

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 28/04/2025 10:38 PM

Application Summary

Address:	4 Pontymason Close Rogerstone Newport NP10 9HG
Proposal:	RESUBMISSION OF RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION TO RETAIN TERRACED PATIO AREAS
Case Officer:	Marnie Ostler

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	
Email:	
Address:	3 Pontymason Close Rogerstone Newport

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	25/0261 RESUBMISSION E24/0115 Engineering Enforcement Case 24/0810 Original Retrospective Planning Application " Refused This development has already been considered by Newport Council under reference 24/0810 and retrospective planning permission has been refused. The applicant(s) unilateral and post-insertion of a red line on the block plan in this re-submission does not mean that those areas outside of it are either permitted developments, have previously been granted planning permission or have existed uncontested for 4 years. The start date provided by the applicant(s) of 02/08/21 is not correct. Excavation of Tier A, requiring both a mechanical digger and bulldozer, happened prior to that, in the Spring of 2021. These works included the creation of the Tier A patio, the construction of the retaining wall at the rear of Tier A and the erection of the balustrade around the perimeter of Tier A. This time-line has previously been evidenced under reference 24/0810 with a Google Earth image dated 17/07/2021, showing that the physical alteration of the land as a result of very significant earthworks had already been completed by that date. The patio and shadow cast by the retaining wall at the rear of Tier A is clearly visible as of 17/07/2021.

The applicant(s) post-insertion of the red line, combined with the start date provided in the application form, obfuscates the true extent and nature of the work under-taken and serves to conceal the full scope of the development.

The absence of a qualified engineer overseeing the development cannot of course be the defining factor in whether these works are to be considered engineering or not, nor whether planning permission is required.

The original plan in application Ref. No: 24/0810 'SD991-01C Original' differs from the corresponding plan in the re-submission Ref. No: 25/0261 'SD991-01C Existing' a segregating red line has again been added by the applicant(s) and the word 'patio' now replaced with 'gravel'.

The proposed potted planters are not considered a sustainable nor lasting remedy to the breaches and seek to circumvent planning permission where it is required - and has already been refused once by the very same body now asked to consider this re-submission.

Generally, we find the wording of the re-submission hard to follow. The various graphics provided do not tie in clearly with the written proposal. That makes it difficult for us to comment meaningfully. However, it seems this re-submission is no less of a contrived effort to mitigate than that found in the original application see objections and case officer report under reference 24/0810. It is not clear the applicant(s) are willing to commit to any lasting and permanent remedies that will address the breaches.

In summary, this re-submission appears to be no more than both a fishing exercise to find a re-interpretation of the development already considered in 24/0810, that may somehow now be deemed acceptable, and an appeal of the original decision.

Kind regards