

From: Laura Pack
Sent: 12 June 2026 08:34
To: Claire Hall
Cc: Chad Collins; Samuel Peetham-Baran
Subject: RE: P2025/0754 Proposed residential care facility at Cardonnel Court Cardonnel Road Skewen

Hi Claire,

Massive apologies for the lateness of this, we have had a few staffing constraints recently.

Please see below my comments in red to theirs.

Kind regards,

Laura

Active Travel Comment: *Thank you for providing an updated GA plan with dimensions shown, as well as the addition of dropped kerbs and tactile paving at the site access. This is welcomed. I have reviewed the gradients marked on the plan, particularly relating to the ramped access and constrained entrance width at the start of the ramp (1.2m). Appendix G of the Wales Active Travel Act Guidance (ATAG) sets a desirable max 1:20, absolute max 1:12, and short localised max 1:10 over*

Applicant Response: The scheme has been amended as per the attached plan – the gradient of the ramped access has been reduced to 1:38 and the width of the entrance increased to 1.5m. We consider this to be an appropriate response to the ATAG, and is the very best that we can achieve on what is a constrained site without having a significant knock-on impact on layout, parking bays etc. **Thank you. The proposed 1.5 m ramp width falls below typical Active Travel Act Guidance expectations for inclusive walking and wheeling routes. While constraints may justify a reduced width in exceptional circumstances, this would require robust justification and mitigation to ensure accessibility for all users.**

Active Travel Comment: *Please provide cycle parking in accordance with the ATAG (as set out in the previous set of observations from us). I couldn't find information on anticipated staff and visitor numbers. Please can this be confirmed and then cycle provision be provided in accordance with the level of staff/visitors anticipated (for both short stay and long stay).*

Applicant Response: The ATAG requires cycle parking provision for sheltered accommodation on the following basis:

- Short-Stay: 0.05 spaces per residential units
- Long-Stay: 0.05 spaces per bedroom

The proposed development would provide 23 units/bedrooms which generates the following requirements:

- Short-Stay: 1.15 spaces
- Long-Stay: 1.15 spaces

We are proposing 2 long-stay spaces and 4 short-stay spaces, so far in excess of the ATAG requirements. Anticipated staff and visitor numbers are not relevant to cycle parking under the ATAG.

The uplift of cycle parking provision above ATAG minimum requirements is noted and welcomed. However, based on the submitted layout (SP803 - P03 Proposed General Arrangement Plan (Rev.E)), there are concerns regarding the location and accessibility of the proposed cycle parking:

- Long-stay parking is accessed via a narrow route which is below typical inclusive design expectations and may restrict use, particularly for adapted cycles.

While quantum is acceptable, the current arrangement raises concerns around usability and inclusivity, and therefore does not yet fully demonstrate compliance with ATAG principles. **Please provide:**

- Revised layout or justification demonstrating safe, convenient and inclusive access to cycle parking; and
- Further detail on cycle stand type, spacing and provision for adapted bikes for disabled people.

Active Travel Comment: *Low vehicle flows are noted, but the primary pedestrian approach should remain comfortable and legible for mobility impaired users. In addition, you state the main entrance to the care home is 1.2m. On the GA plan provided, the path leading to the main entrance/short stay cycle parking shows a dimension of only 1m making it extremely constrained. A person with a bike or as wheelchair user would struggle to access the site via this route. From the GA and local context, it appears there may be vegetation or soft boundary features that could potentially be set back/removed to achieve the necessary width. Please review and revise the GA Plan with compliant widths consistent with ATAG.*

Applicant Response: This is not a primary access to the site, simply an access for the bins and short-stay cycle area. Topography between the site and highway means that this path cannot be widened to the south without retaining structures, and widening to the north would either compromise the disabled parking bay or the proposed improvements to the primary access referenced above. We could reduce the number of cycle parking bays and amalgamate them into one location (as dealt with above) if this is preferable, however we consider that this would be counter-intuitive compared with the over-provision of spaces with a short-stretch of a 1m wide path (which is wide enough to accommodate most cycles) to access them.

The constraints and explanation provided are noted. However, the route in question provides access to the cycle parking, bin store, and car park, and must therefore remain accessible and usable for all users.

Given the nature of the development as a care home, it is particularly important that all routes are suitable for mobility impaired users, including wheelchair users. A width of 1.0 m is insufficient to accommodate this and would not meet inclusive design

expectations set out in ATAG. While constraints are acknowledged, the current arrangement would result in a substandard and restrictive route for everyday use.

Recommendation:

Revise the layout to provide a wider, accessible route, or relocate the cycle parking to a position that can be served by compliant, inclusive access.