Statement of Appeal Against Refusal of Planning Permission for the Extension of Domestic Curtilage at Ladypud Lodge, Lowgate, Fleet

Appeal Statement H05-0102-26

I respectfully appeal the decision of South Holland District Council to refuse planning permission for the extension of the domestic curtilage at Ladypud Lodge dated 12.5.26..

The Council's sole reason for refusal is that it considers there is no demonstrated need for the extension and no wider benefit to justify the proposal under Policy 1 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan. I respectfully disagree with this conclusion.

Ladypud Lodge was originally occupied by [redacted]. The property was entirely suitable for their needs at the time. Following [redacted], the property will become my family home.

The intention is for the property to accommodate further generations of the family: myself, my wife and my adult son. As our family circumstances have changed, the existing bungalow is no longer adequate in its current form. Additional living accommodation is required to enable the property to continue serving as a suitable long-term family home.

The proposed extension of the domestic curtilage is therefore not speculative or intended simply to enlarge the residential plot. It is required to facilitate a future extension to the dwelling so that it can meet the genuine housing needs of my family. The existing curtilage is limited and unusually configured, restricting the practical opportunities to extend the dwelling while retaining adequate private amenity space.

The Council's report states that no evidence was provided explaining why the existing curtilage is inadequate. I respectfully submit that this appeal provides that explanation. The circumstances of the property have fundamentally changed since it was occupied by my elderly parents. A bungalow suitable for two elderly occupants is no longer adequate for a two-generation household.

The Council also refers to the loss of agricultural land. However, the area proposed for incorporation into the domestic curtilage represents only a very small part of a much larger parcel of land that has always been in the same ownership as Ladypud Lodge. The bungalow and the adjoining agricultural land have historically formed a single ownership, and the proposal does not involve the acquisition or fragmentation of a separate agricultural holding. Rather, it represents a modest adjustment to the existing residential curtilage within land already associated with the property.

The remaining land would continue to be available for agricultural use, and the small area proposed for the curtilage extension would have no material effect on the viability, productivity or management of the wider landholding. Furthermore, the Council itself acknowledges that the land does not appear to be actively farmed and has remained fallow for several years. Consequently, there is no evidence that the proposal would result in any meaningful economic harm or loss of agricultural production.

Importantly, the Council accepts within its own report that:

- the proposal would have no adverse impact on the character or appearance of the countryside;
- there would be no harm to neighbouring residential amenity;
- there would be no highway safety concerns;
- there are no ecological or archaeological objections;
- no statutory consultees objected to the proposal; and
- no representations were received from neighbouring residents.

These conclusions demonstrate that the proposal gives rise to no identifiable planning harm.

The proposal represents a modest and logical extension of the existing residential curtilage. It would enable the property to evolve to meet our changing family circumstances without creating a new dwelling or introducing inappropriate development into the countryside.

While the Council concludes that there are no public benefits, the proposal would deliver a genuine social benefit by allowing an existing rural dwelling to adapt to meet the changing needs of an established local family. This represents the sustainable use of the existing housing stock and avoids the need to seek additional residential development elsewhere.

Taking all of these matters into account, I respectfully submit that the proposal causes no demonstrable planning harm and that the Council has attached insufficient weight to the genuine need arising from the change in the occupation of the property, together with the negligible impact on the wider agricultural landholding.

The proposal is not an isolated encroachment into the countryside but a modest rationalisation of the residential curtilage within land that has always been held in common ownership with the dwelling. It would enable the property to meet the changing needs of our family without giving rise to any identifiable planning harm.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Planning Inspector allows this appeal and grants planning permission.

Mr S Congreve