



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 September 2025

by Eleni Marshall BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J3720/D/25/3370394

Sandfields Barn, Luddington Road, Luddington, Warwickshire, CV37 9SW

- 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 Phil Maylin against the decision of Stratford-on-Avon Council.
 - The application reference is 25/00465/FUL.
 - The development proposed is flat roof extension to the front elevation and enlargement of existing window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a flat roof extension to the front elevation and enlargement of existing window at Sandfields Barn, Luddington Road, Luddington, Warwickshire, CV37 9SW in accordance with application ref: 25/00465/FUL and the plans submitted with it subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be commenced before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission;
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents: location plan PA 0484 A-001, proposed site plan PA 0484 A-200 1 and proposed drawings PA 0484 A-201 3;
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby approved shall match those as stated within the application form and on the approved plans. The materials will be maintained for the lifetime of the development, and any changes shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to any alterations on site;
 - 4) Prior to commencement of development a Climate Matrix/Checklist will be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.

Procedural Matters

2. This appeal is accompanied by an application for costs which is subject to a separate decision.
3. I have amended the description of the proposal to include the enlargement of the existing window as I find this more precisely describes the proposal. This element has clearly formed part of the Council's assessment and as is shown on the proposed elevations – this element does, therefore, reasonably form part of the proposals that are before me. The proposed site plan also contains provision for a concrete base for a garden shed to the front of the site. This does not form part of

the appeal proposal or development description and nor has it formed part of the Council's assessment of the proposal. For the avoidance of doubt this decision letter does not infer, directly or indirectly, permission for a garden shed or the concrete base as shown. Such matters should be the consideration of a separate application as appropriate to the Council.

4. At the time of my site visit it is noted that a shed stands in the proposed location of the extension. This is noted by the Council, however, whether the shed has planning permission, and its current positioning, is not determinative and is not within the scope of this appeal which I have considered on its own merits based upon my site visit and the evidence that is before me.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are the impact of the proposal upon i) the character and appearance of the existing building and ii) climate change.

Reasons

Character and appearance of the existing building

6. The appeal site is a converted agricultural building which stands within an open countryside setting surrounded by fields. The existing dwelling consists of what was two separate barns, linked by a stone wall, with the conversion being facilitated by the construction of a flat roof glazed link between the barns to provide a single residential dwelling which is now occupied on a residential basis. Since its original conversion there have been no further alterations to the host building and based upon the plans before me, and my site visit, the traditional character of the original barns has been retained despite the more modern flat roof glazed link between the barns to allow their conversion and subsequent occupation.
7. The proposal seeks to extend the existing dwelling in the form of a modern single storey extension, to the front elevation, to provide a new master bedroom. The proposal would project in the region of 6 metres beyond the front elevation and have a width in the region of 5.6 metres. The design of the extension would have a flat roof which would be seen from the entrance to the appeal site but its overall visibility beyond the appeal site boundary would be limited due to the surrounding site characteristics including the field hedgerow boundaries. At the time of my site visit I found that, in terms of existing visibility, it is realistically only the eaves upwards (i.e. the roof of the original two barns) which are visible within the immediate locality and wider setting. Despite this I acknowledge that character and appearance are two distinctive and separate matters.
8. The proposal would be wider than the existing barn and it would represent a notable extension, in spatial terms, in the context of the existing dwelling as well as altering the currently linear form of the building. Based upon the plans, the flat roof glazed link between the original barns houses (that is shown, on the floorplans, as the kitchen/diner) is clear in its subservience to the original buildings, matching the eave height, which has allowed it to successfully integrate and maintain the character and appearance of the original agricultural buildings. The proposed extension would carry design similarities to the existing link.
9. Whilst the extension, as would be seen from the side elevations, would exceed the width of the existing barn I find that the modern design, akin to the existing link,

would be appropriate in maintaining the character and appearance of the original barns. I find it would be clearly read as an extension which I do not find to be inappropriate for the appeal site. Protrusion above the eaves of the host building would be limited and insufficient to warrant refusal and I do not find that the proposal would mask such a significant proportion of the front elevation to prevent legibility of the host building itself as just over half of the front elevation of the existing original building would remain legible as a result of the proposals.

10. The description of the proposed works, as set out on the original application form and the decision notice, describes the proposal as a flat roof extension to the front elevation, however, from the plans the proposals also include enlargement of an existing window in the front elevation of the original building closest to the road. I acknowledge that the existing opening was part of the original barn and was retained at the time of conversion and whilst the proposed window would be of a more domestic appearance, I find that the change would be, overall, minor and insufficient to erode the character of the former barn. The simplicity of the front elevation, and the simple rural character of the original barns, now linked, would be retained with the link and proposed extensions contrasting sufficiently to ensure the original barns are clearly legible in the context of the character and appearance of the host building itself as well as the appeal site setting.
11. Overall, I find that the proposed extension, despite its scale, and as a result of its design would allow a sufficient proportion of the front elevation of the original barns to remain clearly legible and that the modern, contrasting design of the extension would retain the original rural character and simplicity of the originally converted barns within their open countryside setting as has been the case with the existing glazed link. The proposed enlarged window, whilst more domestic in appearance, I find to be a minor alteration which would not erode the character of the building sufficiently to warrant refusal. I do not find that the proposals would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or its wider setting.
12. The proposal would be consistent with Stratford on Avon Core Strategy 2011 – 2031 Policy CS.5 which seeks to ensure the rural character and local distinctiveness of the district is maintained and enhanced which is reinforced by Policy AS.10 which seeks to protect the countryside from inappropriate development. The proposal would also be consistent with Policy CS.9 which requires that proposals to be of a high-quality architectural design as well as being sensitive to the setting and existing built form as well as Policy CS.20 which confirms that alterations to existing dwellings, including proposed extensions, will be of an appropriate scale and subservience in relation to the existing building taking into account the sites location.
13. The proposal would also be consistent with the guidance contained within the Development Requirements Supplementary Planning Document Part G (Adopted 2018) (SPD) which sets out that extensions to traditional agricultural buildings will not normally be acceptable, however, it does allow for small outshoots or lean-to's in the traditional manner where necessary to link buildings. Whilst I acknowledge that the proposal would not, in terms of scale, be a small outshoot or lean-to I note that the overarching objectives of Part G is to ensure that the character and simplicity of former barns and their setting are retained and, for the reasons outlined above, I am satisfied that the design of the proposals would be appropriate. The traditional buildings, and their distinctive pitched roof forms,

are/would be a contrast to the existing link and proposed extension, and this would allow the original buildings to remain a dominant feature easily distinguishable in terms of their character from more modern alterations in this case.

Climate change

14. The Council's delegated report confirms that the Local Plan, and SPD, jointly seek to improve overall energy performance of buildings, where it is viable to do so and that this is generally assessed via submission of a Climate Matrix. A Climate Matrix was not submitted in support of the application; however, I note from the appellant's submission that this was not a validation requirement.
15. In the absence of a Climate Matrix the Council are of the opinion that it has not been demonstrated that any consideration has been given to the climate change adaptation and mitigation measures set out within the SPD (part v) relating to climate change. The delegated report is, however, clear that the Council are of the opinion that in the event planning permission was forthcoming they would have envisaged that it was possible to use a pre-commencement condition requesting a submission of a Climate Matrix to ensure compliance with the guidance of the SPD prior to commencement of any development approved.
16. On this basis I find that the proposal, subject to a suitably worded pre-commencement condition, would overcome the second stated reason for refusal and would be consistent with CS Policy CS.2 which requires that proposals for development will be required to demonstrate that, dependent on their scale, use and location, measures are included that mitigate and adapt to the impacts of climate change. The proposal would also be consistent with the Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation Measures set out in Part V of the SPD.

Conditions

17. The Council's questionnaire suggests three conditions in the event this appeal is allowed which I have considered as appropriate. A time condition is attached to comply with Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. A condition requiring the development to be in accordance with the approved plans is required to control and define the development which is granted consent.
18. A materials condition is required to ensure an appropriate finish in the interests of visual amenity. The Council's questionnaire suggests that the condition should require the materials in the extension, and amended window, to match those within the existing dwelling, however, as confirmed on the application form, whilst the walls, windows and doors are proposed to match the existing materials the roof is proposed as single ply membrane as opposed to plain clay tile. I have, therefore, amended the materials condition to require these to be in accordance with the details provided on the application form and approved plans to enable the appellant to construct the proposal as intended as per the basis for their submission.
19. Whilst not noted within the Council's questionnaire, as discussed above, the Council's delegated report considers that the second refusal reason could be overcome via a pre-commencement condition relating to the submission of a Climate Matrix prior to commencement of work on site. I have applied this condition to demonstrate that consideration has been given to climate change adaptation and mitigation measures as set out within the Local Plan and the guidance within the SPD. I consider that this is necessary as a pre-

commencement condition to allow any mitigation measures to be appropriately considered prior construction rather than on a more retrospective basis. The appellant's statement of case is clear in the invitation to apply/acceptance of a pre-commencement condition requiring submission and approval of a Climate Matrix (appendix 3 of the SPD) should the appeal be allowed.

Conclusion

20. For the reasons outlined above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions.

Eleni Marshall

INSPECTOR