

Address: 16 MANOR PARK NEWPORT GWENT

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: Newport City Council
24 October 2025

Objection To Planning Application 25/0844

15 Manor Park, Newport, NP10 8SA

Proposal: Two-storey side extension incorporating conversion of an existing garage to habitable accommodation

This letter sets out my formal objection to the above planning application on the grounds that the proposal would result in significant harm to residential amenity, through unacceptable loss of light and outlook, and would introduce an over-scaled and poorly integrated form of development that is both unneighbourly and contrary to adopted planning policy. It also raises material concerns about the future use and definition of the proposed annexe, which does not comply with policy requirements for dependent accommodation.

Impact on Residential Amenity and Loss of Outlook

The planning statement submitted in support of this application incorrectly claims that the neighbouring window most affected by the proposed two-storey side extension is a landing window. This is demonstrably false. The window in question is in fact a side-facing bedroom window at 16 Manor Park "a habitable room" and therefore afforded far greater protection under the Local Development Plan.

The proposed two-storey extension, by virtue of its height, mass, and proximity to the boundary, would significantly reduce daylight to the side-facing bedroom window at 16 Manor Park. The extension would be located approximately 1 metre from this window, creating a severe and permanent obstruction to natural daylight. The light currently entering the room "both diffuse daylight and direct sunlight" would be materially reduced as the proposal doesn't comply with the 25d rule - the proposed development introduces a two-storey wall at 1 metre away, leading to substantial overshadowing of the room for large parts of the day and during winter months in particular. This would render the bedroom darker and less usable and would compromise the living conditions for us.

Another consequence of this extension will be the complete eradication of any outlook from the room, replacing the current aspect "which includes sky and streetscape" with a blank two-storey wall in close proximity. The visual impact would be unavoidably oppressive and overbearing, to the serious detriment of the residential amenity of No. 16.

The proposal directly conflicts with Policy GP2 of the Newport Local Development Plan 2011-2026, which requires that development does not have a significant adverse effect on the amenity of nearby residents. This includes ensuring that sufficient levels of natural light are maintained. The loss of daylight caused by the proposal would significantly degrade the quality of accommodation at 16 Manor Park, particularly to a habitable room, and is therefore unacceptable in planning terms.

Overbearing and Out-of-Scale Design

The form and mass of the proposed side extension are excessive and inconsistent with the scale of existing built form along Manor Park. It lacks the usual design cues that ensure subservience and instead presents a full-height gable wall directly adjacent to the shared boundary. Unlike other side extensions in the area, this proposal does not incorporate any design mitigation such as a set-back, drop in ridge height, or stepped form. It would present as a visually dominant and over-scaled addition, wholly at odds with the more modest interventions seen elsewhere in the street.

From the perspective of No. 16, the resulting structure would create an imposing and overbearing visual presence, particularly when viewed from inside the affected bedroom, frontage and rear. The extension fundamentally alters the visual relationship between the two properties, introducing a harsh and abrupt built form into what is otherwise a relatively open and balanced streetscene.

This is in breach of both GP2 and GP6 of the Newport LDP. GP6 requires that proposals respect the scale and form of surrounding development and that they integrate appropriately into the setting. The unbroken two-storey height and close proximity of the proposed extension fail to meet these design expectations and create visual harm to neighbouring amenity.

Concerns Over Self-Containment and Future Use of the “Annexe”

The ground floor of the extension incorporates a converted garage space and the upper floor includes two bedrooms – one would be the annex’s bedroom and the second, an additional bedroom for the main house. Crucially, for the annex, the proposal does not show shared facilities or a reliance on the primary residence, and therefore raises legitimate concern that this is not a genuine “annexe” – as it is being described – but a self-contained residential unit capable of functioning independently.

Were this to be intended for a dependent family member, it would ordinarily be expected to remain functionally tied to the host dwelling – typically through a shared entrance, kitchen or bathroom. The absence of such links raises material questions about the potential for unauthorised use as a separate rental unit, now or in the future.

Furthermore, the justification for the proposed extension refers to the ground floor garage conversion and first-floor bedroom as forming an “annexe,” yet the layout fundamentally undermines that claim. If the intention were genuinely to provide accommodation for an elderly or dependent relative, the bedroom would logically be located on the ground floor to ensure accessibility and to avoid reliance on stairs. Locating the only bedroom of the annexe on the first floor makes it inherently unsuitable for elderly occupation, particularly for those with limited mobility or long-term care needs. This design choice further weakens the claim that this is ancillary accommodation and suggests instead that it is a self-contained unit intended for more general or even independent occupation, rather than a bespoke annexe tied to the needs of a specific dependent resident.

The proposal fails to comply with Policy H7 (Annexes to Residential Dwellings) of the Newport Local Development Plan 2011–2026. This policy requires that annexes are functionally dependent on the main dwelling. The current application satisfies none of these requirements and therefore should not be approved under the guise of being a subordinate annexe.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, this application would result in substantial and demonstrable harm to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers at 16 Manor Park. It fails to safeguard light, outlook, and residential privacy, and introduces an over-scaled and intrusive form that is wholly out of keeping with the established character of the street. The proposal is also non-compliant with adopted policy on annexes and raises legitimate concerns about the potential for

independent occupation.

The application is contrary to Policies GP2, GP6, and H7 of the Newport Local Development Plan 2011â€"2026, and I therefore respectfully request that it is refused in full.
