

Cllr Farzina Hussain
Ward Councillor for Victoria Ward
farzina.hussain@newport.gov.uk

20th August 2026

Planning Department
Newport City Council

Good Afternoon Ms Vicky Quinn,

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

**R.E: FORMAL OBJECTION TO PROPOSED PLANNING APPLICATION 26/0558 46
Corporation Road Newport South Wales NP19 0AW**

I am writing in my capacity as Ward Councillor for Victoria Ward to formally object to the planning application 26/0558.

I remain firmly opposed to this proposal and would ask that the application be considered very carefully in light of the history of this site, the previous refusals, the subsequent appeal decision, the current plans, the cumulative concentration of HMOs in this part of Corporation Road, the existing parking pressures and the latest comments from the Council's Highway Officer.

History of previous applications and the appeal decision

This is not a new or isolated proposal.

The property has already been the subject of previous applications for HMO use, including the previous 8-bedroom proposal under application 25/0611 and the subsequent 6-bedroom proposal under application 25/0954, both were refused by the Council.

Most importantly, the earlier 8-bedroom proposal proceeded to appeal, and the appeal was dismissed by the Welsh Government Inspectorate on 10th June 2026 under appeal reference CAS-04768-F7Q0D3.

I appreciate that each planning application must be considered on its own merits, however, the previous appeal decision is clearly a highly material consideration, particularly because the current proposal again seeks an intensive 8-bedroom HMO and appears to retain two bedrooms at the ground-floor level.

The Inspectors decision identified significant consequences of flooding and concluded that the previous proposal would materially increase to flood risk at ground-floor level. The Inspector described the flood-risk harm as significant and a compelling factor in dismissing the appeal.

I therefore do not consider that the applicant can simply resubmit essentially the same level of intensive occupation without demonstrating clearly and robustly how the matters identified by the Inspector have now been overcome.

Flood risk and ground-floor bedrooms

This remains one of my strongest concerns.

The property is located within a significant flood-risk area, and the previous appeal decision confirmed that it is within Flood zone 3.

The current plans appear to provide two bedrooms on the ground floor, this is particularly concerning given the previous Inspector's findings that the proposed increase in ground-floor occupation materially increased the number of people exposed to flood risk.

Although the current plans appear to show a larger safe refuge room than the one considered at the previous appeal, I do not believe this should simply be assumed to resolve the previous concerns. The council should be satisfied that the refuge is genuinely functional, accessible, has adequate headroom, can accommodate the proposed occupants safely and is supported by a comprehensive flood evacuation strategy.

In particular, planning should consider whether the proposed intensification from a normal 4-bedroom dwelling to an 8 bedroom HMO represent an unacceptable intensification of residential occupation from a flood-risk perspective.

Over-concentration of HMOs

I remain concerned that the assessment of HMO concentration does not properly reflect the cumulative nature of this part of Corporation Road.

The Newport HMO SPG recognises that clusters of HMOs can increase population density, demand for infrastructure and on-street parking, and can alter the character and balance of a neighbourhood.

The following HMOs are known to me in the immediate area:

21 Corporation Road 9opposite) – 6 Units / 6 Occupants
37 Corporation (opposite) – 6 Units / 6 Occupants
44Corporation Road (next door) - 6 Units / 6 Occupants
44 Corporation Road – 6 Units / 6 Occupants
81 Corporation Road – 5 Units / 5 Occupants

These are significant levels of occupation for individual properties and demonstrate that this is not simply a case of one additional HMO appearing in an otherwise conventional residential street.

Parking and the inadequacy of the parking survey

Parking is a major concern.

The applicants own parking assessment identifies a requirement for 9 spaces for the proposed 8-bedroom HMO, compared with 3 spaces associated wit the existing dwelling. This represents an additional requirement of 6 spaces.

The Councils highway Officer has specifically commented that the parking survey lacks sufficient detail to be validated and given any weight.

The Officer has referred to the need for appropriate information regarding survey times, capacity calculations and date-stamped photographs

This is extremely important.

As ward Councillor, I have received repeated complaints from residents about parking pressures in this area. I have also raised concerns myself on behalf of residents. There are two garages/vehicle businesses in the immediate vicinity, including one situated behind 46 Corporation Road and another a short distance away. Residents have repeatedly raised concerns that vehicles associated with these uses occupy a significant proportion of the available non-resident parking spaces and parking on the pavement too.

This is the reality of parking on the ground and is not adequately reflected by a limited historic survey.

I therefore strongly object to the proposal being assessed on the basis of a parking survey which the Council's own Highway Officer has said cannot currently be given weight.

Residential amenity and intensity of occupation

The proposal would transform a conventional 4-bedroom dwelling into an 8-bedroom HMO.

That is a substantial intensification of the use of the property, eight separate occupants will inevitably generate a greater level of comings and goings, use of shared facilities, deliveries, waste, cycle movement and general activity than a normal single household. I am not saying that the council should make assumptions about the behaviour of future occupants. My concern is the physical intensity of the proposed use and its cumulative effect on the surrounding residential environment.

Given the existing concentration of HMOs and other intensive residential/support uses in the immediate area, I believe this proposal would further erode the balance between traditional family dwellings and more intensive forms of accommodation.

Communal facilities and overall standard of accommodation

The Council's HMO standards also require the number, type and quality of amenities to be appropriate to the proposed number of occupants.

Given the very intensive layout proposed, with 8 bedrooms and numerous small bathrooms fitted into the existing property, I would ask that the council scrutinise whether the communal facilities and circulation areas genuinely provide a good standard of accommodation rather than merely fitting the maximum number of bedrooms into the building.

Waste and storage

The plans appear to show only limited storage space, including a small storage area of approximately 0.77m² for an 8-person HMO, the Council's licensing standards require appropriate waste and recycling provision, and the HMO SPG expects suitable provision for refuse and recycling.

The application should therefore clearly demonstrate where the necessary bins will be stored, how they will be presented for collection and how this will be achieved without creating further obstruction or visual and amenity problems on the street.

Cycle parking

I also noted the latest Highway Officer's comments that the proposed cycle storage is not currently considered appropriate, secure or inclusive and that further information is required.

This should not simply be treated as a minor technical matter, if the applicant is relying on the sustainability of the location to justify the reduced parking shortfall, then proper, secure and accessible cycle storage is an important part of that argument.

For all the reasons above, I strongly object to planning application 26/0558.

This is now the third attempt to secure a substantial HMO use at this 4-bedroom property, following previous refusals and the dismissal of the earlier appeal. The current proposal continues to raise significant concerns.

If the planning Officer is minded to grant the application, I would formally request that the matter is referred to the Planning Committee, so that local residents and I as Ward Councillor can attend and put our concerns directly to Members.

Kind regards

Farzina Hussain