



Appeal Decision

by G Hall BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Decision date: 21/04/2026

Appeal reference: CAS-04698-C6T1V3

Site address: 60 Bassaleg Road, Newport, NP20 3PY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Rhys Yendle against the decision of Newport City Council.
 - The application Ref 25/0873, dated 14 October 2025, was refused by notice dated 20 November 2025.
 - The development is Retention of Raised Parking Spaces.
 - A site visit was made on 14 April 2026.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Both parties have confirmed that the development is complete and has been constructed in accordance with the submitted plans. On this basis, I have considered the appeal as one seeking planning permission under section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, and I have amended the description of development to reflect that permission is being sought to retain the development.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the development on:
 - the character and appearance of the area;
 - the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers; and
 - highway safety.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling in a predominantly residential area. Along this section of Bassaleg Road, properties on the north side sit below road level, while those on the south side are positioned above it. The surrounding area displays a variety of boundary treatments and driveway arrangements. Although there are some instances of parking areas formed at road level, the prevailing pattern is for drives and off-street parking to be sloped, reflecting the natural topography.

5. The front garden of the appeal property has been raised to form, in effect, a two-tiered terrace. At the lower level, adjacent to and raised above the ground floor level of the dwelling, there is a flat, patio-style area. Above this, at approximately road level, is a tarmacked parking area. Alongside these engineered levels, a sloping driveway follows the natural topography, descending to the dwelling.
6. The effect of the development is to introduce a highly engineered and visually prominent form of frontage works that is at odds with the prevailing character of this part of Bassaleg Road. The raised, levelled areas and associated hard surfacing materially alter the natural landform of the plot and create a formalised terraced arrangement that draws the eye in the street scene.
7. In particular, the upper parking platform at around road level, together with the extent of tarmac surfacing and the abrupt change in levels, gives the frontage a utilitarian appearance and results in a dominant, incongruous feature when viewed from the public realm. This is reinforced when the area is in use for parking, as vehicles would sit more prominently within the street scene than would typically be the case on this sloping section of the road, where parking spaces and drives generally follow the gradient.
8. Accordingly, the development harms the character and appearance of the area and conflicts with LDP Policy GP6, notably criteria i) and iv), as the development fails to respond positively to the site context and the adjacent townscape.

Living conditions

9. LDP Policy GP2 seeks, amongst other things, to ensure that development does not have a significant adverse impact on local amenity, including privacy and through overbearing effects. In this case, the main considerations are the effects of the raised patio and associated changes in levels on the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining semi-detached dwelling.
10. The patio is formed at an elevated level close to the shared boundary and sits appreciably above the adjacent ground level. As a result, it introduces a substantial engineered platform when experienced from the neighbouring garden and ground floor rooms. Given its proximity, increased height and hard, level form, the patio terrace appears unduly dominant and overbearing, resulting in material harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.
11. In addition, the raised patio provides an area for sitting, standing and playing at a higher level than the adjoining property. From this position there are clear and direct views across the shared boundary into the neighbouring garden and into the ground floor windows of the adjoining dwelling. The resulting significant overlooking has, in my view, resulted in an unacceptable level of harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.
12. For these reasons, I conclude that the development has an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, by reason of both overbearing effect and overlooking from the raised patio. It therefore conflicts with LDP Policy GP2.

Highway safety

13. The Highway Authority raises concerns regarding the formation of the access, the absence of a dropped kerb, and the manner in which the parking area has previously been used, which they indicate may have resulted in vehicles overhanging the highway. They advise that the closure of the drive to the side of the parking area, or the narrowing of the access to a standard double width with the provision of an appropriate dropped kerb, would be likely to overcome these concerns.

14. From my observations on site, the access and parking arrangements provide sufficient space for vehicles to enter and leave in a controlled manner. There is no persuasive evidence before me that the development has materially increased the risk to pedestrians using the footway or to users of Bassaleg Road. Neither the absence of a dropped kerb nor the possibility of larger vehicles overhanging the highway is an inherent or unavoidable consequence of the development as retained. Any such issues could be addressed through appropriate management or, where necessary, separate action by the Highway Authority. I also note that the internal dimensions of the parking spaces accord with the Newport City Council Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Guidance.
15. At the time of my site visit, traffic along this section of Bassaleg Road was steady and appeared to be travelling at speeds consistent with the speed limit. Visibility when manoeuvring from the site is somewhat constrained by adjacent boundary treatments, planting and parked vehicles. However, the open frontage would alert pedestrians to potential vehicle movements, and on-street parking is likely to encourage drivers to manoeuvre with caution. In these circumstances, I am satisfied that visibility would be adequate.
16. Drawing these matters together, whilst the development has altered the existing access arrangements, the combined effect of the above factors would limit any risk to highway safety such that no unacceptable harm would arise. The development provides off-street parking within the site, and there is no compelling evidence that it has materially increased on-street parking pressure to the detriment of highway safety.
17. I therefore find that the development complies with LDP Policy GP4, which requires, amongst other things, that development provides safe and suitable access arrangements and adequate parking provision.

Other Matters and Conclusion

18. Whilst the planning application was not accompanied by a Green Infrastructure Statement, such a statement has been submitted with the appeal. Had I found the development acceptable in all other respects, I am satisfied that a condition could have been imposed to ensure that the development makes provision for biodiversity enhancements in accordance with the policy requirements of Future Wales Policy 9, Chapter 6 of Planning Policy Wales, and LDP Policies SP1 and GP5.
19. Whilst I have found the development to be acceptable in terms of its effects on highway safety, this does not outweigh the identified harm. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.
20. In reaching my decision, I have taken into account the requirements of sections 3 and 5 of the Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015. I consider that this decision is in accordance with the Act's sustainable development principle through its contribution towards one or more of the Welsh Ministers' well-being objectives.

G Hall

INSPECTOR