

From:

Sent: 10 March 2026 09:51

To: Hawkins, Grant (Principal Planning Officer) <Grant.Hawkins@newport.gov.uk>

Subject: Re: Concerns Regarding Planning Application 25/0972 Stonewall, Lower Road, Llandeud, Newport NP18 2AE

Dear Grant,

Thank you for keeping me informed and for providing the amended plans. Having carefully reviewed the revisions, I maintain my strong objection to application 25/0972. The proposal does not address the key concerns that led to the refusal of application 25/0241, particularly the impact on privacy and the rural character of the area.

I was disappointed to read the suggestion in the supporting statement that there are ongoing disputes between neighbours. This is not a true reflection of the situation. I have no personal dispute with the current owner, and there were no neighbour disputes with the previous owners, who were the current owner's parents. The only disagreement that ever arose related to their objection to planning at Myrtle Cottage. My comments relate solely to the planning merits of the proposal, and I would ask that the application is considered on that basis rather than statements about neighbour relations that are inaccurate.

The proposal introduces multiple rooflights and a rear dormer facing Myrtle Cottage. Although the supporting statement suggests that 1.7m sill height and partial obscure glazing prevents overlooking, the rooflights open outward and allow angled views directly into Myrtle Cottage and the garden. There is an excessive number of roof windows, which further increases the potential for overlooking. The dormer upper window is clear, allowing views outward. Importantly, the dormer window is directly opposite the French doors of a daily-used room, so it would clearly overlook the main living area of the property. Together, these openings continue to create both direct and perceived overlooking, which would significantly impact privacy.

The supporting statement also claims that privacy concerns are reduced because Myrtle Cottage is slightly elevated. This argument is flawed. The proposed roof accommodation effectively brings the viewing points of the development to a level comparable with the ground floor windows of Myrtle Cottage. In practical terms, the new openings would still directly overlook our property and garden, so elevation does not reduce the impact.

The height of the roof and dormer is excessive. The front dormer is significantly higher than the rear, creating an unnecessarily tall and bulky roof profile. This would dominate the property, appear out of scale with neighbouring buildings, and harm the character of this rural area. The overall height would also substantially reduce the sense of openness and rural scene from both Myrtle Cottage and public viewpoints nearby.

The supporting statement refers to a separation distance of 26.5 metres between the properties. This does not take into account the current active planning in place for Myrtle Cottage, which reduces the actual distance. Distance alone does not prevent overlooking; the roof height, number and position of openings, and orientation of the buildings all contribute to the impact on neighbouring amenity.

Whilst existing hedgerow and vegetation provides a degree of screening, planting has previously been cut back or removed by Stonewell, including willow screening. It would therefore not be appropriate to rely on vegetation alone to mitigate overlooking or visual impact.

In view of the previous refusal of application 25/0241, and given that the relationship between the buildings, the roof height, and the number of openings remain largely unchanged, it is difficult to see how the concerns previously identified have been addressed. The amended proposal would still result in overlooking, loss of privacy, and an overly prominent roof form that would harm the character of this rural area. I therefore respectfully maintain my objection to planning application 25/0972.

If you need anything further, please let me know.

Kind Regards