

Address: 47 St. Marks Crescent Newport

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: Hi Kelsey,
We live at 47 St Marks Crescent and our back garden sits directly onto 26 Fields Road. We object to the planning request for the reasons listed below. My wife will also email you directly with together with a couple of photo's to highlight the issues. If anything if unclear I'm happy to chat through or you to visit us and see for yourself. Regards Clive

Re: Planning objection to 26 Fields Road, Newport, NP20 4PJ
Reference: 25\1053

1. Introduction and Status

This statement is submitted as a formal objection to the above planning application and, if applicable, as an Interested Party representation in the event of an appeal.

The objection is made on the basis that the proposal conflicts with:

• The adopted Newport Local Development Plan (2011-2026)

• Supplementary Planning Guidance: House Extensions and Domestic Outbuildings

• Planning Policy Wales (Edition 11)

• Established principles of amenity protection, good design, and place making

All points raised below are material planning considerations.

2. Harm to Residential Amenity (Policy GP1 & PPW 11)

Policy GP1 (General Principles of Development) of the Newport Local Development Plan requires that development does not result in unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, including overbearing impact, noise, disturbance, loss of outlook, or environmental harm.

The proposed extension would result in significant and demonstrable harm to the amenity of my garden and property through:

• The siting of a bathroom extension directly adjacent to the rear boundary, resulting in an intrusive and visually dominant structure when viewed from my garden

• A development height that would sit well above the existing boundary fence line, creating a sense of enclosure and dominance

• The cumulative effect of built form, raised levels, and proximity, which would materially reduce the enjoyment and usability of my garden

This conflicts with Policy GP1 and the amenity protection objectives of Planning Policy Wales (Edition 11), which place strong emphasis on safeguarding the living conditions of existing residents.

3. Visual Impact, Scale, and Poor Design (Policy DES1)

Policy DES1 (Design Quality) requires that development:

• Respects the scale, form, and character of surrounding properties

• Does not appear visually intrusive or overbearing

• Responds positively to its context and setting

The proposal fails these tests for the following reasons:

• The extension would be disproportionate when viewed in relation to neighbouring gardens

• The raised patio and extension combination would amplify the perceived bulk and height of the structure

â€¢ The proposal would introduce an unattractive and visually intrusive rear elevation, harming the outlook from my property

Photographic evidence demonstrates that no comparable large rear extensions exist on the row of properties backing onto my garden. Approval would therefore be inconsistent with the established character of the area and would risk setting an undesirable precedent.

4. Loss of Boundary Wall and Physical Impact on Adjoining Land (GP1 & SPG)

The proposal requires the demolition of the existing boundary wall between the two properties.

The House Extensions and Domestic Outbuildings SPG makes clear that development must:

â€¢ Respect existing boundary treatments

â€¢ Avoid physical or visual harm to neighbouring land

â€¢ Prevent overdevelopment and excessive dominance at boundaries

The boundary wall is a long established physical feature providing separation, security, and visual screening. Its removal would materially worsen the relationship between the two properties and exacerbate the overbearing impact of the extension.

The application fails to justify why removal of this wall is necessary or how its loss would not harm neighbouring amenity, contrary to Policy GP1 and the adopted SPG.

5. Risk of Structural and Ground Stability Impact (Material Planning Harm)

The proposal involves deep excavation adjacent to the shared boundary, replacing an existing raised patio area that currently appears to have no substantive foundations.

This raises legitimate planning concerns regarding:

â€¢ Ground stability at the boundary

â€¢ Potential damage to boundary fencing and structures on my land

â€¢ Long term degradation of the boundary condition

While land ownership is a civil matter, risk of physical harm arising from development is a material planning consideration, and the application provides insufficient evidence that such risks would be avoided or mitigated.

6. Drainage and Flood Risk to Adjoining Garden (GP1 & PPW)

The proposed bathroom extension and associated guttering would discharge water directly adjacent to my boundary.

There is no clear drainage strategy demonstrating that:

â€¢ Surface water would not overflow into my garden

â€¢ Altered ground levels would not increase flood risk

â€¢ Run off would be adequately controlled

This lack of detail conflicts with Policy GP1 and the environmental protection principles of Planning Policy Wales, which require development to avoid harm to neighbouring land through drainage or flooding impacts.

7. Noise, Odour, and Disturbance from External Fixtures

The proposal includes an external bathroom extraction fan positioned directly facing my garden.

This raises clear amenity concerns due to:

â€¢ Likely operational noise

â€¢ Extraction of bathroom odours

â€¢ Loss of tranquillity and enjoyment of private outdoor space

The SPG and Policy GP1 require that development avoids introducing new sources of disturbance that harm neighbouring amenity. No mitigation measures have been proposed.

8. Cumulative Impact and Questionable Development Pattern

Evidence shows that the existing rear lean to structure has already been:

â€¢ Constructed recently

â€¢ Used as a functional kitchen space

â€¢ A source of cooking noise and smells impacting my garden

The proposed extension would intensify this impact and results in a disjointed and illogical

internal arrangement, raising legitimate planning concerns regarding:

- Overdevelopment of the site
- Incremental harm through piecemeal extensions
- The true nature and future use of the building

Planning authorities are entitled to consider the cumulative impact of development, and in this case the harm is already being experienced and would be materially worsened.

9. Failure to Accord with the Development Plan

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 GP1 "General Principles (Amenity, Environmental Protection)
- Policy DES1 "Design Quality
- House Extensions and Domestic Outbuildings SPG
- Planning Policy Wales (Edition 11)

No overriding material considerations have been demonstrated to justify approval contrary to policy.

11. Impact on Existing Cat Proof Boundary Fencing and Garden Safety (Policy GP1)

The proposed development would have a direct and adverse impact on existing boundary fencing within my garden, which has been specifically designed and installed to ensure the safety of domestic animals and the secure use of the garden.

The fencing is not standard fencing; it includes:

- Anti escape measures above fence height
- Gravel and stabilisation measures below ground level to prevent gaps forming beneath the fence

The proposed works involve demolition of the boundary wall and deep excavation immediately adjacent to this fencing, which would inevitably:

- Destabilise the ground along the boundary
- Create voids and gaps beneath the fence line
- Compromise the integrity and function of the fencing

This would result in the loss of safe and secure use of the garden, materially harming residential amenity. Policy GP1 of the Newport Local Development Plan requires that development does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity, safety, or enjoyment of neighbouring land.

This is not a private inconvenience but a direct physical consequence of the development, and therefore a material planning consideration. The application contains no assessment or mitigation to address this impact.

12. Inappropriate and Non-Like for Like Replacement of Boundary Wall (Policies GP1 & DES1)

The application proposes that the existing boundary wall would be replaced with a concrete block structure, which would not represent a like for like replacement in either appearance or quality.

The existing boundary wall is a long established feature that:

- Contributes positively to the character of the boundary
- Provides an appropriate visual and physical separation between properties
- Is consistent with the appearance of surrounding residential boundaries

Replacing this with exposed concrete blockwork would:

- Be visually inferior and harmful to the character of both properties
- Demean the appearance of the boundary when viewed from my garden
- Exacerbate the perception of overdevelopment and dominance at the rear boundary

Policy DES1 (Design Quality) requires that development respects local character and avoids visually harmful or incongruous materials. Policy GP1 further requires that development does not result in unacceptable visual or environmental harm to neighbouring land.

10. Conclusion

For the reasons set out in this statement, the proposed development would result in clear, demonstrable and unacceptable harm to residential amenity, design quality, and the physical and visual relationship between neighbouring properties.

In particular, the proposal would:

- â€¢ Create an overbearing and visually intrusive form of development at the rear boundary, contrary to the established character of the area

- â€¢ Result in the loss of an established boundary wall, to be replaced with an inferior and nonâ€œlike for like concrete block structure that would materially demean the appearance of both properties

- â€¢ Cause physical and environmental harm at the boundary, including ground destabilisation and loss of secure garden use due to impacts on specialist boundary fencing

- â€¢ Introduce noise, odour, and disturbance through poorly sited external bathroom extraction equipment

- â€¢ Exacerbate existing amenity harm arising from recent incremental development, resulting in cumulative overdevelopment of the site

Taken together, these impacts would fundamentally and permanently reduce the enjoyment, safety, and visual quality of my garden and home. The harm is not minor or speculative; it is direct, foreseeable, and inherent to the design and siting of the proposal.

The development is therefore in direct conflict with:

- â€¢ Policy GP1 (General Principles â€œAmenity and Environmental Protection)

- â€¢ Policy DES1 (Design Quality)

- â€¢ The House Extensions and Domestic Outbuildings Supplementary Planning Guidance
- â€¢ Planning Policy Wales (Edition 11), which prioritises placemaking, residential amenity, and high quality design

Under Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, planning permission must be refused where a proposal conflicts with the Development Plan unless material considerations clearly indicate otherwise. In this case, no such material considerations exist that would outweigh the significant and multi faceted harm identified. Accordingly, this representation constitutes a formal and unequivocal objection to the proposed development.

For the reasons set out above, I respectfully request that planning permission be refused.

Where did you hear about this application?

Not specified
