

Highway Response

Ref: 25/0007

Date: 17/01/25

PROPOSAL: CONVERSION OF AN EXISTING GARAGE AND CHANGE OF USE TO A ONE BEDROOM FLAT

SITE: 52 Bryngwyn Road Newport NP20 4JT

Case Officer: Marnie Ostler

Highway Officer: Kevin Jackson

Highway recommendation:

Objection on grounds of highway safety and inconsistent information.

Highway Comments:

The applicant suggests that the garage cannot be used for parking. Whilst this is debatable, it is not relevant or consistent with the proposed parking.

Garages are often not used for cars and this does not change the policy approach. The garage is counted as part of the parking and as cycle parking provision. Any change therefore represents a loss of both in policy terms, regardless of tenants' current practices.

If the garage is accepted as impractical then the proposed "additional space" must also be discounted. This also means that there is no space to turn and excessive reversing is required. The reversing exacerbates the issue of safety where there is no pedestrian area or visibility adjacent to the building.

We do not have any information regarding the required levels of parking/number of existing flats/bedrooms, so cannot provide a full assessment. The loss of the garage however represents an increased demand of 1 space and a loss of 1 space and cycle storage for the existing flats.

The existing drive width is not adequate for pedestrian and car access. A minimum width of 2.4m plus 0.9m is needed for a drive where pedestrian access is also provided.

We would expect the applicant would have provided a parking survey to show that parking is available on street and provided suitable cycle parking provision (enclosed, secure, accessible etc.). We would still have concerns however, as the existing arrangement is not considered a safe/compliant arrangement for multiple units.

We would also comment that the parking at the front of the house is not acceptable to Highways. The existing dropped kerb does not facilitate access/egress at a safe angle; the loose stone is a safety hazard to highway users; and the boundary wall obscures pedestrian visibility. These matters should be addressed to avoid enforcement action under highway regulations.

Should they be addressed as part of the planning application, we would consider that two parking spaces would be provided on the site.

In conclusion the proposals add parking stress and do not comply with current car and cycle parking policies or design standards. We would therefore raise objections on highway safety grounds.