

Highway Response

Ref: 24/0678

Date: 30/08/24

PROPOSAL: PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF 42 NO. DWELLINGS, LANDSCAPE PLANTING AND ASSOCIATED WORKS

SITE: Monbank Development Site Cardiff Road Newport South Wales

Case Officer: Joanne Davidson

Highway Officer: Kevin Jackson

Highway Recommendation:

Further/more current information requested, but multiple objections likely on highway safety, servicing and parking policy grounds.

Highway Comments:

The Transport Statement is marked as “draft” and describes a different proposal. It contains a lot of information relating to the 2011 census which does not help to plan for current or future car ownership. Any reliance on historic data should identify trends and not assume that the situation will remain static for 20 years or that new residents of new houses will be the same demographic as existing.

Personal injury collision data is presented to 2022, presumably because it is sourced from Crash-map. More up to date information should be presented. Stats 19 data should be available to 2023.

The swept paths are based on 4.7m cars; 8m vans; and 9m refuse collection vehicles (RCVs) which are not informative. Appropriate vehicle sizes are 5m for cars and 10/12m commercial vehicles. Whilst the waste policy suggests smaller RCVs 11.5m RCVs are in common use and should be accommodated in new developments for the sake of efficiency and “eco-friendliness”. The size used does not represent the larger delivery vehicles either, which must be able to access and egress safely. (This is not the same as designing for them and does not prevent “placemaking”). The swept path assessments do not complement the waste management proposals. Furthermore, they are not presented clearly and there is no plan to show where each assessment is.

It appears likely that several areas cannot be serviced satisfactorily even with the small vehicles assumed to operate.

An updated/amended TS is requested, but the rest of this commentary is based on the submitted site plan. Examples of issues are given but may not be exhaustive. To garner Highways’ support a number of amendments will be needed.

General comments

The site is considered suitable for the proposed use and sufficiently accessible by non-car modes. A sustainability assessment is however required to support a reduction in parking provision. (refer to Appendix 5 of parking standards for parameters) In addition, an assessment of available on-street parking would be helpful. (Not a survey, just consideration of how much street parking is available, and where people will park in practice, with particular attention paid to cul-de-sacs and shared areas.

At this stage we have not checked the individual parking allocations, not least because amendments are anticipated, but it is clear that provision is low and likely to be problematic as safe on-street parking is almost nil.

Links to the existing cycle track should be provided, to capitalise on the infrastructure available. As a minimum we would expect to see a pedestrian/cycle connection in the vicinity of units 28/30.

The submission states that the access will be taken from Capel Dewi Hall Road and Abberley Hall Road and assumes these are adopted highway. Current information indicates that they are not adopted. Whilst the process may be on-going we are unable to guarantee that they will be adopted. At this stage there are no known obstacles to adoption, but the pace/completion is at Redrow’s discretion.

The proposed roads cannot be adopted until or unless the access roads are adopted. A management/maintenance condition is therefore likely to be appropriate.

The scale of the development and number of access points is acceptable, and no junction capacity issues are anticipated. However, some junctions are not designed to adoptable standards.

Visibility splays that are shown do not relate to the posted speed limits and are not constructed or annotated correctly. The areas shaded do not represent the splays and no tangential sight lines are shown.

Proposed GA LT2402.04.01 Rev P1

Area accessed via Capel Dewi Hall Road

The smaller area has 12 units proposed and the plan is annotated as access to be to adoptable standards with 2m footways. However, this appears to be no more than the existing stub. Even this has no provision for pedestrians to transition to the shared surface. Most of the internal area is too narrow and shows no consideration for pedestrians, service vehicles or disabled users. Visitor parking is at one end and likely to be used by residents. We would anticipate parking along the frontages, exacerbating the existing servicing issues.

Only small vehicles can turn within the site, therefore most service vehicles will have to reverse excessively, raising highway safety issues and objections. The refuse collection area should be adjacent to adopted highway.

There are no visibility splays demonstrated, and their provision would impact in terms of areas to be adopted and landscaping, because the access is on the inside of a bend. 2.4 by 25m splays should be demonstrated and protected.

Roads serving more than 5 units would be expected to be offered for adoption, assuming the roads serving them are eventually adopted, but should be designed to adoptable standards anyway for public safety.

Area accessed via Abberley Hall Road

Units 1-12

Visibility for emerging vehicles appears to be adequate. The turning head appears too small for RCVs and other commercial vehicles likely to visit, resulting in excessive HGV reversing and an objection on grounds of highway safety. As elsewhere there does not appear to be sufficient space for on-street parking which is likely to occur due to the location of the visitor parking, position of units 7 and 12 and generally low provision. Again, this will exacerbate servicing difficulties, even for small delivery vehicles.

Refuse collection areas should be provided adjacent to highway, or will not be used properly and bins will remain on (the already sub-standard) footway, causing obstruction and safety hazards.

The footway on the south (busier) side is sub-standard and the link is therefore unlikely to be adopted. Furthermore, extensive lengths of dropped crossings cannot be supported due to the impacts on street parking and disabled highway users.

Cycle provision for the flats does not appear to be of sufficient scale. Whilst the finer detail can be addressed via conditions the position and scale should be addressed prior to determination (to ensure that conditions can be discharged).

Access to the rear of units 5 & 6 is not of sufficient quality. It has narrow access past #6's parking and no path in garden 5 or room to manoeuvre a cycle at the corner. Similarly access to the bins and bikes for units 8 – 11 (and 13) is not of an acceptable standard. This raises issues with cycle/accessibility and servicing policies and potential objections.

Units 13 to 18

To access or pass this access road, pedestrians must walk out into the main carriageway of Abberley on a tight bend which does not appear to have sufficient forward visibility to start with. This raises a strong safety objection. The footways must return into the minor arm and allow pedestrians safe passage across or into the street.

It is not clear what width the access is, but it is obviously too narrow for cars and pedestrians to use safely. Given the geometry it would be necessary provide additional width for opposing cars and footway as far as parking space 14 as a minimum.

Again, there is no meaningful turning head and vehicles would have to reverse excessively from Abberley. Given the bend, distances involved and geometry of the access, we would object on grounds of all road user types' safety and lack of servicing provision.

There is no consideration of where vehicles would park; or pedestrians / disabled road users' needs. The access serves 5 units and should be designed to adoptable standards.

Units 19 to 22 & 27-30

Parking for 19 and 22 will occur on corners and junctions, raising safety and servicing issues.

Carriageway and footway dimensions are appropriate, and servicing appears practical (but swept path analysis is requested to confirm (and on-street parking will impede it)).

Access to the rear of 19 appears to be far from ideal, being too far and too narrow/difficult to negotiate with bikes and bins.

Unit 30 appears to be a large unit with only one parking space, which would not be adequate.

Units 20, 21 and 23 have parking allocations that are not observable or convenient so they will not be used, and parking will occur on bends and junctions, raising safety issues/objections.

Units 24 to 26

Unit 25 has poor rear access and all have only one parking space, but some opportunity for on-street parking at least.

No comments are provided relating to the other plans as amendments will be needed to secure Highways' support/avoid objections.

In summary there are a number of issues that would raise objections already and further information is requested that may result in further objections.