

Objection – Planning Application 26/0054

Site: White Gates, Outfall Lane, St Brides Wentlooge, Newport NP10 8SS

Proposal: Detached Garage and Detached Garden Room



Dear Sir/Madam,

Wentlooge Community Council wish to object to the above application on the grounds of policy conflict, cumulative overdevelopment, landscape impact, and inconsistency with previous planning decisions, including the long-standing restriction on permitted development rights.

1. Background – Permitted Development Rights Removed for Policy Reasons

The replacement dwelling approved under 23/0379 already exceeded Welsh Government guidance for rural extensions. As noted by neighbours in relation to application 25/0276, the approved dwelling represents a 59% increase, almost double the 30% guideline for rural areas. This is confirmed in the Planning Committee report, which imposed the following condition:

“No development within Classes A, B, C, D or E shall be carried out without the express permission of the Local Planning Authority... to protect the amenities of occupiers of adjoining properties and to control future development... in the interests of the openness of the Green Wedge.”

This condition has been in place since at least 99/0341 and has never been removed. It remains necessary and relevant.

The applicant's current proposal seeks to add two substantial new buildings (33m² garage and 48m² garden room), despite the fact that the dwelling already exceeds rural size thresholds and sits within multiple sensitive designations.

2. Sensitive Landscape Designations – Heightened Need for Restraint

The site lies within several nationally and locally important designations:

- Special Landscape Area (Wentlooge Levels) – SP8
- Site of Special Scientific Interest (Gwent Levels – St Brides)
- Green Wedge (Newport and Cardiff) – SP7
- Countryside – SP5
- Archaeologically Sensitive Area
- Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest

These designations require strict control of incremental development, particularly where cumulative massing threatens openness or rural character.

The applicant's previous supporting letter claims the outbuildings *“will not appear as an incongruous form of development, nor will they result in any demonstrable harm to the Special Landscape Area, countryside, or green wedge.”*

However, this is an assertion, not an assessment, and is contradicted by:

- the scale and permanence of the proposed structures,
- the cumulative footprint when combined with the oversized replacement dwelling, and
- the long-standing planning history restricting further built form.

3. Conflict With Approved Landscape Scheme (23/0379)

The Council's Countryside & Conservation Officer initially raised clear concerns:

“The proposed garden room is offset only around 1m from the neighbouring fence line... there is insufficient room and therefore a clash between the proposals and the approved landscape scheme rev A under application 23/0379.” (NCC Landscape Comments, 12 Feb 2026)

This demonstrates that the proposal physically conflicts with the landscaping that was required to mitigate the impact of the new dwelling.

Although a revised plan was later submitted, the officer still required confirmation that the approved planting has actually been implemented:

“It would help mitigation if the approved landscape scheme can be confirmed as implemented... planting obviously takes time to establish.” (NCC Landscape Comments, 27 Feb 2026)

Given that vegetation on the site was previously cleared, neighbours have already reported increased surface water run-off onto adjoining land and the lane. Until the approved planting is fully established, any additional built form will worsen these impacts.

4. Cumulative Overdevelopment of the Plot

The applicant argues that neighbouring properties have multiple outbuildings. However:

- Those properties did not receive a 59% oversized replacement dwelling,
- They retain agricultural land restrictions, and
- They are not subject to the same long-standing PD removal conditions.

The applicant's comparison is therefore misleading. The land is now lawful residential curtilage, and planning decisions must be based on its current use. The only relevant restriction that prevents outbuildings is the long-standing removal of permitted development rights on the applicant's plot, imposed to protect the Green Wedge and neighbouring amenity. Comparisons with neighbouring land designations carry no weight.

The proposed garage and garden room together total 81m², exceeding the footprint of the former outbuildings (68m²) referenced in the applicant's letter. The garden room does not need to be the size The previous structures were also: *“unfit for use and structurally unsafe... the reason for removal.”*

Their removal was not a licence to replace them with larger permanent masonry constructed, modern structures in a sensitive landscape.

5. Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

The original PD restriction was imposed partly: *“To protect the amenities of occupiers of adjoining properties.”*

Neighbouring residents have already raised concerns that the new dwelling is significantly more imposing than the original bungalow. Additional built form—particularly a 48m² garden room close to boundaries—will further erode privacy, outlook, and rural character.

The applicant’s assertion that the proposal *“will not harm the amenity of neighbouring occupiers”* is not supported by any assessment.

6. Prematurity – Appeal on PD Removal Still Undetermined

The applicant has appealed the refusal of 25/0276 (removal of PD rights). Until that appeal is determined, the PD restriction remains in force.

It would be inappropriate to approve substantial new outbuildings while the Inspector is considering whether unrestricted development would harm the Green Wedge and neighbouring amenity.

7. Policy Conflict

The proposal conflicts with:

- SP7 – Green Wedge (protect openness)
- SP8 – Special Landscape Areas
- GP5 – Natural Environment, particularly:

“the proposal includes an appropriate landscape scheme which enhances the site and wider context including green infrastructure and biodiversity networks.”
(NCC Landscape Comments referencing GP5)

The scheme does not enhance the landscape; it adds further built mass and disrupts the approved mitigation planting.

Conclusion

For the reasons above, the proposal represents unjustified, cumulative overdevelopment within a highly sensitive landscape, contrary to long-standing planning controls and the rationale for removing permitted development rights.

WCC therefore respectfully request that planning application 26/0054 be refused.

Kind regards

Wentlooge Community Council