

Highway Response

Ref: RECON 25/0152

Date: 22/06/26

PROPOSAL: RESERVED MATTERS APPLICATION RELATING TO LAYOUT, SCALE, APPEARANCE, ACCESS AND LANDSCAPING FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AT PHASE 4E/4G PURSUANT TO OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION 06/0471 FOR A MIXED USE REGENERATION OF THE FORMER LLANWERN STEELWORKS AND PARTIAL DISCHARGE OF CONDITIONS 01 (RESERVED MATTERS), 06 (RECREATIONAL AREAS), 08 (MATERIALS), 09 (DETAILS OF HARD LANDSCAPED ACCESS), 10 (BOUNDARY TREATMENTS), 11 (MANAGEMENT STRATEGY FOR MAINTENANCE OF OPEN SPACE), 12 (OFF STREET PARKING AND CYCLE PARKING), 15 (EMERGENCY ACCESS), 16 (DETAILS OF ROADS/CYCLEWAYS/FOOTWAYS), 18 (ESTATE ROADS), 22 (STREET LIGHTING AND CAR PARKING AREAS), 24 (SITE LEVELS), 33 (SURFACE WATER DISPOSAL, 34 (FOUL AND SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE), 39 (SUSTAINABILITY STATEMENT) AND 43 (FIRE FIGHTING ACCESS)

SITE: Glan Llyn Development Site Phase 4E/4G Queensway Llanwern Newport South Wales

Case Officer: Geraint Roberts

Highway Officer: Kevin Jackson

Highway recommendation:

Maintained objection.

Highway Comments:

The latest Swept path assessments show RCVs entering cul de sacs and leaving again. A separate plan shows how they turn. The heads are tight with body parts oversailing footway in some areas, however this is the largest vehicle that could be expected, therefore it does not raise any objection in this respect.

Some cars are shown parked on the plans and the HGV/RCV negotiates these, however the cars would be parked at the entrances to houses in reality not in convenient locations. The plans do however demonstrate a suitable width for the roads.

Houses fronting onto service roads adjacent to Main Road have not been considered. The service roads do not work for any large commercial vehicles and there is no strategy for refuse collection. Roadside collection would not be appropriate or practical here.

Unless it can be shown that RCVs can negotiate the streets safely, we would need to see collection points for those living in these houses.

These areas have only been tracked for a large van. It may be sufficient for grocery deliveries or those that take a van home. However, this does not cover their servicing needs fully. As previously commented, we would expect a 10m van to be able to negotiate these areas as a minimum (with difficulty perhaps).

The engineering drawings do not appear to show any sprinkler mains. This is not necessarily an issue for highways, however the developer should note that if any such apparatus is located under roads they will not be eligible for adoption.

The s38 drawing can not be approved at planning stage. This requires technical approval at a later stage. We note however that it shows patches of block paving (visitor parking indicated on carriageway) which would not be accepted. The use of blocks on bends with vertical deflection may also be challenged. This is not a suitable speed control.

Similarly street lighting and kerb details are matters for s38 agreements, but the plan appears to provide lighting in all the necessary areas. Additional detail of kerbing changes along Main Road will be needed at s38 technical approval. Cesses that serve multiple house should have a bell-mouth with radius kerbs and tactile paving.

Long sections show no inappropriate gradients, but again would be considered in greater detail at s38 stage.

Forward visibility requirements appear to encroach on plot 131. This could be acceptable subject to removal of permitted development rights.

The shared drive adjacent to 179 should show visibility to the right as far as the junction, but there does not appear to be an issue.

The key remaining concerns are around servicing of cul de sacs and service roads.

