



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 August 2025

By G Powys Jones MSc FRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J3720/D/25/3367612

East Side, Oversley Castle, Wixford, Alcester, B49 6DH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Leon field against the decision of Stratford-on-Avon District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00563/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension at East Side, Oversley Castle, Wixford, Alcester, B49 6DH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00563/FUL, subject to the conditions set out in the accompanying Schedule.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings, and the setting of neighbouring listed buildings.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a linked single storey dwelling. It is part of a residential development comprised of several dwellings formed from the conversion and/or rebuilding of former farm buildings¹ associated with the now demolished Oversley Castle, whose site is itself the subject of permission for an imposing dwelling. The complex stands in open countryside, being elevated above Wixford and the surrounding countryside to the south.
4. Regarding the host property, I find some discrepancies in the evidence. The building was formerly stables from which two small dwellings were formed, the appeal property being one. The extension would be attached to the rear, southern elevation. The Council says that the proposed extension would result in the loss of an historic opening in the southern elevation, and in diminishing the original rural character of the property.
5. However, the appellant has produced a plan, taken from the 2013 documentation, showing that the rear, southern elevation was built of solid materials, with no openings. The structural survey submitted with the 2013 applications confirms this

¹ Permissions Ref 13/01140/FUL and 13/01141/LBC

- and further provides that a substantial proportion of the rear wall had collapsed in 2013. The roof at the time was said to be comprised of corrugated fibre cement panels.
6. The permission granted by the Council in 2013 authorised the insertion of 4 large glazed openings in an original solid wall at the rear. There are therefore no historic openings to be lost as claimed by the Council, who permitted the introduction of timber cladding on the remaining surfaces of the rear elevation. The roof is now tiled.
 7. Most of what I could see, internally and externally, particularly to the rear, appeared to be the result of a rebuild rather than a conversion. The overall picture presented at the rear is of a modern building of a contemporary design and appearance. I am not for the moment suggesting that it is unattractive, but it is principally in its scale and shape that it pays any homage to the original building. I do not therefore share the Council's view that the original '*conversion*' retained what it describes as the traditional character of the original building.
 8. In these circumstances I consider the proposal, which I regard as a small-scale addition subservient to the host property, is of an appropriate and matching contemporary design. Although elevated above the countryside to the south, much of the development would be screened by the tall hedges growing on both side boundaries, albeit part of the westernmost hedge closest to the house would be lost.
 9. Otherwise, from those limited publicly accessible points where the development could possibly be seen, it would be viewed at a distance, being set against more prominent and more substantial development to the north. It would therefore be barely discernible on account of this factor and the proposed use of matching materials.
 10. There are three listed buildings in proximity to the appeal property, with the property known as Tudor Barn (*Grade II*) standing alongside. The other listed buildings (also *Grade II*) are sited to the west and north of the appeal property respectively being a former barn and byre, now converted into dwellings.
 11. The extension would not be discernible from points to the front of the appeal property from where the three listed buildings are seen together in their visual and spatial contexts, and are most appreciated. The proposed extension, at the rear of the appeal property, would have no discernible effect on the Byre or The Fold Yard's settings. Since it is situated alongside Tudor Barn, there would be a limited effect on the latter's setting but it would be minimal and insufficient to cause harm.
 12. I note that in 2021 the Council approved a larger rear extension than proposed here to the nearby property known as The Pool House, which stands alongside The Fold Yard. In that case, the Council did not consider that the setting of any of the same listed buildings was materially affected, and I take a similar view in this case.
 13. I therefore conclude that the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings would be acceptable, and its impact would not prove harmful to the setting of the listed buildings in the vicinity of the site. The proposal is therefore compliant with the relevant aspects of the development plan's policies, being CS.5, CS.8, CS.9 and CS.20 of the adopted

Core Strategy and policies HBE.8 & HBE.10 of the Alcester Neighbourhood Development Plan. Accordingly, the appeal succeeds.

Conditions

14. In the interests of certainty, it is important that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, and a condition to this effect is imposed.
15. The Council's suggested standard condition on materials is also imposed in the interests of visual amenity.

Other matters

16. I have taken account of all other matters raised in the representations, including the references to the National Planning Policy Framework and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document entitled Development Requirements (SPD) and the User Guide for Householder Development. In view of the Council's heavy reliance on it, I took careful note of the guidance provided in part G of the SPD, but having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case I do not consider that the almost blanket opposition to extensions therein to be justified here. No other matter raised is of such strength or significance as to outweigh those considerations that led me to my conclusions.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawings Ref 680/001; 680/002; 680/003; 680/004 & 680/005.
- 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.