
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 May 2026

by **L Fern BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 June 2026

Appeal Ref: 6006285

4 Daniels Gate, Long Sutton, Spalding, Lincolnshire PE12 9DP

- 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 and Mrs Lockyer against the decision of South Holland District Council.
 - The application Ref is H11-1009-25.
 - The development proposed is sunroom extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. No 4 Daniels Gate (No 4) is a semi-detached residential property located on a prominent corner plot. Despite the installation of a pergola, its front elevational design is simple, a characteristic that is shared with its adjoining neighbour and other semi-detached properties along this side of Daniels Gate. They all originate from a similar era, which together with their largely symmetrical form, provides unity within the street scene. The front boundary to the plot is dominated by a tall hedge.
4. The proposal is for a single storey front facing sunroom that would stretch across most of the property's width and would be substantial in depth.
5. The introduction of a significant amount and depth of built form, forward of the principal elevation of the property, would be at significant odds with its neighbour and other similar examples along Daniels Gate. It would therefore be an incongruous and overly dominant addition to the front of the property.
6. Whilst the plot is currently bound by a substantial front hedgerow boundary that largely precludes views into the site from Daniels Gate, the retention and ongoing maintenance of such a feature could not be secured in perpetuity. Therefore, existing or proposed soft landscaping features would not provide effective and enduring mitigation against the harm found.
7. References have been made to approvals¹ for forward projecting extensions to both No 4 and neighbouring properties. However, specific details and plans have not been provided, and it is therefore unclear whether they are comparable to the

¹ Council Refs H10-0536-25 and H16-0071-25.

current scheme. Nevertheless, this case has been decided on its own planning merits.

8. For the above reasons, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Thus, it would be contrary to Policies 2 and 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019), which, amongst other things, require development to be of high-quality design, which is appropriate to, and maximises opportunities for improving, the character and appearance of the local area.

Other Matters

9. The absence of harm found relating to the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring residents is not a benefit but a neutral matter in the planning balance.

Conclusion

10. The proposal conflicts with the development plan, and material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Thus, the appeal is dismissed.

L Fern

INSPECTOR