

Highway Response

Ref: 26/0174

Date: 24/4/26

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

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

Case Officer: Grant Hawkins

Highway Officer: Kevin Jackson

Highway recommendation:

Objection. The application is not supported by sufficient information to demonstrate that the proposed development will not be prejudicial to the satisfactory functioning of the highway network.

Highway Comments:

Access from highway is via narrow gates which appear to open out onto highway and offer no visibility at all. This is a 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.

HGVs (including RCVs) are generally 3m wide (including mirrors) with additional space needed if they are unable to approach in a straight line.

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

The applicant suggests that the proposed uses would represent a reduction in traffic potential however this has not been substantiated.

We previously sought confirmation of the current lawful use, as it appears to be a school with very limited traffic movement and unsuited to any commercial use. The applicant has now made it clear that the extant use is B1 offices.

Even as office space, movements are limited and tidal. The applicant asserts that the Church has few meetings and generates little traffic but there is nothing to substantiate this. The web site suggests international appeal and multiple activities or at least a significant catchment. Furthermore, the parking allocation is reduced (to 57%) for residents to provide additional (in excess of the SPG) space for the ground floor use.

The de-intensification argument is not accepted. Intensification would also increase conflicts on Gloster Street, but this has an effective carriageway width of 5m albeit partially obstructed by parking.

Notwithstanding the parking SPG, it remains that the access is unsuited to the proposed uses and cannot be considered safe. It is suggested that the gate would be open most of the time and that residents of Gloster Street would benefit from a turning area. However, they would have no right of entry, and this cannot be secured.

Highways would not support the retention of gates unless they are set back into the site and provision is made for pedestrian access. A condition to remove them would be requested. If there is a heritage issue they could be relocated.

The submission lacks sufficient detail to calculate the required parking provision (or daily trips) accurately. It relies on the parking SPG and suggests that there is little church activity. The ground floor appears to have a significant children's play area as well as prayer rooms and offices.

We note that the applicant suggests that children are not left and parents would be on site, but this doesn't reduce parking demand. 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 an intensification of use. Further information is needed to facilitate a pragmatic approach.

The parking is inefficient and some spaces are obstructed by others (eg 1,2 and 3) and space 4 and 5 are difficult to use with the position of the access. Space is also needed to facilitate servicing (see below). The true parking provision is therefore over-estimated.

It is proposed to reserve 4 spaces for residents which is only half of the SPG requirements. (7 plus 1 visitor space).

It is argued that the church has few meetings, but there is no data to support this and more importantly nothing to provide any scale for it. The SPG is based on prayer space, so assumes no other activity than praying, but there are additional spaces that could be used in parallel albeit some ancillary use is a reasonable assumption.

We note that the agent suggests that informal observation suggests that there is sufficient space for parking in the evening. Firstly, this would be very unusual for a terraced road and there is insufficient width to park on both sides lawfully. Secondly the concern is around the church parking demand not the residential element. We do not have any information regarding the timing, frequency or scale of this.

Provision should include electric vehicle charging and disability spaces.

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

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.