

Highway Response

Ref: 24/0782

Updated

Date: 08/11/24

PROPOSAL: RESERVED MATTERS (CONDITION 01) FOR PROPOSED RETAIL STORE, NURSERY (D1) AND 3NO. COMMERCIAL UNITS AND ASSOCIATED WORKS IN LOCAL CENTRE AND PARTIAL DISCHARGE OF CONDITIONS 07 (LANDSCAPING), 08 (MATERIALS/FINISHES TO EXTERNAL SURFACES), 9 MATERIALS/FINISHES FOR HARD LANDSCAPED AREAS), 10 (BOUNDARY TREATMENTS), 12 (PARKING), 15 (EMERGENCY ACCESS), 16 (ROADS, CYCLEWAYS AND FOOTWAYS), 17 (GREEN TRAVEL STRATEGY), 19 (NOISE ASSESSMENT), 22 (LIGHTING), 23 (ECOLOGICAL MANAGEMENT PLAN), 24 (SITE LEVELS), 27 (GROUND CONDITIONS), 28 (VERIFICATION REPORT), 32 (PILING WORKS), 33 (SURFACE WATER), 34 (FOUL AND SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE AND STORAGE) AND 39 (CARBON REDUCTION STRATEGY) RELATING TO OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION 06/0471 FOR REDEVELOPMENT OF SITE TO CREATE A MIXED USE URBAN EXTENSION

SITE: Land West Of 1 Kings Wall Drive Newport South Wales

Case Officer: Geraint Roberts

Highway Officer: Kevin Jackson

Following receipt of a Transport Assessment (SCP/240426/TN01 Rev 004) (referred to as the TN below) we would update our comments as follows.

Highway recommendation:

Objections relating to servicing, parking and cycle parking policies resulting in highway safety concerns.

Highway Comments:

The TN focusses on a Lidl store but includes what appear to be master plan proposals /amendments for a nursery and employment/commercial uses on an adjacent site within the blue line. The latter is referred to as the "disposal site". (refer to SCP plan Figure 3 within document SCP/240426/TN01 Rev 004).

For the purposes of this commentary, we have considered the proposals in the context of the whole site, because it impacts the conclusions and appears to be part of the description of the proposals above. Consideration is also given to the partial discharge of conditions that relate to highways.

Accessibility/Sustainability

The site is effectively within a residential area (albeit not fully built out). There are various proposals for bus and cycle infrastructure associated with the broader site that do not seem to have been considered within this submission.

There does not appear to be any consideration of how the site relates to the adjacent site which would be pedestrianised (but with cycle and emergency access). Therefore, the key link to Bessemer Drive (and an extensive residential catchment) does not appear to be considered. These pedestrians/cyclists would either have a longer diversion to enter the site or enter adjacent to commercial units, with little/no provision and no clear routes across the site to the Lidl.

Whilst the bulk of that design work relates to a separate (unseen) application it is clear that the route to the retail and nursery would not be clear and would be via commercial units (potentially having vehicular access).

Furthermore, pedestrians and cyclists would be in conflict with commercial vehicles serving the retail unit, whether they are cross visiting the nursery or entering from Bessemer Drive. This raises safety and amenity issues, and we consider it necessary to consider the active travel routes through the site at this stage. (Refer to servicing below).

With regard to public transport there is reference to bus services /stops at Bloomery Circle and on Queen's Way. Whilst these are reasonably close, and between the variants available provide a useful service, the services proposed for Bessemer Drive / Main Street should also be considered for more local patrons, residing on the extensive residential estates. We would expect to see a commitment to a stop adjacent to this site, albeit reliant on another stage to come forward to complete the link, this would be within highway and should be conditioned.

In terms of cycle parking, there is insufficient provision proposed. Long stay parking is needed for all employment uses. None is proposed for the nursery or commercial units, which only have external, less secure, uncovered facilities; and the proposal for the retail element is "space in the warehouse". This is not sufficient and dedicated, weatherproof, secure cycle parking is needed for all units. This could be secured by way of condition.

Electric vehicle charging is only proposed as two spaces primarily associated with the retail outlet. We would expect to see greater commitment and provision for other land uses.

The TN contains a section on Travel Planning; however, it does not give sufficient commitment to specific and meaningful measures or targets. It is also undermined by the lack of connectivity described above and the excess parking described below.

Trip Generation and Parking

Based on the assessment submitted, the applicant suggests that the changes from the masterplan proposals would increase the anticipated movements in certain peaks and reduce them in others (due to the varying profiles associated with different uses and notably the use of a “discount store” based trip generation).

Where there is an increase, the worst case is predicted as an additional 72 trips. This is split between arrivals and departures and further dissipated by distribution in various directions.

Accepting that the discount store has slightly lower trip generation than other retailers, we would accept that the impact of the changes of land uses/areas from the masterplan to the current proposal would not have a significant impact on trip generation or require further capacity assessments.

Within the TN, it is suggested that the parking provision is in line with Newport’s SPG for parking, which it states would allow 172 spaces. We however have concluded that it is not compliant and are unclear what SCP have based this on.

It may have been assumed that the standard for larger stores could be applied (1:14sqm) but this is not consistent with using lower trip rates (as adopted) and there is a standard for stores below 2000sqm which is more appropriate.

The relevant parking provision (for zone 3 as agreed appropriate at Outline (section 3 of Sub-Area Master Plan) is 1:40 sqm. This results in a required provision of 49 spaces. The TN also includes a parking accumulation based on its adopted trip rates which suggests there would never be more than 63 spaces needed for the consented masterplan or the current larger discount proposals.

The proposed parking is 108 for the retail element, which clearly undermines any measures to discourage car use and is contrary to the adopted parking SPG. It therefore raises an objection.

We are unable to comment on the provision for the nursery, as the standards are based on staff numbers, which we do not know at this stage. We do note however that there are no spaces for minibus or commercial vehicles.

The parking requirements for the commercial units are (based on small industrial units < 235sqm) 6 cars and 3 vans in total. We would seek clarification on the space sizes and allocation, but the overall number appears reasonable.

We would however raise concerns regarding the clash between the nursery and parking for unit 1 and potential issues arising from servicing both.

Servicing

There is no specific provision for servicing the commercial units or nursery. Vehicles would have to drive through and stop in front of units 2 and 3. Which could be accepted, subject to submission of swept path assessments, if these units are prevented from having vehicular doors. Unit 1 and the nursery however will require commercial vehicles to reverse in the vicinity of parking and pedestrian movements and it is not clear how this will be done (in terms of where the relevant doors are).

Servicing for the retail store is a single delivery dock, which is accessed by reversing across two pedestrian routes. Whilst the submitted swept paths show this can be done, they make the pedestrian conflicts clear too. In addition, there would be an issue when more than one vehicle is on site. Any waiting vehicle would obstruct pedestrian and vehicular access. The servicing provision is not considered adequate, appropriate or safe. Time sensitive/fresh deliveries will arrive together.

There is no detail of waste management, however we would anticipate that this is returned on the delivery vehicles. Confirmation is requested.

The masterplan does make reference to servicing through the car park, but explicitly states that deliveries would be “subject to a management strategy to ensure that deliveries do not conflict with pedestrian and car traffic” (section 8).

Given the lack of space and likely demand we would not consider that daytime servicing would be acceptable for the retail unit. Whilst a condition could be applied, for out of hours servicing, we would not consider it practical or enforceable. We would therefore raise an objection to the servicing proposals on grounds of public safety.

In conclusion we would object to the proposals on grounds of highway safety, sustainability policies and parking policy. For the same reasons we would object to any discharge of the following conditions.

Conditions 07 (landscaping), 9 materials/finishes for hard landscaped areas), 10 (boundary treatments), 12 (parking), 15 (emergency access), 16 (roads, cycleways and footways), 17 (green travel strategy) as these would be impacted by the necessary amendments to the proposals.