

Brinkworth, Emma (Planning Officer)

From: Arnall, Guy
Sent: 25 June 2026 09:36
To: Brinkworth, Emma (Planning Officer)
Subject: RE: Planning Consultation Request for cases ref: 26/0101(FULL) & 26/0342 (LBC) - Felthorpe College Road Caerleon Newport South Wales

Hi Emma

RE: Planning Consultation Request for cases ref: 26/0101(FULL) & 26/0342 (LBC) - Felthorpe College Road, Caerleon, Newport

Revised comments following another site visit and discussion.

1. Curtilage Listing

Section 76(5) of the Historic Environment (Wales) Act 2023 states that:

In this Act “listed building” means a building included in the list maintained under this section, and includes—

(a) any structure or artificial object that is fixed to the building and ancillary to it;

(b) any other structure or artificial object that—

(i) forms part of the land and has done so since before 1 July 1948, and

(ii) was within the curtilage of the building, and ancillary to it, on the date on which the building was first included in the list, or on 1 January 1969, whichever was later.

76(5) (b)(i) requires that the building was constructed before 1 July 1948. This part is satisfied, as map evidence shows that *Felthorpe* had been built by this time, i.e. it ‘*formed part of the land*’ before 1 July 1948.

76(5) (b)(ii) Is satisfied as *Felthorpe* was within the curtilage of the building, and ancillary to it at the time of listing, on 02/03/2017, as it was in college use by May 2016.

Felthorpe is therefore considered to be ‘curtilage-listed’ with the Former Caerleon Teacher Training College Building (Cadw Ref. no. 87729), and therefore both FULL and LBC applications have been made.

2. Analysis

2.1 Significance

Principal elevation of the property presents a Neo-Classical inspired façade of good design and proportion; constructed in ‘pressed-red’ brick, with multi-pane timber sliding-sash windows, a slated and hipped roof, cast iron rainwater goods, and a prominent decorative corbelled brick chimney stack to the north-western elevation (with buff square pots). However, the whole has a subtle asymmetry, revealing traces of an Arts-and-Crafts aesthetic. To the upper storey, the paired middle windows are offset to the north, and, to ground level, a faceted bay window is offset in the other direction, topped by a wrap-around veranda. Adjacent to the bay is a small window which serves the hallway WC. All identified as original features; they are prominent upon the front elevation and make positive contribute towards the architectural and historic interest of the asset. As identified within the HIA, the

porch is likely a later addition, one which has been built forward of the veranda line with a prominence which imposes unwarranted symmetry. However, its design (with appropriate pitch to the roof and half-timber construction) is not, in my view, detrimental towards significance; it adds some visual interest to the whole.

This prevailing form and materiality are reflected within other listed buildings on the site – perhaps most notably the residential-scale GII Principal's Building (Cadw ref. 87726) and the GII Caretaker's / Gardener's Lodge (Cadw ref. 87727). *Felthorpe* is therefore considered to make positive contribution towards the significance of these college buildings, as well as towards the grand mixed Revival style college building itself (Cadw ref. 87729) which, altogether, have a significant group value.

To the rear of *Felthorpe*, there are further, characterful features, including a single storey 'Sunroom' with large, faceted bay. The mono-pitch outshot with small chimneystack (which perhaps once featured wash house, lavatory, and coal house) also appear to be of some interest (though map evidence makes clear that these are later additions). Internally, there remain features of interest too, including the central bay staircase, egg-and-dart moulded cornices, and other surviving features. However, these obviously less prominent features are considered to make substantially less of a positive contribution towards both the significance of the parent asset group, and the setting of adjacent assets (see below). I would therefore conclude that there is considerably more room for alteration here.

2.2 Setting

Felthorpe has a particularly close contextual relationship with the adjacent Grade II Listed Gate Piers (Cadw Reference Number 87728). It immediately overlooks principal approach to the former College buildings and provides first introduction to classically inspired building forms of the listed asset group. This positioning, and the generous green curtilage which still surrounds it, are therefore considered to make positive contribution towards the setting of *Felthorpe* itself; positive contribution towards this adjacent listed gateway; and positive contribution towards the setting of the listed building group upon the site. This setting, in turn, makes a positive contribution towards the significance of *Felthorpe* as a curtilage-listed asset.

Indeed, during development of the wider site, considerable care has been taken to ensure that the generous curtilage of *Felthorpe* has been maintained, with the extent of modern development which fronts College Road having been curtailed to the south-east. Thought has also been given to the form and materiality of this new development; its red brick construction and hipped roofs make clear reference to the existing buildings upon the site (including *Felthorpe*), to reduce harmful impact upon the setting of both the principal listed building group, and the curtilage-listed asset in question.

2.3 Impact upon special interest of the asset (LBC aspects)

I am pleased to see that the characterful features to the principal front portion of this asset are proposed for retention, thus sustaining primary contribution made by *Felthorpe* towards significance of the asset group - and their setting. It has previously been noted that there is much greater potential for alteration to both the interior of the building and its lesser-seen rear elevation, due to the curtilage-listing of the asset in question, and the minimal contribution these features make towards the significance of the principal asset group. Considering the relatively minimal contribution these features also make towards the setting of the primary listed asset group, the principal of intervention in this location is considered acceptable.

It is proposed to demolish the rear of the property, to build a new extension of matching width and roof form, creating a house of double-pile plan. This is certainly not an uncommon traditional planform and, considering the conclusion outlined above, this approach is also supported. However, any such (virtually flush-finished) extension, which mirrors the form and materiality of the existing front portion, will require very careful material selection and detailing to ensure a cohesive finished result, particularly within those oblique views available of the front elevation from College Road.

- Firstly, I would note that the existing building has only one chimney stack to the north-western elevation (with buff square pots). Existing and proposed drawings appear to show a stack to the south-eastern elevation too. It should be made entirely clear that the existing stack (and its characterful pots) makes a positive contribution towards special interest and should be retained. I am unclear whether a new stack is proposed to balance the front elevation. If the latter is the case, details will be required.

It has now been confirmed that the agent will amend existing and proposed drawings (within FULL and LBC), to show the correct existing arrangement – and the existing stack retained within the proposed drawings.
- Secondly, I would note that the roof of this asset (including the front porch and veranda) featured lead-roll ridge finishes in May 2016. These have now clearly been replaced in modern (and mechanically fixed) red tiles, without listed building consent. This change has resulted in harm to the character, appearance, and therefore special interest of this asset. Though the coloured elevations within proposed drawing no. [PP] 02A perhaps show return to the more traditional (and characterful) leaded finish, this will need to be made clear within proposed elevation drawings.

Considering that the other listed assets within the site feature tiled hip finishes, it is accepted that current arrangements reflect the cohesive character of the listed group and may be retained – and should also be reflected within the new rear extension. Existing and proposed drawing (within FULL and LBC) should be annotated to make these roof finishes clear.
- According to proposed drawing no. [PP] 02, the roof will be “*finished in natural slate to match the existing*”. We will need details for this proposed material. Though it may be secured by condition, it should be straightforward enough to provide as part of the application.

Sample reviewed on site, which suitably reflects the materiality of the existing roof pitches - Agent to submit photo and specification prior to determination.
- Existing drawing no. [PP] 01 states that existing rainwater goods are “*black PVC*”. They are, in fact white-finished, and appear to be cast iron - with what appears to be ornate ogee-form guttering to the prominent principal roof edge. This needs to be addressed and amended.
- Existing RWGs are white, with existing guttering in characterful ogee-form cast iron. Agent to amend annotation of existing drawings (within FULL and LBC).
- Similarly, drawing no. [PP] 02 states that proposed rainwater goods are to be “*black PVC*”. Loss of any cast metal rwgs and the ogee-form guttering to the prominent principal roof edge would result in harm to the special interest of this principal frontage. If unsalvageable, the new should match existing (powder-coated cast aluminium might be acceptable here).

Agent to amend annotation of proposed drawings (within FULL and LBC), to show retention of existing guttering – or replacement in new cast metal, in ogee form.
- The existing brick is a ‘pressed red’. This fabric makes a strong contribution towards special interest of the asset. Within drawing no. [PP] 02, it is proposed to “*sand blast*” the existing brickwork. This is a highly aggressive means of cleaning which will likely permanently abrade the surface and, if wet abrasive blasting, will saturate the built fabric. This will result in harm to historic fabric – and to the special interest of this asset. I would suggest that the front elevation has an appealing patina of age, though I can see there is staining to side elevation. If the applicant wishes to proceed with cleaning, a milder approach should be specified; these can include soda-blasting, DOFF, JOSS, laser cleaning, or dry-ice blasting.

Agent to amend annotation of proposed drawings within LBC.
- We have no information on the proposed brickwork for the large rear addition. As previously stated, this materiality will be critical to a successful extension of such size. As it is intended to “*match that of the existing*” (see drawing no. [PP] 02), they will need to be of a similar pressed-

red, in imperial size. This information should be supplied up-front, to demonstrate feasibility of a good match. [Furness brick](#) produce a good product, for example.

Agent to seek specification for proposed brickwork, to be supplied prior to determination for both FULL and LBC.

- First consideration should be for preservation of the existing windows, with secondary glazing installed, as necessary. We have no details for the proposed windows, other than to “*match that of the existing*” (see drawing no. [PP] 02). If under consideration, we need to see details for proposed window joinery and, crucially, details for their reveal depth, brick arch heads, and stone sills. These should be supplied up-front in elevation and section, to appropriate scale (to also show position within - and form of - the masonry surrounds).

Close examination on site indicates that existing masonry sills are later replacements; formed in concrete with timber additions to achieve external moulding detail (and the whole lead-covered). It is now proposed to replace existing sills in new stone - Agent to amend annotation of proposed drawings within FULL and LBC. Full details may be conditioned.

It is also accepted that several existing windows have been later replaced (to include slimline double-glazing) and that many are in very poor condition.

It is also now proposed to replace existing windows in timber, incorporating slimline double-glazing with perimeter seals coloured to match the finished paint colour.

In addition, the new will be of the “Queen Anne Revival” style, with multiple panes to upper sashes (to match existing arrangement), and single pane lower sashes. Though this will alter the existing appearance, this is considered an acceptable approach, which will reflect arrangements seen within adjacent assets (the Principal’s and Caretaker’s Houses), and will not result in undue harm to the character of the curtilage-listed asset.

Agent to amend proposed drawings and add suitable annotations (within FULL and LBC), allowing further details as identified above to be conditioned.

Considering the large patio doors proposed to the ground floor rear of the new, it is now proposed to insert suitably designed aluminium sash windows into the new rear extension. Considering its context and relatively low visibility, this may be an acceptable approach if the new are of suitably high quality. Details and specification for proposed windows to new extension be submitted prior to determination.

Further details required regarding proposed masonry window heads to new extension. As these are proposed to be ‘rough’ brick arches as per the existing, Agent to annotate proposed drawings to reflect this (within FULL and LBC).

- How is the join between old and new structure to be dealt with at wall and roof levels? We have no construction details for this, or for eaves details of the new.
Agent to annotate drawings (within FULL and LBC) to state that all proposed eaves to new extension will reflect the ‘open’ design of the existing. Further details may be conditioned.
- It is now proposed to remove the existing enclosed porch and continue the existing veranda pitch through (as per the likely as-built arrangement as suggested by the HIA). This is considered an acceptable approach, as close examination of porch joinery makes clear this is later fabric. Agent to amend proposed drawings in plan and elevation (within FULL and LBC). Further details may be conditioned as necessary.

2.4 Setting Impact (FULL aspects)

I am pleased to see the garage now relocated towards the rear of the site. Though this will result in an extended hardstanding, it will maintain the spacious character of the building’s existing curtilage and reveal more of its classically inspired built form, particularly within south-easterly views down College Road.

- However, I would note that drawing no. 218 200 rev.A (Landscape Plan), drawing no. [PP] 03 (Site Block Plan) and document 218 270 rev.A (Plant Schedule) all show a square-plan garage with hipped roof. This is contrary to the proposed garage elevations which show a gable-roofed structure of standard Redrow design. Considering its proposed proximity to the asset, the garage structure and its material finishes needs further consideration. I would recommend that the roof form should be hipped (as per the site plans etc) and finished in natural slate, to compliment the form and materials of the house. I would also recommend you seek information on proposed brick type and details for garage doors prior to determination. Both should reflect the form and materiality of the house.
Agent to amend proposed garage drawings within FULL application (with reference to application 26/0108). It was suggested that bricks from demolitions of the existing might be re-used.
- Proposed landscape plan (drawing no. 218 200 rev.A) shows a resin-bound finish to the proposed hardstanding – and the immediate perimeter of the asset itself. This modern approach would, in my view, be harmful to setting of both the asset and the wider site. A stone flag or block-paved finish would be much more appropriate here. As per my pre-app response, I would recommend you seek that existing stone flags be reused to the perimeter of the property.
It was agreed that the existing flagstone finishes to the perimeter of the house would be retained/reused, with resin-bound finish to driveway adjacent. Agent to amend proposed drawing accordingly - and supply sample and specification of proposed driveway finish prior to determination.
- The Heritage Statement states that: *“for the sake of privacy, a simple metal fence, painted black, is proposed for the street front of the property.”* This is proposed to be *“1.2m high black metal fencing”* within drawing no. [PP] 03. Details for the proposed fence are very plain and could certainly be more ornate (taking inspiration from the immediately adjacent listed gateway). However, they will be read against the proposed laurel hedging, and I would have no real issue with the proposed design.
- More critically, we have no details for the proposed sliding gates. In my view, these will need very careful consideration so as not to look too imposing (large or of solid construction), or too modern in character within principal views of the asset. I suggest these details should be sought prior to determination.
It is accepted that no gates are now proposed. Should the applicant/agent wish to amend this, then the above details will be required prior to determination.
- How will the proposed metal fencing resolve against the listed gate piers? I would caution that care (and details) will be needed if it is proposed for them to pass-by or fix into them. Clarification of intention should be provided up-front.
Provided the proposed is not affixed to the listed structure, this is acceptable.
- Is the high timber fencing to the boundary of college road entrance proposed for retention? It is very unsightly.
I am unclear upon whether the existing (>1m in height against the highway) benefits from Planning Permission, and whether the brick wall is still in situ behind (see below). This was not discussed on site but needs to be addressed by the application.



Many thanks,

Guy Arnall

Prif Swyddog Treftadaeth / Principal Heritage Officer
Swyddog Dirprwyedig (Adeiladau Rhestredig) / Delegated Officer (Listed Buildings)

Adfywio a Datblygu Economaidd / Regeneration and Economic Development
Cyngor Dinas Casnewydd / Newport City Council

E: Guy.Arnall@newport.gov.uk | Planning@newport.gov.uk

From: Arnall, Guy

Sent: 19 May 2026 11:04

To: Brinkworth, Emma (Planning Officer) <Emma.Brinkworth@newport.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: Planning Consultation Request for cases ref: 26/0101(FULL) & 26/0342 (LBC) - Felthorpe College Road Caerleon Newport South Wales

Hi Emma

RE: Planning Consultation Request for cases ref: 26/0101(FULL) & 26/0342 (LBC) - Felthorpe College Road, Caerleon, Newport

1. Curtilage Listing

Section 76(5) of the Historic Environment (Wales) Act 2023 states that:

In this Act “listed building” means a building included in the list maintained under this section, and includes—

(a) any structure or artificial object that is fixed to the building and ancillary to it;

(b) any other structure or artificial object that—

(i) forms part of the land and has done so since before 1 July 1948, and

(ii) was within the curtilage of the building, and ancillary to it, on the date on which the building was first included in the list, or on 1 January 1969, whichever was later.

76(5) (b)(i) requires that the building was constructed before 1 July 1948. This part is satisfied, as map evidence shows that *Felthorpe* had been built by this time, i.e. it ‘*formed part of the land*’ before 1 July 1948.

76(5) (b)(ii) Is satisfied as *Felthorpe* was within the curtilage of the building, and ancillary to it at the time of listing, on 02/03/2017, as it was in college use by May 2016.

Felthorpe is therefore considered to be ‘curtilage-listed’ with the Former Caerleon Teacher Training College Building (Cadw Ref. no. 87729), and therefore both FULL and LBC applications have been made.

2. Analysis

2.1 Significance

Principal elevation of the property presents a Neo-Classical inspired façade of good design and proportion; constructed in ‘pressed-red’ brick, with multi-pane timber sliding-sash windows, a slated and hipped roof, cast iron rainwater goods, and a prominent decorative corbelled brick chimney stack to the north-western elevation (with buff square pots). However, the whole has a subtle asymmetry, revealing traces of an Arts-and-Crafts aesthetic. To the upper storey, the paired middle windows are offset to the north, and, to ground level, a faceted bay window is offset in the other direction, topped by a wrap-around veranda. Adjacent to the bay is a small window which serves the hallway WC. All identified as original features; they are prominent upon the front elevation and make positive contribute towards the architectural and historic interest of the asset. As identified within the HIA, the porch is likely a later addition, one which has been built forward of the veranda line with a prominence which imposes unwarranted symmetry. However, its design (with appropriate pitch to the roof and half-timber construction) is not, in my view, detrimental towards significance; it adds some visual interest to the whole.

This prevailing form and materiality are reflected within other listed buildings on the site – perhaps most notably the residential-scale GII Principal’s Building (Cadw ref. 87726) and the GII Caretaker’s / Gardener’s Lodge (Cadw ref. 87727). *Felthorpe* is therefore considered to make positive contribution towards the significance of these college buildings, as well as towards the grand mixed Revival style college building itself (Cadw ref. 87729) which, altogether, have a significant group value.

To the rear of *Felthorpe*, there are further, characterful features, including a single storey ‘*Sunroom*’ with large, faceted bay. The mono-pitch outshot with small chimneystack (which perhaps once featured wash house, lavatory, and coal house) also appear to be of some interest (though map evidence makes clear that these are later additions). Internally, there remain features of interest too, including the central bay staircase, egg-and-dart moulded cornices, and other surviving features. However, these obviously less prominent features are considered to make substantially less of a positive contribution towards both the significance of the parent asset group, and the setting of adjacent assets (see below). I would therefore conclude that there is considerably more room for alteration here.

2.2 Setting

Felthorpe has a particularly close contextual relationship with the adjacent Grade II Listed Gate Piers (Cadw Reference Number 87728). It immediately overlooks principal approach to the former College buildings and provides first introduction to classically inspired building forms of the listed asset group. This positioning, and the generous green curtilage which still surrounds it, are therefore considered to make positive contribution towards the setting of *Felthorpe* itself; positive contribution towards this adjacent listed gateway; and positive contribution towards the setting of the listed building group upon the site. This setting, in turn, makes a positive contribution towards the significance of *Felthorpe* as a curtilage-listed asset.

Indeed, during development of the wider site, considerable care has been taken to ensure that the generous curtilage of *Felthorpe* has been maintained, with the extent of modern development which fronts College Road having been curtailed to the south-east. Thought has also been given to the form and materiality of this new development; its red brick construction and hipped roofs make clear reference to the existing buildings upon the site (including *Felthorpe*), to reduce harmful impact upon the setting of both the principal listed building group, and the curtilage-listed asset in question.

2.3 Impact upon special interest of the asset (LBC aspects)

I am pleased to see that the characterful features to the principal front portion of this asset are proposed for retention, thus sustaining primary contribution made by *Felthorpe* towards significance of the asset group - and their setting. It has previously been noted that there is much greater potential for alteration to both the interior of the building and its lesser-seen rear elevation, due to the curtilage-listing of the asset in question, and the minimal contribution these features make towards the significance of the principal asset group. Considering the relatively minimal contribution these features also make towards the setting of the primary listed asset group, the principal of intervention in this location is considered acceptable.

It is proposed to demolish the rear of the property, to build a new extension of matching width and roof form, creating a house of double-pile plan. This is certainly not an uncommon traditional planform and, considering the conclusion outlined above, this approach is also supported. However, any such (virtually flush-finished) extension, which mirrors the form and materiality of the existing front portion, will require very careful material selection and detailing to ensure a cohesive finished result, particularly within those oblique views available of the front elevation from College Road.

- Firstly, I would note that the existing building has only one chimney stack to the north-western elevation (with buff square pots). Existing and proposed drawings appear to show a stack to the south-eastern elevation too. It should be made entirely clear that the existing stack (and its characterful pots) makes a positive contribution towards special interest and should be retained. I am unclear whether a new stack is proposed to balance the front elevation. If the latter is the case, details will be required.
- Secondly, I would note that the roof of this asset (including the front porch and veranda) featured lead-roll ridge finishes in May 2016. These have now clearly been replaced in modern (and mechanically fixed) red tiles, without listed building consent. This change has resulted in harm to the character, appearance, and therefore special interest of this asset. Though the coloured elevations within proposed drawing no. [PP] 02A perhaps show return to the more traditional (and characterful) leaded finish, this will need to be made clear within proposed elevation drawings.
- According to proposed drawing no. [PP] 02, the roof will be “*finished in natural slate to match the existing*”. We will need details for this proposed material. Though it may be secured by condition, it should be straightforward enough to provide as part of the application.

- Existing drawing no. [PP] 01 states that existing rainwater goods are “*black PVC*”. They are, in fact white-finished, and appear to be cast iron - with what appears to be ornate ogee-form guttering to the prominent principal roof edge. This needs to be addressed and amended.
- Similarly, drawing no. [PP] 02 states that proposed rainwater goods are to be “*black PVC*”. Loss of any cast metal rwgs and the ogee-form guttering to the prominent principal roof edge would result in harm to the special interest of this principal frontage. If unsalvageable, the new should match existing (powder-coated cast aluminium might be acceptable here).
- The existing brick is a ‘pressed red’. This fabric makes a strong contribution towards special interest of the asset. Within drawing no. [PP] 02, it is proposed to “*sand blast*” the existing brickwork. This is a highly aggressive means of cleaning which will likely permanently abrade the surface and, if wet abrasive blasting, will saturate the built fabric. This will result in harm to historic fabric – and to the special interest of this asset. I would suggest that the front elevation has an appealing patina of age, though I can see there is staining to side elevation. If the applicant wishes to proceed with cleaning, a milder approach should be specified; these can include soda-blasting, DOFF, JOSS, laser cleaning, or dry-ice blasting.
- We have no information on the proposed brickwork for the large rear addition. As previously stated, this materiality will be critical to a successful extension of such size. If intended to “*match that of the existing*” (see drawing no. [PP] 02), they will need to be of a similar pressed-red, presumably in imperial size. This information should be supplied up-front, to demonstrate feasibility of a good match. [Furness brick](#) produce a good product, for example.
- First consideration should be for preservation of the existing windows, with secondary glazing installed, as necessary. We have no details for the proposed windows, other than to “*match that of the existing*” (see drawing no. [PP] 02). If under consideration, we need to see details for proposed window joinery and, crucially, details for their reveal depth, brick arch heads, and stone sills. These should be supplied up-front in elevation and section, to appropriate scale (to also show position within - and form of - the masonry surrounds).
- How is the join between old and new structure to be dealt with at wall and roof levels? We have no construction details for this, or for eaves details of the new.

2.4 Setting Impact (FULL aspects)

I am pleased to see the garage now relocated towards the rear of the site. Though this will result in an extended hardstanding, it will maintain the spacious character of the building’s existing curtilage and reveal more of its classically inspired built form, particularly within south-easterly views down College Road.

- However, I would note that drawing no. 218 200 rev.A (Landscape Plan), drawing no. [PP] 03 (Site Block Plan) and document 218 270 rev.A (Plant Schedule) all show a square-plan garage with hipped roof. This is contrary to the proposed garage elevations which show a gable-roofed structure of standard Redrow design. Considering its proposed proximity to the asset, the garage structure and its material finishes needs further consideration. I would recommend that the roof form should be hipped (as per the site plans etc) and finished in natural slate, to compliment the form and materials of the house. I would also recommend you seek information on proposed brick type and details for garage doors prior to determination. Both should reflect the form and materiality of the house.
- Proposed landscape plan (drawing no. 218 200 rev.A) shows a resin-bound finish to the proposed hardstanding – and the immediate perimeter of the asset itself. This modern approach would, in my view, be harmful to setting of both the asset and the wider site. A stone flag or block-paved finish would be much more appropriate here. As per my pre-app response, I would recommend you seek that existing stone flags be reused to the perimeter of the property.

Your sincerely
Development Management