

## Highway Response

Ref: 25/0428

Date: 27/06/25

**PROPOSAL:** CHANGE OF USE OF GROUND FLOOR FROM B1 TO D1 AND FIRST FLOOR FROM B1 TO 7NO. BEDROOM HMO (PART RETROSPECTIVE)

**SITE:** Ty Derwen Church Road Newport South Wales NP19 7EJ

Case Officer: Grant Hawkins

Highway Officer: Kevin Jackson

### Highway recommendation:

Objection.

### Highway Comments:

Access from highway is via narrow gates which appear to open out onto highway and offer no visibility at all. This is the key safety issue. Notwithstanding the parking practices on Gloster Street the entrance should accommodate two-way traffic as well as pedestrians. It is currently around 2.7m wide with no pedestrian access.

Forward visibility and pedestrian visibility could be achieved by reducing the height of the wall. This would start to address highway safety concerns.

We would seek confirmation of the current lawful use, as it appears to be a school with very limited traffic movement and unsuited to any commercial use. Even if it is office space, movements are limited and tidal. When this and the proposed operations are understood, a view can be taken regarding intensification of use. At this stage however we would assume a significant increase in daily traffic.

However, it remains that the access is unsuited to the proposed uses and cannot be considered safe. Intensification would also increase conflicts on Gloster Street, but this has an effective carriageway width of 5m albeit partial obstructed by parking.

Highways would not support the retention of gates unless they are set back into the site and provision is made for pedestrian access.

The submission lacks sufficient detail to calculate the required parking provision (or daily trips) accurately. It suggests that half of the office space is retained which does not appear correct (from the drawing labelled as existing but assumed to be proposed). The ground floor appears to have a significant children's play area as well as prayer rooms and offices. The web site suggests international appeal and multiple activities or at least a significant catchment.

Without any supporting rationale we can only assume these are all separate uses generating cumulative parking demands and trips throughout the day and evening. On that basis there appears to be too little parking and intensification of use. Further information is needed to facilitate a pragmatic approach.

The provision should include electric vehicle charging and disability spaces, as well as provision for visitors.

Short stay cycle parking is indicated, but all proposed uses would require long stay provision. This must be secure and weatherproof. The commercial element should be separate from the residential provision.

Similarly refuse should be separated and formal storage provided. This must be accessible. The current parking arrangement and narrow gates prevent access. A refuse collection vehicle (RCV) will also be required to enter and turn which does not appear to be provided for. Amended plans with appropriate access and parking should be submitted with tracking for an 11m RCV.

Other service vehicles are anticipated, but these are not generally any more onerous and can be accommodated if the gates are removed and sufficient space is available for the RCV.

In summary, Highways would request more information, which may help to support the proposals, but at this stage would object on grounds of highway safety and parking policy.