

Application Number: DM/2026/00329

Proposal: Construction of second storey extension, to create new living space.

Address: Min Honddu Lancaster Arms Cul-de-sac Pandy Monmouthshire NP7 8DW

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Griffiths

Plans: All Existing Plans A101 - , All Proposed Plans A102 A - , Location Plan A100 - , Green Infrastructure Appraisal/Statement - , Other Planning Statement. - , Bat Survey v4.0 - ,

RECOMMENDATION:

Case Officer: Ms Alice King
Date Valid: 16.03.2026

1.0 APPLICATION DETAILS

1.1 Site Description

Min Honddu is a three-storey detached dwelling located within the semi-rural community of Pandy. Historic maps show that the property has been in place since at least the mid-1850s. The site is adjacent to the boundary of the Brecon Beacon National Park. The dwelling is not within a development boundary and is therefore considered to be within the open countryside. Min Honddu is within TAN15 surface water flood zones 2/3, TAN15 river flood zones 2/3 and the river Wye sensitive phosphorus catchment area.

1.2 Proposal Description

Planning permission is sought for a second storey extension that projects approximately 9m from the side elevation to create a new living space. The proposal takes a contemporary approach, which features a part pitched roof and part flat roof, the roof materials will be box profile cladding. The second storey is proposed to be on stilts which includes an external staircase. The external walls are proposed to be agricultural steel sheet cladding. The extension provides a kitchen/diner, lounge and utility room.

NB: The third floor has not been included within the suite of plans as it is not impacted by the proposal.

2.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY (if any)

Reference Number	Description	Decision	Decision Date
DM/2020/01835	Loft conversion with dormer.	Approved	14.09.2021
DM/2023/00930	Side single storey extension	Approved	09.11.2023

3.0 LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Strategic Policies

S13 LDP Landscape, Green Infrastructure and the Natural Environment
S17 LDP Place Making and Design

Development Management Policies

DES1 LDP General Design Considerations
EP1 LDP Amenity and Environmental Protection
NE1 LDP Nature Conservation and Development
LC5 LDP Protection and Enhancement of Landscape Character
H6 LDP Extension of Rural Dwellings
LC3 LDP Brecon Beacons National Park

4.0 NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY

Future Wales - the national plan 2040

Future Wales is the national development framework, setting the direction for development in Wales to 2040. It is a development plan with a strategy for addressing key national priorities through the planning system, including sustaining and developing a vibrant economy, achieving decarbonisation and climate-resilience, developing strong ecosystems and improving the health and well-being of our communities. Future Wales - the national plan 2040 is the national development framework and it is the highest tier plan, setting the direction for development in Wales to 2040. It is a framework which will be built on by Strategic Development Plans at a regional level and Local Development Plans. Planning decisions at every level of the planning system in Wales must be taken in accordance with the development plan as a whole.

Planning Policy Wales (PPW) Edition 12

The primary objective of PPW is to ensure that the planning system contributes towards the delivery of sustainable development and improves the social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being of Wales, as required by the Planning (Wales) Act 2015, the Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 and other key legislation and resultant duties such as the Socio-economic Duty.

A well-functioning planning system is fundamental for sustainable development and achieving sustainable places. PPW promotes action at all levels of the planning process which is conducive to maximising its contribution to the well-being of Wales and its communities.

5.0 REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 Consultation Replies

Crucorney Community Council: Crucorney Community Council would like to state categorically that it fully supports the current application which is an eminently professional, detailed and fully practical solution to a recurring horrendous problem that this household has had to suffer over recent years with regard to flooding, as evidenced to you in the architect's report that you have in your possession. If there any further minor adjustments /conditions that the planning department wishes to bring forward, Crucorney Community Council suggests that a meeting be convened ASAP with all relevant contributors so that they can be fully discussed, compromises made where

necessary and progressive steps taken to help this well-respected family cope with what they have had to go through over recent years and return to a normal family life which they and their young children fully deserve. Crucorney Community Council would hope to see swift action taken by MCC Planning Officers to solve this problem now to prevent further delay which may cause matters to escalate and further delay the implementation of a totally reasonable request to ease this family's situation.

SAB: No objections.

MCC Biodiversity: V2 provided a holding objection which stated 'Elevation drawings must be updated in accordance with the ecology report showing the locations of the recommended bat and bird boxes. A holding objection is maintained until the requested information is received.' V3 confirms the amended plans (A102 A) have been received and are acceptable, therefore Biodiversity have no objections.

Brecon Beacon National Park: No objections.

Landscape and GI Officer: Objection, this is expanded within the Landscape section (6.4) of the below report.

SEWBREC Search Results - A variety of birds and bats have been spotted as being within 500m of the site. (approximately 3 bird species and 5 bat species).

5.2 Neighbour Notification

A site notice was placed nearby the dwelling and neighbours within close vicinity to the site have been consulted via neighbour letter. A total of 38 letters of support have been submitted.

5.3 Other Representations

No comments to note.

5.4 Local Member Representations

County Councillor David Jones - has referred this application to committee.

6.0 EVALUATION

The application site is located outside of the defined settlement boundaries where new built development is strictly controlled. The applicant is seeking to extend the dwelling within the existing residential curtilage. There is no objection to the principle of development within the residential curtilage of the dwelling, subject to material planning considerations.

6.1 Good Design/ Place making

6.1.1 The proposal is for a second-story extension to the side (southern) elevation of the existing dwelling. The existing dwelling appears to be from the mid-1800s according to historical maps. Min Honddu is considered to be a wholly traditional dwelling and sits well in the landscape. It is positioned directly adjacent to a narrow lane which delineates the boundary to the Brecon Beacon National Park and is within the open countryside. There are a small number of other dwellings within the immediate vicinity. These include similar type dwellings located south of Min Honddu, some of which have been extended in a traditional manner. What is apparent, however, is the use of materials and form. The building is considered to be able to accommodate alterations and modifications, however as the dwelling is traditional, this should be sensitively approached. The dwelling is visible from the A465 to the east. The dwelling is considered to be visibly prominent within the wider landscape, with the BBNP as a backdrop.

6.1.2 While a side extension is potentially acceptable in principle, and a previous single storey extension has been approved (under DM/2023/00930) which took a contemporary approach, a

second storey has the potential to have an increased impact on the dwelling as it is a prominent elevation. The proposed extension adds a new design feature to the property and is considered to result in a confused design out of context with its surroundings, becoming an incongruous and unacceptable feature within the rural landscape. In this instance, a large, flat roofed extension would jar with the host dwelling which currently has a pitched roof and strong traditional features. Additionally, the fenestration does not relate appropriately to the host dwelling, creating another jarring feature, and the fenestration that is on the extension is different in size and orientation, which further adds to a confused design.

6.1.3 Policy DES1 of the adopted LDP sets out that all development should be of a high quality sustainable design and respect the local character and distinctiveness of Monmouthshire's built, historic and natural environment. Of particular relevance to the consideration of this application is criterion c) of Policy DES1 which states that a proposal should respect the existing form, scale, siting, massing, materials and layout of its setting and any neighbouring quality buildings. The proposal is neither wholly traditional or contemporary and therefore the extension is considered visually incongruous with the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surrounding context. In accordance with LDP Development Management Policy DES1 and Strategic Policy S17 (Place Making and Design), the proposal fails to respect the scale, form, and materiality of the existing property, thereby undermining the prevailing design ethos.

6.1.4 The large amount of cladding proposed will emphasise the mass of the extension as there is little relief in the material. The Policy H6 Supplementary Planning Guidance 2015 states in section 3.1 that an extension to any rural dwelling has to be modest, respect or enhance the appearance of the existing building. The proposed volume increase of the extension is 52%. In section 3.9 of the SPG it states that the primary consideration in assessing any proposal will be the need to ensure that there is no significant harmful impact on the countryside through the increased size of the resulting building. Section 3.10 of the Supplementary Planning Guidance regarding extensions to rural dwellings also states extensions to existing dwellings between 650 and 750 cubic metres will normally be subject to a maximum size of dwelling of 975 cubic metres. The proposal would be approximately 1055m². The proposed design is not considered to respect or enhance the appearance of the existing building and as stated above adds an incongruous feature.

6.1.5 For all the reasons listed above, the proposal is not considered to comply with policies DES1 c) and H6 of the Adopted Local Development Plan.

6.2 Impact on Residential Amenity

6.2.1 There are no other dwellings close to the proposed development that could be adversely affected. The nearest property to the dwelling, Roseville, is around 12m north of the site and is not considered to be unduly impacted by the development as the extension is proposed to be on the southern side of Min Honddu. The development will be visible from the road, but it is not anticipated to cause an unacceptable loss of privacy or living conditions to any neighbouring dwellings. Therefore, it is considered to adhere to policies DES1 and EP1 of the adopted LDP.

6.3 Flooding

6.3.1 NRW's Flood Map for Planning indicates the site to be within the Flood Zone 3 (Rivers). Min Honddu has been significantly flooded by the River Honddu at least four times since 2019 (events in October 2019, February 2020, November 2024 and November 2025). However, as this is a householder extension, there are no objections to its development with regards to flooding. As per TAN15: Applications for extensions and householder development section 15.6 states, 'there will be no requirement to justify the location of householder development but if such minor works are likely to have an adverse effect the full consequences of the development will need to be appraised. The planning authority should inform the developer or applicant in such circumstances to provide a Flood Consequences Assessment. The Lead Local Flood Authority will be consulted as a part of this application; it will be at their discretion if they request further information.' In this instance, the LLFA have no objections to the proposals nor have they requested an FCA be undertaken.

6.4 Landscape

6.4.1 Our Landscape and GI officer was consulted with, and they commented as follows:

'Whilst the site is located outside the designated boundary of the Bannau Brycheiniog National Park, it falls within its wider setting and should therefore be developed in a manner that conserves and enhances local landscape character, in accordance with Policy LC5: Protection and Enhancement of Landscape Character.

The surrounding built context is characterised by traditional stone and rendered dwellings. In this context, the proposed extension, by virtue of its scale, form and external appearance, appears more akin to an agricultural building than a domestic extension. It is considered that the proposal would introduce an incongruous feature into the streetscape and would result in a harmful change to the character and appearance of the local built environment.

In relation to Policy DES1: General Design Considerations, the scale and design of the extension are not considered to respond positively to the prevailing form, proportions and character of neighbouring properties. Furthermore, the proposed materials and detailing fail to demonstrate how the development would contribute positively to local distinctiveness or reflect the texture, colour, pattern and craftsmanship that characterise the surrounding built environment.'

6.4.2 Officers agree with this view. Moreover, Section 2.10 of the H6 SPG states that "Proposals that would adversely affect landscape character will not be permitted." The proposed extension occupies a sensitive location within the wider setting of the Bannau Brycheiniog National Park. It is considered that the scale, form and appearance of the development would not adequately respect the character of the surrounding built environment and would result in adverse impacts on local landscape character. On this basis, the design of the extension is considered to have a harmful impact on the surrounding countryside and would be at odds with the rural surroundings, especially in such a prominent location and would cause significant visual intrusion, creating an adverse change in the character of the natural landscape contrary to LDP policies LC5 and LC3.

6.5 Green Infrastructure

6.5.1 Chapter 6 of Planning Policy Wales (PPW) 12 highlights that a Green Infrastructure (GI) statement should be submitted with all planning applications and will be proportionate to the scale and nature of the development. The statement which will need to be informed by a GI assessment of the site will describe how green infrastructure will be incorporated into the proposal and how the step wise approach to protecting biodiversity, habitats and GI onsite will be managed. A step wise approach considers what impacts may occur as a result of development activity to any identified biodiversity, habitats and green infrastructure assets and networks that may be present on or bounding a site. The approach then seeks to manage any harm that may occur by (a) avoiding (b) minimising (c) Mitigate / Restore.

6.5.2 The existing property's curtilage is mainly laid to lawn and patio. There are no established hedgerows and trees on the site. The full extent of construction is due to take place on existing hardstanding. No landscaped areas are to be disturbed. Therefore, the proposal is considered to meet criterion a) of the stepwise approach, which is to avoid any harm that may occur as a result of development. The Biodiversity Officer has confirmed that 'the extension would be constructed over a garden which from a review of images and satellite imagery appears to be mostly hard standing with a small lawned area possibly affected. These are habitats of negligible ecological importance.'

6.6 Biodiversity

6.6.1 As per the Biodiversity officer's comments (which can be viewed in full on the case file), ' a Bat Survey report has been produced by Ecological Services Limited detailing a Preliminary Roost Assessment of the property in April 2026 and two subsequent dusk emergence bat surveys in May and June 2026 No bats were recorded emerging from the buildings during the two surveys. The report references a historic Natterer's bat maternity roost dating to 1996 within the property. As no

bats were recorded emerging from the building during surveys in 2026 and works are limited to the southwest elevation, impacts to roosting bats from the current proposals are considered unlikely and potential (or historically used) roosting features across the rest of the property would be retained'.

5.6.2 As the site is located within an area comprising high quality habitat for bats, the Biodiversity Officer recommended a condition limiting external lighting.

5.6.3 A number of active house martin nests were noted at the eaves across the building during the Preliminary Roost Assessment and construction of the two-storey extension has potential to damage nests if undertaken during the nesting season. Following the completion of works, eaves across the remaining elevations would remain accessible to nesting house martins for future use. All birds are protected by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). The protection also covers their nests and eggs. Construction therefore should be timed to avoid the main nesting bird season (March to August inclusive). If works cannot be timed to avoid the nesting period, a suitably experienced ecologist must check for nests immediately prior to works. A condition has been recommended by the Biodiversity Officer accordingly.

6.6.2 PPW 12 sets out that the planning system has a key role to play in helping to reverse the decline in biodiversity and increase the resilience of ecosystems, at various scales, by ensuring appropriate mechanisms are in place to both protect against loss and to secure enhancement. It is clear that the planning system should ensure overall, there is a net benefit for biodiversity and ecosystem resilience, resulting in enhanced wellbeing.

6.6.3 The applicant has provided biodiversity enhancements in the form of a bat box and a swift box. These enhancements are considered to comply with Chapter 6 of PPW 12 and respond to the Section 6 Duty of the Environment (Wales) Act 2016.

6.6.4 Under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 it is necessary to consider whether the development should be subject to a Habitat Regulations Assessment. This is in particular reference to the impact of increased concentrations of Phosphates on designated SACs. NRW has set new phosphate standards for the riverine SACs of the Wye and Usk and their catchment areas. Development that may increase the concentration of phosphates levels will be subject to appropriate assessment and HRA.

6.6.5 Under the Habitats Regulations, where a plan or project is likely to have a significant effect on a European site, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects, and where it is not directly connected with or necessary to the management of the site, the competent authority must carry out an appropriate assessment of the implication of the plan or project in view of the site's conservation objectives. Natural Resources Wales has set new nutrient standards for the river SACs in Wales. Any proposed development within the SAC catchments that might increase the amount of nutrient within the catchment could lead to additional damaging effects to the SAC features and therefore such proposals must be screened through a HRA to determine whether they are likely to have a significant effect on the SAC condition.

This application has been screened in accordance with Natural Resources Wales' advice for planning applications within the river Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) catchments (v4 issued 28th June 2024). It is considered that this development is unlikely to increase nutrient inputs.

6.7 Response to the Representations of Third Parties and/or Community Council

6.7.1 It is also noted that seven comments have been received from 39 separate households in support of the application. These comments have been carefully considered as part of the planning application, but they are not considered to overcome the visual harm that has been identified in section 6.1 of the officer report. The applicant's personal circumstances have been considered. Personal circumstances are capable of being material planning considerations; however, planning decisions should be based on land use planning considerations and the development plan. In this case, it is not considered that the personal circumstances advanced are of such weight as to outweigh the identified conflict with planning policy and other planning harms.

6.8 Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015

6.8.1 The duty to improve the economic, social, environmental and cultural well-being of Wales has been considered, in accordance with the sustainable development principle, under section 3 of the Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 (the WBFG Act). In reaching this recommendation, the ways of working set out at section 5 of the WBFG Act have been taken into account and it is considered that this recommendation is in accordance with the sustainable development principle through its contribution towards one or more of the Welsh Ministers' well-being objectives set out in section 8 of the WBFG Act.

6.9 Conclusion

6.9.1 On the basis of the above, the development proposed would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding high value, rural environment and is considered to be unacceptable. The proposal does not comply with criterion c) of Policy DES1 or policies H6 and LC5 of Monmouthshire County Council's Local Development Plan and is recommended for refusal on these grounds.

7.0 RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE

Reasons for Refusal:

1 The proposed development, by virtue of its mass, stark design and prominent location, would cause detrimental harm to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding rural environment. The proposal would fail to respect the existing character of the surrounding rural landscape by creating an incongruous design feature and therefore is contrary to criterion c) of Policy DES1, as well as policies H6 and LC5 of the adopted Monmouthshire Local Development Plan.