



Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

PLANNING PERMISSION REFUSED

APPLICATION REFERENCE: 25/00676/HOUS

Name and address for correspondence: Mr M Farooq Building Design Services 418 Bury Road Rochdale OL11 5EU	Applicant name: Tanueer Hussain
--	--

Part I - Particulars of Application

Date of Application: 1 July 2025

Proposal:	Single-storey rear extension
Location:	40 Penistone Avenue, Rochdale, OL16 4AL,

Part II - Particulars of decision

The Rochdale Borough Council hereby give notice in pursuance of the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) that planning permission has been **REFUSED** for the carrying out of the development referred to in Part I hereof for the following reason(s).

Reasons:

- 1 By virtue of its non-compliance with paragraph 5.6 of the Council's Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD, the proposed rear extension would be considered to have an unacceptable overshadowing and overbearing impact on occupants of 38 Penistone Avenue. The development therefore fails to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework, policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, policy DM1 of the Rochdale Council Core Strategy, and the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD.

Procedure Statement:

The proposal would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area nor does it comply with the development plan and therefore does not comprise sustainable development. There were no amendments to the scheme, or conditions which could reasonably have been imposed, which could have made the development acceptable and it was therefore not possible to approve the application.

Date Decision Issued 26 August 2025

Melanie Hale
Head of Planning Services

IMPORTANT

PLEASE ENSURE THAT YOU HAVE READ AND FULLY UNDERSTOOD THE CONTENTS OF THIS DECISION NOTICE. YOUR ATTENTION IS DRAWN TO THE ATTACHED NOTES.

INFORMATIVE:

The Local Planning Authority's reasons for its decision are set out in the accompanying officer's report.

The proposal would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area nor does it comply with the development plan and therefore does not comprise sustainable development. There were no amendments to the scheme, or conditions which could reasonably have been imposed, which could have made the development acceptable and it was therefore not possible to approve the application.

For the avoidance of doubt, this decision relates to the following plans:

- Proposed elevations, floor plans, site plan: 2315/2
- Location plan