

Highway Response

Ref: 25/0152

Date: 05/01/26

PROPOSAL: RESERVED MATTERS APPLICATION RELATING TO LAYOUT, SCALE, APPEARANCE, ACCESS AND LANDSCAPING FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AT PHASE4E/4G PURSUANT TO OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION 06/0471 FOR A MIXED USE REGENERATION OF THE FORMER LLANWERN STEELWORKS AND PARTIAL DISCHARGE OF CONDITIONS 01 (RESERVED MATTERS), 06 (RECREATIONAL AREAS), 08 (MATERIALS), 09 (DETAILS OF HARD LANDSCAPED ACCESS), 10 (BOUNDARY TREATMENTS), 11 (MANAGEMENT STRATEGY FOR MAINTENANCE OF OPEN SPACE), 12 (OFF STREET PARKING AND CYCLE PARKING), 15 (EMERGENCY ACCESS), 16 (DETAILS OF ROADS/CYCLEWAYS/FOOTWAYS), 18 (ESTATE ROADS), 22 (STREET LIGHTING AND CAR PARKING AREAS), 24 (SITE LEVELS), 33 & 34 (FOUL AND SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE), 39 (SUSTAINABILITY STATEMENT) AND 43 (FIRE FIGHTING ACCESS)

SITE: Glan Llyn Development Site Phase 4E/4G Queensway Llanwern Newport South Wales

Case Officer: Geraint Roberts

Highway Officer: Kevin Jackson

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

Highway recommendation:

Objection on grounds relating to highway safety and sustainability policies.

Highway Comments:

For ease of reference the following comments consider each drawing separately. All impacts would however have cumulative effects. Where no updated drawing has been found the comments remain as previously issued.

Vehicle Tracking 24519-C-008E -no updated drawing found – original comments below

- Vehicles indicated include a 12m refuse collection vehicle.
- The plan only shows selected junctions, and these vehicles must access refuse for all units, and others up to a similar size will need access to all areas, albeit less frequently to deliver bulky items. Therefore, further assessments are needed, and these should include details of refuse collection areas for all inaccessible and unadoptable areas and must show that HGVs can turn around with minimal reversing distances.
- The analysis takes no note of the assumed parking on street, which will probably make some areas impossible.
- Inaccessible private drives also include various dwellings accessed directly from the distributor road and these do not have turning heads. This results in a need for all commercial vehicles (not just HGVs) to reverse in/out from the distributor road which is not acceptable.

Pump Tracking 24519-C-021-D (amended layout)

- The vehicle used is from DB32 which has been withdrawn for some time, and this is a small vehicle for the purposes of this assessment. Appliances typically range from around 8.2m to 10.4m.
- For the most part the refuse vehicle assessment shows that a larger vehicle can reach most adopted areas. The appliances will enter private drives if necessary.
- From a highways' perspective we would expect the plans to show that vehicles can get within 40m of any part of a building. However, this can be addressed through building regulations and a lot of the distances shown could be reduced by moving the vehicle along.

Private Parking Tracking Plan 24519-C-022-E (updated site layout)

- The assessment now uses a 4.9m car when the average is 4.4m, popular vehicles such as SUVs are around 4.7m and the largest are over 5m. Which provides for a robust assessment vehicle. However, there are cars colliding with walls etc.
- Examples include 205, 188, 186 and 160 and 34 but some of these may be ok with correct manoeuvres or an extra shunt.
- Parking for 146, 167/8 results in similar issues but is of greater concern as they are adjacent to an under-croft access and local distributor road. In addition, there is only one space for 146 and 147/8 have remote rear courtyard parking.
- 136 manoeuvres are not shown and would logically reverse into the area leading into rear access for 126/7 and potentially others resulting in excessive reversing and potential conflict with pedestrians.
- The spaces for 154 obstruct access to the rear of 152/3 this results in an acceptable detour without a continuous path for bins/cycle storage etc.. Bins and bikes have to squeeze past parking for 150 and the trees in the area compound the issues.

- The cumulative impacts of difficult access, remote spaces and lack of spaces and lack of safe/convenient pedestrian routes raises a likelihood of parking /stopping and reversing on the distributor road bend adjacent to the access points and results in objections on highway safety grounds.
- 128 and 129 appear to be transposed.
- Another rear courtyard for 16/26 with inappropriate access, excessive reversing, inappropriate location for bins (no provision for collection) and cycles and long pedestrian routes for the houses..
- All car park accesses serving more than two properties should be designed as a cul de sac with radius kerbs, tactiles and a minimum of 4.5m carriageway plus a pedestrian route to avoid prejudice to any future s38 agreements for the roads they access.

Visibility Splays – Planning 24519-C-018-E -Updated site layout

- Forward visibility has now been demonstrated on street 1 (north or southbound between “lane” and street 2).
- Street 2 shows forward visibility that is likely to be obstructed by trees, which will also obstruct the available carriageway so should be relocated.
- No forward visibility is achieved for street 3 and lane 3. These are drawn through a building on one side and private curtilage on the other. Clear priorities should be established here if visibility is constrained.
- Splays should be added for the access junctions and the turning head/private drive T junctions.
- Splays must be within adopted highway.
- New layout has no assessment of accesses to courtyard parking all along southern edge of site and others eg access between units 8 and 9 or 1274/134 and 145/146 etc. for example.

LAP Proposals Drawings 1562A10-LLA-ZZ-00-DR-L-0401 No new plan found – original comments below

- Area 6 shows gates opening outwards. These should all open inwards, not over or towards highway/footway.

Cycle Route Plan - Planning 24519-C-020-D – Site layout amended

- The plan shows no detail of how the development provides connection between shared and on road routes.
- Where cycles are intended to share space, the route must be 3m wide and have appropriate tactiles and signs.
- Signs and tactile paving must direct cycles back into carriageway where appropriate and warn other users when they are present on pedestrian areas.
- Further detail is needed at this stage to demonstrate there is sufficient space provided. Finer detail can be conditioned when it is shown that sufficient space is dedicated.

Street Lighting Layout – Planning 24519 – C - 025- B no amended plan found -original comments below

- The plans show no lighting for private parking areas, where pedestrian movement will occur (and anti-social behaviour is likely) and lighting should be provided, although it may not be adopted.
- Street lighting details must be agreed through the s38 process which requires a lot more detailed assessment by lighting professionals and so cannot sensibly be approved before the site has reached technical approval stage.

Planning Layout R9138-SMH-25-00-DR – 0008 P02 No updated plan found- previous comments as below.

- Too many units are served by a single access point (junction road 1 / road 5 and eastern section main access) so developers should provide loops, emergency access or a (convoluted) link between the two accesses to resolve.
- All frontages must have footway/pedestrian provision, and these should generally be 2m wide. Some of these are not an appropriate width (eg around unit 69/70 and 78/79 100/115 and 43 etc appears to be 1m which will be obstructed by parked cars). In other areas there is no provision at all eg adjacent to 140/141. This is a narrow bend, and pedestrians should have a safe route here, not mix with traffic.
- Shared surfaces must have additional width to provide for pedestrians and take account of parking and disabled users. (All Wales standard).
- Private drives should not serve more than 5 units maximum.
- The access points from Main Rd are not positioned or orientated in a safe way but are understood to be existing. As neither are appropriate, it may be better to serve even numbers of units from each. The southern access is arguable worse and serves most units.
- No information has been provided to demonstrate electric vehicle charging and the use communal parking courts makes this difficult for large numbers of residents to ever achieve.
- No information has been provided for bus stop locations which must be accommodated along the frontage of this site and require additional foot/cycleway depth.
- The layout shows a number of build outs that would be problematic in terms of maintenance and adoption. In addition, they are located adjacent to bends so do not have appropriate forward visibility and raise a safety issue and objection.
- Courtyard parking is not supported but examples where there is no pedestrian access/protection or adequate width for two-way movements with pedestrians raise further objections. (adjacent to 141 /153 and 22/8 etc.)

Parking LLAN/PCP/001 rev- No amended plan found -original comments below

- Several corner units have pedestrian access on or near radius kerbs and therefore drivers will park on bends and corners.
- All roads need to be a minimum of 5.5m wide to provide for on street parking. Where vehicles are reversing into the road the manoeuvring space must be considered as well as the space taken by parked cars. Eg street 3 etc.
- Private drives need provision for visitor parking.
- The layout appears does not indicate visitor parking, but this would impact access for larger vehicles as well as visibility splays, so raising safety issues.
- Most main road units have rear parking. This is of a poor standard and (in terms of space and security) so will not be used as intended and parking will obstruct Main Road, which is a local distributor and bus route, so needs to be wider if it is to accommodate parking.
- Parking ratios for individual units have not been considered in detail at this stage.
- Cycle storage is indicated for most units but not all. Eg 171 and 182
- Extensive dropped kerbs are used to provide long stretches of parking. This is prejudicial to certain disabled users and reduces on street parking, so cannot be supported.
- Parking is provided on the inside of bends where it is unlikely there will be sufficient visibility. Eg 108/109.

The application includes the requested discharge of various conditions, but as the layout is not acceptable and needs amendments, to garner Highways' support it would not be appropriate to discharge any of the conditions. Furthermore, insufficient information appears to have been provided to satisfy some of the conditions.

In summary, Highways would maintain a number of objections relating to highway safety, sustainability and design standards.