

## Taflen Ddiweddarau

2020/0343/FUL

Land North Of Chestnut Avenue, West Cross, Swansea  
Approve

26 Further letters of Objection & 1 letter of Support received.  
Minor change in wording recommendation for affordable housing to be DQR compliant (omit or any future equivalent)

2022/1109/RES

Plot D5b, Land South Of Fabian Way And East Of River Tawe Swansea  
Approve

Description of development amended to refer to conditions 6, 8, 9 and 17 (drainage) and not 19 as indicated.

Further comments from CCS Highways (28th Feb. 2023) – see Appendix 1  
Applicant's response to CCS Highways comments received 6th March 2023 – see Appendix 2

2022/2937/FUL

Pendragon Property Holdings , Upper Fforest Way, Swansea Enterprise Park,  
Swansea, SA6 8PP  
Approve

2022/2862/S73

Cwmrhydyceirw Quarry Co Ltd, Great Western Terrace, Cwmrhydyceirw, Swansea,  
SA6 6EA  
Approve

2023/0013/FUL

Bugeilfa, Bethel Lane, Penclawdd, Swansea, SA4 3FP  
Approve

Appendix 1 – 2022-1109-RES – Item 2 - Further Highways Comments

Comments: 2022/1109/RES | Construction of 35 no. apartments and 8 no. townhouses and associated works, (details of access, appearance, landscaping, layout, scale pursuant to conditions 6, 8, 9 and 19 of outline planning permission 2015/1584 approved 13th May 2016 (which varied 2008/0996 and which varied 2002/1000) for SA1 Swansea Waterfront mixed use development | Plot D5b Land South Of Fabian Way And East Of River Tawe Swansea  
Amended comments based on revised drawings/additional supporting documents February 2023.

A Highways Note has been submitted by Corun on behalf of the applicant commenting on the issues previously identified by the Highway Authority. My response to them is as follows:

1. Referring to a 8.0m long fire engine. A standard fire engine is 10.5m. The swept paths provided in appendix B again only show the body line, and wheel line with no safety margin. In addition the swept path shows that the vehicle would oversail the

pedestrian link which is clearly unacceptable and a risk to pedestrian safety. No housing details have been provided with regard to the support for the gate and there are concerns that this would reduce down the available width even further.

I do not accept that the submitted documents demonstrate safe appropriate access and turning for a fire tender.

2. No give way line had been included at the priority junction onto Langdon Road. The comment states that one will be included but no plan has been submitted to evidence this.

3. Car parking provision substantially below that set in the adopted SPG Parking standards Document.

I do not accept the level of provision 29 spaces as it is based on double discounting (sustainability appendix reduction plus another social housing (together with out of date census data) reduction). Social housing is not a recognised category to allow for any reduction (particularly when used over and above that allowed under the sustainability appendix). This approach (i.e. a justified reduction still needing to provide a minimum one parking space per unit) is adopted by all the South Wales local authorities as confirmed at a recent Development Control Forum Event. The minimum requirement equates to 43 spaces plus space for visitors, and the site plan indicates that only 29 are being provided.

4. Swept paths for fire engine of 8m length.

Planning Committee – 7th March 2023

Update Sheet

Already covered above (1), no safety margin has been included and the paths show encroachment onto the pedestrian ramp so unacceptable. Length of vehicle tracked is also substandard. It is acknowledged that refuse vehicles will not have any need to enter the site and will service from Langdon Road.

5. The proposed footway is too narrow and no gradients had been provided.

A longitudinal section has now been submitted showing ramp gradients at 1 in 14 which is outside within the allowable gradients as set out in the Equalities Act 2010. Also in terms of the vehicle ramp no dwell (transition) area has been shown at either end of the ramp, thus it is not possible to determine if the ramp and actual car park would be usable by all vehicles. There was a fatal road traffic accident in Swansea whereby a pedestrian was killed by a high vehicle coming up a ramp that failed to see the pedestrian crossing due to the alignment of their bonnet and a fatality resulted. We have referenced the circumstances of this incident several times to avoid similar issues on other developments in Swansea that we have identified as being liable to result in similar unacceptable scenarios.

The pedestrian link is not considered suitable in terms of width or gradient, and as such is not supported as it is not wheelchair appropriate. The available width would be further reduced by the presence of the gate posts/support mechanism which has not been shown in any detail.

6. An element of cycle storage has been shown but the layout is cramped and the levels indicated are below those set out in the parking document, as such it is not shown to be a useable facility that would help encourage sustainable modes of travel.

The cycle shelter position and provision is shown to house upto 20 cycles which is not considered to be an appropriate level. The SPG requires one stand per five bedrooms, not one space per 5 bedrooms so the provision remains inadequate.

In summary and further to my detailed comments made in December 2022 I am not in a position to support the proposal and recommend that the application is refused on the grounds of;

1. inadequate car parking,
2. inadequate cycle parking,
3. overlong carrying distances to the bin storage area,

4. inadequate provision for pedestrian movement through the site (width and gradient),
5. vehicular access too narrow for two-way flow and/or to allow for a fire tender to enter the site. Fire tender swept path shows encroachment onto the pedestrian element which is considered a danger to pedestrian safety
6. Issues with the layout of the priority junction.
7. No disabled parking provision and those that have been shown as being possible ~blue badge spaces™ would prevent pedestrian access to plots 7 and 8

All of which overall are considered detrimental to highway safety.

Planning Committee – 7th March 2023

Update Sheet

Whilst the LPA may consider that lack of adequate car and/or cycle parking provision is acceptable, the rest of the issues identified above result in serious concerns regarding highway and pedestrian safety. The lack of ramps gives grave concerns that a high vehicles bonnet would impede seeing a pedestrian crossing and/or also that a long/low vehicle would ground due to the lack of transition and/or vertical curves and prevent any access for any other vehicle. The need for a 8m fire tender to overhang the adjacent pedestrian ramp link is unacceptable.

The rebuttal sent in February 2023 has in no way appeased any of the LHA concerns raised and as such I continue to recommend that the application is refused.

If the LPA are minded to approve the Planning Application can I formally request that these updated HA comments are contained within the body of the committee report, provided as an addendum or reported on the update sheet, as the identified safety issues/objections have not been resolved to any satisfactory degree, and outstanding concerns remain