

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 24/03/2025 3:26 PM

Application Summary

Address: 8 Routes View Llanwern Newport NP18 2DR

Proposal: TWO STOREY SIDE AND SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION WITH INTERNAL REMODEL, NEW FRONT PORCH AND REPOSITIONING OF FRONT ENTRANCE DOOR

Case Officer: Parris Atwal

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:

Email:

Address: 7 Routes View Newport

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments:

The Architect has stated that the revised plans submitted address the refusal reasons stated in the refusal notice dated 2nd January 2025 in respect of planning application 24/0906. Clearly this is not the case as several refusal reasons remain unaddressed.

We would also like it noted that there continues to be a discrepancy in the footprint of 7 Routs View. This leads to an incorrect depiction of the street scene when viewed from the plans that have been submitted.

To clarify, the refusal notice dated 2nd January 2025 stated; By reason of its location, scale and design, the proposed development will have a significant adverse impact upon interests of acknowledged importance, namely visual amenity and the appearance of the host property and street scene, by reason of its poor quality design, prominent position in countryside and its large scale.

Each of the unaddressed reasons continues to conflict with and in places are in breach of

Policies SP5, H13, GP2 and GP6; Policies which form planning regulations which are legally binding and enforceable through legislation, guidance, and case law.

The refusal reasons that remain unaddressed are:

Scale:

â€¢ The Case Officer has stated that â€œa reduction in the rear/side extension would not make a material difference to the street scene and was therefore not required to address the refusal reasons.â€ How can:

1) such a significant part of the original planning application (24/0906) refusal reason around its large scale and its non-compliance with Policy H13 of the Newport Local Development Plan 2011 â€" 2026 (Adopted January 2015) no longer be applicable when it was documented as unjustified and not acceptable and many of the reasons relating to that decision remain unaddressed? Surely, this is a breach of planning regulations.

2) it be said this will not make a material difference to the street scene? Clearly the massing of this extension and its continuation of the current strong, simple, and uniform building line of the existing 4 terraces is out of character and will destroy the street scene at both the front and the rear of Routs View? This will impact the adjacent set of terraces too. The massing of the extension will give the impression of a 5th terrace in the row, especially with it being flush with the frontage of the host dwelling. It will, as you have stated previously, be incongruous.

Design:

â€¢ Whilst the ground floor french doors are now smaller, the remaining large, glazed windows and Juliet balcony to the front elevation continue to be out of keeping and harmony with the neighbouring properties, making the extension significantly more conspicuous.

â€¢ We notice that no regard has been given to the House Extensions and Domestic Outbuildings SPG which states that a two-storey side extension should be set back at least one metre from the front elevation of the original building, ensuring it is subordinate to the host building. Such a setback will reduce the visual impact of an extension, helping to maintain the character and appearance of both the original dwelling and the streetscape. No set back is proposed under this development.

â€¢ Similarly, the SPG states that an extension should be set down from the ridge of the host dwelling, but no such set down is proposed in this case. Consequently, the proposal significantly unbalances the rhythm of the front elevation of the terrace, adding a large and visible extension that has little regard to the design of the host property.

â€¢ Comments were made on the rear extension in terms of it being obtrusive in terms of its rearward projection and squat proportions, again being out of harmony and keeping with the surrounding properties. As pointed out, there are other rear extensions in Routs View, however, all have been designed with flat roofs in line with planning requirements to aid uniformity and protect the street scene. There was also the concern raised that the two-storey extension in combination with the rear single storey extension will noticeably and significantly enlarge the dwelling and an extension of this scale and design in this context will appear incongruous when viewed from the access road serving these dwellings â€" an issue here in terms of both design and scale. Surely, a better quality design that would preserve the street scene/character of the existing terraces would be for the two-storey extension to be aligned to the rear of the host dwelling with a single-story flat roof extension at the rear.

Conclusion:

Overall, all the points raised above under both Scale and Design remain outstanding, under this application, even though they were strongly stated as refusal reasons under application 24/0906 and were acknowledged as having a demonstrable adverse impact upon the appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene of Routs View, from both front and rear elevations. This is not in accordance with Policy GP6 of Newport Local Development Plan 2011 â€" 2026 (Adopted January 2015) or the Councils adopted SPG on House Extensions.

As all the points we have raised are clearly in breach or out of line with planning regulations I am sure the case officer already has them on their radar and will be addressing them

accordingly.

Kind regards