

Highway Response

Ref: 25/1038

Date: 15/12/25

PROPOSAL: CHANGE OF USE FROM CLASS B8 TO CLASS B2 (VEHICLE SERVICING) (RESUBMISSION)
(RETROSPECTIVE)

SITE: 22 Exeter Street Newport NP19 8DE

Case Officer: Vicky Quinn

Highway Officer: Kevin Jackson

Highway recommendation:

Objection on highway safety grounds.

Highway Comments:

We note that the proposals now include limited use in terms of times and days, but these are not considered reasonable conditions or enforceable in practice.

It is also noted that the applicant compares the use with domestic movements and suggests only two movements per week. However, the proposals incorporate two vehicle lifts and even simple maintenance (that doesn't require lifts) is not limited to only one car a week and is not even entirely predictable. Two lifts means at least two cars at a time.

The position of the lifts would not allow vehicles to turn within the building, so they would be required to reverse in/out, increasing the risks to pedestrians, especially children who cannot be seen behind typical cars.

Regardless of scale / frequency the basic concern is visibility. We note that the applicant suggests this can be played down based on the lack of collision evidence provided by MfS. However, MfS does not support providing zero visibility of pedestrians and sets out ways of improving accesses in residential settings that are not practical here.

All vehicles exiting the premises do so blindly across a footway whether forwards or backwards. The entrance doesn't meet the requirements of a residential drive, let alone a commercial operation. We would therefore maintain the objection regardless of suggested frequency.

Furthermore, it is unlawful to cross the footway without a footway crossing (dropped kerbs) which do not appear to have been installed and would require licensing from Highways. This is separate to and independent of planning but is needed for lawful access. It is unlikely to be forthcoming given that the visibility cannot be provided.

Having passed over the footway unlawfully vehicles emerge behind parked cars into the middle of a junction. Whilst MfS suggests that drivers can creep out in some situations, this is not one of them.

In addition, any shutter would need to be set back at least 5m to allow drivers to stop clear of the highway when entering and this is a requirement for pedestrian and vehicular safety as well as to prevent obstruction of other road users. This is not a practical amendment as there would not be sufficient space for vehicles within the premises.

In summary the access is not suitable for any safe vehicular movement, and we do not consider the conditions would adequately prevent much greater use than has been claimed. We would therefore maintain the objection on highway safety grounds.