

Highway Response

Ref: RECON 24/0278

Date: 22/11/24

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:

Further information/clarification requested.

Highway Comments:

Further to receipt of additional information, we would update our comments as follows.

We note that the proposal now excludes the jetwash facilities, but these are still included in the description. We assume this is a detail that can be addressed with a new description.

We accept that the amended proposals are closer to the extant use, but do not consider them to be the same offer in terms of scale.

It is noted that additional parking is now proposed, and electric vehicle charging (EVC) is retained. The applicant suggests this would be used by drivers using the retail, but the shop is unlikely to have sufficient offer to keep shoppers for 20/30 mins (applicant's estimate of charging time). Therefore, we still maintain this is more akin to a pump than a parking space (albeit much slower to fill up). It doesn't raise serious concerns but is not accepted as parking and may result in additional parking/waiting.

The retail element appears to be less than 200sqm and therefore required to have (168/60) 3 spaces. These are provided and include a disability space. In addition, a commercial space and a tanker space is required. These could potentially be the same space, subject to a servicing plan condition, but no service area has been identified.

The applicant suggests that servicing agreement could be conditioned, and deliveries/service times conditioned on an "if possible" basis. Clearly this is meaningless and allows servicing at will. Even a properly worded condition is not supported or considered robust. We would however (in the spirit of pragmatism) welcome proposals to manage all deliveries. This would have to be agreed prior to determination to ensure a full understanding of the requirements by both parties and to avoid conditions that can't be discharged.

The servicing issue persists as the swept path assessments still only show a tanker driving through the PFS and not stopping. It would block an aisle and impact queues/throughput. As there is apparently insufficient space for HGVs to stop without potential impact on incoming vehicles and intervisibility between passing pedestrians (on highway) and emerging vehicles, we would request further detail to avoid an objection on highway safety grounds.

We note that the tanks would be centrally positioned, but still do not know where the fillers would be.

The additional information suggests that additional cycle provision could be provided and reluctantly enclosed. This should be secured by way of condition.

The amended plans should be supported with visibility splay diagrams to demonstrate highway safety is duly considered. In addition, we are unable to locate the detail of the access proposals. All site drawings simply refer to detail that doesn't appear to be provided. Existing and proposed highway drawings are needed for comparison to enable a thorough assessment of the safety implications.

It is clear that the proposals would impact on the island adjacent to the access; the position of the control (stop) line and the advanced cycle reservoir. There would also be safety implications for drivers turning right out of the PFS but needing to join the nearside lane for their onward journey.

Much more detail is needed to be confident that the changes are acceptable. As previously stated, a safety audit (RSA1) would be needed to support the application. Additional audits would form part of the s278 process, and the applicant would be expected to provide all highway works at no cost to the authority.

In summary, Highways would raise a holding objection pending more information as the submission fails to demonstrate that there would be an acceptable impact on highway safety.