

## Joanna Barnett

---

**From:** Matthew Phillips  
**Sent:** 31 August 2011 13:05  
**To:** planning\_admin  
**Subject:** FW: Marshalls Site, Llay (WCBC Ref P/2011/0474)

Highway comments to the above.

---

**From:** Peter Douthwaite  
**Sent:** 31 August 2011 12:31  
**To:** Matthew Phillips  
**Subject:** RE: Marshalls Site, Llay (WCBC Ref P/2011/0474)

Matthew

The figure I came up with from TRICS was a very rough guide based on a single user industrial unit. It wasn't meant as definitive figure.

If this site is simply subdivided and all vehicles going to clwyd concrete have to use the west bank access then we are potentially looking at an additional 150 movements /day (assuming 150 /day is accurate)  
We wouldn't want to support this amount of increase.

Can you perhaps request Marshalls undertake a proper TRICS study to determine more precisely what their current permissions would entitle them to move in through the West Bank access?  
Alternatively they could speak to Clwyd Concrete and ask them for some traffic figures - the site has been in operation for at least 9 months so they should have some idea of whats going on there.

Preferably the west bank access would be closed and all vehicular movement to the site taken from the southern access off the main road.

Pete

---

**From:** Matthew Phillips  
**Sent:** 30 August 2011 11:49  
**To:** Peter Douthwaite  
**Subject:** RE: Marshalls Site, Llay (WCBC Ref P/2011/0474)

Pete,

I'd contacted the agent about how the site was going to be subdivided so we could assess whether the amount of traffic leaving via the eastern access was going to be similar to the existing restrictions would permit. Dave mentioned the possibility of closing up the access completely but I haven't put this to the agent. Either way would probably address your concerns and could be secured by condition (the subdivision option requiring a fence to be erected and thereafter no access between the portions of the site).

I have had an email from the agent today suggesting a condition that puts an upper limit on vehicular movements at 200 per access. I doubt such a condition would be enforceable and may get bogged down in all sorts of difficulties in terms of interpretation.

Regards

Matthew

---

**From:** Peter Douthwaite  
**Sent:** 26 August 2011 11:34  
**To:** Matthew Phillips  
**Subject:** RE: Marshalls Site, Llay (WCBC Ref P/2011/0474)

At callover on wednesday Dave said that you were contacting them re. closing the rear access altogether and serving the whole site from the front?

---

**From:** Sean Silk [mailto:sean.silk@silkplanning.co.uk]  
**Sent:** 26 August 2011 10:36  
**To:** Matthew Phillips  
**Cc:** Peter Douthwaite  
**Subject:** Marshalls Site, Llay (WCBC Ref P/2011/0474)

Matthew

Sorry for the delay in coming back to you but I've been waiting to see what information may be available from the client in terms of historic lorry movements. From what I am told, based upon the historic data available, there were an average total of 24 vehicle movements per working day for 2007. This year represents a fair reflection in production terms which then declined up to closure of the site.

I hope this helps.

Regards

Sean

**Sean V Silk MRTPI**  
**Planning Consultant**

Silk Planning  
1 Berkeley Street  
London  
W1J 8DJ  
T: 020 7016 9718  
F: 020 7016 9100  
M: 07908 675866  
E: [sean.silk@silkplanning.co.uk](mailto:sean.silk@silkplanning.co.uk)  
W: [www.silkplanning.co.uk](http://www.silkplanning.co.uk)

Although this email and attachments are believed to be free of any viruses and have been scanned by Norton, it is the responsibility of the recipient to ensure that this is the case. No responsibility is accepted by Silk Planning for any loss of, or damage arising in any way from receipt or use thereof. Emails are susceptible to interference. If in doubt, please verify the authenticity with the sender. This email is confidential, may be legally privileged, and is for the intended recipient only. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately and delete any copies of it from your system. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on it, is prohibited and unlawful.

---

**From:** Matthew Phillips [mailto:Matthew.Phillips@wrexham.gov.uk]  
**Sent:** 18 August 2011 09:49  
**To:** Sean Silk  
**Cc:** Peter Douthwaite  
**Subject:** P/2011/0474 - Marshalls Llay

Sean,

After further considering the concerns expressed by Highways I have the following comments:

i) Highways have worked on the assumption (from TRICS traffic generation data) that the whole site could generate up to 300 vehicle movements per day (based on a figure of 6 movements per 100 sq.m - Peter Douthwaite has assumed 5000 sq.m based on the buildings/plant at the site) . Even using the simplistic assumption that half of those would be deliveries of raw materials this means 150 movements via West Bank Road/Aerial Road.

ii) I appreciate that the objective of removing the condition is to permit free movement to/from the site via both of its access points to aid the leasing or sale of the site to separate companies -i.e. subdivision. However I think the difficulty we face in addressing the Highways concerns is that unless we also know how the site is to be subdivided it is impossible to say what percentage of the estimated 300 movements per day will use either access. If, for example the site were subdivided in such a way that over half of it ended up being accessed from the east, then it may be reasonable to conclude that that would potentially result in an increase in traffic using West Bank and Aerial Road. If on the other hand, the eastern access were only used to access a relatively small percentage of the site - for example, the north-east corner of the site, then it may be possible to argue that there would potentially be a reduction in vehicle movements on West Bank and Aerial Road compared the existing arrangements.

iii) Were Marshalls able to demonstrate how the site is to be subdivided, I think it is likely that this - or any other application for removal/relaxation of the existing restrictions would only be supported subject to a conditions a means of preventing access between the subdivisions is put in place - i.e. a fence or wall and that thereafter it would only be possible for the subdivisions to use one of the two access points.

I trust the above is of assistance.

Regards

Matthew Phillips  
Planning Officer  
Wrexham County Borough Council  
Telephone: 01978 292473