



Transportation Planning : Infrastructure Design

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE

**OF
DAVID ROBERTS IEng FIHE FCIHT
ON BEHALF OF XXXXXXXX**

DEALING WITH HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORT MATTERS

**THE WELSH MINISTERS (THE CHESTER TO BANGOR TRUNK ROAD IMPROVEMENT (A55)
(JUNCTIONS 16 AND 16A IMPROVEMENT REALIGNMENT AND SLIP ROADS) COMPULSORY
PURCHASE ORDER 202-**

**THE CHESTER TO BANGOR TRUNK ROAD (A55) (JUNCTIONS 16 AND 16A IMPROVEMENT
REALIGNMENT AND SLIP ROADS) (SIDE ROADS) ORDER 202-**

**AND THE CHESTER TO BANGOR TRUNK ROAD (A55) (JUNCTIONS 16 AND 16A IMPROVEMENT
REALIGNMENT AND SLIP ROADS) ORDER 202-**

PLOTS PENMAENMAWR, NORTH WALES LL34 6PR

AUGUST 2021

**Colwyn Chambers
19 York Street
Manchester
M2 3BA**

T:

E:

W: www.scptransport.co.uk



This document has been prepared for the titled project or named part thereof and should not be relied upon or used for any other project without an independent check being carried out as to its suitability and prior written authority of SCP being obtained. SCP accepts no responsibility or liability for the consequence of this document being used for a purpose other than the purposes for which it was commissioned. Any person using or relying on the document for such other purposes agrees and will by such use or reliance be taken to confirm his agreement to indemnify SCP for all loss or damage resulting there from. SCP accepts no responsibility or liability for this document to any party other than the person by whom it was commissioned.

1.0 QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE OF DAVID ROBERTS IEng, FIHE, FCIHT

- 1.1 I am a Director of SCP, Transportation Planners and Infrastructure Designers, with offices in Manchester, Leeds and London.
- 1.2 I am an Incorporated Engineer of the Engineering Council, a Fellow of the Institute of Highway Engineers, and a Fellow of the Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation.
- 1.3 I have over 35 years of experience of the highway, traffic and transport aspects of all types of development proposals and have advised many companies and local government authorities in that capacity.
- 1.4 I am acquainted with the site, having first been instructed to address the proposed development of 14 dwellings on my client's site in February 2019, and have carried out a number of observations and assessments of the highway and transport aspects of this development site since that time.
- 1.5 I confirm that the opinions expressed in this statement are my true and professional opinions and have been prepared in accordance with the CIHT Code of Conduct.

2.0 SUMMARY & CONCLUSIONS

- 2.1 My statement deals with the highway and transport aspects of the proposal by Welsh Government to compulsory purchase land from my client in order to provide a shared footway and cycleway, along with a retaining wall and working space for the construction of these works.
- 2.2 My client has secured a planning permission on their land to provide 14 dwellings that would be, at best, seriously impacted by the proposals and detrimental to the approved development, and, at worst, would make the development unachievable.
- 2.3 The case put forward in my Statement relates to the principle that there is no essential need for my client's land to be the subject of the CPO and that without the CPO and the related works along the frontage of their site there would be no material detriment to the objectives of the works that have led to the need for the CPO.
- 2.4 The Welsh Government set out in their reasons for the CPO that the land is needed to provide a cycle link from the urban area of Penmaenmawr to the A55 and Dwygyfylchi. However, this appears to ignore the fact that my client has secured a development that would extend the urban area of Penmaenmawr, which leads to the initial conclusion that the scheme should stop before crossing my client's frontage.
- 2.5 My client's approved development cannot be reasonably modified to accommodate the loss of land across the site frontage due to the significant constraints that the site has, including the topography of the site which leads to a 4-5m level difference over the 31m depth of the site, visibility splays that need to be accommodated at the site access without the need for third party land, and two easements within the site for a gas main and a culverted watercourse. Hence, the loss of land on the site frontage is likely to make the approved development unachievable.
- 2.6 The approved development has also been the subject of an active travel audit by Conwy Council and has been found to be acceptable, subject to certain improvement measures that have been agreed to, including a 2.0m footway provision across the site frontage. On this basis it can be concluded that there are no overriding concerns relating to active travel at the present time at a local level.
- 2.7 The issues affecting my client's land stem from the proposals to enhance active travel along Conway Road. However, the primary purpose of the Welsh Government scheme is to improve safety and the free flow of traffic along the A55 strategic highway, with the active travel opportunities being taken up as part of that scheme.
- 2.8 There are 11 objectives that the success of the proposals is measured against, although in my view only 3 of the objectives can have any relationship with the proposals that affect my client's

land. These relate to enhancing facilities for walkers and cyclists, building healthier communities and providing integrated transport networks.

- 2.9 I have discussed in my evidence that the exclusion of my client's land from the CPO would have no impact on any of these objectives and that there is no overriding need to CPO my client's land. This conclusion is reached on the basis that my client's land would not attract any additional pedestrians since pedestrians are already fully satisfied in terms of a 2.0m wide footway. There are no off-road cycle routes elsewhere in the urban area of Penmaenmawr and therefore cyclists already share the roads with other vehicles throughout the town and a 100m section of shared footway would not change the perception of the attractiveness of cycling in this area. In terms of an integrated transport network, the exclusion of my client's land does not create any gaps in the infrastructure for cyclists or pedestrians.
- 2.10 As an overall conclusion, the proposed extension of a shared footway/cycleway across my client's frontage provides no measurable benefit to the public and only leads to frustrating and preventing the completion of my client's approved residential development. In the absence of any overriding benefit from the scheme of works that the CPO seek to accommodate, the CPO must fail and a modification to the proposals plan is necessary.