to result in an increase in vehicle movements through this substandard access compared with typical movements generated by a single dwelling, I would not be able to support this application on highway grounds.

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

1. **There is restricted lateral visibility at the existing access and increased use would increase the likelihood of danger to road users,**
2. **The proposed / existing access is of inadequate width and is considered unsuitable to serve as a shared access.**

Peter Doornwaerts

pp. Network and Infrastructure Manager