

Development framework plan

1. Should emphasize the quality of the walking and cycling routes here. Designs often default to “Shared Use Paths” (SUP). In a development such as this segregated paths should be the default option . Should reference Active Travel Act Guidance (ATAG) Suggested design DE313, **ATAG considers an SUP as a last resort see ATAG 11.16.2**
2. Noted that some of the proposed active travel routes follow the alignment of MTCBC ATNM (Active travel Network Map). These routes are PL09S which includes the proposed bridge over the River Taff and TW27S which runs alongside Merthyr Road (A4054). MTCBC should consider adding the additional proposed routes in this development to their ATNM.

DAS

3. Page 12 Movement and access. Hierarchy of access needs to be made clear here and should follow the hierarchy set out Llwybr Newydd page 19. Walking and cycling first with private vehicles last.
4. Active travel (AT) could be made a priority throughout the site.
5. Page 14 Location no mention of AT links
6. Page 26 – Walking and cycling Footways should be a desirable minimum of 2m (not less!) so less than 2m would not be considered good quality, see 9.6 ATAG. DE101
7. Page 41 – all AT routes are proposed on the outside boundaries of the site. These maybe fine for those passing through the area but do not serve those that live or are going to a destination on the site (work, school etc).,
8. Page 47, as above_Designs often default to “Shared Use Paths” (SUP). In a development such as this, segregated paths should be the default option. Should reference Active Travel Act Guidance (ATAG) Suggested design DE313, **ATAG considers an SUP as a last resort see ATAG 11.16.2**. The western Trail is likely to form a key part of the AT network in this area and could be heavily used by those both living on the site and those passing through
9. Page 50. Why are 15m radius needed especially in residential areas of the scheme. Such radius encourages higher vehicle speeds and make it more difficult (distance) and dangerous (visibility) to cross as a pedestrian. Layouts as shown in ATAG (also MfS) should be considered . See ATAG 12.2 and figure 12.1.
10. Page 50 Pedestrian and Cyclist Access – NO MENTION OF ATAG!
11. Page 53 Have tracking alignments been considered where both lanes are utilised for turning vehicles? This may be possible in lower trafficked areas allow junction radii to be tightened considerably making it safer for vulnerable users.
12. Page 54 – default statement straight to an SUP **ATAG considers an SUP as a last resort see ATAG 11.16.2**. This route will also have very wide junctions as mentioned above which should not be a default design for this through route
13. Page 54 – If Merthyr Road is a 4mph road then any adjacent AT route will require a minimum 1.5m verge. See DE 313.
14. Page 54 secure cycle parking. Present standards to secure cycle parking are considered inadequate (Suggest garden shed with 2 locks) and makes it very difficult to access a cycle. Suitable cycle storage at the front of properties should be considered such as cycle hangers.
15. Suggest travel plan should be completed at the design stage so that it can influence detailed design. Planning requirement rather than a condition?

16. Page 55 – Street Hierarchy – no mention of cut throughs to make better permeability for AT.
17. Page 60 could mention here front of house secure cycle parking.
18. Page 63 With the main trail route requiring a segregated AT route is 15m width enough space?
19. Page 63 safeguard area at station for future cycle parking/hub and space for shared cycle schemes.
20. Page 65 Yes priorities AT but with segregated routes rather than a default SUP. Like all the other points.
21. Page 66 – highway standards may not be appropriate for some AT routes and there maybe a need for low level lighting in some instances because of environmental constraints

Framework Travel Plan (same comments apply for transport assessment)

22. 1.1.4 Only for residential? Not sure why this is the case considering mixed site proposed.
23. 1.3.1 Llwybr Newydd not mentioned?
24. 2.2.3 this comments on the proposed design of the AT which goes against ATAG. See note 8 and 9 above.
25. 2.2.4 no mention of appropriate verge see point 13 above
26. 2.2.5 design shows a toucan crossing. Is this appropriate in this location when traffic flows are considered and when compared to ATAG guidance Table 12.1. Parallel zebras could also be an option DE611 The text also mentions island and road width. These also need to be ATAG compliant see DE 608. Continuous crossing should also be a priority rather than crossing with central cages.
27. 2.2.12 Why is there no mention of ATAG here.
28. 2.2.13 Disagree with this statement. The junctions listed have been designed with vehicles in mind only and present a hazard to AT users and have not follow ATAG advice or MfS (mentioned in the paragraph above in this report). See also point 9 above
29. 2.2.14 why not ATAG?
30. 2.2.15 There is no consideration made for pedestrians and cyclists wanting to cross these junctions see point 9. Yes they may want to enter the site but they might also want to journey north south as well.
31. 2.3 if we are to develop an area that is suitable for on road cycling parking will need to be carefully controlled and measures put in place to stop pavement parking. Stopping pavement parking is particular important to stop when considering those on foot and disabled people.
32. 2.3.5 ATAG would be more appropriate table 14.4
33. Cycle parking see point 14 above
34. Walking routes. The report should consider carrying out ATAG audits prior to commenting on the routes. Footways may be almost up to the desired minimum but throughout the area there are almost no drop kerbs and tactile paving. In AT terms these would be **Critical Fails. Here is an example of dropped kerb with ponding but no tactiles, therefore a critical fail in ATAG terms.**

<https://maps.app.goo.gl/NonFC2mRevdbeCdR6>

35. 40mph roads are not suitable for on carriageway cycling see table 11.1 of ATAG

36. Cycle routes should be audited before make comment on there suitability. Just because the routes are shown as part of the NCN on the Sustrans website this is not a guarantee of quality
37. 6.3.2 add TfW for train times and tickets