



Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

PLANNING PERMISSION REFUSED

APPLICATION REFERENCE: 25/00233/HOUS

Name and address for correspondence:	Applicant name:
Mr Ian Stott AJ Cocker Associates 176 Drake Street Rochdale OL16 1UP	Mr Ahmed Ali

Part I - Particulars of Application

Date of Application: 20 March 2025

Proposal:	Two storey rear extension and first floor side extension
Location:	26 Chamber House Drive, Rochdale, OL11 3LS,

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 5.9 of the SPD, the proposed two-storey rear extension would be considered harmful to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers of nos. 24 and 28 Chamber House Road, through overshadowing and visual intrusion. Such harm would be especially apparent from the rear gardens of the adjacent neighbours. In particular, occupants of no. 28 would experience a significant loss of light in the later afternoon and evening, being situated to the south-east of the proposed rear extension. The proposal does not therefore accord with policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, the Council's 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' Supplementary Planning Document and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Procedure Statement:

Date Decision Issued 22 May 2025

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: A327-sk-04
- Proposed first floor plan: A327-sk-02
- Proposed ground floor plan: A327-sk-01
- Proposed block plan: A327-sk-07/a
- Proposed schematics: A327-sk-03/a
- Location plan: A327-sk-05