

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 06/08/2026 7:44 PM from

Application Summary

Address:	9 Burberry Close Rogerstone Newport NP10 9JU
Proposal:	DEMOLITION OF EXISTING CONSERVATORY AND CONSTRUCTION OF SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION (RETROSPECTIVE)
Case Officer:	Marnie Ostler

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	
Email:	
Address:	7 Burberry Close Rogerstone Newport

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	We are writing to formally object to the retrospective planning application at the above address (9 Burberry Close). As the resident of the immediate neighbouring property at 7 Burberry Close, we wish to raise the following material planning objections regarding the scale and the design of the single storey wooden extension. 1. Overdevelopment and excessive footprint. The single storey extension occupies a disproportionate footprint relative to the size of the original plot. By consuming a substantial portion of the garden, the development represents and over development of the site. This leaves inadequate outdoor amenity space for the host dwelling which is contrary to local planning policies aimed at maintaining balanced residential plots. 2. Visual Intrusion and Inappropriate materials: While the structure is situated on the opposite boundary, it's excessive height and overall scale make it highly visible and visually intrusive from our property and Garden. The extensive use of timber cladding on a structure of this volume is entirely incongruous with the established character of the area, which features traditional brick finishes. The extension stands out as a dominant, discordant feature that harms the visual amenity of the surrounding neighbourhood. 3. Unneighbourly scale and loss of outlook.
-----------	--

Despite the setback from our shared boundary, the sheer massing and bulk of the extension remain overly dominant. It disrupts the open domestic characteristic of the rear gardens in this row, resulting in a significant loss of outlook and creating an unneighbourly sense of enclosure when viewed from our primary garden areas (We can no longer see the valleys side from our property).

4. Adverse precedent:

Allowing a retrospective structure of this scale, built with materials that conflict with the local vernacular, would set a damaging precedent for future developments in the immediate area.

For these reasons, we request that the council refuses retrospective planning permission and takes appropriate enforcement action to protect the character of the area and neighbour amenity.

Where did you
hear about this
application?

Not specified

Kind regards