DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application No:** | **H09-1116-18** | **Applicant:** | **Mr & Mrs Biggs** |
| **Proposal:** | Lean-to garage extension to side - re-submission of H09-0349-18 | | |
| **Location:** | 105 Farrow Avenue Holbeach Spalding | | |
| **Terminal Date:** | 1st January 2019 | | |

**Planning Policies**

**Local Plan July 2016:**

| | |
|---|---|
| SG14 | Design and Layout of New Development |
| SG20 | Extensions and Alterations to Existing Buildings |

**National Guidance**

**National Planning Policy Framework 2018**

Section 12. Achieving well-designed places

**Representations:**

| | Object | Support | No Obj. | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| PARISH COUNCIL | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| WARD MEMBER | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

This is a resubmission of householder planning application ref. H09-0349-18 which obtained planning permission for lean-to garage extension to side at 105 Farrow Avenue, Holbeach, Spalding.

The main changes submitted in the planning application hereby assessed are alterations in dimensions and internal layout and replacement of external materials.

Whilst the proposed extension would be reduced by 75.9 centimetres in depth, its width would be increased by 91 millimetres. The footprint of the proposal would remain immediately adjacent to the side boundary fence on the edge of the cul-de-sac street end. Such material increase though is marginal, thus the extension would remain subservient to the dwelling. The internal layout shows no partition wall which is considered acceptable.

The brickwork in walls would be replaced for concrete sectional panels. Metal sheet as roof would be provided instead of tiles. The former materials were further keeping with those existing in the host property.

The proposed materials would adversely alter the appearance of the building and adjoining development or the character of the area where brickwork and roof tiles are the most characteristic features. The appearance of concrete material and metal sheet would downgrade the standards of good design of the proposed extension. Alternative materials could be further sympathetic with the visual amenity of the dwelling and surroundings. Although due to the boundary treatment the visual impact to the street scene is negligible, the appearance could be seen from the rear garden and partially from the front elevation.

Holbeach Parish Council has stated no objection to the proposal. No more representation has been made.

In light of considerations above, the proposed development is contrary with Policy SG14 and SG20 of South Holland Local Plan (2006) as well as Section 12 of National Planning Policy Framework (2018).

It is accordingly recommended to refuse this planning application via delegated decision.