

Highway Response

Ref: 24/0278

Date: 15/04/24

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

Highway recommendation:

Objection on grounds of highway safety and efficiency as well as lack of information/assessment and inadequate car and cycle parking or servicing provision.

Highway Comments:

It is understood that the proposals are similar to the previous use, however the assessment lacks sufficient detail to identify or address a number of issues. It should be noted that the location is practically within a major junction on a classified road. Apart from the safety implications the highway authority has obligations to ensure there are no undue delays.

It is important to note that the original petrol station (PFS) has been closed for a long time. Not only has background traffic increased significantly, but the offer of a PFS is very different and the trip generation is therefore different.

The Supporting documents presented brief detail of collisions occurring during the last 3 years (of available data). This is not informative.

We would expect 5 years' data and it should be complete with plans and descriptions of the collisions and causal factors. It should however be noted that this must be sourced from the Council's safety team to be up to date. That said, given that the PFS has been closed for around 20 years current collision data would still not be informative.

Current data would not take account of any movements in or out of this site or the adjacent one (which is expected to come into use soon). Old data would be based on massively underestimated traffic flows for the classified road in particular. It is clear that historical data cannot be relied upon to identify the safety issues presented by this proposal.

A cursory review of Crash map (only because it is the only source readily available) makes it clear that collision rates have been significantly higher when (presumably) the PFS was open, but background network flows were probably around half of what they are now.

The level of trip generation/diversion associated with the development has not been scrutinised by Highways, but it is clearly sufficient to require the access to conform with minimum separation distances and right turn lane requirements.

Highways do not consider that the access /junction/ pedestrians would interact safely. However, the applicant is welcome to submit a more considered safety assessment including an independent road safety audit to support the application.

They should note that for all intents and purposes the access is new, and the proposals would represent intensification of use, even if the PFS was still in operation. The application should include visibility splays and (if proposed) markings, signage and one-way operational proposals.

The TS suggests that trip generation would be in the order of 128 movements during the peak hour and dismisses this as low/insignificant. We however consider that it would cause significant delays and confusion, with inherent safety implications, due to its proximity to the signal control lines/junction. The majority of customers would need to turn right-out and this would not be possible due to queuing at the control line and conflicting movements from all directions.

The newly consented adjacent car hire is likely to add to the confusion with additional movements in the same area.

Even assuming one-way operation highways do not consider that the layout would work in terms of right turn in and out (in from the east bound arm of Cardiff Road). These would be heavily conflicted and result in confusion, collisions and delays. Similar issues would be expected for several other approaches.

In addition, the TS should consider the potential impacts of queuing within the site. In addition to a volume assessment of the through put of vehicles and pump use (taking note of the longer dwell times at the pump due to shopping or queuing at the check-out with shoppers). This should also consider how the PFS would operate with tankers and other delivery /collection vehicles present.

Servicing has not been properly addressed and loading areas have not been identified. A swept path has been provided for a tanker, however it does not show where it would have to stop and how much obstruction that would cause. In any event it shows that the manoeuvre is too tight and cannot be accomplished when cars are at the pumps. It also indicates that it would egress at an angle that does not allow proper visibility of vehicles or pedestrians. Based on this we would raise a further objection on highway safety and efficiency grounds. This could easily impact every arm of the junction.

A swept path for a 10m HGV has also been provided. A retail unit of this size would need to support a 12m HGV as a minimum. Again, there is no identified loading area or assessment of its impact on customers/ other highway users. Further assessment/information is needed for all servicing needs, which should consider the location of tank fillers and refuse stores.

Further detail of the changes to the access should be provided and should detail tactiles, visibility splays etc. whilst making it clear how radii and locations have been changed.

With respect to the internal arrangements, it is suggested that there are 5 parking spaces. These are not shown on the plans and not accepted. It appears that there is one standard space and one disability space only. We would not accept the electric vehicle charging (EVC) space as parking.

EVC provision is more akin to an additional pump in this situation. It should be considered as a trip generator/divertor, as should multiple car wash facilities.

It should also be noted that the on-site supermarket is not really comparable to a kiosk that would've been here 20 years ago and just ancillary to the PFS. That too is capable of generating / diverting trips

to the development (which is why there is a parking requirement, that does not appear to be met, resulting in potential for longer dwell times at the pumps and queuing back to highway).

Any queues for the car washes/tokens etc. would also obstruct parking/movement accentuating the issues. Swept paths for large panel vans should be provided for this area, to ensure that it would be practical and safe.

The submission makes reference to cycle parking for staff, however what is proposed is considered poor even for visitors. Staff require secure, fully weatherproofed cycle storage with natural surveillance. This must be separate from visitor parking which only needs a shelter and Sheffield style racks.

Details of pedestrian routes within the site should also be provided, to ensure safe operation, as it is likely that some shoppers would visit on foot.

At this stage we would raise a number of objections relating to highway safety and progress, as well as servicing, parking and cycle provision within the site.