

## Comments on application 13/1279 from St Julians ward Councillor Ed Townsend

1: This applications should be considered purely in planning terms. With permission already granted for residential development on the site, the applicant can proceed with the original permission. It is not clear why additional numbers are being considered. The original approval was for 153 granted in May 2004. The original application from 2000 (00/768) showed an estimate of 105 homes, taken from the then deposit UDP.

The scoping document from 2012 (12/1102) shows 177 homes.

All of these show a gradual creeping up of the numbers. The original assessments indicated that traffic would be a problem with the numbers then being considered.

The latest application, 13/1279 is asking for 249 homes. This is a 40% increase in the number of homes over the number quotes in the 2012 scoping document, with a consequent increase in likely traffic.

2: It is not the role of Newport City Council planning committee to come to the rescue of a business by making decisions to accommodate its wishes. While I have considerable sympathy with the developer, and indeed can point to good work he has already done in the area at the site of the former Welch's garage and in supporting the Sea Cadets at TS Resolute, this favourable opinion should not cloud the judgment of this application.

### 3: Traffic generated by the proposed development

It is clear that the access roads into the site are severely limited. This was recognised in the original assessment for outline permission and has been a recurring issue. While the existing permission would generate additional traffic, the extra numbers now being asked for should be resisted.

3.1 Turner Street access. Members of the planning committee should have an opportunity to visit this small underpass to see it in context so that they can judge for themselves whether the additional numbers are a sensible option.

3.2 Clarence Place access. The assessment by the highways department indicates that this is already an over-stretched junction. Their solution to ask for £5,000 to adjust the sequencing begs the question of what impact such changes would have on the other routes across this five-road junction.

3.3 There is a play area at the heart of the Collier Street/ Courtney Street/ Crawford Street/ Turner Street square. While one side of this square is currently the through route, the proposed development opens up the other three sides of the square to additional traffic. While accepting that the existing permission also has this effect, the assessment should consider the impact of the additional numbers on this quiet square. It may be appropriate for this to become a one-way system.

### 4: Traffic generated by construction

Strict conditions were imposed on the movement of fill material to the site in the application for the school. This included limiting the access of vehicles moving material to the Turner Street route. Because of the height of the bridge, this meant a requirement for vehicles of a smaller size to be used so that they could fit under the bridge. This should be included in any permission.

An exception was made for vehicles carrying taller building material – roof trusses, for instance – which could, on application and by notification, use the East Usk Road access from Clarence Place.

These restrictions must be included.

#### 4: Rights of Way

The Usk river bank is a popular and well-used right of way, giving access to walkers, strollers, dog walkers and boat owners. This must be protected and not sacrificed for the sake of a few extra houses, even if there has to be compromise during construction. The right of way MUST be protected. During construction an alternative route should be provided.

#### 5: Flooding

Welsh Water say they are now not objecting to the proposal. This is because there is an existing permission, so realistically they can't object. They are currently investigating the reason for a persistent flooding problem in the immediate area, on the opposite side of the railway. It is essential that no additional homes above those already with permission, should be built until they have solved this problem. Members of the planning committee will sympathise with residents in Margaret Avenue and Orchard Street, who have had to wade through sewage to get to their homes during floods in the area.

#### 6: General accessibility

Part of the application is for homes specifically for those over 55. This is supported by the housing department and I agree that this is a local need that should be met. This site is not, however, perfect. Public transport is some distance away and the most direct walk to the Caerleon Road shopping area would be through the Charnwood Road underpass. This has been a source of antisocial behaviour and is currently subject to a restriction order. Members of the committee might consider whether it is appropriate for the additional number of people from the additional homes to be using this route.

##### 6.1 Public transport.

The nearest bus stops are in Caerleon Road. If planners suggest that people in this development can use public transport, thereby reducing the impact of traffic growth, they would be mistaken. Members of the committee should be given an opportunity to visit the site before meeting to consider the application to walk the route from the proposed development to the nearest bus stop judge for themselves the likelihood of people shifting from cars to public transport.

2 May 2014