

[REDACTED]
13a Ridgeway,
Newport,
NP20 5AF

Head of Regeneration and Economic Development
Newport City Council
Civic Centre
Godfrey Road
Newport
NP20 4UR

BY EMAIL

Re: 15 Ridgeway NP20 5AF Outline Planning Permission Application for a single dwelling with all matters reserved excluding access and scale
Council ref: 26/0474

Dear Sir/Madam,

We write in relation to the application cited above and our objections to it. We live at 13a Ridgeway, directly next door to the relevant property and have significant concerns about the proposed development. For the reasons set out below, we object in the strongest terms to the application and wish this letter to be taken into account by the Council when determining its outcome.

A: Background

1. The Council will be aware that this is the second application made by the Applicant in relation to 15 Ridgeway. The first application was made in December 2024 (ref 24/1034) and was decided by the Council in May 2025. The application, opposed by Councillors, Council Officers and several residents, was refused on multiple grounds. For ease of reference, I will be citing a number of these grounds as part of this objection. The only material difference between the first application and the current application is that the Applicant is now seeking to build a single dwelling on the property rather than 2 dwellings.

B: Grounds of objection:

- i- Impact on Residential Amenity and Privacy
- ii- Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Area
- iii- Impact on ecology
- iv- Precedent

In outlining these grounds of objection, I will be referring to the following documents accessed via the Council's website:

Decision Notice re 24/1034 (received 22/05/2025)

Objection letter on behalf of 13a Ridgeway re 24/1034 (received 22/01/2025)

Site Assessment survey prepared by Ecological Services Ltd re 26/0474 (received 01/07/2026)

Planning Statement prepared by G Powys Jones re 26/0407 (received 01/07/2026)

i- Impact on Residential Amenity and Privacy

2. In outlining its decision to refuse the first application, the Council at paragraph 4 stated:

“The proposed development would result in the introduction of traffic and pedestrian movements in close proximity to the boundaries of Nos. 13a and 15 Ridgeway where there are currently no such movements. The neighbouring dwellings currently enjoy a high standard of privacy and amenity and these movements would cause frequent disturbance, noise, light spill and motion and general activity which would compromise the amenity levels of these properties. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy GP2 of the Newport Local Development Plan (Adopted January 2015).”

3. The proposed road/driveway which will serve both Ridgeway House and the proposed property is clearly of prime importance given that “access” is a matter not excluded as part of this outline application. Looking at the drawings that have been submitted, one can see that this access route will run directly along the side of our home. The assertion made by G Powys Jones at paragraph 11 of the Planning Statement, that “No. 13a has no windows serving habitable rooms facing the application site” is demonstrably false, and even the most rudimentary assessment of the location would reveal that several windows (and our utility room door which serves as the side entrance to our property) all face the proposed access road. Not only do they face it, but this road will run just 152 cm from them.

4. The proximity of this road will clearly have a detrimental impact on the amenity of our home. The rooms that will be impacted are in daily use by all members of our family, and having a road that will provide both parking and vehicular/pedestrian access to 2 houses less than 2m away from these spaces poses a huge concern to us. Both the kitchen and the office, spaces that are used at all times during the day and much of the evening, will be within touching distance of this road. With the greatest of respect to the author of the Planning Statement, the suggestion that “a sound proofing fence” and some shrubbery will be sufficient to address these concerns is ill-conceived and fails to address the potential for both noise and light nuisance to those rooms and to the bedrooms located directly above.

5. I would also ask you to consider the impact that the construction work will have upon residential amenity, not only to us but to many other residents in the locality. When considering the scale of the works that are proposed here, including the demolition of outbuildings and other structures, the total excavation of the site, as well as the subsequent construction of a 2 storey dwelling, garage and sizeable access road, this development will inevitably cause substantial upheaval to residents for a considerable period of time. This will not be months in the making; one can reasonably foresee construction noise and building traffic consuming the area for well over a year, potentially longer. For the residents of 13a and 17 Ridgeway, this construction work will be taking place directly outside our homes and will make our rear gardens (and potentially parts of our house) unusable. For residents such as ourselves with young children and pets, this would significantly impact our quality of life and be detrimental to the wellbeing of our family. Therefore, I would submit that the noise,

the pollution and the disruption that this proposal will cause to neighbouring residents should be a key consideration when determining the outcome of this application.

6. Another ground for refusing the initial application was that:

“The proposal would have a significant adverse impact upon interests of acknowledged importance, namely residential amenity by reason of the separation distances between the front and rear elevations of the proposed dwellings and neighbouring gardens, being sited in a position where neighbouring dwellings currently enjoy a high standard of privacy and amenity. No information has been submitted to mitigate this objection. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy GP2 of the Newport Local Development Plan (Adopted January 2015).” (Decision Notice, para 3).

7. Whilst it is acknowledged that the current application relates to a single dwelling rather than the 2 dwellings proposed in the first application, the issue remains the same; any property built on that plot of land is going to adversely affect the privacy of neighbouring properties (specifically 13a and 17 Ridgeway). We purchased this house in January 2026 for the sole reason that it provided our young family with privacy and security. The garden as it currently stands is not overlooked by any property other than our own, providing us with peace of mind as the parents of 3 young children. There are few properties that will afford its residents that level of security, and this was one of the primary reasons that we purchased the house. To be faced now with the possibility of having not only a building site overlooking our home and garden for months, if not years, on end, but then a 2 storey residence disturbing our privacy and outlook, is a hugely concerning for us. The same will apply to the residents at number 17, who will also face the prospect of losing the peace and privacy that they currently enjoy, and have enjoyed for decades. This is too onerous a burden to place upon residents who have chosen this location to live and to raise their families purely in order to financially benefit the Applicant.

8. As well as the lack of privacy that would inevitably follow a development of this nature, there is also a security issue. Opening up the access road/“driveway” down to the proposed property would afford access to the back of our houses and gardens, which doesn’t exist now. Opening up the space directly off the main roadway to create an access point for this unnecessary development compromises the privacy and security that we as residents have paid a premium for and completely alters the status quo.

9. In summary, the current application does nothing to address the initial concerns relating to residential amenity and privacy that formed part of the refusal of the first application. The same issues remain and therefore this application should be refused on the same grounds as the first.

ii- Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Area

10. The first reason listed by the Council for their refusal of the first application was that:

“The proposal is ‘backland’ development which would result in the overdevelopment of the site and be out of character with the well-established pattern of development by protruding away from the building line of residential dwellings. The proposed dwellings, garages, engineering works and retaining structures would erode the undeveloped garden land which currently acts as a buffer between built development and the open countryside, causing harm to the character and appearance of the area. The development would also incorporate

a very wide and intrusive access, and access road of substantial width, which would be out of keeping and detrimental to the appearance of the street scene of Ridgeway and exacerbate the visual impact of the development on the wider landscape. There is a lack of detail in relation to the proposed engineering and levelling works and associated retaining structures which fails to offer mitigation for the visual impact of these engineering works. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies GP2, GP6 and H6 of the Newport Local Development Plan (Adopted January 2015)” (Decision Notice para 1)”

11. The fact that the current application only seeks to build a single dwelling rather than 2 does nothing to address this ground of refusal (save for potentially the overdevelopment element). Every other concern raised remains the same. We adopt the objections raised by the previous owners of our property in their Objection Letter on this issue. To quote directly from it:

“The siting of the proposed (dwelling) a substantial distance back from Ridgeway and projecting beyond the existing built form would be at odds with the prevailing character of this part of Ridgeway, in which dwellings are arranged in a linear way and have road frontages. The proposed discordant layout of built development would be isolated, unsympathetic to, and harmfully erode the established pattern of built development along this part of Ridgeway... as a result, the proposal would be in clear conflict with LDP Policy H6, GP2 criterion 2 and GP6 criterion i) and the Council’s Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on New Dwellings” (page 3).

12. To ensure consistency in the Council’s approach to these issues, the same conclusion should be drawn here as was in response to the first application.

iii- Impact on Ecology

13. At paragraph 5 of the Decision Notice, the Council found that:

“The proposal has had a significant adverse impact upon interests of acknowledged importance, namely green infrastructure and biodiversity”

14. I note from the correspondence attached to the current application that the Applicant relies upon a Site Assessment survey prepared by Ecological Services Ltd dated May 2026. In that document, the author notes at page 9 that:

“Any vegetation removal or work immediately adjacent to (small ornamental trees, hedgerows, and boundary planting within and around the site) has potential to disturb nesting birds during the bird nesting season of March to August inclusive”

15. At page 11, it is noted that:

“The grassland areas, amenity lawns, and shrub planting within the site provide suitable habitat for a range of common terrestrial mammals, including hedgehog, and may also be used opportunistically by badger for foraging. The site’s location, immediately adjacent to woodland along the northern boundary, further enhances its value for mammals by providing direct connectivity for foraging and commuting between habitats.”

16. The author of that report, understandably, is only able to comment hypothetically on the types of wildlife that might be present on site. As residents, we are able to confirm through

firsthand experience that the proposed development site is home to several species. Foxes, bats, doormice, hedgehogs and badgers have all been seen living and foraging on that site. In recent months, a family of deer have also been seen grazing in the garden which the Applicant now seeks to dig up and build upon.

17. Whilst the Applicant would no doubt submit that the proposals made in the survey would ameliorate the harm to wildlife that would be done by having a dwelling on this site, it is hard to see how any adjustments could be made to the construction process that would prevent the total destruction and displacement of this wildlife. Indeed, there is nothing within this survey that addresses how building work, excavation and noise can be adjusted to prevent harm to wildlife.

18. The proposal is therefore not in keeping with GP5ii of the LDP and the Council's SPG on Wildlife and Development.

iv- Precedent

19: We adopt the submissions made on behalf of the previous owners of our property in their Objection Letter regarding the first application (as previously referred to), specifically in relation to the issue of precedent. For ease of reference I will quote directly from it:

"it is pertinent to note that the Council have previously considered 'backland' development on the northern side of Ridgeway (in relation to) 29 Ridgeway [application ref 04/1644 and 04/0049]... Whilst the refusal decisions date back to 2004, they are still very relevant in confirming the Council's previous in principle position that "backland" development on the northern side of Ridgeway is inappropriate. Both planning applications were refused for the same reasons: 1) The dwelling, by reason of proximity to access to the side elevation of the adjacent properties and the introduction of vehicles into the rear garden area, would cause a noise nuisance and loss of privacy detrimental to the amenities of the occupants of the existing property and 2) The 4 bed dwelling would result in the garden area of the adjacent property to be overlooked to the detriment of the amenities and privacy of the occupants of this property... Whilst we understand that each planning application must be considered on its own merits, given the similarities between these planning applications and the fact that Council's are required to be consistent in decision making, it must follow that the subject planning application should be refused for the same reasons". (page 2)

20. In addition to the points made above, I would also add that should this application be granted, it would open the floodgates for similar properties in the area (and beyond) to make similar applications which would be difficult for the Council to refuse. What would follow would be the dissipation of vital green space, areas of natural beauty, the displacement of wildlife and the complete transformation of the character of this area for the sole reason of lining the pockets of private developers. This cannot be said to be in the interests of the wider community and the residents reliant upon the good sense of the Council to prevent such destruction taking place.

C: Summary

21. In summary, we vehemently oppose this application. The current application is essentially the same as the first made in 2025 and, aside from reducing the number of properties, goes no way to address the grounds for refusal found by the Council on the last occasion. There will still be a significant detrimental impact on residential amenity and privacy; the character and appearance of the area will be altered unacceptably; there will be

irremediable ecological damage caused by the construction of this unnecessary dwelling; and finally, allowing this application would set a precedent that could alter the character of what is widely regarded as one of the most beautiful areas of the city.

22. For these reasons, we oppose this application and ask that the Council adopts the same sensible approach as they did on the last occasion.



17.7.26