

Highway Response

Ref: 26/0261

Date: 30/04/26

PROPOSAL: OUTLINE APPLICATION (APPROVAL SOUGHT FOR ACCESS AND LAYOUT) FOR REPAIRS AND PARTIAL REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING BRIDGE OVER RIVER EBBW TO FACILITATE SINGLE LANE TRAFFIC

SITE: Bridge Over Ebbw River Forge Mews Bassaleg Newport NP10 8NE

Case Officer: Grant Hawkins

Highway Officer: Kevin Jackson

Highway recommendation:

Recommend refusal as the application is not supported by sufficient information to demonstrate that the proposed development will not be prejudicial to the satisfactory functioning of the highway network.

Highway Comments:

The proposed plans are unclear as they appear to show a different arrangement to the description found in the Design and Access Statement. Furthermore, there were no "existing plans" found.

The application makes reference to dismantling the existing bridge and providing a 4m carriageway with a 3m footway. The "proposed plans" appear to show the bridge retained and a 4m carriageway with 2m footways on both sides atop of it.

It is not clear how pedestrian access is maintained during dismantling and construction or how pedestrians are segregated when the bridge is commissioned. No detail of surfacing or kerbs has been found.

The plan does not show how the bridge relates to the approach road, yet it is significantly narrower than the existing highway. In particular, detail of how traffic (including pedestrians) is guided onto the bridge is needed. It is not clear what level the bridge will be relative to the existing highway and how vehicles / pedestrians transition from highway to deck level.

Furthermore, the 4m carriageway is not sufficient for two-way traffic and some form of traffic management would be needed. There is no detail of this.

The proposed bridge interrupts the cycle route that has been established along this alignment and makes no provision for cyclists. Details of route, tactiles and marking should be provided to ensure cyclists are appropriately catered for.

It is assumed that the applicant does not intend to undertake any works, but for completeness, they should note that it is an offence to carry out any works within the public highway without permission of the Highway Authority. The grant of planning permission would require the applicant to enter into a S278 Agreement with the Council as Highway Authority. This process is independent of planning and requires technical approval of all details, so planning permission is not sufficient to ensure that the bridge can be built.

Whilst it is appreciated that the bridge is out of use for vehicles, the key issue for Highways is public safety and the applicant would need to demonstrate that the proposals could be used safely.

In summary, the proposals appear to be incomplete and therefore Highways can only recommend refusal at this point.