

# Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 25/07/2025 12:45 PM

## Application Summary

Address:	Bridge Buildings 1A Godfrey Road Newport South Wales NP20 4NX
Proposal:	CHANGE OF USE TO PROVIDE 12 NO. UNITS OF TEMPORARY RESIDENTIAL ACCOMMODATION TOGETHER WITH COMMUNAL FACILITIES
Case Officer:	Marnie Ostler

[Click for further information](#)

## Customer Details

Name:

Email:

Address: Fairmead 85 Allt Yr Yn Avenue Newport

## Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: I own Flats 1-4, 2 Godfrey Road which back onto Bridge Buildings, I also own 35/34/33 Clytha Park Rd which are a combination of flats and commercial premises as well as three properties on Faulkner Road, Agincourt House, offices at 14 Clytha Park Road, and Rathbone House at 1 Serpentine Road, all of these properties are within 100 metres of Bridge Buildings. The upstairs flat at 33 Clytha Park Rd is accessed off Godfrey Rd and is directly adjacent to the current access to Bridge Buildings.

I object to the development for the following reasons:

1. That the vehicular access to Bridge Buildings is defective and dangerous for both pedestrians and passing traffic. This is especially the case for pedestrians that walk from Clytha Park Rd retail area towards the Civic Centre, it is not possible to see a pedestrian as you exit the archway.
2. That the development has the potential to attract "difficult" residents which is not a benefit to the local area which already has a large number of "difficult" residents in occupation. I would suggest that more dispersal is needed not more concentration.
3. I, especially have worked hard to rejuvenate and bring back to use a number of properties within the direct vicinity over the past several years, what the area does not now need is a deterioration in the profile of local residents and all the challenges that this brings.
4. This application has been listed as "Temporary Residential Accommodation" surely it should

be described as an application for a HMO and have to comply with the framework that is set out to regulate such premises and any application for a licence. There appears to be a grey area when it comes to the regulation surrounding temporary accommodation / serviced accommodation type units. Surely if there are going to be 12 unrelated persons residing at one address then as an absolute minimum this application should be as a HMO and that this allows the necessary safeguards and checks to be put in place both in terms of the actual application but also if the application is granted then the running of the 12 bed shared facility building, sounds like a HMO to me, needs to be regulated on an ongoing basis?

5. That currently its use and thus its activity, noise levels, vehicular and pedestrian access is generally limited to daytime hours, a change of use as suggested is going to turn the building into a much busier location, potentially 24 hours a day and cause an ongoing nuisance for neighbouring properties, its enclosed courtyard setting is both positive and negative in the wider setting, but I would argue for those properties that directly back onto the courtyard its very much a negative.

Whilst Newport is in dire need of additional housing and there is a strong demand for emergency type temporary accommodation this type of accommodation often falls through the regulatory net and in my opinion should as a very minimum be tested on the basis of a HMO application, after all that's really what it is...

Regards

---