
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 July 2026

by K Williams MTCP (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 August 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/N2535/D/25/3373715

Primrose Cottage, Snelland Road, Wickenby, Lincolnshire LN3 5AB

- 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 Ian Round against the decision of West Lindsey District Council.
 - The application Ref is WL/2025/00454.
 - The development proposed is described as 'demolition single storey porch/kitchen/bathroom erection side extension forming living room/kitchen bedroom/ensuite/bathroom. Relocate solar panels. Change to existing windows.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The site visit was conducted on an unaccompanied basis as the appellant was not present. The appellant was subsequently given an opportunity to comment on the circumstances of the visit. During the visit, I was able to make the necessary observations of the site and its surroundings.
3. A new National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 17 August 2026. However, I am satisfied that the policy approach relevant to this appeal has not fundamentally changed and that no party has been prejudiced by its publication. Accordingly, I have had regard to the current version of the Framework in reaching my decision.

Main Issues

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property forms one half of a pair of semi-detached cottages. It is characterised by a simple and compact form, comprising a straightforward pitched roof, modest proportions and a restrained arrangement of openings and single storey additions. The dwelling derives much of its character from this simplicity and from its relationship with the adjoining cottage, which, despite having been extended, retains a broadly consistent form and appearance such that they continue to read as a coherent diminutive pair.
6. The site occupies a prominent position fronting Snelland Road within a rural area. Whilst there are other rural buildings and outbuildings in the vicinity, the appeal property and its adjoining cottage stand relatively isolated and are therefore readily

perceived as a distinct pair of dwellings within the surrounding landscape. The rear of the site is largely screened from public view by the existing building and boundary treatments. However, the front and side elevations are highly visible from Snelland Road and therefore play a significant role in how the development is experienced within the street scene.

7. The proposal incorporates a substantial set-back from the principal elevation and a ridge height lower than that of the original dwelling. Whilst these measures assist in distinguishing the extension from the host building and provide a degree of subordination, the extension would nevertheless be almost twice the width of Primrose Cottage. Consequently, it would appear disproportionate in relation to the existing dwelling, reducing the visual primacy of the original cottage within the pair.
8. The existing cottage and adjoining dwelling are characterised by traditional pitched roofs which create a balanced and harmonious composition. Whilst I acknowledge the appellant's intention that the hipped roof should distinguish the extension from the original dwelling; it would introduce a competing roof form that neither reflects nor successfully contrasts with the simple traditional form of the cottages. I saw no evidence that such a design approach is characteristic of, or commonly found within, the surrounding area. As a result, the proposal would disrupt the visual balance of the semi-detached pair and, when combined with the extensive unrelieved upper front elevation and substantial roof mass, would appear visually dominant and incongruous.
9. Whilst the proposal incorporates positive design features, including dog-tooth brickwork and matching external materials, these would not outweigh the harm arising from its overall form, scale and design. The extension would appear as a dominant and visually intrusive addition that would erode the character of the original cottage and unbalance the established relationship between the semi-detached dwellings. Due to the prominence of the front elevation and the site's close relationship with the road, the resulting harm would be highly visible within the public realm.
10. Taken together, the scale, massing and roof design would alter the dwelling from a simple and compact cottage into a substantially broader and more visually assertive building. Whilst the adjoining property has been extended, that addition remains relatively modest in scale and subordinate to the original dwelling, such that the pair continues to be read as a coherent group.
11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy S53 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan, which seeks, amongst other things, to ensure development responds positively to local character and distinctiveness, achieves an appropriate scale, massing and design, and integrates successfully with its surroundings. It would also conflict with the Framework's policies for achieving well-designed places, which require development to respond to local character and context and integrate successfully with its surroundings.

Other Considerations

12. I have had regard to the appellant's arguments regarding improved accessibility, and the provision of accommodation capable of meeting future family needs. These would provide benefits to the occupiers of the property. However, there is

insufficient evidence before me to demonstrate the need or that improved accessibility could not be achieved through a less harmful design solution. Accordingly, these only attract limited weight.

13. The appellant contends that the proposal would reduce energy consumption, facilitate the future installation of solar panels and a heat pump, and improve the dwelling's resilience to climate change. Whilst I acknowledge these aspirations, and Policy support, there is limited information before me regarding the precise nature, extent or effectiveness of the measures proposed. As such, I am unable to make a meaningful assessment of the degree of environmental benefit that would result and can therefore attach only limited weight to these considerations.
14. I note that no substantive concerns have been raised regarding neighbouring living conditions, biodiversity, landscaping, highway safety or parking provision, and I have no reason to disagree with the Council's findings on those matters. However, these are matters that development would ordinarily be expected to address satisfactorily. As such, they weigh neither for nor against the development.

Other Matters

15. The appellant has raised concerns regarding the Council's handling of the application and the lack of opportunity to amend the proposal prior to determination. Whilst I note those concerns, the appeal before me falls to be determined on the basis of the proposal that was before the Council when it refused planning permission. Furthermore, the manner in which the application was processed is not a matter that materially affects the planning merits.

Conclusion

16. Taken together, the benefits of the scheme are insufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.
17. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Williams

INSPECTOR