



## PLANNING COMMITTEE – 10TH JUNE 2015

**SUBJECT: SITE VISIT - CODE NO. 14/0604/OUT – CAR PARK, AIWA TECHNOLOGY PARK, NEWBRIDGE, NEWPORT, NP11 6EY**

**REPORT BY: ACTING DIRECTOR OF CORPORATE SERVICES AND SECTION 151 OFFICER**

---

### PRESENT:

Councillor D.G. Carter – Chair  
Councillor W.H. David - Vice Chair

Councillors A. Lewis

1. Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ms L. Ackerman, Mrs E.M. Aldworth, Mrs K. Baker, J. Bevan, L. Gardiner, G. Johnston and Mrs J. Summers.
2. The Planning Committee deferred consideration of this application on 6th May 2015 for a site visit. Members and Officers met on site on Wednesday, 20th May 2015.
3. Details of the application to erect a residential development, Car Park, Aiwa Technology Park, Newbridge, Newport were noted.
4. Those present viewed the site from the A467, walked the different walking/cycle routes, rights of way paths in and around the site in order to get a better understanding of its sustainability and examined the plans submitted with the application and the additional information provided by the Principal Planning Officer on site to fully appreciate the proposals.
5. Members were asked to note that this is a brownfield site currently used as a car park within a Technology Park industrial estate adjacent to the A467. The proposed development would share access with the B1 industrial estate and Officers confirmed that this use class was one which should be restricted by condition and should therefore sit comfortably with residential use.
6. The Senior Environmental Health Officer expressed concern with regard to 2 potential sources of noise nuisance and advised that although the applicant had provided a TAN 11 assessment he had not responded to the request made for BS4142 assessment without which Officers could not make a recommendation on the application. The Officer confirmed that the BS4142 assessment was a theoretical assessment that would extrapolate the current level of noise experienced in order to give an indicator of the potential noise levels generated should the industrial estate come back into full use. This would allow Officers to gauge the likely impact on houses nearest to the industrial units and mitigate according.

It was noted that there were existing residential properties bordering the site at similar distances to that of the proposed development. However the Senior Environmental Health Officer felt that the positioning of the proposed housing would make them more likely to experience noise nuisance at an unacceptable level should all 8 units become operational. Clarification was sought as to any previous noise complaints received and the Officer

confirmed that she would look at the complaint history of the site and report back to committee.

The Applicant confirmed that they would be willing to discuss further the provision of a 1412 assessment with Officers and Members requested that the outcome of those discussions and the assessment be reported back to Committee.

7. Members noted the land ownership issues and were advised that the access road to the development was not adopted - however this was a civil matter and it was not unusual to have access from a private road. The Principal Planner confirmed that the site did have an unrestricted right of way and given its former use as a car park for 250 vehicles, access would be more than adequate to support residential use. The location of the site with regard to its sustainability and links to walking/cycle paths was explained. The Rights of Way Officer provided an update on the different ownership issues that were currently inhibiting the completion of the cycle path. During the course of debate the Applicant at the request of Members, confirmed that several small pieces of land surrounding the site were also in his ownership, although he was unsure of their location, he agreed to provide further details to Officers in order to establish if they could be used to further the progress of the cycle path.
8. The Senior Engineer Highways expressed concerns regarding the poor pedestrian links from the site to the Town Centre with its associated services and facilities. The southern pedestrian route would involve residents having to walk alongside the busy A467 which forms part of the strategic highway network carrying in excess of 18000 vehicles per day, with traffic speeds of 60mph adjacent to the site. It is considered that the route would not be used by residents due to perceived risk which would result in increase car journeys. The Authority's 'School Travel Plan Coordinator' has assessed the routes as a medium risk due to the speed and high volume of traffic using the A467 and this would mean that the Council would have to provide public transport links from the site to the school. The second route to the north of the site leading to North Road, the Town Centre and Crumlin, if achieved would be excellent. However the present route is very overgrown in places and also required the use of an unlit subway in poor condition which would deter people from its use. Residents would therefore need to rely on cars for even the shortest of journeys, making the site unsustainable. The Senior Environmental Health Officer also expressed concern that this increased reliance on cars would have a detrimental impact on air quality. Having taken into consideration the present links and ongoing difficulties in securing the cycle/path right of way, the Senior Engineering Highway considered the application before Members to be premature and as such has raised an objection to it.
9. Members having noted the concerns raised and the additional information requested, recommended that the Planning Committee deferred the application to the next appropriate meeting that would allow Officers to consider the responses received and provide an update.
10. Officers confirmed that following advertisement to 31 neighbouring properties, advertisement in the press and a site notice being posted, 2 letters of objection had been received. Details of the objections are within the Officer's original report.
11. The initial planning report concluded that having given due regard to relevant planning policy and the comments from consultees and objectors, the application is considered to be acceptable and Officers recommended that permission be granted.
12. A copy of the report submitted to the Planning Committee on 6th May 2015 is attached. Members are now invited to determine the application.

Author:	E.Sullivan	Democratic Services Officer, Ext. 4420
Consultees:	P. Den Brinker	Principal Planner
	J. Rogers	Principal Solicitor
	M. Noakes	Senior Engineer (Highway Development Control)
	C. Davies	Senior Environmental Health Officer
	J. Piper	Rights of Way Officer

Appendices:

Appendix 1 Report submitted to Planning Committee on 6th May 2015