

Highway Response

Ref: 25/0841

Date: 28/10/25

PROPOSAL: CHANGE OF USE FROM DWELLING (C3 USE) TO A 4 BEDROOM HOUSE IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION (C4 USE)

SITE: 7 Conway Road Newport NP19 8PA

Case Officer: Grant Hawkins

Highway Officer: Kevin Jackson

Highway recommendation:

Not policy compliant.

Highway Comments:

The development does not detail bin and cycle storage and there is no scope for meaningful provision as there is no access to the rear. It is more likely that bins will be left on highway permanently with a HMO as nobody has responsibility for taking them in. It is not easy or appropriate to push cycles through the house, so the development does not encourage cycle use.

This is however the case for all the street and the existing use, so the impact is not measurable. Should the application be successful we would request conditions for bin and cycle stores.

It is noted that these are indicated on the block plan however they do not appear to be referenced anywhere, and a combined bin/bike store could not be accepted.

In terms of parking the change of use requires an additional parking space to be provided (refer to parking SPG). Whilst we note the sustainability study, it is not sufficiently detailed and does not help. High levels of sustainability only allow the parking requirement to be reduced to one space per unit, which is all that is required anyway.

We note the parking survey; however, it does not appear to have followed the accepted methodology properly. Furthermore, it shows very high parking stresses which raise concerns, especially as the survey can be inaccurate as there are many variables that are not considered. The key evidence is the photographic record, which is not time stamped. If taken at face value however it does show more than one space available during the hours of darkness.

That said the labelling and accuracy is questionable. There are clearly errors in the photographic evidence with the same picture presented as two different locations and actually not resembling either (having different garden and roof details).

It appears likely the picture was taken within the study area and has accidentally been double counted. We would therefore only consider it once. Notwithstanding that there may be some inaccuracy, the photos broadly support the table that suggests there are 16 spaces one night and 11 the other. As this is substantially more than 1 the accuracy becomes irrelevant.

What the survey has to demonstrate is only that there are spaces available within 200m during periods of high demand. The SPG requires only one space, but as we rely on two snapshots, we would expect the applicant to demonstrate more, which they appear to have done.

Highways could challenge the validity of the survey, on the basis of not following the correct methodology closely in every detail, however this would not be grounds for refusal. We would only request another survey.

Furthermore, the SPG provides a theoretical demand for parking which does not often materialise for HMOs.

Whilst the parking, cycle and bin storage all raise concerns, these are largely existing issues and there is not sufficient demonstrable impact to formally object to the proposals.