

Highway Response

Ref: 25/0416

Date: 16/06/25

PROPOSAL: PROPOSED MODIFICATION AND PART RETENTION OF BOUNDARY TREATMENTS TO EXISTING CAR PARK

SITE: 13 Car Park at Rear Clytha Park Road Newport NP20 4PB

Case Officer: Marnie Ostler

Highway Officer: Kevin Jackson

Highway recommendation:

Further information/amendment requested.

Highway Comments:

The existing fence obstructs visibility between emerging cars and passing vehicles and pedestrians. The application appears to be intended to remedy this, however it shows a lack of understanding of the issues.

A covering letter explains the perceived need for the fence, however the reasons presented do not outweigh public safety. Whilst the need for security is recognised the 1000mm gate and fence would not prevent access any more than a 600mm fence. Presumably, secondary barriers including the cctv etc are to be relied upon. Indeed, it could be argued that greater surveillance could be helpful. However, the focus of these comments is highway safety not security.

It is difficult to determine from the elevations precisely where the fence is lowered in relation to the footway crossing (dropped kerbs). A proposed site plan (including a key to the elevational drawing locations) would be helpful but does not appear to be available.

At the same time as amending the fence detail, the proposal appears to introduce a gate at the back of highway. This is not supported as it prevents vehicles entering the site without obstruction of other vehicles and pedestrians. Any gate would have to be set back 5m behind back of footway to garner highways' support. This would require the internal layout to be amended.

The required visibility splays have not been correctly identified. They are 2.4x 25m and 2m x 2m at 600mm height to both sides of the access.

It appears that the proposals are intended to provide 2.4 by 22m in one direction only at a height of 1000mm. This is not appropriate; it must be adjusted for bonnet length and applied to both sides. However, the main concern here is not vehicular splays, but pedestrian intervisibility.

The 2x2m at 600mm is for pedestrian safety and when it is achieved the vehicular inter-visibility will be adequate, but is obstructed by parked vehicles anyway.

In conclusion the submission does not demonstrate the pedestrian or vehicular visibility splays required and therefore would raise an objection. The gate raises additional safety concerns.