[09.] Full Planning Permission

S/153/00040/25 **APPLICANT:** Mr & Mrs. P. Cunliffe,

VALID: 15/01/2025 **AGENT:** Bella King Design,

PROPOSAL: Planning Permission - Extension to existing dwelling to provide additional living accommodation and installation of a flue to the maximum height of 4.6 metres.

LOCATION: 350 DRUMMOND ROAD, SKEGNESS

1.0 REASONS FOR COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

1.1 This application is presented to the Planning Committee on the basis of the finely balanced issues and following concerns and requests by Councillors Edgington.

2.0 THE SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

2.1 The application site lies on the southeastern side of the town of Skegness and is within Flood Zone 3 – High Risk and the Coastal Hazard Zone. The site comprises of one half of a pair of semi-detached houses with the part subject to this application being a corner plot on the junction of Drummond Road and Fredrica Road. The house is moderately sized with a uPVC conservatory on the rear. The property's amenity space spreads from the north at the side round to the rear facing west. There is a detached outbuilding and a detached single garage (accessed from Fredrica Road) positioned along the western boundary.

3.0 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL

3.1 The application seeks planning permission for an extension to the existing dwelling to provide additional living accommodation and installation of a flue to the maximum height of 4.6 metres.

3.2 The proposals include the removal of the existing uPVC conservatory on the rear to be replaced with a single storey extension which would link through to the existing outbuilding providing an annexe. A vertical flue is also included to the height of 4.6 metres serving a wood burner. The application detail as presented to the committee is a negotiated amendment to that originally submitted.

4.0 CONSULTATION

4.1 Set out below are the consultation responses that have been received on this application. These responses may be summarised, and full copies are available for inspection separately. Some of the comments made may not constitute material planning considerations.

Publicity

4.2 The application has been advertised by means of a press notice and site notice and neighbours have been notified in writing.

Consultees

4.3 SKEGNESS TOWN COUNCIL - Objection on the grounds of overbearing and overdevelopment of site.

Neighbours

4.4 1 letter of objection received on the grounds of extension being overbearing and oppressive in terms of height.

4.5 **Second round of consultations carried out on amendments to roof pitch and height.**

4.6 1 detailed letter of objection received raising concerns that the extension would be overbearing and oppressive in terms of height.

4.7 The Ward Councillor is aware of the application via the Weekly List.

5.0 RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

5.1 None.

6.0 PLANNING POLICY

6.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that planning applications are determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Development Plan comprises of the East Lindsey Local Plan (adopted 2018), including the Core Strategy and the Settlement Proposals Development Plan Document; and any made Neighbourhood Plans. The Government's National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a material consideration.

East Lindsey Local Plan

SP10 – Design
SP17 – Coastal East Lindsey

Skegness Neighbourhoood Plan:

Policy D1

National Planning Policy Framework

Background Documents

Planning Practice Guidance

7.0 OFFICER ASSESSMENT OF THE PROPOSAL

Main Planning Issues

7.1 The main planning issues in this case are considered to be:

- **Impact on the character of the area**
- **Impact on amenity**
- **Flood risk**

Impact on the character of the area

7.2 SP10 of the Council's Local Plan relates to the design of new development. It sets out criteria by which the Council will support well-designed sustainable development which maintains and enhances the character of the district's towns, villages and countryside. This advice is effectively reiterated in the National Planning Policy Framework in paragraphs 135 and within Policy D1 of the Skegness Neighbourhood Plan.

7.3 The proposed extension and flue are to the rear of the dwelling but can be seen when travelling south along Drummond Road and from public views on Fredrica Road.

7.4 The scale of the extension is considered appropriate for the size of the host dwelling and its curtilage, bridging the gap between the outbuilding and dwelling.

7.5 The submitted application form states the materials to be used will match the existing allowing the extension to be read as more of the same. The use of such materials is considered acceptable.

7.6 The northern boundary to the site consists of an established hedge approximately 1.5 metres.

7.7 The extension would be 'recessed' into the site and largely screened by the existing hedge allowing the extension to be viewed in the context of the existing built form.

7.8 Consequently, whilst there would be views of the extension and flue from the public realm, they are not considered to cause undue harm to the character of the immediate or wider area.

Impact on amenity

7.9 The proposed extension would be flush with the western boundary between the neighbouring semi-detached dwelling and would protrude 9.6 metres out towards the rear with a width of 4 metres.

7.10 As a consequence of negotiation, the roof and form of the extension has been amended providing a hipped roof with a maximum height to ridge line of 3.6 metres. It should be noted that the land slopes down towards the north, but the ridge height remains the same.

7.11 The proposal would see the pitched roof of the existing outbuilding removed on the applicant's side to be replaced with a flat roof and the installation of 3no. roof lights on the north and south roof slopes.

7.12 However, as a consequence of the close relationship between the proposed extension and the neighbouring dwelling, it is accepted that there would be impact on the amenities of the neighbouring property in terms of outlook as a result of the proposals. More specifically, the extension would present itself along the full length of the boundary between the two with concern that it would be unneighbourly by reason of its scale and form.

7.13 However, the scheme detail as amended and now being considered provides for a hipped roof to the extension and the introduction of a flat roof over the outbuilding with the aim of reducing impact and providing a degree of visual relief to to the outlook from the neighbouring property.

7.14 It is the acceptability of this impact that requires careful consideration as a finely balanced judgement. In that respect, your officer assessment is to acknowledge that the extension would impact on the outlook from the neighbouring dwelling, but not to a degree that would be unduly unneighbourly or oppressive. In reaching that opinion consideration has been given to the existing situation where there is already a fence along the boundary of the properties. Although the application proposal would result in an increase in that boundary height, it would not be of a scale that substantially altered the nature of impact. Furthermore, as a development to the north, the proposal would not result in any overshadowing or issues of overlooking. It is therefore considered that 'on balance' the level of impact on amenity of the neighbouring property would not be unduly harmful or significant enough to warrant a refusal of planning permission.

Flood risk

7.15 SP17 of the Council's Local Plan includes Skegness within its Coastal Policy and states at Clause 5 that relevant development will need to provide adequate flood mitigation. The NPPF discusses flood risk and requires Flood Risk Assessments for development within Flood Zone 3, however, states that householder development should not be subject to the sequential and

exception test but should still meet the requirements for site specific Flood Risk Assessments.

7.16 In this case a brief but proportionate Flood Risk Assessment has been submitted stating that the land levels are to remain the same which is acceptable.

8.0 CONCLUSION

8.1 The proposed extension represents an honest addition to the rear of the existing dwelling. Whilst it is prominent to the neighbouring property to the south, given the amendments to the roof profile it is not considered to cause unacceptable harm to the amenities of this neighbour.

8.2 This conclusion has been arrived at having taken into account all other relevant material considerations, none of which outweigh the reasons for the officer recommendation made below.

10.0 OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

Grant permission subject to the following conditions:

Grant permission subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
   Reason: As required by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings and other documents and any drawings approved subsequently in writing by the local planning authority pursuant to any conditions on this decision letter.
   Plan no. 4635-01 Received by the LPA 10.01.2025.
   Plan no. 4635-02 Received by the LPA 10.01.2025.
   Plan no. 4365-04C Received by the LPA 10.01.2025.
   Plan no. 4365-06E Received by the LPA 10.01.2025.

   Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

   Reason: In the interests of the character and appearance of the development and the visual amenity of the area in which it is set. This condition is imposed in accordance with SP10 of the East Lindsey Local Plan and paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework.