

Delegated Decision Report

Application No:	25/0457	Statutory Period Expires:	31st October 2025
------------------------	----------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------------

Site:	22 Redbrook Road Newport South Wales NP20 5AA		
Proposal:	PROPOSED EXTENSIONS AND ALTERATIONS TO REAR /SIDES OF DWELLING, TO INCLUDE FIRST FLOOR REAR EXTENSION AND SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSIONS. PROPOSED PARKING AREA TO FRONT GARDEN. PROPOSED REMOVAL OF EXISTING REAR CONSERVATORY AND OUTBUILDING		
Applicant:	M Isaac		
Type:	Full	Ward:	Allt-yr-Yn
Decision:	GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS		

1. BACKGROUND

1.1 None.

2. SITE LOCATION AND CONTEXT

2.1 The application site is characterised within a residential area and is a detached house. Houses face onto Redbrook Road and typically hold small front gardens and driveways. The rooves along the streetscene contain the same materials and contain hipped rooves creating a consistent feature in the streetscene. The land level also decreases down Redbrook Road setting houses at different levels.

3. DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

3.1 The application seeks the removal of a guest house and conservatory to the rear/side elevation, and the implementation of a side and rear extension. On the South East side of the property, a single storey attached outbuilding is proposed. This contains a pitched roof with an elongated rear roof plane. On the North West side elevation there is a single storey lean to hipped roof extension. On the rear elevation, there is a first floor rear extension over the existing ground floor extension. The roof connects to the existing ridge of the dwelling and would be hipped. A secondary driveway is also proposed to the front of the dwelling creating 2no. additional spaces.

Outbuilding side extension (South East)

H: 3.8m (to the ridge) 2.7m (eaves)

D: 5.7m

W: 3.3m

Side extension (North West):

H: 4.2m (to the ridge)

D: 6.1m

W: 2.5m

First Floor Extension

H: 7.6m (from ground level)

D: 3.85m (deepest point)

W: 6.8 m (7.5m to the roof overhang)

4. RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

App Number	Proposal	Decision	Decision Date
00/1151	ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION	GC	05/01/2001

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)

Policy GP2 (General Amenity)

Policy GP4 (Highways and Accessibility)

Policy GP5 (Natural Environment)

Policy GP6 (Quality of Design)

5.4 SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE HOUSE EXTENSIONS AND DOMESTIC OUTBUILDINGS SPG PARKING STANDARDS SPG

6. CONSULTATION RESPONSES

6.1 Local Highways Authority:

The building proposals reduce the existing parking provision and replace the lost space with a second double drive. This is not acceptable anyway, but the issue is compounded by its location on the inside of a bend. The extent of footway crossing also raises objection due to this being prejudicial to other road users and reducing available on street parking.

There are no objections to the building, only the parking arrangement. The applicant should widen the existing drive, to provide a double width, which results in no loss of

parking. This necessitates work in the highway to provide an extended crossing (and relocate/lower an existing cover). It will require separate permission from highways and is independent of planning.

7. PUBLIC REPRESENTATIONS

Neighbour and Ward member notification letters were sent on 25/07/2025.

7.1 NEIGHBOURS: 13 no. neighbours were consulted. 1no. neighbour provided comments.

24 Redbrook Road:

I am writing to formally object to the proposed first-floor extension of 4 metres at the neighbouring property located at 22 Redbrook Road, Newport, NP20 5AA.. As residents of 24 Redbrook Road, we wish to highlight our concern regarding the significant and detrimental impact this size extension will have on our property.

The proposed 4.0 metre first floor extension, if permitted, would severely reduce the natural light entering our home, particularly affecting our rear bedroom, which relies heavily on this light due to the bay window being the only natural light source. We believe this will not only affect our day-to-day comfort but also potentially diminish the value and enjoyment of our property.

We would also like to draw attention to a previous planning decision made regarding the property on the opposite side of us, number 26 Redbrook Road, where only a 3.0 metre first floor extension was permitted. It is unclear why the current proposal has exceeded this precedent, and we urge the planning authority to consider the consistency and fairness in planning decisions within the area.

We trust that the planning authority will give due weight to our concerns and uphold the principles of equitable and balanced development.

Subsequent comments were submitted after the original comments above:

Further to my previous email and having the depth of the first floor extension confirmed by my neighbour at No. 26 and their agent I can confirm that we would have no objection to the proposal. This is on the basis that the depth of the first floor extension where it is adjacent to No. 24 does not exceed 3.00 metres as measured from the existing bathroom exterior rear wall.

8. ASSESSMENT

8.1.1 Principle of Development

The application site is within the defined settlement boundary as shown on the proposals map that accompany the Newport City Council Local Development Plan, accordingly there is a presumption in favour of development and the efficient use of land is encouraged. However, further considerations are discussed below.

8.1.2 The main issues involved in the assessment of the application are the scale, form and design of the extensions and its subsequent impact on the host dwelling, and the character of the wider street scene. The proposal has also been assessed in respect of the impact on neighbours, parking and amenity space.

8.2 Visual Amenity/ Character and Appearance

8.2.2 In general design terms, it is considered there are 3no. different design elements to the proposal. The outbuilding on the Southeast side elevation, the single storey side extension on the North West elevation, and the first-floor rear extension on the North East elevation. Each are assessed below.

8.2.3 Outbuilding

Firstly, when assessing the design of the outbuilding on the Southeast side elevation, it is considered this extension is subordinate in height to the main dwellinghouse and would not create a significant terracing effect within the streetscene. However, the outbuilding introduces a new roof form onto the dwelling and would not appear sympathetic to the main dwelling house. Notwithstanding this, it is considered that the outbuilding could be constructed under permitted development given the scale, and significant weight has been attached to this legitimate fallback position in the assessment of this application. Therefore, on balance it is considered that the proposed outbuilding would not result in any unacceptable adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the existing dwelling or wider area.

8.2.4 Side extension

In terms of the side extension design on the North West elevation, it is considered this room is to serve a kitchen. The design is single storey in height and holds a lean to hipped roof. The roof form is sympathetic to the dwelling and would appear coherent from the front elevation. There would be a single window on the front elevation with decorative brickwork to the bottom to match that of the existing dwellinghouse. Overall, it is considered that this element of the development is acceptable in design terms.

8.2.5 First floor rear extension

The first-floor rear extension would sit flush to the existing ground floor element. The first floor extension would meet the existing ridge height of the dwelling and would not be set down. The House Extensions and Domestic Outbuildings SPG, *The roof of a two-storey extension should be set down from the main roof of the existing building it should be set down and clearly subordinate to the main property... The roof should also complement the host building.* Moreover, the House Extensions SPG in paragraph 5.2.2 states that two-storey rear extensions should not be more than 3 metres deep. It is considered that a set down on the rear extension would appear awkward in this location given the roof is hipped. Therefore, the lack of the set down to the rear of the property is not unacceptable in this instance. The two storey rear extension would be 3.85m in depth. This is 0.85m over the recommended guidelines set out within the SPG, but this would not be demonstrable. Materials will be condition to match to create a sympathetic, coherent appearance.

8.2.6 In terms of fenestration, there are different window styles across the dwelling. One proposed window on the ground floor rear extension appears close to the new doorway and slightly awkward, however, this is to the rear and not readily visible. The proposed fenestration is deemed acceptable.

8.2.7 The removal of the outbuilding and conservatory is deemed acceptable.

8.3 Residential Amenity

8.3.1 20 Redbrook Road

In terms of the relationship to the neighbouring property to the other side at number 20 Redbrook Road, the land level decreases by approximately 0.9m-1m. Extensions are often problematic when sited adjacent to the boundary in cases where neighbouring properties are sited at a lower land level. The outbuilding would be constructed up to the boundary fence. The current relationship of no.20 and no.22 is demonstrated below. The side elevation of no.20 is within close proximity to the boundary fence and appears to have 3no. windows. There is not good outlook from these windows given the intervening boundary fence, therefore, the outbuilding would not exacerbate this problem. In terms of the loss of light, the 45° light test is required where any extension from an existing building line affects a protected window. Given the development proposed, this will be undertaken from no.20's ground floor side extension windows. It is considered that the windows currently fail the elevation and plan view light test from the existing dwelling. It would also fail both tests against the proposed outbuilding. It should be considered these tests were technically already failed against the existing dwelling house; therefore, it could be considered that there is not a worse off impact to these windows. It also appears there is a roof light and a rear window which serves the same room which is unaffected. Additionally, the outbuilding could be constructed under permitted development, and therefore, is acceptable.



8.3.2 The first floor windows on the side elevation facing the host property at no.20 serves a hallway and a bathroom and this is confirmed from imaging on Rightmove. Therefore, these rooms are not habitable, and any significant loss of light to these would not create demonstrable harm to living standards.

8.3.3 When assessing loss of light to the rear windows at no.20, it is considered that the first floor windows should be considered. The closest first floor window is obscure glazed and therefore, not a habitable room. The 45 degree light test was conducted from this window, and the bay window passed the plan view test, therefore, this window would not suffer loss of light from the rear extension. Therefore, this is deemed acceptable.

8.3.4 24 Redbrook Road

Neighbouring comments were raised on concerns over loss of light to the first-floor bay window and the overall size of the extension. The neighbour also made comment on a scheme at 26 Redbrook Road was granted a 3.0 metre first floor extension and it is unclear why the current proposal has exceeded this precedent. The applicant reassured the neighbouring property that the first floor extension would only be 3.05m in depth closest to no.24 after the original comments were made. No.24 no longer has an objection on the basis that the depth of the first floor extension where it is adjacent to No. 24 does not exceed 3.00 metres as measured from the existing bathroom exterior rear wall.

- 8.3.5 On assessment, it is considered that the properties rear elevation is staggered. The proposed first floor extension measured from the exterior wall closest to no.24 would equate to approximately 3.1m in depth. However, it is considered that the overall depth of the extension taken from the existing roof plane would be approximately 3.85m. Whilst the neighbour raises concerns over the rear extension exceeding 3m, these concerns have been addressed within the report. Moreover, when assessing loss of light to the first-floor bay window of no.24, the plan view 45 degree light test was undertaken and passed. Moreover, given the set away and the set up of the neighbouring property there would be no demonstrable light loss to this window, and therefore, deemed acceptable. The closet ground floor window at no.24 protrudes past the rear elevation of the proposed development at no.22, and therefore, would not cause demonstrable loss of light to these windows.

8.4 Driveway

- 8.4.1 The existing driveway is being shortened to allow for a side extension, and the applicant proposes a secondary driveway at the front of the property, which would require removing part of the lawn. However, the Highways Officer has objected, stating that the new driveway's location, on the inside of a bend, is unsafe and would not be supported.
- 8.4.2 Further concerns are raised over the extent of the proposed footway crossing, which could negatively impact other road users and reduce on-street parking. The officer notes the existing dropped kerb is wide enough for two spaces and recommends widening the current driveway instead of adding a second one.
- 8.4.3 However, it is considered that the applicant proposes to create a new access onto a non-classified road and lay hard standing forward of the principal elevation which is permeable. Therefore, this could be undertaken under permitted development and significant weight is given to this legitimate fall back position. The highways officer has confirmed that the proposed works would require separate highways permission due to the need to extend the crossing and alter an existing cover however this would not be a sufficient reason as to withhold planning consent. Therefore, given the information above, it is considered acceptable in this location.

8.5 Biodiversity

Policy 9 of Future Wales states that in all cases, action towards securing the maintenance and enhancement of biodiversity (to provide a net benefit), the resilience of ecosystems and green infrastructure assets must be demonstrated. Policy GP5 of the NLDP supports this and states that proposals will be expected to maintain, protect, and enhance ecological networks and features of importance for biodiversity. No ecological

enhancements are proposed as part of the development. As such the proposal is currently not compliant with the aims of Policy GP5 of the NLDP 2011-2026 (adopted January 2015). However, this can be reasonably conditioned given the scale of development.

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 Overall, whilst it is acknowledged that the proposed outbuildings roof form is not uniform to that of the existing built form of the dwelling house, it is considered this alteration could be undertaken under permitted development, and therefore, given this legitimate fall back position the design is deemed acceptable. Additionally, whilst the highways officer has raised concerns over the new access, the formation of this new access and laying of a permeable hard surface forward of the principal elevation can also be undertaken under permitted development, and again this fall back position has been given significant weight in the assessment of this application and therefore would not amount to a reason for refusal. The two storey rear extension does not create demonstrable loss of light to neighbouring properties, and the single storey rear extension to the North West would appear sympathetic to the dwelling. Materials will be conditioned to match to create a coherent design. Moreover, a biodiversity scheme will be conditioned proportionate to the proposed scheme. Therefore, the scheme is granted with conditions.

11. DECISION

GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS

01 The development shall be implemented in accordance with the following plans:
KD2012 2A Proposed Amended elevations and floor plans; Part of proposed plan;
Revised site location plan; KD2012 1 - Existing Floor Plans, Elevations and Parking Area
Reason: In the interests of clarity and to ensure the development complies with the submitted plans and documents on which this decision was based.

02 Prior to the commencement of development, a biodiversity enhancement scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The biodiversity enhancement scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved plans prior to the first beneficial use of the development hereby approved and retained as such for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: In the interest of protected species, in accordance with Policy 9 of Future Wales and Policy GP5 of the Newport Local Development Plan 2011-2026 (adopted January 2015).

03 The external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall only be of materials to match those used in the existing building.

Reason: To ensure the development is completed in a manner compatible with its surroundings.

04 Prior to the first beneficial use of the development, the driveway shall be constructed and completed in a porous and permeable material and maintained as such in perpetuity.

Reason: To ensure the driveway is constructed in a satisfactory manner and to maintain highway safety in accordance with GP4 of the Newport Local Development Plan 2011-2026 (adopted January 2015).

NOTE TO APPLICANT

01 The development plan for Newport is the Newport Local Development Plan 2011 – 2026 (Adopted January 2015). Policies GP2, GP4, GP5, GP6 were relevant to the determination of this application.

02 Due to the minor nature of the proposed development (including any demolition) and the location of the proposed development, it is considered that the proposals did not need to be screened under the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations.