

Cyngor Cymuned Llangollen Wledig

Llangollen Rural Community Council

Andrea Evans
Clerk/Responsible Finance Officer
clerk.llangollenrural@gmail.com

59 Haytor Road
Wrexham
LL11 2PU
Tel 07950 813858

Planning Department
Wrexham County Borough Council
Guildhall
Wrexham
LL11 1AY

3rd July 2021

For the attention of Sharon Holman

Dear Ms Holman,

PLANNING APPLICATION NO P/2021/0560

Redevelopment of Canal Basin for use as boat hire business including erection of 2 buildings and storage enclosure

Trevor Basin, New Road, Trevor Wrexham by Canal River Trust

I write in connection with the above planning application. Llangollen Rural Community Council has examined the application, together with the provided plans, documents and drawings, and the Council is familiar with the site. The Council wish to object to the redevelopment of the Canal Basin in this location.

The proposal is to redevelop the Canal Basin for use as a boat hire business including the erection of 2 buildings and a storage enclosure.

The Community Council object to the planning application on the following grounds:

Transport Assessment Report

1. The Transport Assessment Report P3 contains inaccuracies regarding the management of vehicles and the many pedestrian users of the site. This is highlighted in the document, and indeed other planning documents submitted, where it is stated that access is from Tower Hill. This is incorrect as Tower Hill connects Garth to the A539 and stops at that point. The site is on the other side of the A539.
2. The report does not adequately assess whether there is any significant impact on the surrounding highway, or demonstrates suitable site access and parking arrangements.
3. The report states that the highway adjoining the access road is lightly trafficked but does not provide any figures to substantiate this. A study carried out in June 2018 by WCBC recorded in excess of 3,200 vehicles travelling on the road over a 7 day period.

Access

1. Access to and egress from the site, and highway safety have not been adequately addressed in the application.

2. The proposed road on the site is shown as 5 metres wide when WCBC have recommended this should be 5.5 metres wide to accommodate the passing of 2 vehicles. The proposal states that a 1.5 metre wide pedestrian line will be identified at the side of the road. It is unclear how the proposals are to be practically achieved whilst complying with planning regulations and ensuring the safety of pedestrians and vehicles. The track/road is currently heavily pedestrianised with access to the canal tow paths for walkers and cyclists. As pedestrians will be sharing a narrow track, pedestrian safety needs to be assured.
3. The Transport Report states there are no formal cycling facilities within vicinity of site, but Planning statement 5.6 states part of the site includes a designated 'walking and cycling route'. The application does not demonstrate that it complies with UDP Policy GDP1 (e) 'Ensure well related to pedestrian and cycle routes wherever possible.' Also Policy T9 provides that, 'Development proposals will be required to provide walking and cycling routes, where feasible and appropriate, that link with existing or proposed walking and cycling routes'. Pedestrian safety and cycling facilities have not been adequately addressed.
4. Regarding access, the application has not provided information to demonstrate that a safe and convenient vehicular access can be achieved into the site. Therefore the proposal would conflict with UDP Policy GDP1 (d) – 'Ensure safe and convenient pedestrian and vehicular access to and from development sites, both on site and in the nearby locality'.

Parking

1. The application provides parking for 21 vehicles. This is not adequate as there are regularly many more than 21 vehicles on the current site. Overspill parking could impact on vehicular and pedestrian safety.
2. Only one disabled parking bay is included in the application.
3. The parking spaces are to be used by visitors and staff, and the area would also be used to accommodate waste collection vehicles. Staff and visitor numbers have not been provided to enable an assessment of the adequacy of parking spaces.
4. UDP Policy T8 Parking requires the provision of vehicle parking spaces with, 'regard paid to road safety hazards and amenity considerations arising from on-street parking in the vicinity of the site'.
5. The proposed car parking is inadequate given the number of vehicles occupying the current site on a daily basis. Car parking provision has not been adequately assessed as figures have not been provided by CRT. This would conflict with Local Planning Guidance (LPG) note 16 (Parking Standards) (a material consideration) which the Council applies to new developments, in accordance with national policy on how parking/transport matters will be considered, and UDP Policy GDP1.

Traffic generation

1. Access to the site is from the road linking the A539 to Queens Street which is a busy link road between villages. A study carried out in June 2018 recorded more than 3,200 vehicles on the road over a 7 day period. The application indicated that there would be no increase in visitor numbers, but the Council consider this to be inaccurate, given the current proposals contained in the Masterplan regarding development of the whole WHS.
2. In Planning Statement 2.6 CRT recognises 'There are high visitor numbers to this location for tourism, leisure and recreational purposes. Water based activities and use of the adjacent towpath and surrounding land are very popular.' Visitor numbers in 2019 were 360,000. Inevitably there will be an unacceptable impact to highway safety from increased visitor numbers.
3. The provided traffic generation figures for the existing and proposed business, and the nature of vehicles is inadequate. The proposal would therefore conflict with UDP Policy GDP1. There has been an inadequate assessment of the effect on traffic generation and highway impact.

The Community Council is very concerned about the impact of the planning application if the above issues are not addressed in line with current planning policies. It considers that the proposal is contrary to national and local policies.

Yours sincerely,

J A Evans

Andrea Evans
Clerk to the Council/Responsible Financial Officer