

Highway Response

Ref: RECON 26/0218

Date: 15/05/26

PROPOSAL: PARTIAL DISCHARGE OF CONDITIONS 2 (CEMP), 3 (TREE PROTECTION PLAN) AND 4 (GROUND CONTAMINATION) OF PLANNING PERMISSION 25/0700 RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT INCLUDING THE ERECTION OF 32NO UNITS, ACCESS, CAR PARKING, ENGINEERING, LANDSCAPING AND ASSOCIATED WORKS

SITE: Land Formerly Known as The Open Hearth Hendre Farm Drive Newport South Wales

Case Officer: Geraint Roberts

Highway Officer: Kevin Jackson

Following receipt of amended documents, we would update our comments as follows.

The CEMP is still called "issue 1 but now dated 30/04/26)

Highway recommendation:

2 (CEMP): Recommend No discharge.

3 (TREE PROTECTION PLAN): No comment.

4 (GROUND CONTAMINATION): No comment.

Highway Comments:

2 (CEMP): Recommend No discharge.

The CEMP states it may be subject to change prior to commencement. Any changes following approval would require LA approval or there would be no point to the document. Furthermore, it talks about non-compliance measures. Non-compliance may result in enforcement notices.

At 5.5.1 the CEMP states that a Traffic Management Plan has been issued to the client for approval. This is a key component of the CEMP, so it should be confirmed if the routing is approved and further information is still required to identify vehicle types and volumes by phase.

The phasing is still not clear. The only information appears to be overall timescales (90 weeks) and maximum "workflow 46". This appears to be the number of personnel on site at the peak. Presumably this indicates peak parking. The area indicated on site for parking is sufficient for around 18 vehicles. Phasing information would help to identify if additional space would be available.

It is necessary to understand what else is available at this stage and the likely impact of HGVs etc.. This has not been addressed. We note an intention to try to negotiate parking in private areas, but the fall-back plan displaces the materials storage area and is inadequate.

The document suggests that HGVs the size of RCVs (10 to 12m long) will service the site. It is likely longer vehicles will also visit for example steel and plant deliveries, which do not appear to have been considered. The plans suggest that these (rigids) can turn within the northern part of the site. There is reference to swept paths, but none provided and it was established at planning stage that only small vans could turn in the area indicated.

Furthermore, the document suggests there is only a need for one haul road (if parking needed on site). So, the turning area does not have any road as such and there is no wheel wash available for vehicles exiting this area.

Similar issue need to be addressed for the southern part where vehicles are shown to be moving forward in both directions without identifying any turning areas. Also loading bays do not appear to relate to storage areas.

We note that the CEMP includes a section dedicated to securing the necessary permits/licences. It should be noted that these works would require temporary closure of highway, working in highway and potentially others. The contractors must secure these prior to works commencing and note that they are not quick processes.

It should be noted that the site is on the walking route to the adjacent school. HGV movements, delivery hours and parking should take account of this to ensure pedestrian safety.

In conclusion the CEMP lacks sufficient detail to be effective or approved.