

Highway Response

Ref: 26/0217

Date: 21/04/26

PROPOSAL: PARTIAL DISCHARGE OF CONDITIONS 2 (ARBORICULTURIST), 3 (CEMP), 4 (CONTAMINATION RISK ASSESSMENT), CONDITION 5 (ENCLOSURE DETAILS), 6 (CONSTRUCTION OF PHASING), 7 (RETAINING WALL DETAILS), 8 (ULEV INFRASTRUCTURE DETAILS), 9 (CROSSOVER CLOSURE DETAILS) AND 16 (AMENITY SPACE MANAGEMENT) OF PLANNING PERMISSION 24/0756

SITE: Land Formerly Known As 21 Kelvedon Street Newport South Wales

Case Officer: Vicky Quinn

Highway Officer: Kevin Jackson

Highway recommendation:

2 (ARBORICULTURIST): No comment.

3 (CEMP): Recommend no discharge pending further detail.

4 (CONTAMINATION RISK ASSESSMENT): No comment.

5 (ENCLOSURE DETAILS): No comment.

6 (PHASING OF CONSTRUCTION): Recommend no discharge.

7 (RETAINING WALL DETAILS): Recommend no discharge pending calculations.

8 (ULEV INFRASTRUCTURE DETAILS): Recommend partial discharge pending provision and retention.

9 (CROSSOVER CLOSURE DETAILS): Recommend no discharge pending proposals.

16 (AMENITY SPACE MANAGEMENT): Recommend no discharge.

Highway Comments:

3 (CEMP): Recommend no discharge pending further detail.

The CEMP does not address parking fully. It does not attempt to assess demand or identify measures to manage parking off site (if needed). Parking cannot be addressed without reference to a programme, which has not been provided. The contractor should provide estimated durations and numbers of contractors. These are needed to demonstrate the adequacy / issues around parking.

The programme would also inform the servicing requirements and further information is needed to establish if the servicing management is adequate. A booking system should be strictly adhered to for HGVs but occasional light (panel vans) may be allowed a more flexible approach. The CEMP should detail where deliveries are met and how highway is kept clear if they wait to be admitted. We would expect a gate management point within the site to prevent obstruction on arrival.

Throughout the CEMP suggests that HGVs will be able to access and egress in forward gear, but the phasing plans do not show any turning areas. Furthermore, at the bottom of page 7 it is suggested that they will enter and leave in forward gear without turning. Swept paths are needed to identify /demonstrate suitable turning areas.

6 (PHASING OF CONSTRUCTION): Recommend no discharge.

There is insufficient detail to establish if the phasing is likely to be problematic in terms of parking and servicing.

7 (RETAINING WALL DETAILS): Recommend no discharge pending calculations.

Specifically, where the retaining walls are adjacent to highway, calculations should be provided and approved/checked by structural engineers.

8 (ULEV INFRASTRUCTURE DETAILS): Recommend partial discharge pending provision and retention.

9 (CROSSOVER CLOSURE DETAILS): Recommend no discharge pending proposals.

The submission suggests that there are no areas that need to be addressed. This is not accepted as there are clearly low kerbs around much of the site with little or no reason. Some have clearly provided access previously, but there is no reason to retain any. A full height kerb is required in all areas except pedestrian crossings.

16 (AMENITY SPACE MANAGEMENT): Recommend no discharge.

No information regarding the maintenance of car park, lighting or drainage etc has been found.