

From: Peterson, James (Elected Member) <James.Peterson@newport.gov.uk>
Sent: 17 April 2025 11:35:36 UTC+01:00
To: "Hawkins, Grant (Senior Planning Officer)" <Grant.Hawkins@newport.gov.uk>
Subject: objection to 25/0220 Traston lane

Moring Grant,

I am writing to respond to the planning application for Traston Lane 25/0220, which proposes 26 units and a pump station. As a ward councillor living approximately 35 meters from the site on Traston Road, I must declare my proximity. However, I have been approached by numerous residents during the pre planning application consultation who have raised concerns after receiving PAC letter. To better understand their views, I visited homes around the site, including Traston Lane, Traston Road, and Traston Close. I encouraged residents to provide feedback.

In general, most residents are against the development, with only two expressing neutrality at the time of the pre application. however, since than one resident contacted myself and stated that I spoke to her husband who has early onset dementia and they she wanted to make it clear that she opposed the development as well.

The primary concern is flooding, both surface and foul water.

All adjoining residents have highlighted that their gardens already flood during winter months. They fear that the development will exacerbate this issue by replacing natural drainage. The site is a green space that feeds into Great Spytty Reen, and replacing this with the proposed development will increase flooding. While the development includes surface water actions to meet SUDs requirements, such as ponds that will feed out of the site in the northwest corner, residents are worried. The ground on the site is being raised from 6.0m to 6.8m to allow drainage pipes to have a gradient fall. However, residents are concerned that raising the road will block the natural flow and create a taper from the high point of the site to the low point of Traston Lane, which is 5.84m. The drainage on the outer boundaries of the site does not seem to account for the existing drainage or the taper that will be created. Traston Lane is not an adopted highway and relies on natural drainage for their flood defence, as do the private gardens that back onto the site. Additionally, a large proportion of the boundary vegetation, which absorbs water and serves as a flood defence, is proposed to be removed.

It should be noted that that 50% of the site has a boundary with a reen and the plans do not show access for plant machinery to clear any blockages caused by falling trees etc at the rear of the properties causing another potential flood risk.

Another major concern is the sewer system's capacity to handle an additional 26 properties and a pump station. The properties on Traston Lane are over 100 years old, with the lowest finished floor levels on the estate and ground-level toilets. In recent years, residents have experienced toilet overflows into the ground floor. They believe that the additional pressure on the sewer network will

increase these events, disproportionately affecting them due to their location at the lowest point of the estate.

The proposed pump station has also raised concerns among nearby residents. It is proposed to be placed 10 meters from existing properties, raising issues about noise, smells, and unsightliness. While the pump station may meet specifications when installed, residents are concerned that over time, issues will arise, requiring their time and resources to rectify. The plans do not clearly show how or where the pump station will connect to the existing public sewer and the route the pipes will travel. Residents are concerned that even though they object to this development they will be forced to have their gardens dug up as the sewer lines in Traston flow through private gardens.

Traffic impact is another concern. The existing estate comprises about 100 properties, and an additional 26 properties represent a 26% increase in traffic on Traston Road. The highway is already showing signs of deterioration. Residents worry that the initial development, with lorries delivering supplies, will accelerate this deterioration and increase potholes, as the road is limited to 7.5-ton vehicles except for access. The continued traffic from new homes after development will exacerbate this issue. Furthermore, Nash Road outside the high school and college can get heavily congested, and additional traffic will worsen this congestion and its negative impacts. The plans also mention access through Traston Lane, but as it is a private lane and not an adopted highway, permission would be required to use this entrance.

Concerns were also raised about the 400-year-old oak trees on the site and the root protection area (RPA) necessary to maintain the tree's health. The exact measurements for the RPA seem inconsistent across different drawings. Specific concerns include:

1. Excavation: Digging into the soil to lay foundations or trenches is likely to damage roots, such as those of boundary fences/walls.
2. Soil Compaction: Parking vehicles, storing heavy materials, or operating machinery within the RPA can compact the soil and harm root systems.
3. Changes to Ground Levels: Raising or lowering the soil level disrupts the tree's access to oxygen, water, and nutrients.
4. Impermeable Surfaces: Installing asphalt, concrete, or other impermeable materials directly over roots prevents water and air from reaching them.

Residents are also worried about the devaluation of their properties due to affordable housing being put on the site. Although research shows that affordable housing does not negatively affect house prices in the long term, residents fear short-term impacts. Combined with the above concerns, some residents feel that this development will trap them in their current properties. A few residents reported that they bought their properties because they are on a private estate. If they choose to move due to this development, they believe they would not get the current market value and would have to move to a lower-standard property on another private estate.

These are a brief summary of the concerns shared with me as a councillor. While I support these concerns, I am aware that not all of them fall under your responsibilities. However, the impact on other authorities through this development affects residents' day-to-day lives.

I object for the above concerns along with the history of planning applications for this site as it is unfair on residents to continually having to object to proposals for over 32 years because (93/0980) developers can't meet the condition set by planning,

I would therefore like to call this application to planning committee if you are of a mind of granting permission for this application.

Kind regards,
Cllr James Peterson