

1 Church Row
St Nicholas
Cardiff CF5 6SP
28 October 2020

Application No: 2020/0874/RG3/EW

St Nicholas C/W Primary School proposed replacement primary school

To Whom It May Concern

I am again writing to explain my objections to the proposed expansion and rebuild of the school on its current site for the following reasons.

1. The proposed one way system is unrealistic and unsafe, dangerous and unworkable. This places my property on a roundabout. The proposal expects my household to travel around the village in a specific direction until a safe place to park can be found in the vicinity. This may require my household to put greater effort into active travel in the vicinity of the school site than the majority of parents, pupils or staff. The proposals do not address the impact on residents of circulating traffic and pollution created further hindering the enjoyment of their amenities. The circulatory route may not prove tortuous for school traffic but will severely impact residents, as it will further pressurize the need to be close to the site by parents to collect offspring. The one way system proposed is not enforceable for residents, some properties can only be accessed by residents going against the supposed "flow". The proposal of a one way system was explored at my former address in St Brides Major and was eventually discounted for this reason. The expectation that school management will promote, monitor and enforce a one way traffic system goes above and beyond current pay and conditions of education staff. Recent experience of the engagement by school management to discuss traffic concerns at peak times with residents has met with strong resistance to engage in discussion. The attitude being that the jurisdiction ends at the school boundary. I do not expect this attitude to change when the demands of the role will have expanded considerably. The proposed exit onto the A48 is flawed due to the reduced visibility offered to vehicles exiting at this junction. I cannot think of any residents who routinely chooses to access the A48 at this point. In addition, can you demonstrate that agricultural vehicles will be able to comply with the proposed system?
2. If an active route is necessary – why has it not already been established? If footpaths are to be considered, this will further restrict the carriageway around Church Row. If the traffic assessment states that the lack of these currently is not considered to be a significant issue, why should the Conservation Area be further compromised by urbanisation? Also, the statement of 'indicative crossing' has not been explained. How will these be designed to reflect the rural nature of the predominantly Victorian Conservation Area?

Cardiff school have established a process of road closures around primary schools at peak times, enforceable by fines. This system promotes active travel and ensures access for residents. Why has this not been commented on in the submission?

3. Children attending school and residents will be at increased risk due to the increase in traffic in the vicinity of the site. This will be further compromised by the addition of nursery provision. The resulting jostling for access already stretches capacity and the proposed increases will not alleviate this.
4. The proposed drop off zone, to be managed by school staff, puts them at public liability risk and would add to traffic chaos. The drop off zone on school premises is exactly that, a zone to drop off children. This will not assist the situation at the end of the school day, neither will it help the school when events such as consultation evenings, concerts, and fundraising events are held. Therefore the roads nearest to the site will again be clogged with vehicles trying to park in the vicinity, blocking access to nearby property.
5. A 6% reduction in car usage over 5 years does not seem to be an ambitious target if it is to be promoted by newsletters and noticeboards. Far better, a "Park and Stride" approach whereby access to the site is by a 10 minute walk thereby promoting active travel and reducing the funnelling of a large number of vehicles through narrow lanes. Traffic impact estimates increases of 200% or greater at AM and 350% at PM school times. To aim to reduce this by 6% is lamentable. A travel plan to "promote" travel options is inadequate. The SPG acknowledges that the "adjacent highway system offers limited opportunities to park cars". This proposal does not change that fact. The proposed school opening times of 7am to 5pm is envisaged to "further reduce traffic flow" – how?

The assumption that school management will **consider** arrangements to seek to reduce traffic congestion to be approved after the approval of the development puts the cart before the horse.

The existing minibus service currently offered by the school is loss making and unsustainable in the long term. It is already operating a reduced service.

6. The proposal further restricts access for emergency vehicles. Given the stated increased traffic attempting to access the site, and the wider village community circumnavigating the church and its environs in the proposed one way system, the proposal is again flawed putting lives potentially at risk.

I trust due consideration will be given to these comments.

Yours faithfully



Sally Carnall