

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 31/03/2025

Application Summary

Address:	8-10 Griffin Street Newport NP20 1GL
Proposal:	CHANGE OF USE OF GROUND FLOOR FROM OFFICE TO 4NO. RESIDENTIAL APARTMENTS
Case Officer:	Marnie Ostler

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	
Email:	
Address:	Caerleon Newport

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: I wish to object on four grounds

1. Loss of Office Space

The proposal contradicts Newport's economic priorities by removing small, affordable office spaces vital for startups and SMEs. Compact offices align with post-pandemic trends favoring flexible, low-cost workspaces, and their loss undermines Policy SP3 (Economic Development) of the Newport Local Development Plan (LDP), which supports employment-generating uses in the city centre

The erosion of office stock harms daytime footfall for retail and food businesses, countering Policy GP2 (General Amenity) by reducing economic vitality

2. Misclassification of Housing Type

The description of "four one-bedroom apartments" conflicts with the shared living/kitchen arrangement, suggesting a de facto House in Multiple Occupation (HMO). HMOs fall under Use Class C4 and require assessment under Policy H8 of the LDP, which restricts overconcentration and mandates adequate amenities

If the units are genuinely self-contained (open-plan living spaces per unit), the application must

clarify this to avoid misleading stakeholders. Ambiguous wording risks non-compliance with Policy GP6 (Quality of Design)

3. Overconcentration of HMOs

Newport's Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) for HMOs caps their concentration at 10% within a 50m radius to preserve community character

Approval could exacerbate imbalances, violating Policy H8's safeguards against neighborhood destabilization, especially when other buildings exist which would be better suited for such HMOs. For example, premises on upper floors should be prioritised as ground floor conversions harm the streetscape of the city's main streets, and ground floor flats are more affected by noise and anti social behaviour at street level.

4. Inadequate Consideration of Alternatives

The applicant has not demonstrated efforts to retain office use or explored hybrid solutions (e.g., partial conversion), failing Policy SP3s emphasis on viable alternatives

The application should be refused for non-compliance with Policies SP3, GP2, H8, and GP6. The loss of office space harms economic resilience, while the ambiguous housing proposal risks perpetuating HMO overconcentration. Clarity on unit design and evidence of viable office retention must be provided for reconsideration.

Thank you

Kind regards