

Highway Response

Ref: RECON 26/0237

Date: 13/07/26

PROPOSAL: CHANGE OF USE FROM EXISTING WINDSCREEN CENTRE TO INTERNATIONAL SUPERMARKET

SITE: 17-21 Wharf Road Newport NP19 8ET

Case Officer: Vicky Quinn

Highway Officer: Kevin Jackson

Following receipt of further information, we would update our comments as follows.

Highway recommendation:

Objection.

Highway Comments:

For ease of reference our comments use the same headings as the Nene Valley Technical Note (TN) (no date or reference found).

1. Introduction

The nature and scale of the store is understood, and the principle of re-use is not a concern subject to a practical arrangement.

We do not consider there is any meaningful relationship with Maindee District Centre.

2. Policy

From a Highways' perspective the key policies are those that address public safety. The responses issued previously to the draft TN, do not constitute a "rigid suburban parking response". They required full and correct information to assess the proposals, and this is still lacking. Therefore "evidence led decision making" is still impossible. The issues raised are safety related and put pedestrians first.

3. Existing Site Context and Lawful Fallback

The context and fallback have not been presented. The TN does not provide any information to support the assertion that the extant use or any fall-back position is worse than what is proposed. It would be acceptable to change the nature of the commercial activity as long as it is shown to be no worse or any impacts are mitigated.

4. Corrected Trip Generation Assessment

We note the correction and welcome the amended TRICS assessment. The supporting data is not presented; however, the new forecast trip numbers are accepted as broadly proportionate and show significant levels of activity for a residential street. The evening peak for example is predicted to have 47 movements in the hour with the morning peak predicted to have 38. This raises a number of concerns around the access and the adjacent junction.

The site access is considered in section 7 below. The vehicular access to this site is via residential roads, with weight and directional controls. All customers must approach via these residential streets. It appears likely that most would approach via Eveswell Street, using the box junction with Chepstow Street, potentially impacting the school and Fire station.

All will exit onto Wharf Road where vehicles are likely to queue beyond the access in peak hours and obstruct Wharf Rd if turning right (here or next right) as they would not be likely to cross in one movement.

An increase of 10% over existing volumes (or 30 movements) would normally trigger an assessment. To understand the weight that should be given to these concerns the application should include surveys to establish the existing movement out of Archibald Street as well as full TRICS profiles.

We would seek input from the local fire and rescue service as this could impact emergency vehicles if they use this route to reach Wharf Rd.

5. Pass-by, Diverted and Linked Trips

It appears that the applicant now understands that pass-by and diverted trips do not help as they are all new to Archibald Street. We note that discounting is not relied upon.

Whilst we accept that it is possible to park in the Maindee centre and visit multiple stores/services, it is unlikely there would be any significant number of trips shared with this development. The Retail study suggests that this store fulfils a specific role but also overlaps other stores in terms of offer. That added to the perceived severance suggests that there would be no significant cross over and no pass by.

6. Parking Survey Dataset and Methodology

Highways do not accept that the methodology and parameters were appropriate for the reasons previously provided. A new survey however is not requested. The results should omit streets that could not be used conveniently and assess the discreet gaps. It is suggested in the TN that photos and mapping is available to demonstrate the number of spaces available. This information should be presented if the survey is to be given any weight.

It is noted that there is on site parking claimed (this is discussed in detail in the next section) however there is an issue in so far as customers pass most of the on-street spaces before they know if they can park in or close to the shop. They are unable to circulate without a significant loop of main and residential roads to get back to Archibald.

We are content to review the survey information when it is adjusted and presented whole. At this time however the survey cannot be given any weight.

7. Revised Layout, Parking, Cycle Parking and EV Provision

The TN now includes a plan to show the proposed customer provision of parking, which consists of three spaces with no space to manoeuvre and an access that isn't wide enough for two-way movements. In addition, the space is shared with the service vehicles (considered further in the next section).

Although there are no swept paths it is clear that neither the space or the access is practical.

In effect there is zero accessible / safe customer parking in curtilage. Combined with the lack of on street parking this raises further objection. It is not accepted that unsafe and impractical arrangements are better than a "suburban format parking layout" whatever that is.

It is clear from the TN that there will be significant levels of visitor parking required with circa 19/23 arrivals in the peaks. The TRICS data have not been provided, but would readily demonstrate accumulation greater than the provision. Given that the access doesn't accommodate two-way movements it is academic anyway.

We note that the only parking is for customers and there is no provision for staff. The yard on the other side of the property is not used for anything. Indeed, it is obstructed by customer cycle parking.

8. Access, Visibility and Pedestrian Safety

The plan referred to in the TN shows visibility splays through the boundary wall and in the neighbour's land. Furthermore, the vehicular visibility is drawn to some random point and not within 1m of the kerb line as required. Therefore, it demonstrates that there is insufficient visibility for pedestrian or vehicular safety.

It is academic anyway as vehicles cannot turn within the site. The drivers would cross the footway "blindly". And at an angle that doesn't allow them to make effective observations (even going forward).

The reference to collision records is not helpful as the nature of the access/use will be changed. It is not even known if it was used for vehicles to exit in the last five years. Images on Google Maps appear to show a drive through operation, which would mean no manoeuvring in this yard and no exit via this gate.

9. Servicing and Refuse Strategy

The plans referred to show goods in in the same area as customer parking. Again, there are no swept paths to show this is practical and there is certainly no possibility of vehicles entering and leaving in forward gear. This is not a suitable arrangement.

The TN suggests that presenting the swept paths/basic information would be "a drawing presentation matter". The applicant must demonstrate that the proposals work before we can support them. The previously submitted swept paths made it clear that the vehicle could not manoeuvre within this yard.

Furthermore, it is not accepted that all deliveries would be made with a vehicle of similar proportions to a large 4x4.

In terms of refuse the document refers to the "agreed waste management arrangements". It is not clear what has been agreed or who agreed. Private collections on street would be required and would obstruct the street. Whilst there is some control (compared to LA collections) these are still going to clash with customers and other highway users.

Furthermore, highways do not consider the suggested delivery/collection strategy is practical or enforceable.

10. Sustainable Transport and Local Amenity Benefits

The only point made and accepted in this section is that provision of specialist foods may be convenient for some customers and reduce the distance they travel to purchase them. Given the relatively small customer base, convoluted routes and likely catchment however we would not expect this to represent a significant saving in terms of vehicle mileage.

11. Alternatives and Planning Balance

The previous use is not considered worse than the proposed in terms of highway matters. It appears to have catered for a steady stream of customers on site with a one-way operation and windscreens do not require large vehicles to deliver (or fit) them.

The other points raised are not for Highways to comment on.

12. Suggested Planning Conditions

Highways would not support the access and parking provision.

The visibility is not achievable.

Any proposed servicing plan is unlikely to be able to address our concerns or be enforceable.

Any potential solutions should be set out prior to determination to avoid conditions that cannot be discharged.

Highways do not consider that the impacts can be managed via conditions and maintain an objection.