

**From:** \*REDACTED\*

**Sent:** 12 February 2026 10:01

**To:** NCC - Planning <[Planning@newport.gov.uk](mailto:Planning@newport.gov.uk)>

**Cc:** [marnie.ostler@newport.gov](mailto:marnie.ostler@newport.gov)

**Subject:** RE:Objection to Planning Application 25/1037 – 202 Stow Hill, NP20 4HB

**Importance:** High

Dear Marnie Ostler,

I am writing to formally **object** to planning application **25/1037**, submitted retrospectively for the erection of a tall timber boundary fence at **202 Stow Hill, Newport NP20 4HB**

### **1. Fence Height Exceeds Permitted Levels**

The fence appears **significantly above the 1-metre height normally permitted** for boundary structures adjacent to a highway under the General Permitted Development Order. Its scale is clearly visible from the public road and is far higher than what would be allowed had the applicants sought permission beforehand.

Allowing retrospective consent in this case risks encouraging a “build first, ask later” approach.

### **2. Removal of the Original Hedge and Environmental Harm**

There was previously a **mature hedge** along the boundary that has now been removed. This hedge:

- Provided wildlife habitat
- Contributed to the greenery of the area
- Softened the appearance of the elevated stone boundary wall

The photo also shows where the former hedge had **pushed out sections of the stone wall**, which now requires repair for safety. Rather than removing the hedge and adding an over-scaled fence, a more appropriate solution would have been to **repair the wall and reinstate a hedge**, aligning with environmental and biodiversity goals.

### **3. Detrimental Impact on Visual Amenity**

The fence is **harsh, out of character, and visually intrusive**. Neighbouring properties largely retain hedges or period-appropriate walls, which respect the historic streetscape of Stow Hill.

Because the property sits on an elevated corner plot, the excessive height of the fence makes it even more dominant and unsightly.

#### 4. Safety Concerns

A tall, lightweight timber fence in such an exposed position presents several risks:

- It may **fail in high winds** and fall into the road.
- It may attract **graffiti and fly-posting**, degrading the appearance of the area and increasing maintenance demands.

These concerns highlight why planning rules generally restrict front boundary heights.

#### 5. Condition of the Existing Wall

The underlying stone wall already shows signs of **displacement and instability**. Adding a large wind-load structure on top increases the risk of future structural failure.

---

#### Conclusion

For the reasons above — excessive height, environmental harm, negative visual impact, and genuine safety concerns — I respectfully request that planning permission **be refused** and that the applicant be required to replace the fence with a boundary treatment that complies with planning guidelines and respects the character of Stow Hill.

A rebuilt wall and reinstated hedge would be a more appropriate, environmentally responsible solution.

Thank you for considering my objection.

Yours sincerely,

**\*REDACTED\***

Stoughton, 13 Stow Park Circle, Newport NP20 4HF.