Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2026

by F P Tinsley MA (Hons) MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd March 2026

Appeal Ref: 6001125
14 Halmer Paddock, Spalding, Lincolnshire PE11 2HF

- 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 & Mrs Phil Ingleby against the decision of South Holland District Council.
- The application reference is Ref: H16-0332-25
- The development proposed is 'proposed extensions and alterations to dwelling and outbuilding

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for proposed extensions and alterations to dwelling and outbuilding at 14 Halmer Paddock, Spalding, Lincolnshire PE11 2HF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref H16-0332-25, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:

   1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

   2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: A1693-08 Rev P2 - Site Location Plan & Block Plan as proposed; A1693-10 Rev P5 - Elevations as Proposed; A1693-09 Rev P3 - Floor Plans as Proposed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, particularly the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within a mixed residential area on the outskirts of Spalding. The surrounding townscape is characterised by a combination of traditional detached and semi-detached two-storey houses, which primarily front onto Queens Road, and bungalows, which form the predominant built form along Halmer Paddock. Buildings within the locality span a range of architectural periods, largely dating from the twentieth century, and include examples of dwellings from across that era. Correspondingly, there is no prevailing or uniform architectural style.

4. There is no defining building line on the eastern side of Queens Road. Similarly, along Halmer Paddock the building line is not strongly established, with dwellings typically set back within their plots behind front gardens and driveways.

5. The appeal site itself comprises a large, prominent, detached, double-fronted dwelling dating from the early twentieth century, positioned at the junction of Queens Road and Halmer Paddock. The existing property is a substantial red-brick house featuring cream-coloured window frames and two bay windows to the principal elevation. A single-storey mono-pitch extension is present to the rear. A two-storey outbuilding, incorporating an open garage at ground level, is also situated to the rear of the main dwelling.

6. The appeal proposal seeks planning permission for a series of extensions and alterations comprising three main elements. First, a northern side extension would project approximately 2.5 metres from the existing rear single-storey component towards Halmer Paddock. This extension would be constructed in brickwork matching the host dwelling, including detailing along the eaves. Second, a rear extension would span the full width of the property between the existing single-storey section and the garage. This element would be finished in timber cladding and would incorporate a roof lantern. Finally, projecting from both the rear extension and the garage, the southern side extension would feature a flat roof and incorporate extensive glazing, including on the elevation facing Queens Road.

7. Policy 2 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011–2036 (the Local Plan) is supported by explanatory text emphasising that extensions must be carefully designed to respect and relate to the original building and integrate sensitively with the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The appellant has adopted a contrasting design approach for the different elements of the proposal, in an attempt to ensure each component is appropriate to its context while collectively achieving a cohesive overall scheme and partly as a result of feedback from the Council at the planning application stage.

8. The northern extension would be the most visually prominent component of the proposal, as it would extend beyond the existing gable line of the dwelling. However, following consultation with the Council, the appellant proposes that this element be constructed using traditional brickwork and materials that match the host property. Its design incorporates sympathetic, traditional detailing and would replace what is currently a large, plain gable with limited architectural interest. Importantly, the extension would remain single-storey in scale, would be set back from the front elevation of the dwelling, and would be positioned within the existing garden, which benefits from mature boundary vegetation. The extension would remain clearly subordinate to the main dwelling and sympathetic to its overall design. As a result, it would appear respectful of the character and appearance of the area and would not create an undue sense of enclosure at the entrance to Halmer Paddock.

9. While the extension would project forward of the existing gable, which itself lies forward of the bungalows along the southern side of Halmer Paddock, these dwellings do not display a consistent building line. Instead, there is a clear stepping back of the building line that follows the slight curvature of the road within Halmer Paddock when viewed from Queens Road and several of the dwellings incorporate significant forward projections. I am therefore content that the proposal would not appear harmful in this respect.

10. The rear single-storey extension would be largely unobservable from the surrounding area and would therefore have a negligible effect on the character and appearance of the locality. Both this rear element and the more prominent

southern side extension, incorporating extensive glazing, adopt a design approach that intentionally contrasts with that of the host dwelling. These components employ a more contemporary architectural style, together with a modern palette of materials and finishes. While the Council considers this approach to be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, I am persuaded that the resulting development would be acceptable. In reaching this view, I am satisfied that, in this context, the use of contrasting additions provides a design solution that best highlights the original form of the host dwelling and clearly distinguishes the dwelling and outbuilding from the new elements. The development would not appear incongruous but would instead form a composition that is appropriate within the mixed character of the area. In this regard, I consider that the proposal respects the original building and has been sensitively conceived. This represents an instance where a contrasting design approach offers an appropriate and effective design solution.

11. In reaching this conclusion, I have also noted that the rear and southern side extensions would be less prominent within the streetscape to such an extent that that level of visibility would have a negligible impact upon the character and appearance of the area. They would remain clearly subordinate to the original house and outbuilding, and the contrasting design approach would in fact reinforce this hierarchical relationship.

12. While the three elements together would result in a notable increase in the building's overall footprint, I am satisfied that, given the variety of dwelling sizes in the area, particularly along the eastern side of Queens Road, this would be acceptable. In reaching this conclusion, I have also taken into account that a substantial proportion of the existing garden area surrounding the property would be retained in essentially its current form, even with the incorporation of the extensions. As a result, the extensions would not appear visually excessive in terms of massing, and the overall sense of openness within the area would be preserved.

13. For the reasons given, I conclude that the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, particularly the street scene. Accordingly, it would not conflict with Policy 2 or Policy 3 of the Local Plan, which among other things require that extensions must be carefully designed to respect and relate to the original building and integrate sensitively with the character and appearance of the surrounding area. In reaching this conclusion I have also had regard to the provisions of the National Design Guide (2019) which recognises that well designed places contribute to local distinctiveness and that they should be influenced by an appreciation and understanding of vernacular, local or regional character including existing built form.

Conditions

14. The Council has not provided any suggested conditions that it considers necessary in the event that this appeal is allowed. I have therefore included two conditions, imposed with regard to the tests set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. For clarity, a condition is required to specify the timescale for the implementation of the permission, and a further condition is necessary to identify the approved drawings.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is allowed.

F P Tinsley
INSPECTOR