



NENE VALLEY

Transport Planning

NENE VALLEY TRANSPORT PLANNING CONSULTANTS LTD

Prepared by	Nene Valley Transport Planning Consultants Ltd
Document status	Draft for review
Purpose	Technical response to Newport City Council Highway Officer objection dated 8 May 2026
Documents reviewed	Highways Response; Transport Statement; Parking Survey Report; SPA-01; SPA-02; VS-01
Date	May 2026

Executive Summary

This Technical Note has been prepared in response to the Highway Officer's objection dated 8 May 2026. The objection raises matters relating to floorspace, trip generation, parking, servicing, access visibility, pedestrian and cycle accessibility, cycle parking and electric vehicle provision.

The applicant acknowledges that some plan-based clarifications would assist the Local Planning Authority and Local Highway Authority. In particular, it would be reasonable to provide an updated site layout showing customer and staff parking, visitor cycle parking, electric vehicle provision, the servicing area, signage, pedestrian routes and access visibility details. However, these are matters capable of being resolved by amended plans and/or suitably worded conditions, rather than fundamental reasons for refusal.

The development would bring a vacant/derelict commercial building back into productive use. The site has an established lawful commercial history as a windscreen/vehicle repair centre and already benefits from commercial access arrangements from Wharf Road and Archibald Street. The proposal therefore changes the nature of an existing commercial use rather than introducing a wholly new activity to a previously inactive residential street.

Even if the Highway Officer's uplifted trip generation figures are adopted as a sensitivity test, the resulting vehicle movement would remain modest in absolute terms, amounting to fewer than one two-way vehicle movement per minute in the busiest assessed peak hour. This does not represent a level of activity that would reasonably be expected to result in an unacceptable capacity or highway safety impact.

The submitted parking survey was undertaken using the recognised Lambeth methodology within a 200m walking distance and included a neutral weekday survey across late morning, mid-afternoon and early evening periods. The 200m catchment is a reasonable and commonly used survey area for assessing on-street parking stress in urban locations, and Newport has recently accepted 200m parking survey evidence in comparable urban change-of-use decision making.

For the reasons set out in this note, the Highway objection should be withdrawn subject to proportionate clarification drawings and/or conditions controlling parking layout, servicing, cycle parking, EV provision and visibility improvements.

Summary Response Matrix

Highway issue	Response position	Proposed action
Floorspace/trip generation	A sensitivity test can be presented using 285sqm GIA, while maintaining that the 133sqm sales area is the principal customer-facing trip-generating element.	Provide amended trip generation sensitivity test.
Parking survey methodology	The 200m Lambeth methodology is appropriate for urban on-street parking assessment and was applied conservatively with severance and unsuitable streets considered.	Provide optional addendum using discrete-gap capacity calculation if required.
On-site parking layout	The principle of staff/customer parking is acceptable but should be shown more clearly.	Submit revised layout showing parking, disabled bay, EV, cycle parking, servicing and signage.
Access and visibility	Archibald Street visibility has been assessed on the basis of the one-way operation; additional clarity on land control and pedestrian visibility can be provided.	Submit revised visibility/access plan showing boundary works and splays.
Servicing	LGV-only servicing can be secured by condition and managed by a Servicing Management Plan.	Submit delivery protocol and accept condition restricting HGV deliveries.
Cycle parking and EV	The TS states staff and visitor cycle parking will be provided; EV provision can be shown on the revised layout.	Add visitor cycle parking and EV/passive EV provision to layout.
Policy balance	The proposal supports reuse of a derelict/vacant commercial building, local regeneration, sustainable transport objectives and urban placemaking.	Emphasise PPW, TAN 18, Newport LDP SP1, SP18, GP2, GP4 and T4.

1.0 Introduction

1.1 This Technical Note has been prepared by Nene Valley Transport Planning Consultants Ltd in response to the consultation comments issued by Newport City Council's Highway Officer dated 8 May 2026 in respect of the proposed change of use of 17-21 Wharf Road, Newport NP19 8ET from an existing/former windscreen centre to an international supermarket.

1.2 The Highway Officer has recommended objection on highway safety and policy grounds, with concerns raised in relation to the assessed floorspace, trip generation, parking, servicing, access visibility, pedestrian/cycle accessibility, cycle parking and electric vehicle provision. This note responds to each of those matters in turn and should be read alongside the submitted Transport Statement, Parking Survey Report, swept path drawings and visibility splay drawing.

1.3 It is acknowledged that the Highway Officer has raised detailed comments, and the applicant is willing to provide reasonable clarifications and plan-based refinements where these would assist the Local Planning Authority and Local Highway Authority in securing a controlled and acceptable development. However, for the reasons set out in this note, it is not considered that the residual transport impacts of the proposal would be unacceptable, nor that the development would result in a severe or unacceptable impact on highway safety, parking operation or network capacity.

1.4 The site comprises an established commercial building in the urban area of Newport. It has an existing lawful commercial use and benefits from established access arrangements from both Wharf Road and Archibald Street. The proposal would bring a vacant/underused building back into productive use, assisting local regeneration and improving the appearance, activity and passive surveillance of a site which is presently derelict and understood to be attracting anti-social behaviour. That planning benefit is material and should be weighed in the overall planning balance.

2.0 Policy Context and Decision-Making Framework

2.1 The application falls to be determined in accordance with the Newport Local Development Plan 2011-2026, Planning Policy Wales Edition 12, Future Wales: The National Plan 2040, Technical Advice Note 18: Transport, and the relevant Newport supplementary planning guidance, including the Parking Standards SPG and Sustainable Travel SPG.

2.2 Planning Policy Wales places walking, cycling and public transport above private motor vehicles within the sustainable transport hierarchy, and requires development to be considered in a manner which promotes placemaking, active travel, accessibility and reduced reliance on the private car. PPW Edition 12 prioritises walking and cycling, then public transport, then ultra-low emission vehicles, with other private motor vehicles at the bottom of the hierarchy.

2.3 TAN 18 requires transport impacts to be assessed proportionately and confirms that parking standards should be applied in a manner which takes account of local circumstances, public transport accessibility, walking and cycling opportunities, the availability of safe public and on-street parking, and the need to manage demand for car travel. TAN 18 advises that maximum car parking standards should be used at regional and local level as a form of demand management, and that evidence should consider the relative location and accessibility of the land use.

2.4 Newport LDP Policy SP1 supports sustainable development, while Policy GP4 requires appropriate access for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport, appropriate parking and cycle storage, and development that is not detrimental to highway safety, highway capacity or pedestrian safety. Policy T4 requires appropriate parking provision. These policies should not be interpreted as requiring rigid numerical parking compliance in every urban change-of-use case; rather, they require an evidence-led judgement as to whether the development would result in unacceptable highway or parking impacts.

2.5 Newport's own recent committee reporting supports this approach. In a December 2025 Newport committee report, the Council accepted a 200m parking survey for a change of use where the additional parking demand was to be accommodated on street. The report confirmed that the Highways Officer accepted the methodology and that the survey demonstrated adequate on-street capacity. The same report noted an appeal decision in which parking stress of 96% in a dense urban area was not found to justify refusal where the site was sustainable and the effects were primarily matters of convenience rather than highway safety.

3.0 Existing Site Context and Regeneration Benefits

3.1 The site is not a greenfield or previously inactive parcel of land. It is an existing commercial building with an established history of vehicular activity, servicing and parking demand. The submitted Transport Statement identifies that the site was most recently occupied by a windscreen repair centre and benefits from vehicular access arrangements from both Wharf Road and Archibald Street.

3.2 The lawful fallback position is important. A commercial windscreen/vehicle repair operation could generate vehicle visits, customer arrivals, servicing movements and staff parking demand. The proposed development therefore does not introduce commercial activity to a quiet residential street for the first time; it changes the nature of an existing commercial activity within an established mixed urban corridor.

3.3 The building is currently vacant/derelict and, as advised by the applicant, is attracting anti-social behaviour. The proposal would bring the site back into active use, improve natural surveillance and support the local community through the provision of a specialist local retail offer. Newport LDP Policy SP18 supports development which assists regeneration of the urban area and the reuse of vacant, underused or derelict land. This was also recognised in the Newport committee report for 5 Clytha Park Road, where the reuse of a vacant unit and creation of employment were treated as recognised benefits.

4.0 Floorspace and Trip Generation

4.1 The Highway Officer notes that the submitted Transport Statement assessed the proposed supermarket on the basis of a 133sqm retail floorspace, whereas the application form and retail assessment refer to a gross internal floor area of 285sqm. The TS identified 133sqm as the proposed retail floorspace with ancillary storage, staff facilities and office accommodation elsewhere in the building.

4.2 For the avoidance of doubt, the applicant is willing to provide an amended trip generation sensitivity test based on the 285sqm GIA, without prejudice to the position that the 133sqm sales area remains the principal customer-facing trip-generating element of the development. Ancillary storage, office, staff welfare and back-of-house space does not generate customer trips in the same way as sales floorspace and should not be treated as equivalent to retail sales area for all transport purposes.

4.3 Even if the Highway Officer's uplifted figures of approximately 38 two-way AM peak trips and 47 two-way PM peak trips are adopted as a sensitivity test, this level of movement remains modest in absolute highway capacity terms. A two-way flow of 47 vehicles in the peak hour equates to fewer than one two-way vehicle movement per minute. Such a level of activity would not, in itself, be expected to result in a material capacity impact on the surrounding highway network.

4.4 The critical issue is not whether the proposal generates any additional trips, but whether the residual impact would be unacceptable. The submitted TS already compares the proposal against the lawful fallback use and identifies the extant windscreen centre as a commercial baseline.

4.5 The Highway Officer suggests that the proposal could result in additional traffic on Archibald Street in the order of 50 vehicles per peak hour. That conclusion is not accepted as a realistic worst-case operational outcome. It assumes that all calculated trips would be new to the network, would access solely via Archibald Street, and would not include any pass-by, diverted or linked trips. That is not how local convenience retail operates in practice.

4.6 The proposed use would serve both local residents and customers already moving through the area. The site sits close to Maindee/Chepstow Road facilities and within an established residential catchment. The TS identifies the surrounding urban area, the 2km walk catchment, local bus stops and the proximity of Newport Station as part of the sustainable accessibility context.

4.7 The specialist international nature of the store does not mean that it operates as an out-of-centre destination foodstore. The retail assessment reference to a proportion of trade being drawn from outside the immediate catchment should be understood in retail-planning terms, not as evidence that the store will operate with the same car-borne profile as a large foodstore. The floor area remains modest, the product range is specialist, trolley-based bulk shopping is unlikely, and customer dwell times and transaction sizes are likely to be materially different from a full-line supermarket.

4.8 It is therefore appropriate to present both a sales-area assessment and a 285sqm sensitivity test, but the transport conclusion remains unchanged: the proposed development would not generate a level of vehicle movement that would materially affect the operation or capacity of the local highway network.

5.0 Parking Survey Methodology and 200m Walking Distance

5.1 The Highway Officer gives limited weight to the parking survey on the basis that it assumes customers may park up to 200m from the site, and suggests that this may be more appropriate for residential parking than retail parking. This criticism is not accepted.

5.2 The submitted Parking Survey Report explains that the survey was undertaken in accordance with the Lambeth methodology, within a 200m walking distance, and recorded all available legal parking spaces on a neutral weekday during three periods: 10:00-11:00, 15:00-16:00 and 18:00-19:00. The report explains that the methodology records parking occupancy, turnover and availability in a structured, repeatable and transparent way.

5.3 A 200m walking distance is a reasonable and widely used parking beat catchment in dense urban environments. It does not require an assumption that every customer will choose to park 200m away; it simply defines the realistic area within which any displaced or overspill parking effect should be assessed. The relevant question is whether there is capacity within a reasonable walking distance such that any residual demand can be safely accommodated without causing unacceptable highway harm.

5.4 Newport's own recent decision-making demonstrates that a 200m survey area can be accepted for assessing on-street parking impacts associated with change-of-use development. In the December 2025 Newport committee report referenced in Appendix A, a parking survey within a 200m survey area was accepted by the Council's Highways Officer, and the evidence was considered sufficient to demonstrate adequate capacity to support the change of use.

5.5 The survey area was also deliberately refined to reflect local severance and route choice. Glebe Street was excluded because it required crossing Wharf Road, a principal urban route, and Oxford Street was excluded because it operates as a cul-de-sac with constrained geometry. These are reasonable and conservative exclusions.

5.6 The Highway Officer suggests that Phillip Street should also be excluded. That conclusion is not accepted. Phillip Street lies within the 200m walking distance and is on the same side of Wharf Road as the site. Unlike Oxford Street, it is not dismissed in the survey as a constrained cul-de-sac requiring an unattractive manoeuvre for egress. If the Highway Authority considers that individual parts of Phillip Street should be excluded due to turning head/junction constraints, those specific lengths can be reviewed, but it is not reasonable to exclude Phillip Street in its entirety while simultaneously relying on a 200m parking survey methodology.

5.7 The Parking Survey Report records overall parking stress of 75.34% during 10:00-11:00, 69.86% during 15:00-16:00 and 87.67% during 18:00-19:00. The report also identifies that the 18:00-19:00 period reflects a peak residential accumulation period rather than the primary daytime commercial parking profile of the proposed store.

5.8 The Highway Officer's critique of the way available lengths have been divided by 5m is noted. However, the survey did not simply rely on abstract totals: it included mapped space availability and timestamped photographs to evidence the survey. The report confirms that dropped kerbs, double yellow lines, zig-zags, bus stops, junction proximity and other non-usable lengths were excluded from the capacity calculations.

5.9 If required, the applicant can provide a short addendum schedule recalculating free capacity on a discrete-gap basis rather than an aggregate available-length basis. This would address the Highway Officer's example of an 8m gap plus a 2m gap being treated as two spaces. However, that refinement should not undermine the core conclusion that the survey was undertaken using an appropriate 200m beat survey area, at relevant times, and with visual evidence.

5.10 The suggestion that additional survey days are required should be considered proportionately. This is a small-scale change of use of an existing commercial building, not a major retail foodstore. The survey was undertaken on a neutral weekday, outside school holidays, across late morning, mid-afternoon and early evening periods. The 18:00-19:00 survey already captures a robust residential parking accumulation period. Any request for further survey work should be justified by reference to likely material planning harm, not simply as a preference for a larger dataset.

6.0 Parking Standards and Operational Parking Demand

6.1 The Highway Officer refers to the Parking SPG requirement for 7 car spaces and 2 commercial spaces if the full 285sqm floorspace is applied. The applicant acknowledges this point but considers that a rigid application of the maximum standard would not reflect the specific circumstances of the site, the proposed use, or national policy in Wales.

6.2 The standards must be applied alongside accessibility, urban context, existing lawful use, active travel policy and observed parking conditions. TAN 18 confirms that parking standards should be evidence-led and should consider accessibility, walking/cycling opportunities and the availability of safe public and on-street parking.

6.3 The proposal includes on-site provision, with the TS describing five off-street spaces split between the Wharf Road frontage and rear yard. The submitted TS also indicates that the Wharf Road forecourt would be reserved for staff use, with customer parking directed to the rear via Archibald Street.

6.4 The Highway Officer's concern that the parking layout has not been adequately demonstrated can be addressed by the submission of a revised site layout plan showing the precise arrangement of staff parking, customer parking, disabled parking, cycle parking, EV provision, pedestrian routes, loading/servicing area and customer signage. This is a matter capable of being resolved through amended plans or a pre-occupation condition, rather than a fundamental reason for refusal.

6.5 The likely parking demand should also be understood in light of the store's trading characteristics. The proposal is not a large foodstore. It is a small specialist supermarket within a dense residential urban catchment. Customer trips are expected to include walk-in trips, linked trips, short-stay visits and pass-by/diverted movements. The parking demand at any one time will therefore be materially lower than the total hourly trip generation figure.

6.6 Newport's recent committee reporting also demonstrates that high parking stress in dense urban areas does not automatically justify refusal. The December 2025 report expressly states that a lack of plentiful on-street parking at peak times has proven not to be a robust reason to refuse planning permission where the site is sustainable and there is no significant highway or pedestrian safety concern.

7.0 Access, Visibility and Pedestrian Safety

7.1 The Highway Officer raises concerns regarding pedestrian exposure along the Wharf Road frontage, the width/definition of the access, and visibility at both the staff and customer accesses.

7.2 The applicant accepts that the submitted plans can be clarified. A revised site access plan should be provided to show the defined pedestrian entrance, any retained or altered boundary treatment, pedestrian inter-visibility splays, the staff-only arrangement at the Wharf Road forecourt, and the customer access arrangement from Archibald Street.

7.3 The submitted TS already identifies that the Archibald Street access has been assessed based on one-way westbound operation and that a 2.4m x 43m visibility splay has been shown in the relevant direction of approach. It also notes that boundary treatment alterations are proposed to improve pedestrian inter-visibility and manoeuvrability.

7.4 The Highway Officer states that the splays are shown through walls and third-party land. This point should be addressed through a revised visibility drawing. The revised drawing should distinguish between existing adopted highway, land within the applicant's control, land to be altered, and any third-party land. If full splays rely on boundary changes within the applicant's control, the drawing should show the precise boundary lowering/removal required and confirm that the splay would be kept clear above 0.6m.

7.5 It is also relevant that the local collision record does not identify a baseline safety issue. The submitted TS records that no personal injury collisions were identified within the defined study area over the reviewed five-year period, including Wharf Road, Archibald Street and surrounding junctions.

7.6 The absence of recorded injury collisions does not remove the need for safe design, but it does provide important context. There is no empirical evidence of an existing collision pattern at the site accesses that would be exacerbated by the proposal. With revised access definition, pedestrian visibility splays and a controlled staff/customer access strategy, the residual safety impact would be acceptable.

8.0 Servicing and Deliveries

8.1 The Highway Officer does not accept that the store would avoid HGV deliveries and raises concerns that the applicant would not control the fleet of suppliers.

8.2 The applicant is willing to accept a planning condition restricting servicing to light goods vehicles only, prohibiting HGV deliveries, and requiring a servicing management plan prior to occupation. Such a condition would be enforceable and would provide the certainty sought by the Highway Authority.

8.3 The submitted TS states that servicing would be by small to medium vans, with no HGV servicing, and that this could be secured by condition. It also states that deliveries would take place outside customer opening hours and be supervised during manoeuvres.

8.4 The submitted swept path drawing SPA-01 tests a 4.6t light van with an overall length of 5.885m and kerb-to-kerb turning radius of 6.0m. The TS states that this vehicle can enter the site, manoeuvre and exit in a forward gear.

8.5 The Highway Officer suggests that 8m or 10m vehicles should be anticipated. That would only be appropriate if such vehicles were proposed or reasonably necessary for the operation. They are not. A small specialist supermarket can be supplied by smaller vehicles, particularly where the operator is aware of the site constraints. If required, the applicant can provide a written delivery protocol confirming that supplier contracts/instructions will specify LGV-only deliveries and that no articulated or rigid HGV deliveries will be permitted.

8.6 The servicing management plan can include delivery hours, vehicle size restriction, staff training, banksman arrangements, a booking system for deliveries, prohibition of reversing from Archibald Street where avoidable, and signage/instructions for suppliers. These are practical management measures which can be secured by condition and are proportionate to the scale of the development.

8.7 The objection also refers to reliance on a Traffic Regulation Order for double yellow lines. It is accepted that a TRO cannot be guaranteed at planning stage. For this reason, the revised strategy should not rely on the TRO as essential mitigation. The applicant can still support a TRO if the Highway Authority considers it beneficial, but the acceptability of the development should be assessed on the basis of the existing highway arrangement plus any physical works within the applicant's control. If swept path access requires the TRO, this should be made explicit; otherwise, the TRO should be presented as a betterment rather than a dependency.

9.0 Cycle Parking and Electric Vehicle Provision

9.1 The Highway Officer states that there are no customer cycle facilities and no electric vehicle charging provision. The applicant is willing to clarify this by amended plan.

9.2 The submitted TS already states that the proposals include both secure long-stay cycle parking for staff and short-stay visitor cycle parking, with two staff spaces and two visitor spaces. If this was not shown clearly on the submitted layout, it can be added to the revised site plan and secured by condition.

9.3 EV provision can also be shown on the revised plan. Given the small number of spaces and constrained urban context, provision of one active EV charging space, or passive infrastructure for future installation, would be a proportionate response. The details can be secured by condition prior to occupation.

9.4 These matters are not fundamental reasons for refusal. They are standard plan-detail matters and can be resolved by condition or amended drawings.

10.0 Sustainable Transport Accessibility

10.1 The Highway Officer does not fully accept the TS position that the site is well served by footways, cycling and bus provision. The applicant maintains that the site is located in a sustainable urban area and that the proposal accords with the transport hierarchy in PPW and TAN 18.

10.2 The TS identifies that the site is within a 2km walking catchment, with a significant surrounding residential population in Maindee and Beechwood, and that the site is located close to Maindee District Centre. It also identifies local pedestrian infrastructure and nearby crossing opportunities.

10.3 The TS identifies bus stops on Wharf Road and Chepstow Road within the 400m guideline walking distance, with services including routes 5, 6, 8A/8C, 9A, 73, 74/74A/74C and X60 providing connections to Newport City Centre, Ringland, Chepstow and other destinations.

10.4 The site is therefore not car-dependent. The proposal is a modest-scale retail use within an established urban neighbourhood. The presence of on-street parking pressure in surrounding streets is precisely the type of context where policy should support local services that can be accessed on foot, by cycle and by public transport, rather than requiring suburban-style parking provision that would undermine placemaking and sustainable transport objectives.

11.0 Newport Precedents and Material Considerations

11.1 Newport has previously accepted that changes of use in urban locations can be acceptable where parking is constrained, provided the site is sustainable and the residual highway safety impact is not unacceptable.

11.2 In the December 2025 Newport committee report referred to in Appendix A, the Council accepted a 200m survey area and confirmed that available spaces within that survey area could support a change of use. The same report gave weight to an appeal decision where very high parking stress did not justify refusal because the issues were principally matters of convenience and the site was sustainable.

11.3 In the 5 Clytha Park Road decision, Newport granted a change of use from a vacant A1 unit to a micropub in a local centre. The Highway Officer offered no objection because of proximity to the city centre, transport links and public car parks, and noted that deliveries would also be associated with the existing A1 use. The report also recognised the benefit of using a vacant unit and creating employment opportunities.

11.4 These examples do not create binding precedent, and each case must be determined on its own merits. However, they are material because they demonstrate Newport's recent approach to urban change-of-use proposals, parking stress, sustainable locations and the reuse of vacant commercial premises.

Suggested Conditions

1. Prior to first occupation, the approved parking, servicing, cycle parking and EV charging/passive EV infrastructure shown on the approved site layout shall be provided and thereafter retained.
2. No HGV deliveries shall take place at the site. All deliveries shall be undertaken by vehicles not exceeding 5.885m in length unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
3. Prior to first occupation, a Servicing Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter operate in accordance with the approved plan.
4. Prior to first occupation, details of customer/staff parking signage and cycle parking provision shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter retained.
5. Prior to first occupation, any approved boundary alterations required to provide pedestrian and vehicular visibility splays shall be implemented and retained free from obstruction above 0.6m.

13.0 Conclusion

13.1 The Highway Officer's comments are noted, but the objection overstates the likely transport impact of the proposal and does not give sufficient weight to the site's lawful commercial fallback, sustainable urban location, modest scale, regeneration benefits and the ability to secure operational controls through condition.

13.2 The proposal would bring a vacant/derelict commercial building back into beneficial use, improving activity, passive surveillance and local service provision. It would support urban regeneration objectives and provide a specialist local retail offer within an established residential and mixed-use area.

13.3 Even on the Highway Officer's uplifted trip generation figures, the level of vehicle movement would remain modest in absolute terms and would not be expected to result in a material highway capacity impact. The proposal would generate fewer than one two-way vehicle movement per minute in the busiest assessed peak hour, with a proportion of trips expected to be local walk-in, linked, pass-by or diverted trips.

13.4 The parking survey was undertaken using a recognised Lambeth methodology within a 200m walking distance. That approach is reasonable for an urban change-of-use proposal and is consistent with Newport's recent acceptance of 200m survey evidence in determining parking impacts. The results show that daytime parking stress remains below the commonly referenced 85% level during the two principal daytime survey periods, with the early evening period reflecting peak residential accumulation rather than the primary commercial parking profile.

13.5 The access, visibility, cycle parking, EV and servicing matters raised by Highways are capable of resolution through amended plans and appropriately worded planning conditions. In particular, a revised layout plan, servicing management plan, LGV-only delivery restriction, cycle parking provision, EV provision and clarified visibility drawings would provide a robust and enforceable framework for the safe operation of the site.

13.6 When assessed against PPW, TAN 18, Future Wales and Newport LDP Policies SP1, SP18, GP2, GP4 and T4, the development is acceptable in transport terms. It would not result in unacceptable highway safety impacts, would not materially prejudice the operation of the local highway network, and would support the beneficial reuse of a vacant/derelict urban building. The Highway objection should therefore be withdrawn, subject to the submission of the clarifying plans and/or the imposition of suitably worded planning conditions.

Appendix A: Reference Material

- Newport City Council committee report, December 2025 - 200m parking survey / change of use reference: <https://democracy.newport.gov.uk/documents/g8878/Public%20reports%20pack%2003rd-Dec-2025%2010.00%20Planning%20Committee.pdf?LLL=0&T=10>
- Newport City Council committee report - 5 Clytha Park Road change of use to micropub: <https://democracy.newport.gov.uk/mgConvert2PDF.aspx?!ID=7488>
- Planning Policy Wales Edition 12: <https://www.gov.wales/sites/default/files/publications/2024-07/planning-policy-wales-edition-12.pdf>
- Technical Advice Note 18: Transport: <https://www.gov.wales/sites/default/files/publications/2018-09/tan18-transport.pdf>

Appendix B: Submitted Documents Reviewed

- Highways-3.pdf - Highway Officer consultation response dated 8 May 2026
- TS 17-21 Wharf Road.pdf - Transport Statement
- Parking survey Wharf Road.pdf - Parking Survey Report
- SPA-01 Archibald Street.pdf - 4.6t light van swept path analysis
- SPA-02 Archibald Street.pdf - estate car swept path analysis
- VS-01 Archibald Street.pdf - visibility splay drawing