

45 St Marks Crescent
Newport
NP20 5HE

12 March 2026

Kelsey Parsons
Regeneration and Economic Development
Civic Centre
Newport
NP20 4UR

Dear Kelsey

Re: Proposed development at 26 Fields Road, Newport, NP20 4PJ

This statement is submitted as a formal objection to the planning application for the above property, ref 25/1053.

The covered storage area, abutting the rear living room and alongside the existing single storey annex kitchen, was built during July and August 2025. Has an application for this development ever been submitted or approved?

The blockwork columns supporting the roof timbers were built directly onto the rear yard without any foundations or damp coursing materials being incorporated.

This construction conflicts with the adopted Newport Local Development Plan (2011 -2026) and other planning articles.

The visual impact, scale and poor design of the proposal directly opposes (Policy DESI) in respect of scale, form and character, is unusually intrusive and overbearing. It is also disproportionate when viewed in relation to neighbouring gardens.

The construction has introduced an unattractive and visually intrusive rear elevation when viewed from my property.

After the roof was completed (the polycarbonate sheeting is now leaking and covered with a plastic sheet) the area was used as a dining/living area complete with table, six chairs, settee and television for a social gathering, which was quite noisy. Due to this use as a living area, it raises legitimate concerns regarding development of the site and the true nature of the future use of the structure, currently listed as a 'covered storage area'.

Under Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, planning decisions must be made in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

This proposal conflicts with:

- Policy GPI – General Principles (amenity, environmental protection)
- Policy DESI – Design Quality

- House Extensions and Domestic Outbuildings SPG
- Planning Policy Wales (Edition 1)

In the matter of the 'extension' no overriding material considerations have been demonstrated to justify approval contrary to policy.

There are other issues that concern me and may not directly affect me or my property but are of great concern for neighbours closer to the 'construction' in St Marks Crescent.

Conclusion

The proposed development would/does result in clear, demonstrable and unacceptable harm in design, quality and the visual relationship between neighbouring properties.

Does the position of the proposed bathroom extension contravene the existing established line of build by the location and extent of the single storey annexe buildings to each property, that is both 26 and 27 Fields Road? If it does contravene established practice/ criteria, should it not be considered for approval?

Additional

Further kitchen, washing facilities have been fitted within the 'storage area' on or about 10 March.

Yours sincerely

