

Land at Tyn-y-Caeau, Margam

Transport Note: Response to Local Highway Authority and Welsh Government

Client: **Western Bio-Energy Limited**

18 July 2025

Document Reference: **C24103/TN01**

QUALITY MANAGEMENT

REPORT DETAILS

Issued by	Apex Transport Planning Ltd Clockwise, Brunel House 2 Fitzalan Road Cardiff CF24 0HA Tel: 02920 619 361 info@apextp.co.uk www.apextp.co.uk	
Client	Western Bio-Energy Limited	
Project Name	Land at Tyn-y-Caeau, Margam	
Report Title	Transport Note: Response to Local Highway Authority and Welsh Government	
Report Ref.	TN01	
Project No.	C24103	
Date	18/07/2025	

ISSUE HISTORY

Issue No.	Status	Date	Produced by	Approved by	Revision Details
1	Final	15/07/2025	LK	DC	First Issue
2	Final	18/07/2025	LK	DC	Second Issue

NOTICE

This report has been prepared for Western Bio-Energy Limited in accordance with the terms and conditions of appointment. Apex Transport Planning Ltd cannot accept any responsibility for any use of or reliance on the contents of this report by any third party.

The material presented in this report is confidential. This report has been prepared and is intended solely for Western Bio-Energy Limited for use in relation to the Land at Tyn-y-Caeau, Margam project.

CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION	2
1.1	Overview	2
2.	LOCAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY	3
2.1	Overview	3
2.2	Site Access Arrangements	3
2.3	Road Safety Audit	4
2.4	Construction Method Statement	4
2.5	Car Parking Provision	5
3.	WELSH GOVERNMENT	6
3.2	Construction Traffic Management Plan	7
4.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	7
4.1	Summary	7
4.2	Conclusions	8

Tables

Table 2-1: Employment Density Matrix and Development Floorspace	6
---	---

Appendices

Appendix A	PAC Meeting Minutes dated 20th January 2025
Appendix B	LHA Consultation Response dated 6th May 2025
Appendix C	WG Consultation Response dated 30th April 2025

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overview

- 1.1.1 Apex Transport Planning (Apex) has prepared this Transport Note (TN) in relation to Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council ('NPT') planning application P2025/0187, which seeks permission for a new data centre on land at Tyn-y-Caeau, which is southwest of the A48 Margam Road in Margam and c.6.5km south of Port Talbot town centre.
- 1.1.2 The TN provides further information in relation to consultation responses provided by NPT in its role as the local highway authority (LHA) and Welsh Government's Transport Division (WG) as statutory consultees in the planning process.
- 1.1.3 The development proposals are for the delivery of a new data centre, which includes an improved access with the A48 Margam Road, internal servicing area, staff parking, conversion of existing dwelling to ancillary offices and landscaping/drainage infrastructure. The plans are being developed and will be finalised for the application submission.
- 1.1.4 A Transport Note (TN01) (ref: C24103/TN01) dated November 2024 was submitted as part of the ongoing pre-application consultation (PAC) discussion between NPT and Apex. On the 20th January 2025, a meeting between the LHA, Apex and applicant took place to discuss the evidence set out within TN01 relating specifically to the access proposals.
- 1.1.5 Following the meeting on the 21st January 2025 the LHA provided a positive response agreeing specific points relating to the site's access arrangements and trip generation. A copy of the meeting minutes, agreed with the LHA are provided at Appendix A.
- 1.1.6 In support of the formal planning submission a Transport Assessment (TA) (ref: C24103/TN01) dated March 2025 was submitted in support of the proposals and included full details of the scheme from a transport perspective along with the agreed points and queries raised during the PAC discussions. A Travel Plan (TP) (ref: C24103/TP01) was also produced in support of the proposals accompanying the submission.
- 1.1.7 In April 2025, Welsh Government's Transport Division issued a response to the proposals requesting that a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) be submitted prior to approval. In May 2025, the LHA provided further consultation comments relating to the proposals.
- 1.1.8 NPT are also understood to provide a further response in relation to active travel, although at the time of preparing this note, no formal response has been provided. It is assumed that comments are likely to be associated with the site's access and its interaction with the shared footway / cycleway which crosses the access, albeit this also occurs with the existing access at this location.
- 1.1.9 As such, this TN has considered the comments from the LHA and WG and provides further information to overcome these queries. Where required, relevant sections of the Transport Note (TN01) and Transport Assessment (TA01) reports have been referred to in this TN. Following comments from WG this report should also be read in conjunction with the Framework CTMP (ref: C24103/CT01).
- 1.1.10 This TN, for ease, has been set out with the specific consultee (LHA and WG) comments in **navy boxes** with the Apex further information provided below. The comments have been set out in sections associated with the specific consultee.

2. LOCAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY

2.1 Overview

- 2.1.1 On the 6th May 2025 the LHA provided a consultation response (ref: OBS250187) to the planning submission, which is attached at Appendix B.
- 2.1.2 In summary, the LHA have raised further queries with regard to the site's access arrangements, road safety audits, post-permission requirements as well as car parking within the site. These elements have been considered within this section of the report.

2.2 Site Access Arrangements

"A scheme should be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA for the construction of the junction between the site and the A48. The scheme should provide the following:

- Full details of junction geometry including kerb type, radii etc*
- Maximum achievable vision splays should be provided on a suitably scaled drawing. Any apparatus or vegetation within the vision envelope that needs to be relocated or cut should be included on the drawing*
- Full construction details for junction make-up*
- Details of any signage and markings associated with the new junction."*

- 2.2.1 As part of the PAC process, TN01 specifically considered the site's access arrangements, whilst also including trip generation and an alternative access option.
- 2.2.2 TN01 included a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA) of the preliminary design, which was undertaken by an accredited independent auditor. The access proposals were updated to address the recommendations raised by the Auditor. As such, the proposed access with the A48 and its geometry, vehicular visibility, crossing facilities, signage and swept path analysis were agreed with the LHA as part of TN01 and are set out in full within TA01 which supported the formal submission.
- 2.2.3 It is unclear whether these comments are a potential planning condition, which would be appropriate, as it is at the detailed Section 278 stage where full details would be considered. This would include carriageway dimensions/geometry, drainage, visibility splays, materials, lighting and signage amongst other elements.
- 2.2.4 On review of the LHA's recent comments the following statement sets out that *"maximum achievable vision splays should be provided on a suitably scaled drawing"*. However, this deviates from the agreed position with the LHA. TN01 set out that recorded 85th percentile vehicle approach speeds were 49 mph (78 kph) and as such the required 'y' distance / Sight Stopping Distance (SSD) is 111m as an absolute minimum and 144m as the desirable minimum, which is line with the formula set out within the Manual for Streets 2 paragraph 10.1.5.
- 2.2.5 Within the LHA's PAC comments dated 21st January 2025 it was stated that *"finally, the splay of 160m is viable through the underside of the signs due to them being c.2.3m in height. And using the calculation method in DMRB/MfS you have provided accurate distance required of 144 metres which easily achieved as well."*
- 2.2.6 **As such, it is considered that the evidence has already been provided and agreed with regard to the visibility splays at the site's access with the A48 Margam Road. Should the access be conditioned as**

part of any planning permission, we would advise that visibility splay requirements refer to the plans prepared, which are based on recorded traffic speeds.

2.3 Road Safety Audit

“All works to be constructed on the public highway shall be subject to a Road Safety Audit stage 1-4 in accordance with GG 119 of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. Each stage of the Road Safety Audit shall be submitted for approval in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All issues highlighted at each stage, being addressed to the written approval of the Local Planning Authority within three months of that stage of the Road Safety Audit has been approved.”

- 2.3.1 The requirement for RSA stages 1 to 4 were detailed in discussions as part of the PAC process with the LHA. The above statement appears to be a repetition of the discussions to date.
- 2.3.2 In any event, TN01 submitted as part of the PAC process and agreed at the meeting on the 20th January 2025 sets out that a Stage 1 RSA, which assesses the preliminary design, had been completed and undertaken by an accredited independent auditor. The Stage 1 RSA considered the access proposals with the A48 Margam Road. The outcome and findings of the audit were all addressed as part of TN01 and are set out in detail within TA01 supporting the formal submission.
- 2.3.3 RSA stages 2 (undertaken at completion of the detailed design), 3 (undertaken once the works are substantially completed) and 4 (undertaken one year post completion and operation) are all requirements post-planning permission and would be captured/undertaken following or during the Section 278 Agreement for the delivery of the highway works.
- 2.3.4 As such, a Stage 1 RSA has been undertaken in line with the request above, and this is also in line with the requirements of the preliminary design agreed with the LHA. Stages 2 to 4 would be dealt with as part of a Section 278 Agreement following any granting of planning approval as part of the detailed design process, site construction or site operation.

2.4 Construction Method Statement

“A Construction Method Statement should be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to works commencing on site. The statement shall provide for:

- (i) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors*
- (ii) loading and unloading of plant and materials*
- (iii) storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development*
- (iv) the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate*
- (v) wheel washing facilities*
- (vi) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction*
- (vii) a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works*
- (viii) scheme for the erection of temporary/semi temporary signage warning drivers of speed restrictions.*
- (ix) Scheme for controlling construction traffic associated with the development which should include the following:*

- *Number of HGV vehicles associated with the construction phase*
- *What days and times deliveries will be permitted to enter the site*
- *Construction traffic route*
- *What mitigation measure are proposed to minimise the impact on disruption and highway safety."*

- 2.4.1 Within the LHA's PAC consultation comments dated 21st January 2025, they referred to the need for a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). The requirement for a CEMP can be conditioned as part of any planning permission, however, in line with the PAC discussions and response, Section 5.8 of TA01 supporting the application provided high-level details of the approach and measures to be implemented as part of any CEMP. As the end operator is not yet known, conditioning this requirement is considered appropriate and the plan would be refined and agreed post-permission, prior to commencement of works on the site and once a contractor is appointed.
- 2.4.2 The recent LHA comments now refer to the provision of a Construction Method Statement (CMS), and appear to be the wording of a typical planning condition, where the trigger is prior to the commencement of works on the site. Thus, being a post-permission requirement that is secured by condition.
- 2.4.3 In April 2025, WG's Transport Division requested that a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) be submitted in support of the proposals, which is set out in greater detail at Section 3 of this note.
- 2.4.4 CMS's and CTMP's are broadly the same document, which from a transport perspective provide the overarching strategy and measures to be implemented to manage the temporary and short term nature of construction traffic impacts on the highway network.
- 2.4.5 In line with WG's requirement for a CTMP, a Framework document (ref: C24103/CT01) has been prepared as the data centre's end occupier is not yet known. As such, the document sets out the measures and strategies to manage construction traffic but will require refinement and agreement with the LHA and WG once a contractor is appointed. Where possible, at this stage the elements suggested by the LHA points (i) to (ix) have been included within the Framework CTMP.
- 2.4.6 As such, there is no requirement for a CMS as the CTMP prepared covers all elements set out by the LHA and ultimately the CTMP will be conditioned as part of the development's strategy to manage construction traffic, whereby post-permission an updated version will be submitted to the LHA and WG for agreement/approval prior to construction.

2.5 Car Parking Provision

"A breakdown of how the number of parking spaces was calculated should be submitted. Have EV charging points been provided within the design? What are the proposed staffing levels for the development?"

- 2.5.1 Section 5.5 of the submitted TA01 sets out the car parking provision on the development site.
- 2.5.2 It confirmed that following a review of the NPT Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG), Parking Standards dated October 2016 that the standards do not specifically provide parking thresholds for a data centre use, or for a use which would be similar.
- 2.5.3 Section 4.2 of the SPG sets out the parking standards for B1 office use. Given this will be the part of the site which would have employees, it is considered appropriate to apply the standards from this use

to the proposals. The standards for B1 office use in Zones 4 to 6 have been used, within which the site is situated.

- 2.5.4 The B1 office use standards are 1 space per 20 sqm of floorspace for offices under 1,000 sqm. This is also the same standard for offices over 1,000 sqm of floor space.
- 2.5.5 The office facility provided within the development site provided is c.213 sqm of floorspace, which would indicate a provision of 11 spaces.
- 2.5.6 The proposals provide 12 car parking spaces, which include a single disabled space (in line with the 5% of the total provision requirement). This level of provision is line with the NPT Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG), Parking Standards dated October 2016 and therefore in line with policy.
- 2.5.7 At this stage as the end occupier of the site is not known and that there is no guidance in Wales to derive expected staffing levels, consideration has been given to the '*Employment Density Matrix*' set out within the '*Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) Employment Density Guide 3rd Edition*' published November 2015. To be robust B1, B1b and B1c uses, which cover a variety of functions and their density/occupancy level has been set out at Table 2-1. This considers all staff employed at a site, including those working shifts, so does not necessarily reflect the staff on the site at one time.

Table 2-1: Employment Density Matrix and Development Floorspace

Use Class	Sub-category	Density (sqm)	Staff Occupancy Levels (213 sqm)
B1a Offices	General Office (Corporate)	13	16
B1b	Research and Development	40-60	3-5
B1c	Light Industrial	47	4

- 2.5.8 Data centres are lightly staffed and those based on site undertake maintenance, data collection and administrative functions, which is tantamount to an office use.
- 2.5.9 B1a sub-sector uses were not comparable to that of the operations of the site, but the corporate sub-sector use showed a total of 16 staff could be employed within the space available. Not all of these staff would necessarily be on site at once and not all would travel on their own in a car. As such, the provision of 12 parking spaces is considered appropriate even when considering occupancies for a typical office use.
- 2.5.10 If considering the 'research and development' and 'light industrial' uses, which may be more applicable to the use of a data centre. The guidance indicates that up to 5 staff would be employed on site, well below the 12 parking spaces proposed.
- 2.5.11 As such, the proposed provision is considered to be in line with the adopted SPG, as well as the likely level of employees that would be employed on the site.

3. WELSH GOVERNMENT

- 3.1.1 On the 30th April 2025, the Welsh Government Transport Division provided a response to the proposals with regard to the construction work at the site, specifically, with regard to the potential impact upon the operation of the Margam Interchange at Junction 38 of the M4, which is c.280m southeast of the development's access with the A48 Margam Road.
- 3.1.2 A copy of the WG consultation response is provided at Appendix C.

3.2 Construction Traffic Management Plan

“The proposed junction lies within the jurisdiction of Neath Port Talbot Council and as such the access itself is a matter for their consideration. However, undertaking the construction work at this location has the potential to cause queuing on the A48 and back to M4 J38. At this stage it is unclear what the outline traffic management proposals are. Depending on time of day, working hours and lane restrictions the impact on J38 may vary. Please provide the Construction Traffic Management Plan for these works”

- 3.2.1 It is considered appropriate to condition the production of a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) as part of any potential planning approval on the site, ensuring its delivery can be secured prior to commencement of works on the site.
- 3.2.2 In any event, a Framework CTMP has been prepared as a separate report (ref: C24103/CT01), which sets out the suggested processes and measures which can be implemented by the contractor during the construction of the development.
- 3.2.3 The provision of a Framework CTMP is considered appropriate as at this stage, the potential occupier of the data centre is not known, as such specific details will need to be refined by the appointed contractor and agreed prior to construction.

4. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

4.1 Summary

- 4.1.1 This Transport Note has considered the consultation responses from the LHA and WG in full and provides further information to overcome their concerns with regard to the development proposals.
- 4.1.2 A summary of the further information provided to each consultee has been set out as follows.

LHA Summary

- Detailed drawings associated with the site’s proposed access would be captured as part of the Section 278 Agreement process for the delivery of highway works on the A48 Margam Road. It is not a planning requirement to submit detailed drawings as the principle and preliminary design are appropriate, effectively acting as a ‘general in accordance’ drawing.
- Visibility splays shown on the proposed access drawing are in line with the recorded 85th percentile vehicle approach speeds, which were accepted by the LHA during the PAC process as well as identified as suitable from the Stage 1 RSA.
- A Stage 1 RSA, which covers the planning stage has been completed. The proposed preliminary access design with the A48 is appropriate and where recommendations identified as part of the RSA were raised, these are captured. Stage 2 to 4 are post permission requirements implemented following the signing of the Section 278 Agreement for the proposed works.
- A Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan has been prepared and all recommended measures or details have been included within this plan.
- Car parking provision within the site is in line with the adopted SPG and estimated staffing levels on the site and is therefore appropriate.

WG Summary

- A Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (ref: C24103/CT01) has been prepared, which provides details on the strategy and measures to be implemented during the construction

phase of development. A planning condition can be provided for a final version of the CTMP to be submitted post permission, prior to the commencement of works on the site, and this can be agreed with the LHA and WG.

4.2 Conclusions

- 4.2.1 The proposed access onto the A48 Margam Road is suitable and safe to serve the proposed data centre development.
- 4.2.2 The proposals would be in accordance with Policy TR2 of the Local Plan as they would not result in an adverse impact on highway safety or create unacceptable levels of traffic generation.
- 4.2.3 As such, based on the information provided we trust this enables the LHA and WG to provide a positive response on the application.

Appendix A PAC Meeting Minutes dated 20th January 2025

Data Centre, Margam - NPT Pre-App Meeting

20 January 2025

Attendees:

Name	Organization
Matthew Griffiths (MG) - Planning	Neath Port Talbot CBC (NPT)
Justin Griffiths (JG) - SAB/ Highways	Neath Port Talbot CBC (NPT)
Nicholas ? (N) - SAB/ Highways	Neath Port Talbot CBC (NPT)
Barry Collins (BC) - Client	Western Bio-Energy (WBE)
Roderic Lerwell (RL) - Client	Western Bio-Energy (WBE)
Lewis Keenan - Transport Consultant	Apex Transport Planning Ltd.
David Chapman - Transport Consultant	Apex Transport Planning Ltd.
Mike Fox (MFx) - Planning Consultant (Data Centre)	The Urbanists (TU)
Richard Banks - Planning Consultant (Landowner/ Truck Stop)	Evans Banks Planning

Apologies

Name	Organisation
Joanna Weeks (JW) - SAB/ Highways	Neath Port Talbot CBC (NPT)

Notes

1. Background and Purpose of meeting

- To run through Technical Note prepared by Apex in detail

2. Highways Issues

- Existing Transport Context
 - The existing site access is established.
 - The planning application for the truck stop (ref: xx) remains outstanding.
 - Those proposals have been designed in line with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges guidance, as required.
 - That is a very different proposal to a data centre in terms of impacts on the highway network.
- Proposed Data Centre and Transport Note
 - Nature of Proposal/ Key Differences - Issues/ Impacts
 - The characteristics of a data centre are very different from a truck stop. The truck stop would result in c.300 HGV movements per day, vs. c.1 per month for a data centre.
 - Road Safety Audit
 - LK explained that the Road Safety Audit has identified no road safety issue in the study area adjacent to site and site access
 - Vehicle speeds are less than 50mph.
 - Two RSAs have now been prepared in relation to the site access, neither of which has raised concerns. One of the RSAs has been prepared specifically with the WBE data centre scheme in mind.
 - Proposed Access Arrangement – standards/visibility
 - The main concern for NPT has been site location
 - NPT's key concern relates to HGVs maneuvering close to the roundabout to the north (c.100m) at close to 50 mph - JG explained this was the only concern in highway terms.
 - DC explained Apex can provide a swept path analysis to understand maneuvering and address any concerns.
 - Traffic / HGV generation
 - Done research looking at comparable sites. HGV movements - worst case drops down to 2 per day.

- In reality, there are likely to be 1-2 HGV movements per month. There is also an opportunity to limit the size of any HGV through the use of planning conditions. JG acknowledges that, although it only takes one vehicle for an accident to happen, this would reduce the risk significantly.
 - The lawful use of part residential/ part guest accommodation, with an agricultural component - would generate a similar/ greater number of movements by HGVs, etc.
- Conclusions
 - In principle, JG/ NPT is happy with the comments thus far. The new RSA, proposed visibility splays, and that NPT can condition the number of HGVs, the use, etc. makes JG more comfortable with the proposals.
 - JG needs to finish reviewing the Technical Note, but acknowledges response is likely to be positive given the additional evidence provided.
 - JG/ NOT will aim to respond by the close of business on Tuesday 21st January 2025.

4. Data Centre - Programme/ Next Steps

- MFx/ MG discussed WBE's intention to commence the Pre-Application Consultation (PAC) process on 27th January, due to WBE's own time pressures.
- BC explained the issues surrounding the import connection to supply power for the data centre. If planning application/ determination slips, National Grid may not provide the upgrade required to the grid.
- MG explained that NPT would welcome a written update/ explanation on WBE's drivers from a programme perspective so that the currency is fully understood.
- MG aiming to provide a Screening response during w/c 20th January.

5. DONM (if relevant)

- Early-mid March, post-PAC process
 - MFx to send some suggestions through to MG

6. AOB

- MG would welcome a statement from WBE on steps made to try to secure land/ access to land from the north.

From: Justin W. Griffiths <j.griffiths4@npt.gov.uk>
Sent: 21 January 2025 16:22
To: Lewis Keenan; David Chapman; Michael Fox
Cc: Matthew Griffiths; richard@evansbanks.com; Joanna Weeks
Subject: Data Centre Site - Note of Highways Meeting

Importance: High

Afternoon Lewis/David/Michael

Further to our meeting on Monday 20th January 2025, I apologise having had the issue of not being able to see sight of the complete TN Transport document due to technical IT difficulties on my computer. Nevertheless, I am pleased to provide you with my comments as agreed.

Notwithstanding our standard highway conditions, we wish to provide no highway objection to the proposed data centre subject to the following:-

1. Subject to a Full RSA (all 4 stages) - noted that stage 1 and response are within the TN document.
2. The new use will subjected to only two HGV's per day, controlled by Planning – Matthew confirmed in meeting that this could be undertaken.
3. Finally, the splay of 160 is viable through the underside of the signs due to them being c.2.3m in height. And using the calculation method in DMRB/MfS you have provided accurate distance required of 144 metres which easily achieved as well.
4. This may have not be considered by the auditor - would there be a requirement for any or additional signage (temporary or otherwise) along the A48 dual to accommodate and/or advise of this new access for the above use (if any?), if so, then it would be required under the detailed stage 2 RSA.
5. We also need to ensure that the visibility splays (hedging & grass) is cut back to sustain the required visibility splays. Subject to a condition via planning.

General query:

Notwithstanding the CEMP which would be required, would you be able to advise on the following:-

6. Estimate how many HGV construction vehicles would be provided during the course of construction and its phases?
7. What times and days are the deliveries for construction and works proposed?
8. What are the routes the construction will traffic undertake to and from the site?
9. What mitigation measures (if any) are you proposing to minimise disruption, traffic delays, highway safety during construction?

I trust that the above is of assistance.

Regards

Cofion cynnes / Kind regards

Justin W. Griffiths

MSc | BSc (Hons) | HND | C.Build E | FCABE | FIHE |

SAB & Highway Development Control Manager/ SAB a Rheolwr Rheoli Datblygu Priffyrdd
Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council/ Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol Castell-nedd Port Talbot



Tel/Ffôn: 01639 686397

Email / E-bost: j.griffiths4@npt.gov.uk

The Quays, Brunel Way, Neath SA11 2GG
Y Ceiau, Ffordd Brunel, Castell-nedd, SA11 2GG

We welcome correspondence in Welsh and will deal with Welsh and English correspondence to the same standards and timescales.

Croesewir gohebiaeth yn y Gymraeg a byddwn yn ymdrin â gohebiaeth Gymraeg a Saesneg i'r un safonau ac amserlenni



DARPARU GWELL GWASANAETHAU AR-LEIN | DELIVERING BETTER SERVICES ONLINE



Digidol drwy Ddeuwis
gwell profiad customer, gwell defnydd gwell o'r arian cyhoeddus

Digital by Choice
improving customer experience, making better use of public money



This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately. Please note also that there is no guarantee that this email or any attachment is virus free or has not been intercepted or amended.

Mae'r e-bost hwn ac unrhyw ffeiliau a drosglwyddir gydag ef yn gyfrinachol ac at ddefnydd yr unigolyn neu'r corff y cyfeiriwyd hwy atynt yn unig. Os ydych wedi derbyn yr e-bost hwn mewn camgymeriad, dylech hysbysu'r person a anfonodd yr e-bost ar unwaith. Hefyd, sylwer nad oes unrhyw sicrwydd nad yw'r e-bost hwn neu unrhyw ymgysylltiad yn rhydd o firws ac nad yw chwaith wedi'i ryng-gipio na'i newid.

This message has been scanned for malware by Forcepoint. www.forcepoint.com

Appendix B LHA Consultation Response dated 6th May 2025

NEATH PORT TALBOT COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL

The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure)
(Wales) Order 2015 (as amended)

HEAD OF ENGINEERING & TRANSPORT

HIGHWAYS OBSERVATIONS

PLANNING APPLICATION NO: 2/3/25/0187/00
APPLICANT: BARRY COLLINS
LOCATION: LAND AT TYN-Y-CAEAU, MARGAM, SA13 2NR
PROPOSAL: ERECTION OF A DATA CENTRE (USE CLASS B8)
& SUPPORTING INFRASTRUCTURE, PARKING,
ALTERATION TO ACCESS, DRAINAGE,
LANDSCAPING & ASSOCIATED WORKS.
INCLUDING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING ANNEX
& RETENTION OF EXISTING BUILDING FOR
ANCILLARY USE, SUBSTATION & POWER
CONNECTION TO EXISTING WESTERN WOOD
BIOMASS PLANT.

The Highway Authority, in responding to the above application, provides the following substantive response:

No comment	☐
No objection (subject to any specified conditions below)	☐
Concerns have been identified (see below for how those concerns can be addressed by the applicant)	☒
Objection – on the grounds set out below	☐

MY HIGHWAYS OBSERVATIONS ON THIS PROPOSAL ARE AS FOLLOWS:-

I have concerns as follows:

1. A scheme should be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA for the construction of the junction between the site and the A48. The scheme should provide the following:
 - Full details of junction geometry including kerb type, radii etc
 - Maximum achievable vision splays should be provided on a suitably scaled drawing. Any apparatus or vegetation within the vision envelope that needs to be relocated or cut should be included on the drawing
 - Full construction details for junction make-up
 - Details of any signage and markings associated with the new junction.

2. All works to be constructed on the public highway shall be subject to a Road Safety Audit stage 1-4 in accordance with GG 119 of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. Each stage of the Road Safety Audit shall be submitted for approval in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All issues highlighted at each stage, being addressed to the written approval of the Local Planning Authority within three months of that stage of the Road Safety Audit has been approved.
3. A Construction Method Statement should be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to works commencing on site. The statement shall provide for:
 - (i) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors
 - (ii) loading and unloading of plant and materials
 - (iii) storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development
 - (iv) the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate
 - (v) wheel washing facilities
 - (vi) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction
 - (vii) a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works
 - (viii) scheme for the erection of temporary/semi temporary signage warning drivers of speed restrictions.
 - (ix) Scheme for controlling construction traffic associated with the development which should include the following:
 - Number of HGV vehicles associated with the construction phase
 - What days and times deliveries will be permitted to enter the site
 - Construction traffic route
 - What mitigation measure are proposed to minimise the impact on disruption and highway safety.
 - (x) The Construction Method Statement shall be signed by a competent person(s).

The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period.

4. A breakdown of how the number of parking spaces was calculated should be submitted. Have EV charging points been provided within the design? What are the proposed staffing levels for the development?

NOTES TO APPLICANT

SIGNED: NF ~~Water~~ DATE: 06/05/2025
pp HEAD OF ENGINEERING & TRANSPORT

HIGHWAYS REF: OBS250187

Appendix C WG Consultation Response dated 30th April 2025



Llywodraeth Cymru
Welsh Government

Planning Department
The Quays
Brunel Way
Baglan Energy Park
Briton Ferry
SA11 2GG

Eich cyf / Your ref P2025/0187

Ein cyf / Our ref 25/SW-7279

30 April 2025

Dear Sir/Madam,

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE) (WALES)
ORDER 2012:**

Land At Tyn-Y-Caeau, Margam, Port Talbot

Erection of a data centre (Use Class B8) and supporting infrastructure, parking, alteration to access, drainage, landscaping and associated works, including demolition of existing annex and retention of the existing building for ancillary use, substation and power connection to the existing Western Wood Biomass Plant.

I refer to your consultation of 11th April 2025 regarding the above application, and advise that the Welsh Government as highway authority for the M4 trunk road directs that planning permission is not granted at this time as the applicant has provided insufficient information to determine the application.

The applicant must provide the following information to support this application or resubmit the application with the following details;

- 1) The proposed junction lies within the jurisdiction of Neath Port Talbot Council and as such the access itself is a matter for their consideration. However, undertaking the construction work at this location has the potential to cause queuing on the A48 and back to M4 J38. At this stage it is unclear what the outline traffic management proposals are. Depending on time of day, working hours and lane restrictions the impact on J38 may vary. Please provide the Construction Traffic Management Plan for these works.

If you have any further queries, please forward to the following Welsh Government Mailbox
Lgc_development_control-south@Gov.Wales

Yours faithfully

Jason Ingram

Parc Cathays
Caerdydd

Transport
Welsh Government
Cathays Park
Cardiff

Ebost/Email: Lgc_development_control-south@Gov.Wales



BUDDSODDWR MEWN POBL
INVESTOR IN PEOPLE