



Appeal Decision

by L. Hughson-Smith LLB MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Decision date: 16.01.2026

Appeal reference: CAS-04605-N7J9S0

Site address: 1 Bersondy, Llanarth NP15 2AY

- 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 Mr. and Mrs. K Bendon against the decision of Monmouthshire County Council.
- The application DM/2025/00330, dated 12 March 2025, was refused by notice dated 24 July 2025.

The development is the proposed single storey rear and two storey side extension.

- A site visit was made on 11 December 2025.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the proposed two storey side extension. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the proposed single storey rear extension and planning permission is granted for the proposed single storey rear extension at 1 Bersondy, Llanarth NP15 2AY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DM/2025/00330, dated 12 March 2025, and subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council have issued a split decision. In such cases, section 79(1)(b) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (the Act) states that under a section 78 (of the Act) appeal the decision maker may reverse or vary any part of the decision of the local planning authority and may deal with the application as if it had been made to them in the first instance. For the avoidance of doubt, I have considered the scheme as a whole as originally submitted to the Local Planning Authority.
3. I have taken the description of development as stated on the appeal form and Council's decision notice since it more accurately describes the proposed development.

Main Issue

4. This is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Llanarth Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is located on a prominent corner plot at the entrance of the Bersondy cul-de-sac, within the Llanarth Conservation Area (CA). Although some more recent development exists within the cul-de-sac, these properties are set back from the road. The appeal property is, therefore, experienced primarily in the context of the four original semi-detached houses that face the road. These properties are simple in form and modest in size, with gabled roofs and typically small single storey side extensions. Whilst limited alterations have occurred, including varied porch designs, roof mounted solar panels and a slightly larger side extension to the appeal property, the group retains a strong sense of coherence and consistency. Although identified in the Llanarth Conservation Area Appraisal as 20th century infill development, the cul-de-sac's simplicity and uniformity create an attractive and orderly street scene that makes a positive contribution to the CA.
6. The proposed rear extension, despite spanning the full width of the appeal property, is limited to single storey with a lean to roof and would be finished in materials to match the host dwelling. Whilst views of the proposed rear extension would be possible from the lane on the approach to the cul-de-sac, its modest height together with its discreet position would have an unobtrusive impact on the streetscene and would, therefore, preserve the character and appearance of the CA. I note the Council do not object to this element of the scheme, which reinforces my views in this regard.
7. The proposed upper floor side extension would broadly follow the footprint of the existing side projection, be set back from the principal elevation, sit below the main roof ridge and finished in materials to match the host dwelling. Notwithstanding these design measures, the proposal would represent a substantial addition relative to the host dwelling. Whilst I acknowledge that the existing side extension introduced a limited degree of imbalance within the semi-detached pair, its modest scale and clearly subordinate form do not significantly detract from the streetscene. In contrast, the increased height and bulk of the proposed two storey extension would result in a dominant form of development that would overwhelm the host dwelling and erode the simple, balanced appearance of the semi-detached pair.
8. The proposed window and door arrangement, combined with the side extension's significant scale and massing, would result in its new side elevation having a similar appearance to a principal elevation rather than a subordinate addition. Given the appeal property's prominent corner position, this would introduce an uncharacteristic and imposing façade that would appear as a discordant feature when entering the cul-de-sac. Overall, the proposed development would result in an overly dominant and unsympathetic addition that would disrupt the consistent character of the cul-de-sac and undermine its positive contribution to the CA.
9. I am not persuaded that the views of the appeal property are significantly limited by, amongst other things, the narrowness of the lane and the garage associated with the adjacent listed building, Hen Bersondy. Indeed, I observed during my site visit that the appeal property, particularly the side elevation, is widely visible from public vantage points and seen primarily in the context of the other properties within the group, including no. 2 Bersondy.
10. I note the appellants suggests a condition could be imposed to secure landscaping to soften and screen the proposals. However, landscaping should not be used to screen otherwise unacceptable development and, therefore, a condition to this effect would not be appropriate. I have seen the photographic figures in the LCAA referred to by the appellants, but these primarily depict historic buildings, with some showing principal

elevations rather than side, and, therefore, are not comparable to the proposals at the more modern appeal property and does not sway me from my findings above.

11. I conclude that the proposed side extension would neither preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. It would, therefore, be in conflict with Monmouthshire Local Development Plan Policy HE1 which permits development if they, amongst other things, preserve or enhance character or appearance of the area and LDP Policy HE2 which requires that proposals for the alteration and extension of existing buildings in Conservation Areas must take into account whether the details of the proposed works properly respect the proportions of the existing building, as well as other requirements. It also fails to accord with Policy DES1 which states 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 including, but not limited to, respecting the existing form, scale, siting and massing.

Other Matters

12. I acknowledge the proposed side extension would provide some benefit to the appellants in terms of additional accommodation for their family. However, this benefit is limited in scope and would not outweigh the significant harm I have identified in relation to the main issue.

Conditions

13. I have reworded the planning conditions imposed by the Council on their split decision in relation to the single storey rear extension to make them more precise.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposed side extension would result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the CA.
15. I also find that, subject to appropriate conditions, the proposed single storey rear extension would be acceptable and compliant with the relevant planning policies and statutory duties. As this element of the scheme could clearly be implemented without the other parts of development proposed, I have issued a split decision.
16. I, therefore, conclude that the appeal should be allowed in part and dismissed in part as set out in my formal decision.
17. 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.

L. Hughson-Smith

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

1. The development shall begin not later than five years from the date of this decision.
Reason: In accordance with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan and document, except insofar as it relates to the proposed side extension.
 - Proposed Floor and Elevation Plans (drawing number: [PP] 02F)
 - Green Infrastructure Statement

Reason: To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans submitted with the application.

3. The ecological enhancement measures as shown on the Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations (drawing number: [PP] 02F) shall be carried out in full within one month of completion of the single storey rear extension hereby approved. The approved ecological enhancement measures shall be retained for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: In the interests of maintaining and enhancing biodiversity, in accordance with Future Wales Policy 9.