

Delegated Decision Report

Application No:	25/0827	Statutory Period Expires:	19th December 2025
Site:	<i>Land Adjacent To 18 Ridgeway Hill Newport NP20 5DG</i>		
Proposal:	<i>PROPOSED ERECTION OF 2 NO. BUNGALOWS WITH ASSOCIATED ON SITE PARKING AND GARDENS (RESUBMISSION OF PLANNING APPLICATION 25/0161)</i>		
Applicant:	<i>D Watts</i>		
Type:	Full	Ward:	Allt-yr-Yn
Decision:	REFUSED		

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The proposal seeks to overcome the previous 4no. reasons for refusal relating to character and appearance, residential amenity, contrary to existing pattern of development, insufficient visibility splays and unsigned Section 106 agreement.

2. SITE LOCATION AND CONTEXT

- 2.1 The site is located within a residential area formed of detached bungalows. The detached bungalows are formed of brick and tile with dual pitched roofs. Neighbouring properties benefit from off street parking with open frontages bounded with low railings. The topography of the area inclines from south to north and the application site levels incline from east to west also.

3. DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

- 3.1 Erection of 2no. detached bungalows with off street parking and private amenity spaces.

4. RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

App Number	Proposal	Decision	Decision Date
25/0161	PROPOSED ERECTION OF 2NO DORMER BUNGALOWS WITH ASSOCIATED ON SITE PARKING AND GARDENS	Refused	27.06.2025

5. PLANNING POLICY

- 5.1 THE NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK: FUTURE WALES - THE NATIONAL PLAN 2040

Future Wales sets out the Welsh Government's land use priorities and provides a national land use framework for SDPs and LDPs. Future Wales concentrates on development and land use issues of national significance, indicating areas of major opportunities and change, highlighting areas that need protecting and enhancing and helping to co-ordinate the delivery of Welsh Government policies to maximise positive outcomes.

Policy 1 - Where Wales Will Grow

Policy 2 - Shaping Urban Growth and Regeneration - Strategic Placemaking

Policy 9 - Resilient Ecological Networks and Green Infrastructure

- 5.2 PLANNING POLICY WALES (EDITION 12) 2024

3.3 - Good design is fundamental to creating sustainable places where people want to live, work and socialise.

3.4 - Meeting the objectives of good design should be the aim of all those involved in the development process and should be applied to all development proposals at all scales.

5.3 NEWPORT LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (2011-2026)

- SP1 – Sustainability
- SP4 – Water Resources
- SP10 – House Building Requirement
- SP13 – Planning Obligations
- GP2 – General Amenity
- GP4 – Highways and Accessibility
- GP5 – Natural Environment
- GP6 – Quality of Design
- GP7 – Environmental Protection and Public Health
- H2 – Housing Standards
- H4 - Affordable Housing
- H6 – Sub-division of Curtilages, Infill and Backland Development
- T4 – Parking
- W3 – Provision for Waste Management Facilities in Development

5.4 SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE

- Planning Obligations
- Affordable Housing
- Wildlife and Development
- New Dwellings
- Waste Storage and Collection
- Parking Standards

6. CONSULTATION RESPONSES

- 6.1 Highways Officer: Objection on grounds of highway safety relating to pedestrian visibility splays.

Highway Comments:

The pedestrian visibility splays have not been constructed correctly. They must be at the side of the drive and within the read line. Subject to front boundary treatment this could be rectified by moving the northerly parking space for unit 1 towards the other space.

Subject to amending the drive position and reducing the front boundary treatment to 600mm height above footway, the proposals would be acceptable with conditions.

- 6.2 Ecology Officer: No response.

- 6.3 Landscape Architect: ISSUES WITH EXTERNAL DETAILING & GIS 1. The road frontage treatment is not clear – is this to be railings with or without a wall? 2. Plot 1 parking is shown hard against retaining structure – highlighted below. Redesign would enable hedge planting to soften the retaining wall.



3. The key on the 'Proposed Site Layout' by LeTrucco states 'as per landscape drawings by others' so it may be the intention is for planting to be conditioned?
4. Shrub planting is shown in large mono species blocks (all evergreen) and note the block of Choisya at around 7 x 2m on the south boundary is very large. I would advise input from a planting specialist. Groundcover, bulbs etc should be indicated.
5. There is no rear garden planting proposed – small garden trees/specimen shrubs should be added to extend above the 1.8m fence line and soften views from neighbouring properties. Note that the GIS para 3.2 states 'New landscaped rear gardens and shrubs are also proposed' but this is not the case.
6. The rain garden planting mix is unclear – the risk is this could be 85% Alchemilla.
7. The Site Layout key states shrubs include native species (this is also stated in the GIS) but none are native, I don't have an issue with ornamental but the inconsistency needs to be clarified.
8. The GIS needs rewriting to reflect the proposals.

GIS para 3.3 'Areas of native structure planting and hedgerows feature fronting the development contributing to the overall soft landscape areas and diversifying GI features'.

GIS para 4.2. 'Native species will be used throughout the scheme to enhance peripheral corridors, connect to central development spaces, and diversify SUDS features improving biodiversity, providing important ecological habitats and enhancing the amenity value of the site'.

GIS para 3.5. 'Planting – Native and Ornamental planting proposes mixed shrub, planting throughout the development. Evergreen structure provided by shrubs is balanced with seasonal flowering plants, grasses and bulbs enhancing visual amenity and providing habitat and foraging opportunity'.

- 6.4 Drainage Officer: No response.
- 6.5 Planning Contributions Manager: Planning contributions required as detailed within Section 8.
- 6.6 Environmental Health Officer: I confirm I have no objections to the proposed developments; however the following conditions should be attached to any permission granted;

Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).

Waste Storage and Recycling

There is a lack of information regarding the waste storage and recycling facilities that will be provided to serve the future development. Therefore, either additional information is required or the following condition is recommended;

Advisory - Sound insulation

In relation to sound insulation between the proposed separate residential dwellings, I have not commented. I assume that Building Control will ensure that the Building Regulations, Approved Document E is applied.

Advisory:

If Air Source Heat Pumps (ASHPs) are intended to be installed in the residential scheme for sustainable heating source; further acoustic impact information will be required, including an environmental noise assessment to consider the cumulative impact of multiple ASHPs. Further information is available from the Environmental Protection team.

- 6.7 Senior Scientific Officer: I have no comments in regard to contaminated land in respect of the below application. In terms of air quality, I recommend the following planning conditions:
 -Low Carbon Heating/Photovoltaics Condition: No development shall take place until details of a lower emission / low carbon heating system has been submitted to the LPA. Considerations to include air source or ground source heat pumps, roof top photovoltaic

panels, and the insulation types. The sustainable heating systems shall be implemented prior to occupation of the development and retained thereafter. Reason: To prevent unacceptable harm because of air pollution (Policy GP7); There must not be a significant adverse effect upon local amenity in terms of air quality (Policy GP2). -ULEV Condition: No development shall commence on site until a scheme of Ultra Low Energy Vehicle infrastructure has been submitted to the LPA. The scheme must be approved by the LPA prior to implementation and thereafter be permanently retained. Reason: To prevent unacceptable harm because of air pollution (Policy GP7); There must not be a significant adverse effect upon local amenity in terms of air quality (Policy GP2).

- 6.8 SAB Officer: We have received a pre-application for this site but are still awaiting for the full application to be submitted.
- 6.9 Waste Manager: No response.
- 6.10 Dwr Cymru/Welsh Water: We can confirm capacity exists within the public sewerage network in order to receive the domestic foul only flows from the proposed development site.

Turning to surface water drainage, as of 7th January 2019, this proposed development is subject to Schedule 3 of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010. The development therefore requires approval of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) features, in accordance with the 'Statutory standards for sustainable drainage systems – designing, constructing, operating and maintaining surface water drainage systems'. In this instance, we offer no objection to proposals for disposal of surface water flows into the public surface water sewer, in principle, subject to a maximum attenuated discharge rate of 0.154 l/s.

Notwithstanding this, we would request that if you are minded to grant Planning Consent for the above development that the **Conditions and Advisory Notes** listed below are included within the consent to ensure no detriment to existing residents or the environment and to Dwr Cymru Welsh Water's assets.

Condition

Surface water flows from the development shall only communicate with the public (combined sewer / surface water sewer) through an attenuation device that discharges at a rate not exceeding 0.154 l/s.

Reason: To prevent hydraulic overloading of the public sewerage system, to protect the health and safety of existing residents and ensure no pollution of or detriment to the environment.

7. PUBLIC REPRESENTATIONS

Neighbour notification letters were sent on the 9th October 2025.

- 7.1 NEIGHBOURS: 3no. objections (summarised):
- Out of character with the area
 - There are NO pitched roof windows in this development, the proposed ones would be out of place.
 - Does not match building line.
 - Front garden overshadowed
 - Impact on visibility splays on driveway
 - Rear roof windows overlook garden.
 - Block natural light
 - Adverse impact on privacy and amenity
- 7.2 Councillor Drewitt:
- I wish to register my objection to new planning Application 25/0827 for the same site on the grounds that it fails to address all of the issues raised in the Refusal Notice of Application 25/0161. This is evidenced as follows:

Two-storey + dormers among bungalows; proximity to neighbours

The proposal by reason of scale, design, height, and over-development / overbearing impact. The comment about overbearing impact, loss of privacy, and being unneighbourly is supported by evidence in drawing CO1 below.

The two-storey + dormer design is inconsistent with the area's bungalow character, confirming a top-heavy and out-of-scale appearance and this is evidenced in drawing CO2 below.

Please see the drawing evidence below:

The site layout shows two detached dwellings (Plots 1 & 2) on relatively small plots.

The street elevation shows the new houses are two-storey dwellings with dormers, positioned between single-storey bungalows (Nos. 16 & 18 Ridgeway Hill, and 48 Ridgeway Park Road). The existing context (surrounding dwellings) is predominantly single-storey, confirming that the new two-storey designs introduce a top-heavy appearance in comparison.

Dormer windows are present to the front elevations, increasing the perceived height and bulk. Rear elevations are not visible here, but given the proximity on plan to the boundaries (especially to the rear, facing 11 & 12 Ridgeway Gardens), overlooking of rear gardens and main living areas is likely due to the height and upper-floor windows.

Clearly extends forward of established line

Siting of Plot 2 and setback from footway

The statement that Plot 2 projects forward and is out of keeping with the existing building line is clearly supported by the drawing.

Please see drawing evidence below:

The layout shows Plot 2 positioned close to the Ridgeway Hill footway, with minimal front setback.

In contrast, adjacent properties (Nos. 16 & 18 Ridgeway Hill) are set further back, with visible front garden/driveway depth.

The street elevation confirms Plot 2 sits noticeably forward of the established building line.

Sightlines shown may be insufficient since the boundary is close to footway.

Visibility splays / pedestrian safety

There is insufficient pedestrian visibility.

Please see drawing evidence below:

The boundary wall/fence lines appear to extend right up to the highway edge, potentially obstructing sightlines.

Sustainability / Affordable Housing Contributions

The proposed development falls within the Rogerstone and Newport West Affordable Housing Target Area, where there is a policy requirement for a 30% affordable housing contribution under planning obligations (typically secured through a Section 106 Agreement) to meet local housing needs. No mention is made of this in the application.

LEGEND

Red dashed lines → Existing building line (showing how Plot 2 projects forward).

Orange shading / arrows → Areas where the new dwellings create overlooking / loss of privacy into gardens and living spaces (11 & 12 Ridgeway Gardens, 18 Ridgeway Hill, 44-46 Ridgeway Park Road).

Dark red outline / hatching → Overbearing impact zones (where two-storey bulk is dominant).

Labels "C01", "C02", "C03" → To link the visual issues directly with the three main objection points.

8. ASSESSMENT

8.1 Principle of Development:

- 8.1.1 The application site is located within an urban boundary of an established residential area. Therefore, the site benefits from being located within a sustainable location in accordance with Policy SP1.

8.2 Water Resources:

- 8.2.1 The development site is over 100sqm and would therefore require separate approval for sustainable drainage to be incorporated into the site. It is noted that a SAB pre-application has been submitted, but a full application has not.
- 8.2.2 The submitted details include a drainage strategy which includes methods of sustainable drainage which connect into an existing Welsh Water surface water sewer. The points of connection will also be fitted with flow restrictors.
- 8.2.3 Welsh Water have confirmed that sufficient capacity exists in the public sewage network to receive domestic foul flows. They raise no objection to the discharge of surface water to the public surface water sewer, subject to flow rates being limited. The proposed flow rate restrictors accord with the discharge rate requested by Welsh Water. A condition is attached to ensure flow rates do not exceed 0.154l/s. Subject to condition the proposal is in accordance with Policy SP4.

8.3 House Building Requirement

- 8.3.1 The scheme would contribute toward the overall house building objectives of the adopted local plan in accordance with Policy SP10.

8.4 Impact on Amenity

- 8.4.1 The rear garden depth measures 5.6m and 8.4m for Plots 1 and 2 respectively. The New Dwellings SPG sets out that rear gardens on new dwellings should extend at least 10m from the rear elevation. Neighbouring dwellings generally have garden depths of around 5-6m as they were designed for occupants requiring low maintenance properties. Given the specific site context, it is considered that the depth of the rear gardens is acceptable in this instance in terms of the amount of amenity space provided.
- 8.4.2 The proposal seeks to introduce 3no. rooflights to the rear roof slope to allow for natural light to enter the first floor bedroom and ensuite. The cill height of the rooflights is 1.65m above the finished internal floor level. Typically, windows are considered *high level* if cills are 1.7m above internal finished floor levels. It is considered that there would be no demonstrable difference between 1.7m and 1.65m in terms of overlooking in this instance. Therefore, the rear rooflights are considered to be *high level* in this instance.
- 8.4.3 The rear roof lights would be within 5.6m of the common boundary with 12 Ridgeway Gardens. The ground floor finished floor level would be 83.6m AOD which is approximately 1m lower than the existing ground level. Given the changes to ground level, the proposed bungalows would be sited at a lower level than the property of 12 Ridgeway Gardens. As such, when taking into account the ground levels and the height of the cills above internal floor levels, it is considered that the rooflights would not result in overlooking of neighbouring properties.
- 8.4.4 However, the proximity of the rooflights to the common boundary is considered to result in the perceived overlooking of properties 12 Ridgeway Gardens and 18 Ridgeway Hill. The provision of first floor accommodation in such close proximity highlights the overdevelopment of the site and its adverse impact upon the amenity of neighbouring properties. The proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the privacy and amenity of any future occupant of 12 Ridgeway Gardens contrary to Policy GP2.
- 8.4.5 The first floor side elevation windows are located to the south side of Plot 1, and the north side of Plot 2. When taking a 45 degree line from the centre point of each of these windows, this demonstrates the visibility splay of each window which shows that there is overlap between the windows which have a separation distance of 3m. The proposed windows would serve a habitable room and are not obscure glazed, nor confirmed to be non-opening. To

ensure that these windows would not lead to any unacceptable intervisibility, a condition could be attached to ensure that the windows are fixed closed and obscured glazed to privacy level 5 should all other matters be acceptable.

8.4.6 As each unit would be served by rooflights that would have a view of the sky only, it is considered that this would not afford future occupants with an adequate outlook thereby resulting in an adverse impact on the living conditions for any future occupant.

8.4.7 The fenestration located to the principle elevations are considered to not result in any adverse impacts regarding overlooking as the views gained would be of the public highway and adjacent residential properties.

8.5 **Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Area**

8.5.1 The area has a uniform character formed of bungalows with set backs from the edge of the footway which provides open frontages and a sense of place and space. The topography declines from north to south resulting in the properties along Ridgeway Park Road having a higher slab level than those of Ridgeway Hill.

8.5.2 The siting of the proposed dwellings contradicts the existing pattern of development as Plot 2 would be sited within 0.5m of the edge of the footway and Plot 1 being set back 5.3m and 6.5m to the respective boundary with the footway. The existing pattern of development has the opposite relationship. This issue was raised on the previously refused scheme also and remains to not be sufficiently addressed.

8.5.3 The submitted street scene drawing shows that Plot 1 would have a higher ridge height than the neighbouring property of 46 Ridgeway Park Road and Plot 2 would have a disproportionately higher ridge height with 18 Ridgeway Hill when compared to the relationship with neighbouring properties. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed development does not integrate with the established building heights resulting in a contrived form of development resulting in harm on the wider character and appearance of the area. This aspect remains as per the previously refused scheme and therefore the same conclusions are drawn as the other factors of the scheme do not outweigh the material harm caused through the lack of integration with the existing street scene. The proposal is contrary to the requirements of Policy GP6.

8.6 **Impact on Highway Safety and Parking Provision**

8.6.1 The Highways Officer has raised objection on highway safety grounds relating to pedestrian visibility splays afforded to the northernly space associated with Plot 1. The visibility splays have not been corrected annotated on the drawing resulting in a narrow splay. The Highways Officer concedes that this could be rectified by firstly, currently annotating the visibility splays along with moving the parking space further south closer to the second parking space associated with Plot 1. The current arrangement is therefore unacceptable resulting in an adverse impact on pedestrian safety contrary to Policy GP4.

8.6.2 The number and size of off-street parking spaces serving both units accords with the parking standards contained within the Parking SPG document.

8.6 **Impact on Biodiversity**

8.6.1 The proposal is supported with an ecological appraisal and Green Infrastructure Statement. The appraisal concludes the site has low ecological value and sets out recommendations during and post construction. No comments have been received from the Councils Ecologist and a condition would be attached to ensure the recommendations are implemented on site.

8.7 **Waste**

8.7.1 The proposed site plan includes dedicated areas for the storage of waste and recycling which accords with the Waste SPG document. No objection received from the Waste Manager. Proposal accords with Policy W3.

8.8 Section 106 Planning Obligation matters

- 8.8.1 The terms of the Section 106 agreement have been agreed by the relevant parties, however as the application is being refused on other grounds, a signed Section 106 agreement has not been completed and therefore forms a further reason for refusal.
- 8.8.2 In 2010 the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010) came into effect. Reg 122 of these regulations sets out limitations on the use of planning obligations. It sets out three tests that planning obligations need to meet. It states that planning obligations may only constitute a reason for granting planning permission if the obligation is:

In this case, the developer has provided information in relation to the viability of the planning obligations relevant to the scheme...(officers must explain what information received, what viability issues raised and our assessment of them, how has this affected the planning obligation agreed by officers)?

a) Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; (the obligations of the Section 106 Agreement are necessary to ensure adequate education provision, secure affordable housing on site, provide sufficient open space and ensure its continued maintenance, monitor air quality, promote local employment benefits, secure appropriate long-term marketing of the retail/ commercial units and to improve accessibility for vehicles and pedestrians to/ from the development to ensure policy compliance.)

b) Directly related to the development; (the obligations of the Section 106 Agreement are directly related to the development.)

and

c) Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development (the obligations as set out in the Section 106 Agreement, both in terms of scale and kind of obligations being required, are fair and reasonable to ensure the aforementioned contributions for the development of this strategic site).

In accordance with Policy SP13 of the adopted Newport Local Development Plan 2011-2026 and the adopted Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Guidance, development will be required to help deliver more sustainable communities by providing, or making contributions to, local and regional infrastructure in proportion to its scale and the sustainability of the location. In this case, section 106 planning obligations are required to mitigate the impact of the development in accordance with the table below.

Service Area that requires planning obligation	Purpose of planning obligation	Planning obligation initially sought by Planning Authority	Summary Heads of Terms agreed by applicant(s)	Viability Issues?
Regeneration and Economic Development	To provide a contribution toward off site affordable housing.	A commuted sum of £3,064 toward off site affordable housing.	Agreed.	No.

HEADS OF TERMS AGREED BY APPLICANT

Section 106 Planning Obligations – Draft ‘Head’s of Terms’ **(Without prejudice & subject to contract)**

1. Introduction

Based upon a development of 2 x 2 bed dwellings, the following S106 planning obligations are required to mitigate the impact of the development.

2. Affordable Housing

Commuted sum payments for affordable housing will normally be sought on developments of 1 to 2 dwellings anywhere in Newport. The site lies within the Housing Target Area of Newport West. Newport West requires the delivery of 30% affordable housing on new development. The equivalent commuted sum generated is £3,064

This sum is to be index linked to the RPI and paid prior to occupation

3. Fees

Administration Fee

In accordance with the Planning Obligations SPG (2020), a £200 administration fee is charged for monitoring the S106 agreement. This is to be paid upon signing of the legal agreement

Legal Fees

Planning Obligations can be contained in Unilateral Undertakings or s.106 Agreements. Unilateral Undertakings are usually drafted by the developer's solicitors, whereas s.106 Agreements are usually drafted by the Council's in-house solicitors (but there is no general objection to developers arranging for their own solicitors to draft the s.106 Agreement with prior agreement). Either way the developers will be responsible for the Council's legal costs incurred in relation to the process of drafting, approving and completing the s.106 Agreement and Unilateral Undertakings, including costs of title investigation which is necessary to ensure the correct parties enter into the Deed. There is a minimum contribution to legal costs of £700, although more time-consuming and complex documents would require an increased contribution to legal costs.

Please Note:

Planning Obligations can be contained in Unilateral Undertakings or Agreements. Unilateral Undertakings are usually drafted by the developer's solicitors, whereas Agreements are usually drafted by the Council's in house solicitors (but there is no general objection to developers arranging for their own solicitors to draft the Agreement if preferred). Either way the developers will be responsible for the Council's legal costs incurred in relation to the process of drafting, approving and completing any Deed of Obligation, including costs of title investigation which is necessary to ensure the correct parties enter into the Deed.

You are required to agree to these Heads of Terms in writing. In doing so you also agree to an extension of time for the determination of your proposal in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Fees for Applications, Deemed Applications and Site Visits)(Wales) Regulations 2015 and the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure)(Wales) Order 2012. This will extend the statutory period for determination of your application by 16 weeks from the date the Local Planning Authority resolve to grant your planning permission (i.e. the Planning Committee date or the delegated Agenda date) subject to a legal agreement. This extension of time is required to enable completion of the section 106 Agreement (although the Local Planning Authority will endeavour to determine your application as soon as possible prior to this date).

Once your written agreement to the Heads of Terms for section 106 has been received by the Authority and a resolution made on the basis of such agreement, the Local Planning Authority will NOT enter into any negotiations that seek to alter the Heads of Terms in terms of discounting agreed figures due to, for example, viability reasons before the final Notice of Decision is issued. It is important that you check the Heads of Terms you receive thoroughly and if you have any questions regarding the figures included or the justification for them, you must raise these and satisfy yourself that the request is reasonable, relevant and necessary, prior to providing your written agreement to the Terms.

Any negotiations must take place before Heads of Terms are agreed by you and if you seek to discuss or re-negotiate section 106 Heads of Terms having agreed them in writing and having received a resolution (but not a decision notice), your application must be withdrawn to enable re-negotiation to take place. Failure to sign a section 106 within 3 months of any resolution being made may lead to your application being refused. Alternatively, you may proceed to complete the section 106, receive a Notice of Decision and then make a new submission to the Authority that will enable altered terms to be negotiated. Please be advised that any such re-submission will likely attract a new planning application fee.

9. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

9.1 *Crime and Disorder Act 1998*

Section 17(1) of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 imposes a duty on the Local Authority to exercise its various functions with due regard to the likely effect of the exercise of those functions on, and the need to do all that it reasonably can to prevent, crime and disorder in its area. This duty has been considered in the evaluation of this application. It is considered that there would be no significant or unacceptable increase in crime and disorder as a result of the proposed decision.

9.2 *Equality Act 2010*

The Equality Act 2010 identifies a number of 'protected characteristics', namely age; disability; gender reassignment; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief; sex; sexual orientation; marriage and civil partnership.

9.3 Having due regard to advancing equality involves:

- removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by people due to their protected characteristics;
- taking steps to meet the needs of people from protected groups where these differ from the need of other people; and
- encouraging people from protected groups to participate in public life or in other activities where their participation is disproportionately low.

9.4 The above duty has been given due consideration in the determination of this application. It is considered that there would be no significant or unacceptable impact upon persons who share a protected characteristic, over and above any other person, as a result of the proposed decision.

9.5 *Planning (Wales) Act 2015 (Welsh language)*

Section 31 of the Act clarifies that impacts on the Welsh language may be a consideration when taking decisions on applications for planning permission so far as it is material to the application. This duty has been given due consideration in the determination of this application. It is considered that there would be no material effect upon the use of the Welsh language in Newport as a result of the proposed decision.

9.6 *Newport's Well-Being Plan 2018-23*

The Wellbeing of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 imposes a duty on public bodies to carry out sustainable development in accordance with the sustainable development principle to act in a manner which seeks to ensure that the needs of the present are met without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. This duty has been considered during the preparation of Newport's Well-Being Plan 2018-23, which was signed off on 1 May 2018. The duty imposed by the Act together with the goals and objectives of Newport's Well-Being Plan 2018-23 have been considered in the evaluation of this

application. It is considered that there would be no significant or unacceptable impact upon the achievement of wellbeing objectives as a result of the proposed decision.

10. CONCLUSION

- 10.1 The proposal is considered to result in harm on the wider character and appearance of the area, residential amenity and pedestrian safety contrary to the policies contained within the Newport Local Development Plan 2011 – 2026 (Adopted January 2015).

11. DECISION

Refuse, for the following reason(s):

01 The proposed development by reason of its height, siting and design results in an unacceptable visual impact which is contrary to the established pattern of development in the area resulting in an overdevelopment of the plot and an incongruous form of development which is unduly harmful to the character and appearance of the area contrary to Policies GP2 and GP6 of the Newport Local Development Plan 2011 – 2026 (Adopted January 2015) and the New Dwellings SPG..

02 The proposed development by reason of its height, layout, fenestration arrangement and relationship with neighbouring properties would result in an unacceptable impact upon the living conditions of both future and neighbouring occupiers by means of an overdevelopment of the plot contrary to Policies GP2 and GP6 of the Newport Local Development Plan 2011 – 2026 (Adopted January 2015) and the New Dwellings SPG.

03 The proposed layout has insufficient visibility splays to ensure the scheme would not result in harm on pedestrian safety contrary to Policy GP4 of the Newport Local Development Plan 2011 – 2026 (Adopted January 2015).

04 The development would have a significant adverse impact upon interests of acknowledged importance, namely it represents an unsustainable form of development which fails to be mitigated by contributions towards affordable housing. As such, the scheme is contrary to the Planning Obligations SPG dated January 2020 and policies SP1, SP13 and H4 of the Newport Local Development Plan 2011-2026 (Adopted January 2015).

NOTE TO APPLICANT

01 This decision relates to plan Nos:

- Proposed Drainage Strategy for Planning (Drawing ref: CSK14 Rev C)
- Plans & Elevations – PLOT 2 (Drawing ref: LT2417.04.101)
- Plans & Elevations – PLOT 1 (Drawing ref: LT2417.04.100 Rev D)
- Boundary Details (Drawing ref: LT2417.04.02)
- Proposed Site Layout (Drawing ref: LT2417.04.01 Rev E)
- Existing Site Plan (Drawing ref: LT2417.00.02)
- Site Location Plan (Drawing ref: LT2417.00.01)
- Green Infrastructure Plan – dated September 2025
- Ecological Site Assessment Survey by Ecological Services dated 20th February 2025

02 The development plan for Newport is the Newport Local Development Plan 2011 – 2026 (Adopted January 2015). Policies SP1, SP4, SP10, SP13, GP2, GP4, GP5, GP6, GP7, H2, H4, H6, T4 and W3 were relevant to the determination of this application.

03 The proposed development (including any demolition) has been screened under the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations and it is considered that an Environmental Statement is not required.