

Matthew Griffiths

Subject: FW: Planning Application. P2025 0187 AT OBS FORM - Margam Data Centre.

From: Peter Jenkins < >

Sent: 24 September 2025 09:46

To: Matthew Griffiths < >

Cc: Laura Pack < >; Jonathan J. Davies < >; Martin C. Brumby < >; Lucy Theophilus < >

Subject: FW: Planning Application. P2025 0187 AT OBS FORM - Margam Data Centre.

Hello Matthew,

I directly received the below email following my reply to David Chapman. The main areas raised, as I'm led to understand with their detailed reply. Please view the Active Travels responses below:

Point 1

- They will carry out the placement of the bollards/signage at the entrance of the site as requested.
 - a. **Accepted.**

Point 3 & 4

- They initially accepted improvements to the crossings south of the site, linking to Margam Park. However, when requesting controlled crossings, they have evidenced why they would reject this claim.
 - a. **These crossing points have been the subject for several complaints due to their safety concerns. A controlled crossing allowing pedestrians and cyclists to safely cross these busy roads is the only option when addressing these complaints.**

Cycle Parking

- They have rejected the need to move the cycle storage to the front of the premises.
 - a. **I would like to maintain this requirement as increased natural surveillance at the front of premises will reduce cycle thefts.**
 - b. **They have quoted several times the limited number of staff working at the facility. This is irrelevant as the ATAG standards are applicable to all staff members regardless of the numbers.**
 - c. **They have stated a 'gated access' is in place but have not gone into specifics. It's unlikely to be at a security level where a person intent on sealing a bike cannot enter the site undetected.**

Additional areas not confirmed as stated in AT OBS Form (attached) are as follows. Can these please be addressed.

Point 4.1/4.2 – Tactile paving and dropped kerbs are required at pedestrian crossings.

Point 4.3 – All disabled parking bays require dropped kerbs when transitioning to and from paths.

Point 4.4 – A smooth transition for cyclists to and from the paths. **This was mentioned as acceptable during the teams meeting; however, no additional details have been provided.**

Point 4.5 – Path widths around the site have not been confirmed as meeting ATAG standards.

Irrespective of staffing levels, the necessary infrastructure must be in place to ensure compliance with ATAG standards

We have identified the above as Active Travel concerns as part of the Engineering Assessment. We kindly ask that these considerations be taken into account when finalising your planning policy decisions

Thanks.