

Highway Response

Ref: 25/0611

Date: 01/09/25

PROPOSAL: CHANGE OF USE FROM 4 BEDROOM DWELLING (C3) TO 8 BEDROOM HOUSE IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION (SUI GENERIS)

SITE: 46 Corporation Road Newport NP19 0AW

Case Officer: Vicky Quinn

Highway Officer: Kevin Jackson

Highway recommendation:

Further information requested.

Highway Comments:

The survey is not checkable as it does not include all of the information specified by the Lambeth methodology. In particular it does not include the assessment of the available parking (just totals) or sketches to show where parking was available and there are no date/time stamped and identifiable photos. Without these we can give no weight to the survey.

Time stamped photos are key because the assumption that the number of spaces available is the result of the length divided by 5 less the number of cars parked. This assumes efficient use of the space, when in fact there could be lots of gaps too small to use, but adding up to a number of car lengths.

The report suggests that the parking demand is reduced on the basis of sustainability, but there is no sustainability assessment. Furthermore, HMO rooms are individual households. The lowest allowable parking provision is 1 per household as set out in the sustainability guidance and that is all the SPG requires anyway. On that basis sustainability does not reduce the requirements (and hasn't been established).

Highway assessment of the parking requirements based on the SPGs is (assuming the house is currently occupied):

| | | | | | |
|--------------|---|----------|---|----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Occupants | + | Visitors | - | existing requirement | |
| (8 rooms x1) | + | (8/5) | - | 3 | = 6.8 which should be rounded to 7. |

Actual demand varies based on a number of factors including location and quality of the accommodation.

Taken at face value the report shows 13 spaces available which would be sufficient. However, Highways cannot confirm this unless the survey information needed for validation is provided.

Cycle storage is proposed; however, it is not appropriate and there does not appear to be any access without pushing the bike through the house. Notwithstanding the lack of access, any shared facility must provide sufficient space to secure and remove/replace cycles easily. What is proposed is only suitable for a single household. This could be addressed by way of condition.

Highways also have concerns regarding waste management. This is likely to be left in the footway permanently as nobody has responsibility for returning the bins. We also note that the storage area does not have level access to the path or footway.

In summary, Highways are unlikely to support the development due to issues with bins and bikes. At this stage we are unable to comment on the impact of parking, pending further detail of the parking survey, which are needed for validation.