From: Tim Perkins
Sent: Monday, October 9, 2023 10:30 AM
To: Developmentmanagement <Developmentmanagement@wiltshire.gov.uk>
Subject: PL/2023/07307 : THE PINES HOTEL, 81-82 MARSHFIELD ROAD, CHIPPENHAM, SN15 1JR - Response to highways comments

FAO Kate Clark

Dear Kate

We have noted the Highways response on the application and would wish to offer the following comments in response.

We note the comment that the proposal does not meet the parking standard for HMOs.

However we would draw your attention to our Planning Statement which sets out why there are a mitigating factors in this case given the nature and permitted use of the property.

To start with there is an existing permitted use on the site for 22 bed C1 hotel/guesthouse. According to Wiltshire Parking Standards this would require 1 space per bedroom. The current permitted use therefore has a latent parking demand. We note the comments made by others that the hotel is under occupied however it can lawful operate as a 22 bedroom hotel and therefore generate a parking demand in line with that.

This is a material consideration (i.e. a baseline fallback position) in determining the application when assessing the change in relation to the proposed use.

The Highways response incorrectly records the current parking spaces. There is a total of 13 spaces (3 at the front and 10 at the back) which would mean it falls only 1 short of the 14 required under the standard.

We have acknowledged in the application that the spaces to the rear are accessed via a a very narrow passage (1.95m) wide. This is likely an original access way from when the building was constructed in the late 19th century. It is difficult although not impossible for smaller cars to use this access way and indeed there are vehicles parked there as shown on the site photographs. This situation has been ongoing whilst the hotel has been in operation. A Listed Building application to widen the access by altering the side wall of the building was refused in 2012 (N/12/00306/LBC) as it would detrimentally affect the historic and architectural interest of the building.

It is reasonable to assume that not all car drivers would wish to use the hotel parking and will utilise on street parking or public car parks. This is the situation now and would be so if the hotel was occupied at its full permitted capacity. All of this is the lawful situation as it stands.

The site is located in very close proximity to public transport, shops and services. It is approx. 300m from the town centre, 600m from Chippenham railway station and 100m from a bus stop on Marshfield Road with regular services to Bath and Swindon.

There are 13 parking spaces provided and even if drivers might not wish to use the narrow access to the side the parking demand from the proposed use is no worse than might be the case for a 22 bedroom hotel.Residents will have excellent access to public transport, shops and services and are less likely to own cars in any event.

The highways response also says that "minimum cycle parking levels of 1 cycle space per dwelling'" cannot be provided on site. This is incorrect. The submitted Site Plan shows cycle shelters for 24 bikes to the rear of the property. Indeed there is ample space to the rear to provide cycle parking which is easily accessible.

We note the comments about service vehicles however again this is no different to the situation with the current permitted use, and if anything one would expect the servicing requirements for a residential use to be less than a commercial one.

We would ask that the Highways Officer reviews the particular circumstances of this property including the existing extant permitted use and how that should be taken account of in making any comparison with the proposed use. There are also incorrect assertions in the response about the level of car and cycle parking which are proposed and these need to be amended.

Kind Regards

Tim Perkins
Director

TMP Planning Ltd

RTPI
Chartered Town Planner