

Comments Details

Commenter
Type:

Neighbour

Stance:

Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for
comment:

Comments:

Application 25/1058 submitted on 05/12/2025 for 8 Routs View, NP18 2DR continues to conflict with and is therefore in breach of Policies SP5, H13, GP2 and GP6 of the Newport Local Development Plan (LDP) 2026, adopted 2015. It's also in breach of Newport City Council Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) for House Extensions and Domestic Outbuildings. These policies are legally binding and enforceable through legislation and must be adhered to so as not to signify that they are optional and thereby encourage widespread disregard. Selective enforcement can lead to legal challenges, potential dismissal of cases, or civil rights lawsuits as trust in the legal system is eroded.

The breaches are as follows:

SP5 Countryside;

The design does not take into account the character of the surrounding area. Routs View's historic design is made up of two sets of four terraces, not one long row of terraces, and it is this that makes it unique in terms of its streetscape and is a key consideration. The planned side extension will affect the equilibrium of these in terms of its size and placement for the following reasons:

It's proposed for the extension to be placed in line with the front of and at the same height as the existing dwelling. This will give the impression of a fifth terrace. If the front door is moved along from the front left of the property to the centre then this would look like a double fronted terraced property. Both of these outcomes are totally out of keeping with the two sets of four single fronted terraces in Routs View so directly impact its historic character, appearance and streetscape. It will change the pattern of development in the street thereby negating the visual rhythm of solids and voids.

In addition to SP5, the Council's SPG on House Extensions and Domestic Outbuildings which provides clear, in depth advice and guidance on the Newport LDP 2011-2026 regulations state;

5.3 Side Extensions:

Section 5.3.1. Insensitively designed side extensions can harm the townscape by eliminating the lines of symmetry in small terraces and in this case this is even more relevant as we have two identical sets of small terraces. For these reasons, section 5.3.2. states that an extension that requires planning permission owing to its height or width should be set back at least one metre from the original front elevation of the existing building, ensuring it is subordinate to the host building.

Such a setback will maintain the character and appearance of both the original dwelling and the streetscape. This planning rule is also reiterated in section 5.3.4. where figure 8 shows an image of an acceptable two-story side extension which should also be set down from the roof of the host dwelling. Section 5.6.2. reiterates the roof of a two-story extension should be set down from the main roof of the existing building. The plans submitted are a direct breach of this legislative requirement.

5.1 General:

In addition to the positioning of the extension, section 5.1.4 and 5.1.6. clearly states that the fenestration in an extension should replicate the proportions and details of doors, windows and skylights in the existing building. Therefore, the windows in the extension should be a maximum of two panes of glass wide, not three as shown. All front windows in the existing dwelling and all other dwellings in the two sets of terraces in Routs View are a maximum of two panes wide. Where the existing front door (which is on the front left of the dwelling, not the side) is to be removed and replaced with a large elongated single pane window, this should mirror the size of the existing two pane kitchen window. The size of the replacement door window is, again, not in keeping with the existing frontage of this or the other dwellings in Routs View.

H13 Extensions to Dwellings in the Countryside:

The volume of the extension is more than 30% and as per the design in the submitted plans this will have a detrimental impact upon the character, appearance and streetscape of Routs View for the reasons already stated in my comments above under SP5 and the SPG on House Extensions and Domestic Outbuildings; sections 5.3.1., 5.3.2., 5.3.4 and 5.6.2. In addition section 5.3.1. states that a side extension be set in at least one metre from the side boundary. At the narrowest point of the boundary and double story side extension the plans do not meet with this regulation due to its enlarged size.

GP2 General Development Principles - General Amenity:

The design of the planned side extension is detrimental to the character and appearance of Routs View for the reasons already stated in my comments above under SP5 and the SPG on House Extensions and Domestic Outbuildings; sections 5.3.1., 5.3.2., 5.3.4., 5.6.2., 5.1.4. and 5.1.6.

GP6 General Development Principles - Quality of Design:

The development is over scaled and is not sensitive to the unique qualities of the site and does not respond positively to the character of the area for the reasons already stated in my comments above under SP5 and the SPG on House Extensions and Domestic Outbuildings; sections 5.3.1., 5.3.2., 5.3.4., 5.6.2., 5.1.4. and 5.1.6.

The submitted Drawing - OS Site Location Plan incorrectly depicts the location of the Summer House. It is sited at a 90 degree angle to that shown and is along the right hand side boundary line directly behind the newly planned side extension.

As per previous comments there continues to be a discrepancy in the footprint of 7 Routs View in the plans submitted, leading to an incorrect depiction of the streetscape.

We would like to raise the issue that the boundary line at the rear of the property, between number 7 and 8 Routs View, shown on the submitted OS Site Location Plan for this planning application may not accurately reflect the true position of the legal boundary, as the red-lined area appears to differ from the general boundaries indicated on the HM Land Registry records, which could lead to confusion regarding the extent of the application site and its impact on neighbouring properties.
