

APPLICATION DETAILS

No: 26/0029 **Ward:** Tredegar Park And Marshfield

Type: Full

Expiry Date: 18th June 2026

Applicant: S Farmer

Site: Beech House 21 St Mellons Road Marshfield Cardiff South Wales

Proposal: **CHANGE OF USE OF LAND TO RESIDENTIAL CURTILAGE AND REINSTATING DRIVEWAY USING ORIGINAL OPENING TO THE SITE (RETROSPECTIVE) AND PROPOSED LOWERING OF BOUNDARY WALL**

Recommendation: GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The application site forms part of a residential development comprising five houses. Four of the dwellings have already been constructed, and the final unit, is currently under construction. The wider site was developed replacing a single dwelling. The site lies within an Archaeologically Sensitive Area. The character of the area is predominantly residential, with open countryside to the West.
- 1.2 This application seeks consent to the change the use of land to the front of the dwelling to residential curtilage and to reinstate the driveway/vehicular access that served the original dwelling to be used by the applicant/to serve No 21 only. This application is submitted on a retrospective basis. The proposal includes a lowering of the Eastern boundary wall and pillar to allow for improved visibility splays to be achieved (proposed). The driveway has been constructed using permeable pavers. There is a small fence existing on site to distinguish the land levels and demarcate the driveway. Planting boxes to the front of the dwelling are proposed to achieve a biodiversity enhancement.
- 1.3 This application has been called by Councillor Allan Screen for reasons including:
- The demolition of part of the wall would fundamentally alter the character of the boundary, the historic character and surrounding area.
 - The wall is a party wall, and as such, the applicant does not have the unilateral right to carry out works to it without the consent of adjoining residents under the Party Wall etc. Act 1996.
 - The required visibility splays cannot be achieved within land solely controlled by the applicant, as they rely on alterations to a shared structure.
 - The proposal would also have a detrimental impact on the character of Orchard Close. As a private road with a consistent and coherent layout, the introduction of an additional vehicular access point would erode the established street scene and set an undesirable precedent for similar alterations in the future
 - This is a retrospective application following the creation of an unauthorised access, which has already been refused. This suggests a disregard for the planning process and established controls

2. RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

App Number	Proposal	Decision	Decision Date
25/0927	S73 APPLICATION TO VARY CONDITION 1 (APPROVED PLANS) OF APPLICATION 19/1003 - AMENDMENT TO THE DESIGN OF PLOT 5	GC	31/03/2026
25/0094	GARAGE CONVERSION	GC	11/02/2025
22/0856	PARTIAL DISCHARGE OF CONDITIONS 7 (BIN STORAGE) AND 8 (CYCLE STORAGE) RELATING TO PLANNING PERMISSION 19/1003 FOR THE DEMOLITION OF HOUSE AND CONSTRUCTION OF 5 NO. DETACHED DWELLINGS	A	06/09/2022
19/1003	DEMOLITION OF DERELICT HOUSE AND CONSTRUCTION OF FIVE DETACHED DWELLINGS	GC	23/09/2021
20/0094	PROPOSED VARIATION OF APPROVED PLANNING PERMISSION 16/1055 TO AMEND DESIGN OF DWELLINGS	GC subject to S106	13/10/2020
19/1264	PARTIAL DISCHARGE OF CONDITION 02 (CEMP) IF PLANNING PERMISSION 16/1055 FOR THE DEMOLITION OF EXISTING PROPERTY AND ASSOCIATED OUTBUILDINGS AND CONSTRUCTION OF 4NO. DETACHED DWELLINGS	A	30/03/2020
18/1190	PARTIAL DISCHARGE OF CONDITIONS 02 (CEMP), 04 (DRAINAGE), 06 (BOUNDARY TREATMENTS), 12 (ARBORICULTURALIST) OF PLANNING PERMISSION 16/1055 OF DEMOLITION OF EXISTING PROPERTY AND ASSOCIATED OUTBUILDINGS AND CONSTRUCTION OF 4NO. DETACHED DWELLING	PAPR	14.11.2019
16/1055	DEMOLITION OF EXISTING PROPERTY AND ASSOCIATED OUTBUILDINGS AND CONSTRUCTION OF 4NO. DETACHED DWELLINGS	GC	22.01.2018
94/0174	Change of use from single dwelling to residential care home for eleven/twelve persons	GC	08/04/1994

3. POLICY CONTEXT

3.1 THE NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK: FUTURE WALES - THE NATIONAL PLAN 2040

Future Wales sets out the Welsh Government's land use priorities and provides a national land use framework for SDPs and LDPs. Future Wales concentrates on development and land use issues of national significance, indicating areas of major opportunities and change, highlighting areas that need protecting and enhancing and helping to co-ordinate the delivery of Welsh Government policies to maximise positive outcomes.

Policy 1 - Where Wales Will Grow

Policy 2 - Shaping Urban Growth and Regeneration - Strategic Placemaking

Policy 9 - Resilient Ecological Networks and Green Infrastructure

3.2 PLANNING POLICY WALES (EDITION 12) 2024

3.3 - Good design is fundamental to creating sustainable places where people want to live, work and socialise.

3.4 - Meeting the objectives of good design should be the aim of all those involved in the development process and should be applied to all development proposals at all scales.

3.3 Technical Advice Note

Technical advice note (TAN) 12: design

Technical advice note (TAN) 15: development, flooding and coastal erosion

3.4 NEWPORT LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (2011-2026)

Policy GP2 (General Amenity)

Policy GP4 (Highways and Accessibility)

Policy GP5 (Natural Environment)

Policy GP6 (Quality of Design)

Policy CE6 (Archaeology)

Policy SP3 (Flood Risk)

3.5 SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE

PARKING STANDARDS SPG

4. CONSULTATIONS

4.1 HENEB:

we have reviewed the detailed information contained on your website and can confirm that archaeological mitigation is not required. We have reviewed the area against the information in the regional Historic Environment Record (HER) which shows as follows: The proposed works are within the Archaeologically Sensitive Area of Newport. A review of the 1st Edition (1883) shows no archaeological features in the works area. By the 2nd - 3rd Editions (1901, 1920), historic Ordnance Survey maps show the property labelled 'Bro Dawel', later known as 'Marshfield House'. The proposal includes the reinstatement of the driveway (retrospective). Whilst we do not condone works carried out in retrospect, the works are of small scale. With our understanding of the historic environment, it is unlikely that significant archaeological features will be encountered or that existing features will be disturbed. Therefore, the potential impact is considered low. As a result,

there is unlikely to be an archaeological restraint to this proposed development and consequently, as the archaeological advisors to your Members, we have no objections to the positive determination of this application. The record is not definitive, however, and features may be disturbed during the course of the work. In this event, please contact this division of the Trust.

5. INTERNAL COUNCIL ADVICE

5.1 Highways:

The plans now show the high wall reduced in height to similar levels as the lower/retaining wall which addresses the visibility issue to this side (right when exiting). The plans however indicate planters that would impact visibility to the other side. These should be relocated away from the access. As there is no footway the verge is the likely to be used instead. This could be addressed via a condition to provide and retain pedestrian visibility splays. It would require planters to be located away from the corner. In summary there are no objections subject to the following condition.

Suggested Condition:

No part of the development shall be brought into use until visibility splays of 2metres by 2 metres have been provided on each side of the access. The depth shall be measured from the back of footway/verge; and the width measured outward from the edges of the access. The splays shall be created clear of obstructions to visibility at or above a height of 0.6 metres above verge level. Once created, the visibility splays shall be maintained clear of any obstruction and shall be retained at all times. Reason: To provide the driver of a vehicle using the access and other users of the public highway with adequate inter-visibility in the interests of road safety.

6. REPRESENTATIONS

6.1 NEIGHBOURS:

All properties with a common boundary and opposite with the application site were consulted (12 properties), a site notice displayed on 17/04/2026.

5 neighbouring comments were submitted which in summary as as follows:

- The wall is a long-established shared boundary structure, not solely within the applicant's control.
- Its removal/demolition would:
 - Reduce privacy for Orchard Close residents
 - Undermine property definition between sites
 - Harm the established character of the area
- The wall is a historic/legacy feature (linked to Marshfield House) and contributes to the existing street layout.
- Insufficient detail provided regarding:
 - Height and extent of wall removal/lowering
 - Final appearance and design impact/impact to neighbouring properties
- Contrary to Planning Policy Wales and the Planning (Wales) Act 2015, which require:
 - Protection of neighbouring amenity

- Respect for existing residential character
- Fails to comply with Newport LDP policies that:
 - Safeguard residential amenity
 - Prevent unacceptable impacts on surrounding properties
- Does not properly consider existing site context and established boundaries
- Changes to the wall and access arrangement may:
 - Affect visibility and traffic flow
 - Alter the function of the entrance onto St Mellons Road
- Introduction of an additional access may conflict with the originally approved scheme
- The wall is a shared (potentially party wall) structure
- Its removal raises property law considerations and should not proceed without:
 - Proper agreement from all affected parties

6.2 Councillor Allan Screen:

I am only calling the application in if the officers are minded to approve it.

The objections are as detailed below.

- The applicant's property already benefits from a purpose-built communal access onto St. Mellons Road, which provides adequate visibility splays and was clearly designed to serve the development safely and appropriately. The creation of a second, individual access is therefore unnecessary. The new access has been formed at the location of a historic access point associated with the former Marshfield House, which has since been demolished to accommodate the current development. This unauthorised access was previously refused planning permission due to inadequate visibility caused by the retained boundary wall.
- The current application seeks to overcome that refusal by proposing a reduction in the height of the existing wall to achieve the required visibility splay. However, this wall is approximately 150 years old, of substantial construction with integral pillars, and forms part of a shared boundary. Any meaningful reduction in height would not be feasible without effectively demolishing the structure entirely, which would fundamentally alter the character of the boundary and surrounding area.
- Importantly, the wall is a party wall, and as such, the applicant does not have the unilateral right to carry out works to it without the consent of adjoining residents under the Party Wall etc. Act 1996. Planning permission does not override these legal requirements, and there is no indication that such consent has been obtained. This raises serious concerns about the deliverability of the proposal.
- In addition, the required visibility splays cannot be achieved within land solely controlled by the applicant, as they rely on alterations to a shared structure. This conflicts with established guidance set out in Planning Policy Wales and the Manual for Streets, which require that safe access arrangements must be achievable within land under the applicant's control. Technical Advice Note 18 also makes clear that development should only be permitted where safe and suitable access can be provided. In this case, a safe access already exists, and the proposed additional access would introduce unnecessary risk onto St. Mellons Road.

- The proposal would also have a detrimental impact on the character of Orchard Close. As a private road with a consistent and coherent layout, the introduction of an additional vehicular access point would erode the established street scene and set an undesirable precedent for similar alterations in the future. Furthermore, the loss or significant alteration of a long-standing boundary wall would harm the visual amenity and historic character of the area.
- It is also of concern that this is a retrospective application following the creation of an unauthorised access, which has already been refused. This suggests a disregard for the planning process and established controls

6.3 Marshfield Community Council: No comments received to date.

7. ASSESSMENT

7.1 Principle of Development

7.1.1 The application site is within the defined settlement boundary as shown on the proposals map that accompany the Newport City Council Local Development Plan, accordingly there is a presumption in favour of development, and the efficient use of land is encouraged. A full assessment is carried out below.

7.2 Visual Amenity/ Character and Appearance

7.2.1 The application site comprises of an existing residential dwelling in an area with a predominantly residential character. The access point is existing and previously served the original dwelling on the site, accordingly, the development is not considered to result in a significant change in respect of visual amenity that would impact upon the character or appearance of the area.

7.2.2 The applicant proposes to reduce the height of the north-eastern boundary wall and pillar in order to achieve improved visibility when accessing/egressing the site. The reduction of the north-eastern pillar and an associated section of boundary wall would result in the disruption of the symmetry of the entrance pillars either side of the access. The stated justification for the alterations is to achieve appropriate visibility splays onto St Mellons Road. Whilst the reduction in the wall and pillar does not appear visually coherent, it does not create significant visual harm to the area given the small section of wall to be removed. The applicant has also stated that the wall is within their ownership and has provided a title plan. It is acknowledged that the applicant could, if within their ownership, reduce the height of the wall and pillar without the need for express planning consent. A condition will be attached ensure the visibility splays are achieved following the grant of planning consent.

7.3 Residential Amenity

7.3.1 The use of the original access is for the applicants use only. Therefore, it is considered that this would not create an intensified use of the access and would not have an adverse impact on neighbouring properties. Given the scale and nature of the development and its relationship with the closest residential properties no adverse impact upon the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers has been identified.

7.4 Highway Safety

7.4.1 The Local Highways Authority was consulted on the scheme and states that the plans show the high wall reduced in height to similar levels as the lower/retaining wall which addresses visibility issues to the right. However, the plans indicate planters that would

impact visibility to the other side (West). The planters should be relocated away from the access. As there is no footway the verge is the likely to be used instead. The highways officer requested this as a condition; however, the applicant has since moved these to a location where they would no longer impede visibility thus overcoming this concern, it is therefore concluded that the development accords with Policy GP4 of the LDP. Through later correspondence the officer is now satisfied and requests a condition for these visibility splays to be kept from obstruction.

7.4.2 Moreover, through correspondence, it was acknowledged that access and egress in a forward gear may not be achievable from this access. The highways officer confirmed that this is more insisted on A roads, whereas this is a much lower classification of road, with relatively low/slow traffic. This is separate from the main parking area and is not significantly different to other drives along the street. It is therefore noted that it is directly comparable to houses opposite. This is therefore acceptable in this instance.

7.4.3 Councillor Screen raised concerns that this access was previously refused planning permission due to inadequate visibility cause by the retained boundary wall. It is noted that this access was the original access to the original house on site. Under a previous application, 16/1055, a central access was proposed to meet visibility splays. Under this application, part of the wall is being removed to meet these splays and there has been no objection from highways.

7.5 **Biodiversity**

7.5.1 PPW12 states in paragraph 6.2.12, *A green infrastructure statement should be submitted with all planning applications. This will be proportionate to the scale and nature of the development proposed and will describe how green infrastructure has been incorporated into the proposal. In the case of minor development this will be a short description and should not be an onerous requirement for applicants. The green infrastructure statement will be an effective way of demonstrating positive multi-functional outcomes which are appropriate to the site in question and must be used for demonstrating how the step-wise approach (Paragraph 6.4.15) has been applied.*

7.5.2 Policy 9 of Future Wales states that in all cases, action towards securing the maintenance and enhancement of biodiversity (to provide a net benefit), the resilience of ecosystems and green infrastructure assets must be demonstrated. Policy GP5 of the NLDP supports this and states that proposals will be expected to maintain, protect, and enhance ecological networks and features of importance for biodiversity. A brief GIS statement has been provided, planters and a bird box has been provided as an ecological enhancements are proposed as part of the development. As such, given the scale of development, this is deemed acceptable and the proposal is compliant with the aims of Policy GP5 of the NLDP 2011-2026 (adopted January 2015) and PPW12.

7.6 **Archaeology**

7.6.1 The site is defined within an archaeological sensitive area. HENEB have stated there is unlikely to be an archaeological restraint to this proposed development and consequently, as the archaeological advisors to your Members, we have no objections to the positive determination of this application. The record is not definitive, however, and features may

be disturbed during the course of the work. In this event, please contact HENEB. Therefore, it is noted the works are in line with Policy CE6.

7.7 Flood Risk

- 7.7.1 The site is within Flood Zone 3 (Sea, defended). TAN15 within defended zones states '*On brownfield sites redevelopment proposals should not over intensify use neither should they reduce the area's ability to absorb flood water nor cause problems with flooding elsewhere.*' It is noted that development is less vulnerable development and does not intensify the use. Therefore, the scheme accords with Policy SP3 and TAN15.

7.8. Other comments

- 7.8.1 5 consultation responses were received from neighbouring occupiers in response to the proposed development raising concerns primarily relating to the amendment to the existing boundary wall. Additionally Councillor Screen has raised concerns in relation to the ownership of the side boundary wall. Councillor Screen has stated that the applicant does not have the unilateral right to carry out works to it without the consent of adjoining residents under the Party Wall etc. Act 1996. The applicant has stated that the wall is within their ownership, signed the appropriate ownership certificates and provided a title deed demonstrating ownership of the boundary wall. No evidence to the contrary has been submitted.
- 7.8.2 Councillor Screen and neighbouring properties have also provided comment and states that there is a main access for all dwellings, and therefore, the private access is unnecessary. The Council is assessing what has been submitted by the applicant who has the right to apply for any development they propose. The highways officer does not raise an objection to the proposal subject to condition(s). A full assessment has been carried out above.
- 7.8.3 Concerns were also raised by Councillor Screen that the wall is approximately 150 years old, of substantial construction with integral pillars, and forms part of a shared boundary. Any meaningful reduction in height would not be feasible without effectively demolishing the structure entirely, which would fundamentally alter the character of the boundary and surrounding area. On assessment, it is noted the applicant is not proposing to demolish the entire wall, and therefore, we are only assessing what has been submitted. Building regulations would need to be contacted separately to see if this is achievable. If the applicant does not build the development in accordance with the plans, then this is in breach of condition. However, there is no restriction on the demolition of the wall and therefore this could be done at will without the need for planning consent.
- 7.8.4 Councillor Screen has also stated that the required visibility splays cannot be achieved within land solely controlled by the applicant, as they rely on alterations to a shared structure. As forementioned, the applicant has stated that they own the wall wholly and no evidence to the contrary has been provided.
- 7.8.5 Councillor Screen also states that the development conflicts with established guidance set out in Planning Policy Wales and the Manual for Streets, which require that safe access arrangements must be achievable within land under the applicant's control. Technical

Advice Note 18 also makes clear that development should only be permitted where safe and suitable access can be provided. In this case, a safe access already exists, and the proposed additional access would introduce unnecessary risk onto St. Mellons Road. The highways officer has confirmed that they have no objection to the development as long as visibility splays can be met, and this has been demonstrated by the applicant. Therefore, this is in accordance with Policy GP4.

- 7.8.6 Concerns were also raised by Councillor Screen and neighbouring properties that the proposal would also have a detrimental impact on the character of Orchard Close. As a private road with a consistent and coherent layout, the introduction of an additional vehicular access point would erode the established street scene and set an undesirable precedent for similar alterations in the future. Furthermore, the loss or significant alteration of a long-standing boundary wall would harm the visual amenity and historic character of the area. On assessment, it is noted that this access was an existing access to serve Marshfield House, and therefore, the retention of this access does not add a new form of development into the streetscene impacting the character. In relation to the loss of part of the wall, neighbours have stated that the applicant has not taken into account the existing boundaries and site context. Whilst it has been acknowledged that the lowering of the wall/pillar will disrupt the symmetry between the pillars, it does not have a demonstrable impact to the streetscene to refuse the application. It is also considered it would not reduce privacy to the residents of Orchard Close given that the wall encloses a driveway rather than a private garden or habitable windows. Therefore, the proposed development would not demonstrably reduce privacy to residents of Orchard Close.
- 7.8.7 Concerns were also raised by the non-compliance with planning policies including PPW12, the Planning Act 2015 and the NLDP 2015-2026 in relation to protecting neighbouring amenity and respecting existing residential character. A full assessment has been carried out above.
- 7.8.8 Concerns were raised from neighbouring properties that the finishes of the wall have not been provided. Since this, the applicant has provided detail stating that the where wall and column are lowered, existing materials to be maintained including coping stones and pier cap. This will create a more coherent form of development and deemed acceptable. Concerns were also raised on the lack of information on the extent of lowering. The applicant has provided a scaled plan which demonstrates the wall is proposed to be lowered by approximately 1.6m for a depth of 2m.
- 7.8.9 Councillor Screen finally raises concern that this is a retrospective application following the creation of an unauthorised access, which has already been refused. This suggests a disregard for the planning process and established controls. On assessment, this has been discussed within the report, where a previous planning application to reinstate the access has not been submitted, however, it was acknowledged in a previous planning report, 16/1055, that a new access is proposed to serve the 4no. new dwellings, and the old access could not achieve visibility splays. Under this application, given the amendments, the access can now meet visibility splays, and therefore, this is no longer a key issue. Furthermore, the planning process allows for retrospective applications to be submitted and is not designed to be punitive therefore the LPA gives little weight to this concern.

7.8.10 Finally, concerns were raised in relation to inadequate consultation. All neighbours with a common boundary and opposite the host site were consulted, including a site notice. When the amendment happened in relation to removing a section of the wall, and the change of use to residential curtilage was added into the description, the same consultation was undertaken. It is therefore considered that there has been sufficient public consultation undertaken.

8. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

8.1 *Crime and Disorder Act 1998*

Section 17(1) of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 imposes a duty on the Local Authority to exercise its various functions with due regard to the likely effect of the exercise of those functions on, and the need to do all that it reasonably can to prevent, crime and disorder in its area. This duty has been considered in the evaluation of this application. It is considered that there would be no significant or unacceptable increase in crime and disorder as a result of the proposed decision.

8.2 *Equality Act 2010*

The Equality Act 2010 identifies a number of 'protected characteristics', namely age; disability; gender reassignment; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief; sex; sexual orientation; marriage and civil partnership.

8.3 Having due regard to advancing equality involves:

- removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by people due to their protected characteristics;
- taking steps to meet the needs of people from protected groups where these differ from the need of other people; and
- encouraging people from protected groups to participate in public life or in other activities where their participation is disproportionately low.

A Socio-economic Duty is also set out in the Equality Act 2010 which includes a requirement, when making strategic decisions, to pay due regard to the need to reduce the inequalities of outcome that result from socio-economic disadvantage.

8.4 The above duties have been given due consideration in the determination of this application. It is considered that there would be no significant or unacceptable impact upon persons who share a protected characteristic, over and above any other person, as a result of the proposed decision. There would also be no negative effects which would impact on inequalities of outcome which arise as a result of socio-economic disadvantage.

8.6 *Planning (Wales) Act 2015 (Welsh language)*

Section 31 of the Act clarifies that impacts on the Welsh language may be a consideration when taking decisions on applications for planning permission so far as it is material to the application. This duty has been given due consideration in the determination of this application. It is considered that there would be no material effect upon the use of the Welsh language in Newport as a result of the proposed decision.

8.7 *Newport's Well-Being Plan 2018-23*

The Wellbeing of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 imposes a duty on public bodies to carry out sustainable development in accordance with the sustainable development principle to act in a manner which seeks to ensure that the needs of the present are met without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. This duty has been considered during the preparation of Newport's Well-Being Plan 2018-23, which was signed off on 1 May 2018. The duty imposed by the Act together with the goals and objectives of Newport's Well-Being Plan 2018-23 have been considered in the evaluation of this application. It is considered that there would be no significant or unacceptable impact upon the achievement of wellbeing objectives as a result of the proposed decision.

9. CONCLUSION

- 9.1 Overall, the proposed development is considered acceptable in principle. The reinstatement of the access, alongside the associated alterations to the boundary wall, would not result in significant harm to the character of the area or neighbouring amenity. Highways concerns have been satisfactorily addressed, subject to conditions securing appropriate visibility splays. Other material considerations, including biodiversity, archaeology, and flood risk, have also been adequately considered and found to be acceptable. While a number of concerns have been raised by neighbours and the local ward member, these have been fully assessed and do not outweigh the policy-compliant nature of the proposal. Accordingly, the development is considered to accord with the relevant policies of the Development Plan and is recommended for approval, subject to conditions.

10. RECOMMENDATION

GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS

01 The development shall be implemented in accordance with the following plans and documents: 21 St Mellons Road-03A Elevations; 21 St Mellons Road-01B Existing&Proposed; 21 St Mellons Road-04 Block Plans; 21 St Mellons Road-02 Section; Location Plan; Supplementary Information V2; Green Infrastructure Statement.

Reason: In the interests of clarity and to ensure the development complies with the submitted plans and documents on which this decision was based

02 The development, namely, the lowering of the boundary wall and pillar, shall be completed and finished in materials to match the existing boundary wall as per drawing: *21 St Mellons Road-03A Elevations* within 3 months of the date of this consent and shall thereafter be retained for the lifetime of development.

Reason: To ensure the wall is finished in appropriate materials.

03 The visibility splays of 2m x 2m on each side of the access at or above a height of 0.6 metres above verge level shall be free from obstruction and retained for the lifetime of development. The depth shall be measured from the back of footway/verge; and the width measured outward from the edges of the access. The splays shall be created clear of obstructions to visibility. The visibility splays shall be maintained clear of any obstruction and shall be retained at all times.

Reason: To provide the driver of a vehicle using the access and other users of the public highway with adequate inter-visibility in the interests of road safety.

04 The biodiversity enhancement scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved plans: *21 St Mellons Road-01B Existing&Proposed; Green Infrastructure Statement* prior to the first beneficial use of the development hereby approved and retained as such for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: In the interest of protected species, in accordance with Policy 9 of Future Wales and Policy GP5 of the Newport Local Development Plan 2011-2026 (adopted January 2015).

NOTE TO APPLICANT

01 The development plan for Newport is the Newport Local Development Plan 2011 – 2026 (Adopted January 2015). Policies CE6, SP3, GP2, GP4, GP5, GP6 were relevant to the determination of this application.

02 Due to the minor nature of the proposed development (including any demolition) and the location of the proposed development, it is considered that the proposals did not need to be screened under the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations.

03 As of 1st October 2012 any connection to the public sewerage network (foul or surface water sewerage) for the first time will require an adoption agreement with Dwr Cymru Welsh Water. For further advice contact Dwr Cymru Welsh Water on 01443 331155.