

Highway Response

Ref: RECON 24/0278

Date: 28/02/25

PROPOSAL: DEMOLITION OF EXISTING PETROL FILLING STATION AND CAR WASH, AND CONSTRUCTION OF A REPLACEMENT PETROL FILLING STATION, INCLUDING A NEW KIOSK BUILDING, 4 PUMP ISLANDS, FORECOURT CANOPY, 2 NO. JET WASH BAYS, LANDSCAPING AND CAR PARKING ARRANGEMENTS

SITE: 71 Cardiff Road Newport NP20 2EN

Case Officer: Jacob Cooke

Highway Officer: Kevin Jackson

Following receipt of an amended proposal and applicant's comments accompanied by an RSA1 we would update our comments as follows.

Highway recommendation:

Objections maintained on grounds of highway safety.

Highway Comments:

The additional information includes a servicing plan. This does not provide sufficient commitment and suggests that it is a living document that can be reviewed and changed at any time. This is clearly of no value. Whilst review and amendment is acceptable, it must be clear that it can only be varied with the written prior agreement of the planning authority.

In terms of the detail, it relies on night-time tanker deliveries and management of other vehicles on site. The site would be closed for at least 45mins for tanker deliveries which are expected twice a week. We would therefore require all tanker deliveries to be between 8pm and 6am and ideally this should be outside of trading hours. A condition to this effect would be recommended.

The smaller vehicles are less problematic, however fresh deliveries are likely to coincide. It is accepted however that they would arrive outside of peak times naturally and could find space to park if they coincide. It is not considered realistic to assume they would have a dwell time of 10minutes, but they are not expected to take as long as the tanker refill operation.

Cycle parking has been proposed but is not suitable for long stay (staff) parking. This should be more secure and fully weatherproof. This could be conditioned.

As anticipated the road safety audit has identified multiple overlapping safety issues. The designer's response is to accept that right turn in or out should not be allowed and to remove the right turn lane ahead of the signals. The plans /narrative do not however show how this is achieved.

Only a relatively small percentage of patrons will be turning left in and left out. There is nothing proposed to stop them or service vehicles making right turn manoeuvres. Indeed, the access /egress points have been further widened, which encourages abuse and is prejudicial to pedestrian safety. Should visitors observe the no right turn then they would have to make U turns nearby, raising further safety concerns.

In terms of visibility splays the plans only show vehicular splays to the right (on exit). There are no physical constraints to prevent vehicles approaching from the left. Full visibility is therefore required to be demonstrated.

In addition, we would raise concerns regarding the highway approach angle for tankers exiting the site. HGV already have difficulty with limited visibility (even ahead). We cannot support these leaving at an acute angle for reasons of highway safety, particularly pedestrian safety.

Whilst it is noted that some positive amendments have been made, we would maintain the overall objection on grounds of highway safety.