

Highway Response

Ref: RECON 24/0782

Date: 24/04/25

PROPOSAL: RESERVED MATTERS (CONDITION 01) FOR PROPOSED RETAIL STORE, NURSERY (D1) AND 3NO. C COMMERCIAL UNITS AND ASSOCIATED WORKS IN LOCAL CENTRE AND PARTIAL DISCHARGE OF CONDITIONS 07 (LANDSCAPING), 08 (MATERIALS/FINISHES TO EXTERNAL SURFACES), 9 (MATERIALS/FINISHES FOR HARD LANDSCAPED AREAS), 10 (BOUNDARY TREATMENTS), 12 (PARKING), 15 (EMERGENCY ACCESS), 16 (ROADS, CYCLEWAYS AND FOOTWAYS), 17 (GREEN TRAVEL STRATEGY), 19 (NOISE ASSESSMENT), 22 (LIGHTING), 23 (ECOLOGICAL MANAGEMENT PLAN), 24 (SITE LEVELS), 27 (GROUND CONDITIONS), 28 (VERIFICATION REPORT), 32 (PILING WORKS), 33 (SURFACE WATER), 34 (FOUL AND SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE AND STORAGE) AND 39 (CARBON REDUCTION STRATEGY) RELATING TO OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION 06/0471 FOR REDEVELOPMENT OF SITE TO CREATE A MIXED USE URBAN EXTENSION

SITE: Land West Of 1 Kings Wall Drive Newport South Wales

Case Officer: Geraint Roberts

Highway Officer: Kevin Jackson

Highway Comments:

Following receipt of amended plans (P400 Rev P) and additional information (TN06), we would update our comments as follows. The reference numbers below relate to TN06 sections for ease.

1. It has now been established via other sources, that bus stops are planned which are closer than those originally relied upon in earlier assessments. The issue is therefore satisfactorily addressed.
2. The access points and pedestrian routes now cater for all desire lines.

However, the pedestrians are still in conflict with reversing HGVs. It is suggested that driver training addresses the issue, but most of the issue is lack of public understanding or training. It is well documented that the majority of HGV collisions occur in reverse (when adjusted for mileage). The HSE and other professional bodies have gone to great lengths to help hauliers manage the risk, but it can only be controlled where the public are excluded.

The frequency of movements is not relevant as it only needs one truck and one pedestrian. It is not reasonable to suggest that there is no risk as HGV and pedestrian collisions occur and are on record.

The conclusion at point 6 is not considered relevant as a combined service yard would only have forward movements.

The approved masterplan does make reference to servicing through the car park but explicitly states that deliveries would be "subject to a management strategy to ensure that deliveries do not conflict with pedestrian and car traffic" (section 8).

For the avoidance of doubt, it is reversing that causes concern. Where HGVs are moving in forward gear the risk is considered manageable as they have much better visibility of the area.

There has been some discussion of out of hours servicing and other management measures, but without these the proposals still raise an objection on grounds of pedestrian safety.

3. Changes to the layout and additional swept path assessments are noted and there appears to be adequate space for servicing, although some paths are based on excessive reversing. This issue is considered to be adequately addressed.

In conclusion the key issue remaining is servicing of the main store. As the developer is adamant that the layout will not be amended the only possible mitigation would be management of the deliveries. Highways would be content to agree out of hours deliveries or store based banksmen but would maintain an objection to HGVs reversing unaided across what is possibly the busiest pedestrian route.