



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 June 2026

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 June 2026

Appeal Ref: 6007885

20 Broadgate, Sutton St Edmund, Spalding, PE12 0LT

- 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 Ecuyer against the decision of South Holland District Council.
 - The application Ref is H19-1200-25.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the building and the area and on the significance of the building as a non-designated heritage asset.

Reasons

3. 20 Broadgate forms part of a building sited in a rural location of scattered dwellings of a variety of ages and styles, in open countryside. It was previously a holiday let converted from an agricultural barn that is likely to have served the adjacent former farmhouse, now a separate dwelling. The building is listed under building record MLI124086 within the Lincolnshire Heritage Explorer as an 'Unnamed Farmstead' which the Council has said functions as the publicly available database of the Lincolnshire Historic Environmental Record (LHER). The listing relates to the cataloguing of the building under the English Heritage Farmsteads Project, which documented historic farmsteads throughout Greater Lincolnshire and suggests that the site holds some historic value as a part of a former C19th farmstead. It shows that it formed part of a loose courtyard with three sides of the courtyard being formed by working agricultural buildings, with more than 50% of those remaining. The documents supporting this cataloguing (Greater Lincolnshire Farmstead Character Statement and The Greater Lincolnshire Farmstead Assessment Framework) both outline the importance of these assets to the cultural and architectural history of Lincolnshire. I agree, therefore, with the Council that the site could be considered as a non-designated heritage asset.
4. The building has a traditional linear form with a pitched roof of two different ridge heights and is positioned with its gable end to the road. It has been previously extended with a gabled roof on its southern side elevation which has partially obscured the original features on that side. This proposal is for an extension on the opposite, northern elevation which would provide a second living room and a

hallway for the modestly sized, one bedroom property. This elevation is little altered and retains its three original openings. Thus, despite the annexing of the building from the main farmhouse and the presence of the existing extension, this elevation contributes strongly to its cultural and architectural significance. The siting of an extension on this elevation would disrupt its existing linear form and would undermine its significance. The proposal would be accessed from the existing accommodation by one of the original openings but the siting of the extension would obscure this opening from view externally. Another existing opening would be partially bricked up externally. Those openings would therefore be significantly diminished and that would fundamentally harm the character and appearance of the building on this elevation.

5. The proposal would have a gabled roof with its gable end facing the road and at 90° to the main pitched roof. As such, it would appear almost as a separate rather than a related addition and its form would fail to integrate satisfactorily with the existing form of the original building. The height of the ridge would be only very slightly below that of the main ridge and the width of the gable end would be only slightly less than that of the gable end in the existing extension. The proposal would therefore fail to be sufficiently subordinate in terms of size and scale to the main building and would appear overly dominant. This would be exacerbated by the proposed cathedral style window in the upper part of the gable end. Cathedral windows are a feature of cathedrals, not agricultural buildings and that detail would therefore be incongruous in this building.
6. Whilst the extension would be set back by a few metres from the road, it would be clearly seen in public views in the approach from the north along this long, straight road as well as from outside the site and in private views from the dwelling opposite. Its uncharacteristic appearance would detract from the rural character of the area.
7. No public benefits have been put forward by the appellant that might be balanced against the harm I have found. Although it would provide enlarged accommodation for the occupants, that would be a private benefit that does not outweigh the wider harm identified.
8. I conclude then that this is a poorly designed proposal, that by reason of its siting, form, scale, size and detail, would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the building and the area and to the significance of the building as an undesignated heritage asset. As such, it would be contrary to development plan policies 2,3 and 29 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 (adopted 2019) which together seek to ensure that proposals take into account considerations such as quality of design, size, scale and impact on the character and appearance of the area and conserve and enhance the significance of non-designated heritage assets.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed development would be contrary to the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that. The appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

INSPECTOR