



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 March 2026

by **Richard Gilbert BA (Hons) MSc MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 June 2026

Appeal Ref: 6000947

13 The Little Cottage, Rasen Road, Tealby, Market Rasen, Lincolnshire LN8 3XL

- 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 Tom Parkes & Oliva Clarke against the decision of West Lindsey District Council.
 - The application Ref is WL/2025/00511.
 - The development was originally described as “Proposed 1.5 storey side and rear extension to form car port, living area at ground floor with bedroom, bathroom and master bedroom at first floor with enclosed balcony.”
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a 1.5 storey side and rear extension to form car port, living area at ground floor with bedroom, bathroom and master bedroom at first floor at 13 The Little Cottage, Rasen Road, Tealby, Market Rasen, Lincolnshire LN8 3XL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref WL/2025/00511, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions listed below:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: 1551/001; 1551/002 Rev A; 1551/004 Rev A; 1551/005 Rev A
 3. Notwithstanding condition 2 which requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, no development shall take place until details of all external materials to be used in the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Procedural Matter

2. I have amended the description of development in my formal decision above to remove reference to an enclosed balcony which was not included in the plans which the Council considered in their determination of the application. I note that annotation referring to a balustrade remains on the elevation plan, however no such feature is shown on either the elevation drawings or floor plans.
3. The Council has cited Policy S54 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (2023) (CLLP) in its reason for refusal. However, as this policy relates to health and wellbeing, it is clear from the Officer Report that it has assessed the proposal against Policy S53. The appellants have referred to Policy S53 in their statement of

case and therefore I am satisfied that the Council's reference in their decision notice is a typing error.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the property and the surrounding area, including the setting of the Tealby Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property, 13 Rasen Road, is a stone and brick-built semi-detached dormer bungalow located at Rasen Road, a main route through the village. It forms one half of a pair of cottages, the other being 15 Rasen Road, which are set back from the highway by gardens and driveways. Despite the addition of flat-roof dormers, the pair have retained their symmetrical appearance. The character and appearance of Rasen Road, where the appeal site is located, is typified by 20th century residential development mostly in the form of dormer bungalows. Some two-storey stone cottages are located to the northeast, but these are largely screened from the appeal site by trees and hedging situated next to the telephone exchange. A public footpath (PRoW) traverses the fields to the south of the site.
6. The appeal proposal involves an extension to the side which would be set-back from the front elevation of the main house and incorporate a car port with office, living and bedroom accommodation above. The proposal would feature a clipped gable elevation with a recessed link connecting the main part of the extension to the dwelling. A flat roofed single storey element would project beyond the main rear elevation of the house into the rear garden. The proposal would occupy the gap between the host property and telephone exchange adjacent.
7. The location of the extension is typical of a side addition and is set-back substantially from the main façade, lessening its visual presence. The recessed link element, combined with the set-back of its principal elevation, would preserve the legibility and prominence of the host dwelling, resulting in a subservient, rather than over-dominant addition. Furthermore, the recessed link would enable the clipped-gable elevation to appear detached from the main dwelling, making it seem narrower and therefore diminishing the impression of its visual width.
8. The roof of the recessed link would attach to the side dormer towards the rear roof slope of the appeal dwelling. The front of that dormer would be retained alongside most of the roof. Therefore, when combined with the set-back of the extension, the shape and form of the original roof would not be interrupted from vantage points across the highway. The recessed link would produce a further visual separation between the extension and the pair of dwellings allowing their original balance to remain a defining characteristic. Consequently, although the extension would alter the symmetry shared between Nos.13 and 15, this change would not result in harm.
9. In terms of design, the extension would have a modern style, particularly in respect of its car port, fenestration and choice of materials, notably the contrasting slate tiles. Notwithstanding, the subservience of the extension relative to the host property would enable these characteristics to be viewed as positive and complimentary to No.13's appearance, not incongruous. Whilst I acknowledge that the extension's depth contributes to its bulk, the 1.5 storey element would terminate

at the existing depth of the host dwelling. This arrangement, in combination with its clipped gable roof, would minimise the impression of bulk and massing when viewed from vantage points across Rasen Road, the public footpath and Front Street further south.

10. The significance of the Tealby Conservation Area (TCA) is derived from its development as a medieval fortified village and subsequent evolution. It has an organic form concentrated along a spine. Where there has been more recent development it has been concentrated along Rasen Road and Cow Lane.
11. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that when considering the impacts of development on the significance of heritage assets, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The extension would not be particularly visible from the TCA due to the presence of intervening trees and hedges while, because of its positioning within the profile of the appeal property, it would not interrupt views eastward into the TCA. The views obtained across the pasture land and PRow towards the appeal site include only modern 20th century dwellings situated on the southern side of Rasen Road. I am therefore satisfied that the extension would not cause harm to the TCA from these vantage points. Consequently, the location and scale of the development, in combination with intervening boundary treatments, mean that it would not incur harm to the significance of the TCA.
12. The development is proposed within the Lincolnshire Wolds National Landscape. In arriving at my decision, I have had regard, and given great weight, to furthering the purpose of conserving and enhancing the landscape, scenic and natural beauty of this area of national importance. In so doing, I have taken into account the consultation response of the Lincolnshire Wolds Countryside Service who, alongside confirming the acceptability of the proposal as far as it relates to their remit, have offered advice in relation to the development's external material finish.
13. For the reasons set out above, the development would preserve the character and appearance of the area, as well as the setting of the TCA. Consequently, the development would not be in conflict with Policies S53 and S57 of the CLLP which seek to ensure development achieves high quality design that contributes positively to local character while also protecting the historic environment.

Conditions

14. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council against paragraph 57 of the Framework and the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance.
15. In the interests of certainty and clarity, I have imposed the standard conditions relating to the commencement of development as well as the approved plans. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, I have imposed a pre-commencement condition relating to the submission of all external materials as it is necessary for precise details to be agreed prior to development taking place.
16. A number of conditions relating to archaeology have been suggested, however given the location of the appeal site, I consider that they would not be proportionate to the scale and nature of the development and therefore would not be reasonable to impose.

17. I have considered the appellant's suggested conditions relating to tree protection and energy efficiency. However, I am satisfied that they are not necessary to impose in order to grant planning permission.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

Richard Gilbert

INSPECTOR