

Sent: 02 September 2026 20:38

To: NCC - Planning <planning@newport.gov.uk>

Subject: Subject: Planning Application AKPA/26/0564 – 5 Glanwern Rise, Newport NP19 9BS Applicant's Response to Neighbour Representations

Subject: Planning Application AKPA/26/0564 – 5 Glanwern Rise, Newport NP19 9BS

Applicant's Response to Neighbour Representations

Dear Planning Officer,

I write further to the representations submitted by neighbouring residents in relation to planning application **AKPA/26/0564**.

I have carefully read all of the comments submitted by Nos. 3, 7 and 9 Glanwern Rise. I fully recognise the right of neighbouring residents to raise concerns and I do not wish to dismiss their views.

However, I would respectfully ask that the application is considered on the basis of **the actual planning history, the existing planning permission and the specific amendments proposed under the current Section 73 application**, rather than on assumptions about the development or its history.

I would therefore like to respond to the matters raised.

1. The existing planning permission is important

I believe it is important that the Council's assessment clearly distinguishes between the previous planning applications and the present application.

Planning permission **25/0543** was granted by Newport City Council on **21 August 2025** for:

“Retrospective application for retention of garden room and raised platform (resubmission).”

The application was **granted with conditions**.

Condition 1 requires the development to be implemented in accordance with the approved plans, including **PL10B**.

Enforcement notice Glanwern rise.pdf

The present application, **AKPA/26/0564**, is a Section 73 application concerning the approved plans.

Welsh Government guidance explains that a Section 73 application operates by amending the plans condition attached to an existing planning permission.

Accordingly, I respectfully ask that the present application is not treated simply as another application seeking retrospective permission for the garden room and raised platform as a whole.

The Council has already granted planning permission for the retention of the garden room and raised platform.

The question now is whether the amendments proposed under AKPA/26/0564 are acceptable.

Response to No. 9 Glanwern Rise

I have carefully considered the objection from No. 9.

2. The suggestion that this is simply another retrospective application

The representation states that this is another retrospective application and objects strongly to the structure.

I respectfully disagree with that characterisation.

The planning history demonstrates that the Council has already considered the retention of the garden room and raised platform and granted permission under **25/0543**.

The present application is therefore concerned with the variation of the approved scheme rather than the principle of the garden room being considered for the first time.

I respectfully ask that the Council assesses the current application on that basis.

3. Size and overbearing impact

I acknowledge the concern that the structure is perceived as large or overbearing.

However, the relevant assessment should be based upon the **actual scale, position, levels and relationship of the structure to the neighbouring properties**, as shown on the submitted plans.

The submitted drawings include elevations and sections showing the relationship with the neighbouring properties and garden levels.

I would respectfully ask that this is assessed objectively rather than simply on the perception that the structure is “large”.

The garden room and raised platform have already been considered acceptable in principle by the Council through permission 25/0543.

4. Privacy and overlooking

I recognise that privacy is a genuine concern for neighbouring residents.

However, it is particularly important to note that privacy was expressly considered by Newport Council when permission **25/0543** was granted.

Condition 3 of that permission requires boundary treatments to be agreed with the Council and retained, with the stated reason including:

“the privacy of neighbouring occupiers.”

Enforcement notice Glanwern rise.pdf

The Council therefore already identified privacy as a relevant planning consideration and imposed a condition specifically addressing it.

The present application should therefore consider whether the **specific amendments now proposed** create unacceptable additional overlooking or loss of privacy and whether the proposed boundary treatment provides an appropriate means of addressing that issue.

I remain willing to cooperate with the Council regarding reasonable and proportionate measures to protect neighbouring privacy.

5. Site visit requested by No. 9

No. 9 has offered to allow a Planning Officer to visit their property to understand the impact.

I would welcome an appropriate site inspection.

Given the differences in levels between the properties, I believe a site visit would be helpful in establishing the actual relationship between the garden room and neighbouring gardens.

Newport's planning process confirms that planning officers assess the impact of applications and prepare reports taking consultation representations into account.

I would therefore be happy to facilitate any reasonable inspection required by the Council.

Response to No. 7 Glanwern Rise

I have also carefully considered both representations submitted by No. 7.

6. Previous refusal and current application

The representation refers to the current proposal as being substantially the same as previously refused.

I respectfully ask that the Council considers the full planning history.

The earlier proposal was followed by **application 25/0543**, which was granted on **21 August 2025** for the retrospective retention of the garden room and raised platform.

The present application is therefore not simply a repeat of the earlier refused application.

It is a Section 73 application relating to the approved permission.

The Council should therefore consider the **specific amendments now before it**.

7. The suggestion that the 1.8 metre fence makes the development more dominant

I acknowledge the concern regarding the proposed fence and its visual effect.

However, the fence also has an important functional planning purpose: **privacy screening**.

This needs to be balanced against its visual impact.

The Council's existing permission already recognised the importance of boundary treatments in protecting neighbouring privacy.

I therefore respectfully ask that the proposed fencing is assessed in the context of both:

- its potential visual impact; and
- its ability to reduce overlooking and protect neighbouring residential amenity.

If the Council considers that the precise design, height or appearance of the screening requires adjustment, I remain willing to discuss reasonable amendments.

8. The allegation that the decking should have been lowered

No. 7 refers to an understanding that the decking would be lowered.

I would like to clarify this.

During the evolution of the proposals, consideration was given to lowering the garden room/upper terrace. This was considered in good faith because I believed that bringing it down to the level of the existing area might provide a better overall appearance.

However, after further consideration, it became apparent that lowering the garden room would require substantial consequential works to the surrounding garden levels, retaining arrangements, access and associated construction.

The current proposal therefore retains the garden room at the level shown on the submitted plans.

This is not intended to disregard the concerns previously raised.

It is simply the result of considering the practical, structural and planning implications of the alternative arrangement.

I respectfully ask that this is not treated as an admission that the existing permitted arrangement is unacceptable.

9. Age of the drawing

The representation refers to the drawing being dated July 2025 and suggests that this means the plans may not have been meaningfully revised.

I respectfully ask that the Council assesses the **plans actually submitted with AKPA/26/0564**, rather than drawing conclusions from the date appearing on an individual drawing.

The purpose of the current application is precisely to allow the Council to determine the proposed variation to the approved plans.

Response to No. 3 Glanwern Rise

I have noted the two representations from No. 3, which appear to contain both a supporting representation and a further comment raising concerns about the level of the upper tier.

10. Concern about privacy

I understand the wish expressed by No. 3 to retain a private area within their garden.

I do not dispute the importance of residential privacy.

However, I respectfully ask that the Council considers the actual relationship between the properties, including the respective garden levels, existing boundaries, orientation and proposed screening.

Again, the Council's previous permission expressly dealt with privacy through Condition 3.

11. The suggestion that the upper tier could simply be lowered

The representation suggests that the upper tier could be lowered and that the ground underneath could be removed and levelled.

I respectfully explain that this is not as straightforward as simply removing soil.

The garden arrangement involves differences in levels and associated structural and retaining considerations. Lowering the garden room would require consequential alterations to the surrounding arrangement rather than simply removing a quantity of soil.

It would therefore be a substantial intervention rather than a minor alteration.

I would ask that this is assessed on the basis of the actual engineering and construction implications rather than an assumption that the level can simply be reduced without consequential works.

12. Allegations concerning lack of communication

I note that some neighbouring residents have expressed frustration regarding communication.

I am sorry that some residents feel that communication has not been sufficient.

However, I respectfully ask that this is distinguished from the planning merits of the application.

I have engaged with the formal planning process and have submitted the necessary applications to Newport City Council.

The current application is now before the Council for determination and I remain willing to engage constructively with the Planning Officer.

I also welcome the suggestion of a site meeting if the Council considers that this would assist in resolving the concerns.

13. The allegation that I have attempted to circumvent the planning process

I respectfully reject the suggestion that I have attempted to circumvent the planning system.

The planning history demonstrates that I have engaged with the Council's planning process.

Most importantly, application **25/0543** resulted in the Council granting retrospective planning permission for retention of the garden room and raised platform.

The current application **AKPA/26/0564** has likewise been submitted through the proper statutory planning process.

I therefore respectfully request that the application is determined objectively on its planning merits and on the plans and information actually submitted.

14. I am willing to find a practical solution

I want to make clear that I am not seeking to disregard the concerns of neighbouring residents.

I want the garden room and surrounding arrangement to remain in a form that is acceptable in planning terms and that minimises unnecessary impact upon neighbouring properties.

If the Planning Officer identifies a **specific and proportionate planning concern** which can be addressed through a reasonable amendment or condition, I remain willing to engage with the Council.

I would much prefer to resolve any genuine planning concern constructively rather than through continued disagreement.

15. Request for site inspection

Given the different levels between the properties, I believe a site inspection would be particularly useful.

I respectfully request that the Planning Officer considers visiting the site and, where appropriate, viewing the relationship from the neighbouring gardens.

This would allow the Council to assess:

- the actual relative garden levels;
- the position of the garden room;
- the distance from neighbouring properties;
- existing boundary treatments;
- existing vegetation and screening;
- the proposed fencing;
- potential views into neighbouring gardens; and
- the actual visual relationship between the properties.

I believe an objective assessment on site would be more useful than relying solely upon differing perceptions contained within the representations.

16. Enforcement proceedings

I also respectfully ask that the Council considers this application alongside the Enforcement Notice **E23/0217(1489)**.

The Enforcement Notice was served on **5 August 2026**, with an effective date of **14 September 2026**.

The Section 73 application **AKPA/26/0564** was registered on **28 July 2026**, with a target determination date of **22 September 2026**.

The two processes therefore overlap directly.

I respectfully maintain my request that the Council defers further enforcement action pending determination of AKPA/26/0564.

The Council itself confirms that a breach can include development carried out other than in accordance with approved plans, which is precisely why the relationship between the approved plans and the Section 73 application is important in this case.

17. Conclusion

I respectfully request that Newport City Council considers the following matters when determining AKPA/26/0564:

1. Planning permission **25/0543 was granted on 21 August 2025** for retention of the garden room and raised platform.
2. The Council had already considered neighbouring privacy and imposed Condition 3 specifically addressing boundary treatments and privacy.
3. The current application is a **Section 73 application concerning the approved plans**, rather than simply a fresh application for the principle of the garden room.
4. The current proposal should be assessed on its actual planning merits and the specific amendments proposed.
5. The concerns regarding overlooking and visual impact should be considered objectively having regard to the actual levels, distances, boundaries and proposed screening.
6. The proposal to lower the garden room/upper terrace has been considered, but would require substantial consequential works to the existing garden arrangement.
7. I remain willing to consider reasonable and proportionate measures to address any specific planning concerns identified by the Council.
8. I would welcome a site inspection.
9. I respectfully request that enforcement action is deferred pending determination of the live Section 73 application.

I hope this response assists the Planning Officer in assessing the representations fairly and in the proper planning context.

I would be grateful if this letter could be placed on the application file and taken into account when determining **AKPA/26/0564**.

I remain willing to work constructively with the Council and neighbouring residents to achieve a reasonable and proportionate outcome.

Yours faithfully,

5 Glanwern Rise
Newport
NP19 9BS