



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 April 2025

by **J Smith MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R2330/W/25/3358656

29 Limefield Street, Accrington, Lancashire BB5 2AF

- 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 Plumbserve against the decision of Hyndburn Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 11/24/0344.
 - The development proposed is erection of single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development found on the decision notice is different to that given on the application form. Due to the use of an abbreviation on the application form description, for a reason of clarity, I have utilised the description provided on the decision notice.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal to the character and appearance of the existing building and the wider environment.

Reasons

4. No. 29 Limefield Street is an end terraced property located on a corner plot at the junction with Beaconsfield Street. The ground floor of the premises is utilised as a shop and therefore, it has a different appearance to the properties within the immediate vicinity. The proposed development would be located to the rear yard of this property. A tall wall runs from the rear of No. 29 to the end of the rear yard. This structure is a defining feature of the property boundary and is not unexpected in this environment. The property is constructed from stone except for a pebbledash material to the rear elevation.
5. Turning to the immediate surrounding area, properties take the form of terraced housing. They are constructed from stone with rendered rear elevations, similarly to the building subject to this appeal. The row of terraces to which the appeal property is attached to predominantly host single storey outriggers. These are of a similar depth to the two-storey rear outrigger found at the appeal property.
6. The proposed development would extend from the rear wall of No. 29 with a significant protrusion into the rear yard area. As such, the proposed length of this extension would appear significantly disproportionate to the host building and its small rear yard. Furthermore, this extension would be much taller than the existing boundary wall which runs along Beaconsfield Street. Therefore, this extension

would appear as a significantly large structure overall due to its height, close proximity to the street scene and proposed length into the rear yard when viewed from Beaconsfield Street. It would fail to maintain local distinctiveness, would not respond to the overall pattern of development and it would not be of an appropriate scale and size to its surroundings. The use of stone in the construction of certain elevations would not overcome this harm.

7. It is contended that a smaller scheme at 6 metres could be constructed through the utilisation of permitted development rights for householders. Schemes of this size and through this utilisation of permitted development rights are subject to a neighbour consultation scheme as set out in the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015. This is not what has been applied for, nor have I been presented with a Lawful Development Certificate to demonstrate that this is a possible fallback position. I therefore ascribe limited weight to this matter in my decision.
8. To conclude, the proposed development would conflict with Policy ENV6 of the Hyndburn Borough Council Local Development Framework: The Core Strategy 2012 and Policy DM26 of the Hyndburn Borough Council Local Plan: Development Management DPD 2018. These policies expect for development proposals to maintain and enhance local distinctiveness, respond to distinctive patterns of development and be of an appropriate scale and size, amongst other things.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

J Smith

INSPECTOR