

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 09/06/2025 2:50 PM

Application Summary

Address:	26 St Edward Street Newport NP20 4GG
Proposal:	CHANGE OF USE FROM DWELLING (C3 USE) TO A 4 BEDROOM HOUSE IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION (C4 USE)
Case Officer:	Marnie Ostler

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	
Email:	
Address:	19 St Edward Street Newport

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: I have a number of objections to make against this ill-thought out plan. Whilst several policies have been quoted and raised in the proposal, they have been used to measure impact etc theoretically, not according to the actual life of the street for existing residents.

Firstly, this is a street with some diversity in it of families, singles and elderly people. Families have dwindled over the years (I've been here since 2012, so I know). Number 26 in its 'current' state would be an ideal family home and would maintain the character of the neighbourhood as such. The proposed four bedrooms to be inhabited by individuals or couples who are strangers to one another shows a complete lack of consideration for the quality of life of those inhabitants too, who would be living on top of each other.

Secondly, the idea that there is bin storage in the rear garden that will make no impact on the waste management of the street is based on a complete lack of knowledge by the proposer, who is based in Herefordshire, of how waste is managed in these small terrace houses. Wheelie bins are kept on the street and it is unrealistic to think that someone in a multiple occupancy arrangement is going to take on the task of wheeling the bin through the house to the street for each collection day. It will necessitate a large wheelie bin on the street and an overflow of recycling, IF all the residents, in the house, recycle.

Then we come to the parking arrangements. Much has been made of the locality being near many facilities so that walking to nearby shops etc can be done. This completely misses the

point of supermarkets and people having to make large shops, like the families in our street. It also misses the understanding of the need for parking for the older residents, for whom walking up the hill is a struggle. I suffer with a health condition that would make it impossible for me to traipse from St Mary's Street with heavy shopping bags. I am sure there are others in the street who would equally struggle. Moreover, many of us pay for a parking permit to park in our own street. In addition, it is unrealistic to think that, because people can walk into town they either will or therefore do not need a car at all.

The parking survey undertaken is completely inadequate for assessing parking needs and usage. To begin with, it was completed in the week before the schools half term holiday - a time when people take their own holidays to avoid the crowded holiday destinations when school holidays take place - this could easily account for the FEW spaces left on those two days.

The survey also claims that 15 spaces were available "within the surrounding area", ie St Mary Street - NOT St Edward Street where we pay to park. In St Edward Street there were just 5 spaces on the Wednesday and just 3 spaces on the Thursday. However, when I come home from an evening out, I struggle to find a space. Also, many times there may be a 'space' of sorts but one cannot park in it either due to the space being too small, or simply because it cannot be manoeuvred into because of the full take up of parking spaces opposite. This does NOT demonstrate that parking demand "can be comfortably accommodated" for extra cars. In a house of 4 bedrooms, at least two of which appear to be doubles, you can be looking at anything from 3 to 6 cars - as couples can have a car each.

As to the future planning for EV vehicles, St Edward Street is already going to be difficult to implement the Council's ideal of providing on street charging, adding more vehicles to the mix simply does not make sense.

The proposer claims, in their survey, that 'even at peak times' there is sufficient parking available. This still does not take into account people who were on holiday at the time of the survey, people who work nights or the fact that people who pay for their permit to park in their street do not expect to park in someone else's street. The survey also claims that 'although parking is restricted to residents' the Council has full control. Neither of these statements are true. Parking is NOT restricted to residents. Residents' permits are in force from 8am to 8pm Monday to Saturday, AND anyone can park in the street between those times for up to 2 hours. This means that someone, without a permit, can park at 6pm and leave their car there until 10am the following day. The Council is NOT in full control of parking - it cannot monitor parking 24/7 and it does not monitor on Saturdays from what I have observed - the weekends being the busiest 'peak' times, which were not surveyed. I took photos on 5th June at 17:31 and the street was already nearly full of parked vehicles, I took photos earlier that day at 15:23 and it was already half full at least. On Saturday at 13:45 I took another photo and again the street was pretty full already. I would like to have attached the photos.

To the question 'is vehicle parking relevant' the proposer has responded 'no'. My comments demonstrate that it is indeed highly relevant - unless the proposer is going to make it a condition of tenancy that occupiers never own or park a vehicle in the street, not realistic.

The policy that bedsits and multiple occupancy housing is only permitted if "the proposal does not create an over concentration on houses in multi occupation in anyone area of the city which would change the character of the neighbourhood or create an imbalance in the housing stock", is, I believe, exactly what this proposed 'development' does create - the street is not attracting families, as it traditionally had with a school so nearby AND it would massively impact the character of the street and contribute to the changing character of Stow Hill/Baneswell which is in danger of becoming 'bedsitter land'. It will also absolutely harm the character of the locality in this regard and cause an unacceptable reduction in amenities in terms of parking.

On these terms, I most strongly object to this proposal.

Just to add - the proposer also states that work has not been started on this project - there has been work vehicles and a skip placed outside the property for the last few weeks. Whilst this does not in itself prove work has begun already, it raises a worrying concern that it has.

Addendum to my previous comment:

No consideration has been made for our visitors, for which I purchase parking vouchers, or, more importantly, carers' visits. We have elderly residents who have carers calling and I also, on occasion, have nurse visits for medical attention. It is seriously proposed that carers and medical support workers park in another street in order to carry out their much needed work?

Kind regards