

Highway Response

Ref: 25/0999

Date: 22/12/25

PROPOSAL: CONVERSION OF FIRST FLOOR ROOF SPACE TO STAFF ACCOMMODATION INCLUDING 4NO. BEDROOMS IN CONJUNCTION WITH USE OF SITE AS MEDITATION CENTRE AND CONSTRUCTION OF 5 NO. DORMER WINDOWS IN FRONT ROOF SLOPE AND INSTALLATION OF ROOF LIGHTS IN REARROOF SLOPE

SITE: Blue Cross Rehoming Centre Willenhall Street Newport NP19 0GE

Case Officer: Ben Webster

Highway Officer: Kevin Jackson

Highway recommendation:

Not supported or policy compliant.

Highway Comments:

The application appears to be very similar to the original application (24/0916) which raised highway concerns but was subsequently approved. Highways removed their objections on the basis of no residential development and limited attendance, however there are no conditions to restrict attendance.

The current application again includes residential development. It appears from the information submitted that four units are proposed for two staff. Furthermore, the units appear to be a HMO.

As such they would require five parking spaces regardless of sustainability credentials.

Whilst combining work and home locations is generally positive in terms of reducing car use, The matter of parking must still be addressed, and the number of units does not correlate with the number of staff.

A sustainability assessment has been completed and claims a reduction for the meditation centre. However, this is based on accessibility to services that relate to residential development not this development. Whilst the SPG is not explicit it is clearly not relevant to have a school or GP (for example) near a meditation facility.

Furthermore, the reductions are from the standard and there is no clearly applicable standard for this use. It has been assumed that the most relevant is community centre or assembly halls, but this is not fixed or applied with any confidence. It is applied on the basis that it seems reasonable for this use in this location.

It is not clear if the centre is operational or not, but the only reliable measure would be to survey this or similar operations.

The submitted Transport Statement and Travel Plan are both based on lots of unsubstantiated assumptions and do not provide any confidence in their conclusions. It should also be noted that the proposals are too small to expect a Travel Plan to have significant impacts and there are no sanctions imposed if the assumed modal shares are not achieved. That said it would still be welcomed in the spirit of promoting reduced car use.

In conclusion, highways do not support the proposals on the basis that there is insufficient evidence of likely parking or use levels.

Should the Planning Case Officer be minded to approve the proposals, we would request conditions to ensure high quality provision (and retention) of cycle parking (staff/residents and visitors) along with electric vehicle charging.