



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2026

by **P Hatch BA (Hons) Ad. Dip MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/R2330/D/25/3376457

11 Higher Antley Street, Accrington, Lancashire, BB5 0SN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr A Ahmed against the decision of Hyndburn Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 11/25/0252.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Following the site visit, the appellant was invited to explain why the proposed extension would be essential to provide adequate, accessible and dignified living arrangements. The response received has been taken into account in the determination of this appeal. Comments were subsequently invited in relation to the proposal and the right to respect for private and family life and home. No representations were received in relation to this request. As a result, this matter has not been considered further in this appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and
 - the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupants of adjoining properties, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. Higher Antley Street's sense of place is characterised by high density terraced housing which is common to the vernacular of the wider neighbourhood. It's terraced nature and the absence of visual breaks means that the proposed rear extension would not be visible from Higher Antley Street. Whilst the rear elevations of the terrace are visible in the views along the rear alleyway from Willows Lane and Richmond Street, given the location of No.11 towards the middle of the terrace, the scale and form of the proposed extension would complement, rather than be at odds with the terrace.

5. I therefore conclude that the proposed extension would not harm the character and appearance of the existing building or the surrounding area. As such the proposal would be consistent with Policy Env6 of the Hyndburn Core Strategy and Policies DM10 and DM26 of the Hyndburn Development Management DPD which seeks to promote high quality design and develop a sense of place through reinforcing distinctive patterns of development.

Living conditions

6. From conducting my site visit, I note that there are already a number of existing rear extensions to properties on Higher Antley Street, these range in size and scale from single storey outriggers to two storey extensions.
7. The proposed extension at No.11 will project 6m out from the existing rear elevation and it will be setback from the boundary with adjoining property of No.9. This setback will provide sufficient distance to ensure that the outlook to No.9 will not be adversely affected. The proposed extension will run directly along the property boundary with No.13 and its side elevation facing onto the rear yard area of this adjoining property will be blank with no windows or openings.
8. From the submitted plans and the site visit, I noted that No.15 already has an existing single storey rear extension which projects out a similar distance of that being proposed at No.11. The extension also runs directly along the property boundary with No.13 and includes a blank elevation.
9. The cumulative impact of the proposed rear extension at No.11, combined with the existing rear extension at No.15 will lead to a significant sense of enclosure and loss of outlook for the occupants of 13 Higher Antley Street. This impact is exacerbated by both the existing and proposed rear extensions running directly along the boundary line of this property. The resulting harm would adversely affect the outlook experienced from the majority of the rear yard, which is the only private amenity space serving No.13 and therefore of high value, as well as the outlook from the rear ground floor windows.
10. Consequently, the proposed extension would result in unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupants of 13 Higher Antley Street. This would conflict with Policy Env7 of the Hyndburn Core Strategy and Policy DM29 of the Hyndburn Development Management DPD which seeks to ensure that development respects the living conditions of neighbours, including factors such as outlook.

Other Matters

11. Decision makers are required by the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED), set out in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, to have due regard to advancing equality of opportunity and to eliminate unlawful discrimination in relation to, amongst others, children. I have had due regard to the PSED in considering the information provided by the appellant regarding the housing needs of his family. However, as it has not been demonstrated that this need could not be met by a lesser scheme that would not harm the living conditions of No 13, I attach little weight to the equality implications of the proposal in favour of the appeal.
12. During my site visit, I noted extensions which have been added to the rear of other properties on Higher Antley Street. However, those extensions do not have the same cumulative relationships with adjoining properties and so their effect on the

outlook enjoyed from the rear of adjacent houses is materially less than the appeal proposal. I therefore attach little weight to this consideration in favour of the appeal.

Conclusion

13. 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. Accordingly, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P Hatch

INSPECTOR