

Cerys Jones

From: Sharon Holman
Sent: 08 September 2021 11:33
To: planning_admin
Subject: FW: Boat Hire Relocation - Site Meeting 19.08.21

civ- additional / supporting information web

From: Nick Wild <Nick.Wild@canalrivertrust.org.uk>
Sent: 08 September 2021 11:00 AM
To: Sharon Holman <Sharon.Holman@wrexham.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Boat Hire Relocation - Site Meeting 19.08.21

Hello Sharon,

Having looked online, I have picked up the attached consultation response. The Highway Officer has made some recommendations for amendments/additional information, which I have set out below in blue italics with my corresponding comments in black for discussion.

- *'Based on the submitted layout plan (Drg. No. 2019 38 26 Rev V14 - GA Proposed Site Access Plan) dimensions road widths of 5.0m are proposed and the 1.2m pedestrian provision is shared with the vehicular traffic. This is not acceptable to WCBC standards and will require the road width of 5.5m and pedestrian provision in the form of a footpath and delineating kerb with a width of 2.0m, this arrangement should be continued on layout (Drg.No. 2019 38 25 Rev V14 - GA Proposed Site Plan). Pedestrian facilities and provision for cycling will need to be addressed specifically with movement safety'.* We knew this was a debatable issue following the pre-app response which said *'I would normally recommend a width of 5.5m'*. However, it was not ruled out at 5.0 metres and we had the benefit of the professional opinion of our appointed highway consultant regarding the 5.0m width with shared pedestrian access. The suggested 5.5m and 2.0m for pedestrians is simply not possible here – the existing access and land available either side provide physical constraints which we cannot extend beyond. To the western side is a substantial stone wall and to the eastern side is the perimeter of the existing car park bordered with a palisade fence. If we cannot proceed with the currently proposed arrangements what implications will this have in achieving overall support for the scheme? That said, we will now be looking at every possible way in which to achieve any increase in width in this location.
- *'This section of Tower Hill may be difficult to access by a coach/refuse vehicles given the geometry of the road. It is not clear which route such a vehicle would use to access the proposed site, access can be via Queen Street or Tower Hill. We recommend the submission of swept path details of such vehicles entering / manoeuvring / exiting the site for all associated movements.'* Just to be clear, coach access is not required. With regard to the swept path, I am sure we can arrange for our highway consultant to prepare the swept path analysis work relating to a refuse vehicle at the junction of Tower Hill/Queen Street.
- *'Parking space dimensions are to be a minimum of 2.4m x 4.8m. Please detail the dimensions on the revised layout plans.'* We need to confirm the proposed dimension of our spaces – if there is a size difference then consider the impact.
- *'We request the applicant provides details of the previous daily traffic movements generated by the former business through this access and details of what daily vehicle movements are anticipated for the proposed business. Staffing requirements/parking facilities to be confirmed. This information has not been provided and an estimation of 15 cars per day has been used within the transport assessment. The assessment also confirmed CRT were not able to provide daily traffic numbers relating to the proposals. We await this information.'* Our Transport Assessment does include a figure of 45 vehicle movements per day in relation to

the former use of the site. It also includes reference to the same anticipated level of vehicle movements being generated by the proposed use. This does not seem to have been acknowledged/taken into consideration.

- *'The proposed site car park includes for a total of 21 spaces adjacent to the proposed building. Double banking car park spaces will require a management plan, this has not been provided to support the reasoning for double banking of vehicles. The suggested overflow of parking to the main car park adjacent is not acceptable as the perpetuity of the facilities is not confirmed. We would suggest due to the current layout submitted and the swept path analysis contained within the report, additional parking spaces would be required'* A management plan should not be difficult to provide, which I strongly suspect could be information requested by way of a condition? However, quite frankly, I am unsure whether we are able to provide any further parking spaces within the site given the ecological/arboricultural impact it would have, which is especially the case given that we are being asked by the Council's tree/ecology officers to reduce spaces down from the 21 currently proposed to lessen any impact. Again, if we are unable to provide any additional car parking then what implications will this have in achieving overall support for the scheme?
- *'The submitted plan appears to indicate a refuse vehicle / coach within the site. I would request confirmation of what maximum size of vehicle is likely to visit the site. Local Authority refuse vehicles are typically 11.2m in length. Refuse Section do not normally service private sites of this nature where the access road is un-adopted. I assume that the site may be serviced by a smaller private waste collection vehicle. Please confirm'* Again, there is no proposed access to the site by coach. We have worked on a refuse vehicle size of 10.4m in length, which is the maximum size of the vehicle used by the private refuse collection operator.
- *'Developments of this nature is considered likely to generate a significant number of daily vehicle movements. No traffic generation figures in respect of the existing / proposed business have been provided. Please ask the applicant to provide this information and the nature of vehicles which previously accessed this site through this existing access.'* Significant number of vehicle movements? I think that statement is debatable. Also, our Transport Assessment does include reference to an anticipated figure of 45 vehicle movement a day (the same as the previous use of the site generated).

Clearly, there are some considerations to be had here in terms of the planning balance. I hope we are able to negotiate on the points raised above to agree a successful outcome?

Regards

Nick Wild MA MRTPI

Senior Delivery Planner (north and north wales)

Canal & River Trust

Fearn's Wharf, Neptune Street, Leeds. LS9 8PB

T 0303 0404040

F 0113 2 81 6 886

M 07795 354 689

DD 0113 2 005 723

E nick.wild@canalrivertrust.org.uk

