

From: Steve Harrison

Sent: 05 March 2026 18:54

To: Hawkins, Grant (Principal Planning Officer) <Grant.Hawkins@newport.gov.uk>

Cc: Steve Harrison Charlotte Cooke

Subject: Access/Visibility Offices at Wentwood Lodge

Dear Grant,

Thank you very much for giving us time to re-look at this application. My observations are below.

I am pleased that you acknowledge that the proposed scheme has merit and we are grateful that you have given us the opportunity to address the objection by the technical consultee.

We acknowledge your concerns in relation to larger equestrian vehicles having access to the site via the residential curtilage. Nevertheless we have to acknowledge that there is already equestrian traffic accessing the property as the applicant is legitimately using the access for her own equestrian needs. There are 11 Stables at this property and a menage and as such there is existing equestrian traffic of course. In the fullness of time it may be that the access to the house and the equestrian area and also of course the office building; would be amended however at this stage we must consider the access as it is, in its existing state.

I understand that you feel that you are not in a position where you can justify going against the recommendation of the highways officer and to this end I have attached a fresh visibility display drawing which hopefully is a more accurate portrayal of what is required to accompany this application. Please accept my apologies for the previous inaccurate visibility display.

As far as the swept path analysis is concerned, please see my comments below in the concluding paragraph.

Now in order to be as helpful as possible please allow me to specifically address the concerns that have been raised by the highways officer on the 20th of November 2025.

Mr Jackson acknowledges that traffic flows are low and he refers to our suggestion that the change/removal of restriction would decrease vehicle numbers but goes on to say that it is not clear how this can be supported without further information. As far as this is concerned, we feel that we need to look at the fact that the office building actually still has commercial usage and as such there could well be a situation where the property was let out as offices (with both staff and visitors) which would then potentially have a significantly higher traffic flow compared to a holiday let situation.

We acknowledge the point made that the class of vehicles attracted by the proposal is far more onerous than cars and to this end if he feels that he cannot support the application in its current form, we would be happy to scale down application for non-

equestrian use. We acknowledge the fact that the diagram of visibility displays was not helpful and hopefully we have now addressed this with the amended plan.

As the frontage of the access to the highway is lengthy we feel that this adequately satisfies the pedestrian inter-visibility and due to the rural nature of the road there is very limited pedestrian traffic along this road.

We acknowledge that it would indeed be possible to narrow the access in order to direct cars along an appropriate line however as he says this would also prevent larger vehicles accessing the parking and would reduce available passing places and whilst this is not a highway or planning matter we feel that it would not be in the best interests of the rural community to stop the use of this private area as a passing place.

We acknowledge the fact that the proposal is anticipated to generate vehicles of a larger nature and we feel that a swept path assessment as requested would probably demonstrate that the suitability of the access is not acceptable for such vehicles (unless we are allowed to use the residential gateway as well as a commercial gateway) we therefore refer to the statement above where we would entertain scaling back this application so as to address his concerns.

In conclusion, as we have previously stated we feel that a change of use to holiday that would actually be a matter of planning gain as this would be a more appropriate use in the rural neighbourhood than commercial/office. It is surely likely to result in less vehicular traffic than an office staffed with numerous employees and potential visitors. If accepted we would also be making efforts to improve the appearance of the building so as to be more sympathetic to the rural area (and less unattractive).

Could we respectfully ask that you reconsider your position in light of the points that we have made. Please feel free to revert back to us to have a further conversation if you feel that it would be helpful. You will note that we have not included a swept path assessment as we are of the understanding that this would not be relevant if non equestrian traffic were involved (i.e. Same type of vehicles which currently use the site – although of course the applicant accesses the site with her horsebox for personal use).

We hope that the concession of scaling to non equestrian will assist you in your concerns and hope that you can now support this application.

Many thanks.

Steve

Steve Harrison BSc (Est Man)

www.stevharrisonproperty.co.uk