

From: planning_admin
To: Philip Mullineux
Subject: RE: P/2023/0497 - FW: Utopia City - Response to highways queries [CJO-IMANAGECLOUD.FID1013120]

Subject: Utopia City - Response to highways queries [CJO-IMANAGECLOUD.FID1013120]

Hi Andy,

Thanks for your email re: off-site junctions (10/02/2026), internal cycle lanes (11/02/2026), and car parking internal layout (11/02/2026).

The project team has been reviewing these. We'd be grateful for WCBC's views, although we think there would be a benefit in speaking about these as a group (including the Planning Department). I've separately asked for availability for late next week.

Off-site junctions

Firstly, previously agreed changes to the Bryn Lane entry and the Site Access arm entry geometry have been amended in the ARCADY model. This was confirmed by Cora via a separate email on 24/02/2026.

Cora IHT have reflected the junction geometries for the two site accesses (now agreed with WCBC) into their modelling. They've sought to resolve issues raised previously.

For the Industrial Estate Road / Borrass Hall Lane roundabout, Cora have now addressed the majority of the comments raised. However, in doing so, further technical challenges have emerged which are difficult to fully resolve within the physical constraints of the site.

There are clear spatial limitations at this roundabout, particularly given that adjacent land is within third-party ownership and all arms of the junction are existing highway connections. These constraints significantly limit the scope for geometric alterations.

The main remaining technical issues have been addressed. As a consequence, notwithstanding that all other queries have been addressed, there remains an entry deflection issue on the Industrial Estate Road of the roundabout which cannot be fully resolved within the available highway boundary. Responding to previous WCBC comments has led to successive design amendments, each of which introduces new technical complications. In light of this, we would suggest the following potential solutions (drawings attached for each option):

- **Agreement on current Cora IHT design at this stage** - agree that the revised design, which responds to the majority of WCBC comments, is appropriate at this stage of the planning & design process and can be refined through detailed design.
- **Contribution towards KSS2 North mitigation scheme** - agree that a comparable financial contribution towards the KSS2 North mitigation scheme for this roundabout would be acceptable in mitigating highways impact. This scheme was based on VISSIM modelling which forms part of the LDP evidence base and

included traffic generation from KSS3 / Utopia City alongside KSS2. This approach was previously accepted by WCBC. I've attached the relevant drawing produced by CBO.

Linked to the above, Cora IHT note that revisiting WCBC's assumption around forcing the model to queue may mean that the mitigation requirements move from Phase 1 to Phase 2, which would be advantageous to support delivery. Although the modelling shows shorter queues (where queue forcing hasn't been applied) than those observed in the survey data, the results can still be considered valid for several technical and methodological reasons.

The surveyed queues reflect conditions on a specific day (or short survey period), which may have included:

- Temporary traffic fluctuations
- Incidents or minor disruptions
- Driver behaviour anomalies
- Weather impacts

By contrast, average models represent average, steady-state conditions based on input flows. Therefore, it is expected that modelled queues may differ from a single observed snapshot. The model calculates queues using deterministic traffic flow theory and uniform arrival assumptions. Real-world traffic includes:

- Random platooning effects
- Uneven arrival patterns
- Blockage from upstream congestion
- Driver reaction delays

Observed queues often appear longer due to these stochastic effects, whereas Arcady reflects the junction's theoretical operational capacity under the given inputs. Therefore, shorter modelled queues may demonstrate improvement potential rather than inaccuracy.

If queue forcing was not applied, Table 1 shows the 2030 Base assessment of the roundabout without the development in place. Table 2 shows the results of the capacity assessment with Phase 1 and 2 in place.

Tables 1: A534 / Industrial Estate Road / Sandy Lane / Borrass Hall Lane Roundabout Junction – 2030 & 2037 Base

Arm	2030 Base AM Peak		2030 Base PM Peak		2037 Base AM Peak		2037 Base PM	
	RFC	Queue	RFC	Queue	RFC	Queue	RFC	Queue
Borrass Hall Lane	0.29	0	0.04	0	0.33	1	0.04	0
Wrexham Road	0.62	2	0.38	1	0.69	2	0.41	1
Industrial Estate Road	0.25	0	0.81	4	0.26	1	0.86	6
Sandy Lane	0.04	0	0.07	0	0.04	0	0.09	0
A534	0.65	2	0.33	1	0.69	2	0.35	1

Tables 2: A534 / Industrial Estate Road / Sandy Lane / Borrass Hall Lane Roundabout Junction – 2030 & 2037 Base + Development (Sensitivity – No Committed Developments)

Arm	2030 Base + Development (Phase 1) AM Peak [Sensitivity - No Comm Dev]		2030 Base + Development (Phase 1) PM Peak [Sensitivity - No Comm Dev]		2037 Base + Development (Phase 1 & 2) AM Peak [Sensitivity - No Comm Dev]		2037 Base + Development (Phase 1 & 2) PM Peak [Sensitivity - No Comm Dev]	
	RFC	Queue	RFC	Queue	RFC	Queue	RFC	Queue
Borrass Hall Lane	0.34	1	0.04	0	0.49	1	0.06	0
Wrexham Road	0.70	3	0.40	1	0.91	9	0.46	1

Industrial Estate Road	0.29	1	0.88	7	0.37	1	1.02	48
Sandy Lane	0.04	0	0.08	0	0.05	0	0.14	0
A534	0.72	3	0.37	1	0.83	5	0.45	1

For Holt Road / Golf Club roundabout, we note that the design appears to be satisfactory subject to confirming the following query. Confirmation was provided by Cora IHT on 20 February 2026.

Within the modelling though it is noted that the entry radius for this updated layout has increased to 68m, whilst the physical alignment of the radius does not appear to have changed from that presented previously. Clarification is requested on this point.

Internal cycle ways

We note your comments below and at our meeting. However, following various discussions internally within Net World Sports, we're still keen to make the case again for advisory cycle lanes. These were an important part of the original intent and objectives for Utopia City.

In response to your comments, we'd note the following:

- The 7.3m carriageway has been the default standard in the UK for many years. A 7.3m width (2 x 3.65m lanes) generally provides space for a driver to overtake a cyclist without crossing the centre line but does not allow for any safety margin for the comfort and protection of a cyclist. Carriageways with lane widths between 3.2 and 3.9m should therefore be avoided for active travel routes. **On review, Cora IHT consider that this may not be able applicable as we are not providing just a 7.3m carriageway but also a 2m cycle lane on both sides. In addition, there is a 2m footway each side beyond this. This is a good amount of space on the carriageway for HGVs and a generously sized cycle lane. This should be weighed in decision making around whether this is appropriate. There would be contrasting colour surfacing and treatments at junctions, making it clear where the cycle lane starts and the carriageway ends. Whilst the principle behind Utopia City is to promote active travel, we feel there is a distinction between - say – a cycle way in Wrexham Town Centre and a route in an industrial estate setting.**
- In high proportion HGV environments, on-street cycle lanes place cyclists in close proximity to large vehicles, reducing safety margins further. **The Applicant has spoken with cyclist groups in the local area to understand their view on safety and preference. On pavement cycle lanes can be harder to enter / exit due to dropped kerbs and need for change of speed. They also run the risk of being maintained less frequently than the roads, increasing chances of debris impacting them. It also important to consider pedestrian / cyclist interactions, noting the potential for collisions between these groups where cycle paths are on the footway. In addition, we consider that the HGV levels will be lower than that of the main roads surrounding the site. This is a different context to, say, Bryn Lane or Abenbury Way.**
- Traffic flows (irrespective of vehicle composition) are likely to be too high for on street advisory cycle lanes. **The applicant is willing to confirm that the internal estate road will not be adopted to cater for the advisory cycle lanes. If, in the future, the road was to be adopted, NWS would be able to accommodate a cycle track and install this to allow adoption to take place. This would be designed to DE303 Welsh Active Travel Act as set out below with 2x2m footways, 2x2m stepped cycle lanes and 7.3m carriageway.**

We would be grateful to understand whether the above – particular NWS' offer to not seek adoption for the estate road – can mean that the advisory cycle lanes are acceptable.

Internal layout / car parking

We've attached a car parking note which seeks to justify car parking provision for a 'B8' layout (as submitted) and a 'B2' layout. These layouts prepared by SGP can be [accessed here](#).

As discussed, the B2 layout drawing is to demonstrate that relevant units in the detailed phase can accommodate an appropriate amount of car parking versus WCBC's Parking Standards. For completeness, NWS are comfortable that Unit 2 can be restricted solely to a B8 use (subject to amendment / further information being required by the Council). This unit is one of the very large format units within Utopia City and is wholly geared towards B8.

The report covers matters in detail but we think the argument is clear for the majority of units where we can accommodate a high percentage of the parking standard requirements (exceeding this on occasion) for both layouts. We have also set out other factors which we think WCBC can consider to support our justification (including Travel Plans and Active Travel).

There are a couple of smaller units where this hasn't been possible due to their size and adding further car parking would compromise yard operations and therefore the use-ability of the unit themselves. However, even for these units, we still think the amount of car parking is appropriate.

In addition, the B2 and B8 layouts show a turning head solution within the detailed units. This will mean that HGVs do not need to reverse onto the estate road from a minor road in any circumstances.

In summary, we'd be grateful for comments on the above to help move us forward. Subject to agreement / comments, we will produce specific drawings for the detailed element of the planning application including full details on the highway (including cycle lanes) and B2 & B8 layouts etc (plus any updated elevations, if these are needed). These drawings would form part of the determination.

Any questions please let me know.

Thanks,

Andy
Andy Cowan
Associate Partner

Carter Jonas

T: 0161 674 0480 | M: 07776 490276 | carterjonas.co.uk
17 Marble Street, 6th Floor Bloc, Manchester, M2 3AW



This e-mail does not constitute any part of an offer or contract, is confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual(s) to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient be advised that you have received this email in error and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing, or copying of this email is strictly prohibited. There is an increasing risk of cybercrime and fraud including alleged changes to bank details, illegal scams and hacking of emails. We advise you to remain vigilant at all times as we cannot accept liability for any incorrect or intercepted payments. For further information please refer to [our website](#) to review the Cybercrime Alert Notice and our Terms and Conditions. Although the firm operates anti-virus programmes, it does not accept responsibility for any damage whatsoever that is caused by viruses being passed. Carter Jonas LLP is a Limited Liability corporate body which has "Members" and not "Partners". Any representative of Carter Jonas LLP described as "Partner" is a Member or an employee of Carter Jonas LLP and is not a "Partner" in a Partnership. The term Partner has been adopted, with effect from 01 May 2005, because it is an accepted way of referring to senior professionals. We are committed to protecting your personal information and your right to privacy, please see our [Privacy Policy](#).

Carter Jonas LLP
Place of Registration: England and Wales
Registration Number: OC304417
Address of Registered Office: One Chapel Place, London, W1G 0BG.