

Cooke, Jacob (Senior Planning Officer)

From: Cooke, Jacob (Senior Planning Officer)
Sent: 02 December 2025 12:33
To: Cooke, Jacob (Senior Planning Officer)
Subject: FW: 25/0861 - 11 Pentre Tai Road, Rhiwderin

From: Jackson, Kevin (Traffic Transport & Development Engineer) <Kevin.Jackson@newport.gov.uk>
Sent: 28 November 2025 17:23
To: Cooke, Jacob (Senior Planning Officer) <Jacob.Cooke@newport.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: 25/0861 - 11 Pentre Tai Road, Rhiwderin

Hi Jacob

I have commented on the letter below using the same headings for ease of reference.

Orientation of the driveway

Firstly the swept path assessments should be based on the current plans. Apologies if we have the wrong plan but they do not accord with PL04B which we believe to be the current proposals. The GA shows a landscaping area which reduces the overall depth behind the spaces. This depth should be a minimum of a 6m wide aisle based on MfS guidance, however we would suggest more is warranted where there is no clear aisle and space is constrained by walls etc. Whilst the assessments show that the manoeuvre is possible (albeit that residents could have a bigger car and the one used appears to hit the wall) it would clearly be difficult (more so than indicated) and we simply do not accept that this represents the driver behaviour we are likely to see.

The width of the access is based on the manoeuvre in and that means it accommodates making the same manoeuvre in the reverse direction. Whilst we would hope they would reverse in this is statistically unlikely and they are most likely to reverse out to their left. Either way the angle of approach is demonstrated by the swept path in. For clarity we are looking at the left in manoeuvre into the space closest to the highway.

As previously stated we are looking for approach angles close to 90degrees. This can be achieved by any means, but is necessary for drivers to be able to comfortably and reliably make the observations they should. We do not consider that the parking bay must be perpendicular to highway just the exiting car. Where this is dictated by the layout arrangements similar to the proposal would be accepted.

We do not rely on MfS to dictate every detail. Clearly the documents (MfS 1 and 2) have a limited scope. The principle was accepted in highway design before MfS was ever written.

Our comments are tempered with how drivers behaviour not just what is just about possible. Where they perceive it is easier to reverse into the highway (because there's more space) they will.

Reference to "extensive" parking areas

As set out above there is no meaningful manoeuvring space or any requirement to provide any. It is all likely to be used for parking.

Pedestrian safety and pedestrian visibility

We do not appear to have an updated plan showing the pedestrian visibility splays but accept they can be achieved with appropriate planting. A landscaping condition and a visibility condition would be appropriate

The existing lawful situation

As set out above we do not expect any change in terms of reversing and therefore do not accept that there is a material improvement or that the fallback position provides any support for the proposals. We would reiterate that the proposal is less safe in practice.

Comparisons with other local garages

The adjacent garages all appear to present vehicles at an acceptable angle. There are other properties nearby with access arrangements that would raise objections for various reasons but they do not set any precedent

Traffic volumes

We consider the comments represent a balanced assessment. We are not asking for any difficult or expensive amendments, just keep it simple. If the road was a classified one we would ask for the turning area, but we do not consider it is essential or adequate in this case.

Footway crossing

These comments were advice continued from the pre-app. They are governed by separate legislation and were not presented as grounds for refusal so this just appears to be a misunderstanding. The only relevant point would be that it should not be any wider than needed and the developer would need to action it if the development is approved.

Conclusion

We would conclude that the proposals are not policy compliant and would operate less safely than the existing situation.