



Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

PERMISSION IN PRINCIPLE REFUSED

APPLICATION REFERENCE: 25/00741/PIP

Name and address for correspondence:	Applicant name:
Miss Hazel Bentley 100 Barbirolli Square Manchester M2 3AB	Mr Allan Craigan

Part I - Particulars of Application

Date of Application: 6 August 2025

Application No: 25/00741/PIP

Proposal:	Application for permission in principle for the erection of one dwelling
Location:	Land Adjacent To 12 Eton Close, Rochdale, ,

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 The application site is situated within a finger of the Roch Valley Greenspace Corridor and, by virtue of previous piecemeal encroachment, would result in an unacceptable narrowing of this corridor, encroaching into routes used by wildlife and the Meadowcroft Wood Site of Biological Importance and diminishing its amenity value and contribution towards providing visual relief from the urban environment. As a result, the proposal would have a significant negative impact on the openness, landscape quality and character of the greenspace corridor. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to saved policy G/8 part A of the Rochdale Unitary Development Plan which seeks to limit development in Greenspace Corridors to those which will enhance their recreational, ecological, landscape and amenity value. The proposal also fails to comply with policy G6 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy which seeks to enhance the Roch Valley Corridor as a key landscape feature forming a part of Greater Manchester's strategic green infrastructure network and an ecological corridor. As such the application is considered to be unacceptable in principle and contrary to saved policy G/8 of the adopted Rochdale Unitary Development Plan, policy G6 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

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 10 September 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.

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

- Location Plan. Drawing number: AS868-01. Revision: D
- Indicative Proposed Site Massing Plan. Drawing number: AS868-SK02. Revision: B

Appeals to the Secretary of State

- If you are aggrieved by the decision of your local planning authority to refuse permission in principle for the proposed development, then you can appeal to the Secretary of State under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
- If you want to appeal against your local planning authority's decision then you must do so within 6 months of the date of this decision notice.
- Appeals must be made using a form which you can obtain online from www.gov.uk/government/organisations/planning-inspectorate or from the Planning Inspectorate at Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Temple Quay, Bristol, BS1 6PN.
- The Secretary of State can allow a longer period for making an appeal, but will not normally be prepared to use this power unless there are special circumstances which excuse the delay in making an appeal.
- The Secretary of State need not consider an appeal if it seems to the Secretary of State that the local planning authority could not have granted permission in principle for the proposed development having regard to statutory requirements, to provisions of any development order and directions given under a development order.
- In practice the Secretary of State does not refuse to consider appeals solely because local planning authority based their decision on a direction given by Secretary of State.