



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 October 2025

by **Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A2525/D/25/3372366

Markenville, 17 Broadgate Road, Sutton St James, Spalding, PE12 0EL

- 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 A Coupe and Miss Z Roberts against the decision of South Holland District Council.
 - The application Ref is H20-0417-25.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of conservatory and erection of single-storey front and side extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellants' agent states that an amended proposal for a different design was submitted to the Council. However, that proposal was not determined by the Council, nor have I been furnished with any amended plans. Notwithstanding, the appeal process should not be used as a mechanism for amending proposals and, therefore, I have determined this appeal based on the plans that were determined by the Council.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a single-storey bungalow, which is situated within a row of ribbon development that fronts Broadgate Road. Other properties along Broadgate Road vary in terms of their age, scale and appearance and some have been altered and extended since they were originally built.
5. The proposal is to demolish an existing and relatively small conservatory at the front of the property and construct flat-roofed single-storey front and side extensions. The extensions would provide two additional bedrooms, a bathroom and an enlarged garage. I have no doubt that the extensions would enhance living conditions within the property for the appellants.
6. The Council considers that the design of the proposal is 'poor' and that the development would have a negative impact on the character and appearance of the area. As such, the Council states that it would conflict with Policies 1, 2, and 3 of

the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2019 (LP). Of these, I consider Policies 2 and 3 to be the most relevant, as they require (amongst other things) for development to have regard to the character and appearance of the area and the design to be of a high quality that would improve the quality of an area. These policies accord with paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (NPPF), which contains similar provisions.

7. The appellants state that the proposed side extensions could be constructed as Permitted Development. Whilst that may be the case, my main concern is the design and appearance of the front extension. Although it would be positioned some 7m from the highway, it would be highly visible from Broadgate Road, and its box-like appearance would appear incongruous and detrimental to the appearance of both the appeal dwelling and the streetscene. In my opinion, a front extension of a different design could be acceptable, but this would require further discussion with the Council. As submitted however, the proposal would conflict with the provisions of both the LP and the NPPF, as referred to above.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR