

From: planning_admin
To: Jenni Perkins
Subject: RE: P/2024/0315 Dog Walking Fields Plas Issa, Penrycae

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

From: David Williams <davidswilliams44@icloud.com>
Sent: 06 March 2025 16:12
To: Jenni Perkins <Jenni.Perkins@wrexham.gov.uk>
Subject: P/2024/0315 Dog Walking Fields Plas Issa, Penrycae

Afternoon Jenni,

Firstly, thank you for your patience and for holding the application in abeyance. We are now able to address the issues raised during the consultation process. If you recall there were three outstanding issues, Net Biodiversity Gain, a Noise Management Plan and the Highways response including their request for a Speed Survey. For your convenience I have addressed each in turn below 1. Net Biodiversity Gain A baseline habitat assessment is impossible to provide on a retrospective application. The fields have been in use for dog walking for 3 years. However I have discussed this with Emma and she agreed that provided we clearly illustrated the additional hedge planting, new trees etc on plan it would address her concerns. You could then accurately determine whether the planting had been carried out as part of any future monitoring to ensure net biodiversity benefit is achieved. She also suggested planting blackthorn in the field corners which is also shown on the plans below.

2. Noise Management Plan. This is attached below. It should be noted that no complaints have been received since the business was opened over 3 years ago. Nevertheless the NMP does set out clear procedures for handling complaints and how potential noise will be mitigated.

3. Highway Response

The Speed Survey and drawn visibility splays are attached below. However, the following observations are made in response to Highways comments.

a) Access

The submitted speed survey addresses their concerns with regards to the required visibility splays. Adequate visibility splays can be provided.

b) Northerly Access

There is no intention to use the northerly access for the proposed use. This can be conditioned if necessary. Despite our offer to permanently close it, the applicants have since requested it remain as is. It is used only very occasionally for agricultural machinery to gain access to some fields which cannot be accessed from elsewhere. The situation therefore remains unchanged as far as this access is concerned. Consequently we have not provided a suitably scaled layout plan indicating the details of a permanently closed access as was requested by Highways.

c) Southerly Access

The speed survey and resultant visibility splays would indicate that there is no impact upon 3rd party land on the opposite side of the road. Any other improvements to improve visibility for cars approaching from the north can be conditioned if necessary. These improvements are shown on the attached plans below. A suitably scaled layout plan illustrating the full extent of the proposed/required splays is provided.

Improvements to the existing southern access can be conditioned. However, given the nature of the use together with the appointment/booking regime it appears unreasonable to insist upon the existing driveway widened to a minimum of 4.8m for at least 10m behind the highway boundary or up to the parking area to facilitate the simultaneous passage of 2 vehicles. Sufficient space is available for vehicles to pull clear of the highway at the access and allow another to pass. Vehicles entering the site and leaving the car park have clear sight of each other. The appointment system should ensure that the occurrence of 2 vehicles having to pass simultaneously is extremely

infrequent. It certainly doesn't justify the need to widen and hard surface an area of 4.8m x 10m within the site as there is no impact upon the public highway.

Pedestrian Access to Field 3

We do not intend to submit a Road Safety Audit in response to concerns raised regarding pedestrian access to field 3 i.e. crossing the road. The submitted speed survey demonstrates that speeds are relatively low and Cristionydd Lane is lightly trafficked. Crossing at a maximum rate of once an hour when fully booked is still infrequent. The norm will be even less and the field will not always be in use. It would be unreasonable to put the applicants to further additional cost given these circumstances, particularly given the results of the speed survey. Adequate visibility for pedestrians is available and background noise levels low so dog owners will clearly hear vehicles approaching.

d) Parking and Turning

We do not intend to submit a scaled plan indicating the layout of customer parking spaces. Highways have accepted that there is "adequate space within the farm complex to accommodate 10 additional vehicles if necessary". This is the maximum required at the busiest time. There is in fact capacity within the farm complex to accommodate a much higher number of vehicles on the hardstanding areas. There is no potential for overspill onto the public highway and I see no reason why the spaces need to be marked out on a plan.

e) Parking Management Plan

This can be conditioned if necessary. However, many of the points raised can either be conditioned or are addressed in the submitted Noise Management Plan.

I hope will now be in a position to determine the application. I acknowledge you will need to re consult internally but if there are any issues which require further clarification etc please come back to me. Could I also request that if these concerns remain following re consultation we have a meeting to resolve. I am more than happy to come in and discuss if it helps.

Kind Regards

Dave Williams

Sent from my iPhone