

PLANNING STATEMENT



PREPARED BY JOHN HODKINSON

**Proposed Two-Bedroom Detached Bungalow
within the Garden of Existing Dwelling Sedgewell, Brandlesholme Road,
Greenmount, Bury.**

1. Introduction

This Planning Statement accompanies a full planning application submitted by John Holt Architects for a detached bungalow within the garden of Sedgewell, a large detached dwelling with extensive grounds. Following the applicant's bereavement, the existing house is no longer suitable for a single occupant. The proposed bungalow provides a modest, energy-efficient home that meets his long-term needs while allowing him to remain in Greenmount.

Two Lawful Development Certificates (LDCs) have previously confirmed that a building of similar size, height and footprint could be erected on the site as **permitted development** for purposes incidental to the main dwelling. A Pre-Application Enquiry also confirmed that such a building would be lawful, though residential occupation would require planning permission.

The building now proposed is a refined architectural version of the lawful structure. Its **form, height, massing and siting remain fully compliant with permitted development criteria**. The only matter requiring planning permission is its **use as an independent dwelling**.

2. Relevant Planning History

- **LDC Ref. 72091 (15 August 2025)** Approval for an L-shaped garden building meeting all permitted development criteria, including maximum eaves height of 2.5m and ridge height of 4m. The internal layout demonstrated potential for future residential use.
- **Pre-Application Enquiry Ref. 03129/E (15 October 2025)** The Council advised that a dwelling in this location would require justification under Green Belt "Very Special Circumstances" (VSC). It was noted that erecting the building first under permitted development could simplify a subsequent change-of-use application.
- **LDC Ref. 72818/LDCP (17 February 2026)** A revised LDC confirmed that a larger garden building—following demolition of an existing brick shed—was lawful under permitted development.

The current proposal is a more sophisticated version of the approved LDC building, with a slightly reduced footprint and identical siting.

3. Planning Policy Context

3.1 Green Belt (PfE JP-G9 & NPPF)

The site lies within the Green Belt. Under NPPF paragraphs 153–154, development is inappropriate unless it falls within listed exceptions or is justified by **Very Special Circumstances**.

Two exceptions are directly relevant:

- **Limited infilling in villages** (NPPF 154(e))
- **Re-use of buildings of permanent and substantial construction** (NPPF 154(d))

The proposal satisfies both principles. A refined and expanded justification is provided in Section 4.

3.2 Residential Amenity

The bungalow sits between Sedgewell and Dowry House. Mature hedging and boundary vegetation fully screen the development from Dowry House and the adjacent public footpath. Only an obscure-glazed bathroom window faces Sedgewell. No overlooking, overshadowing or loss of amenity will occur.

3.3 Biodiversity (PfE JP-G8)

The site is well screened by mature trees and hedging, all of which will be retained. Additional planting will enhance biodiversity. Although the proposal is a self-build and therefore exempt from formal BNG submission, the scheme delivers a clear net enhancement in accordance with JP-G8.

3.4 Density & Housing Standards (PfE JP-H3 & JP-H4)

The bungalow meets nationally described space standards. While JP-H4 seeks minimum densities of 35 dph, lower densities are acceptable where justified by landscape character and Green Belt context. The proposal increases the site's density from one dwelling to two, representing efficient use of land without harming local character.

3.5 Housing Need

The Bury Housing Needs and Demand Assessment (2025) identifies the greatest need for **2–3 bedroom properties** and highlights a significant shortage of **single-storey, accessible homes**. Nationally, bungalow construction has fallen from 11% of new homes (2010) to just 1% (2024). The proposal directly responds to this unmet need.

3.6 Air Quality (PfE JP-S5)

The site is outside any Air Quality Management Area. Traffic generation will be negligible. In line with EPUK guidance, no Air Quality Assessment is required. A 7kW EV charging point will be installed.

4. Green Belt Justification

4.1 Limited Infilling in Villages

The side garden of Sedgewell forms a **clear gap** within a continuous frontage of nine detached dwellings along Brandlesholme Road. This frontage reads as part of the built-up village of Greenmount, not open countryside.

The NPPF does not define “infilling”, but appeal decisions consistently interpret it as:

“Development of a small gap in an otherwise built-up frontage.”

The proposal meets this definition precisely.

The bungalow sits **behind the existing building line**, does not project into open countryside, and does not extend the settlement boundary. The site is functionally and visually part of the village. Accordingly, the proposal constitutes **limited infilling in a village** and is **not inappropriate development** under NPPF 154(e).

4.2 Re-use of a Building of Permanent and Substantial Construction

Two LDCs confirm that a building of identical scale, height and footprint **can be erected lawfully** under permitted development. The Council has already accepted that such a structure is of **permanent and substantial construction**.

Under NPPF 154(d), the **re-use** of such a building as a dwelling is not inappropriate development. It is therefore artificial to treat the same building as inappropriate simply because the applicant seeks permission **before** construction rather than **after**.

4.3 Openness: No Harm (Spatial or Visual)

Spatial openness is unaffected:

- The garden already contains clearance for a building of this scale.
- The footprint and volume of the proposed bungalow are **less than** the lawful LDC building.
- No additional land is enclosed or domesticated.

Visual openness is also preserved:

- The bungalow sits **behind Sedgewell**, screened by mature trees and hedging.
- It is **not visible** from Brandlesholme Road or the public footpath.
- Additional planting will further increase screening.

There is **no harm** to openness in either dimension.

4.4 No Conflict with Green Belt Purposes

The development does not:

- Contribute to unrestricted sprawl
- Cause towns to merge
- Encroach into countryside
- Affect historic town character
- Undermine urban regeneration

The site is already part of a long-established residential frontage.

4.5 Very Special Circumstances (If Required)

Even if the Council concludes the proposal is inappropriate, the following considerations clearly outweigh any perceived harm:

- A building of identical scale is **lawful** under permitted development.
- The proposal meets a **genuine personal need** for accessible, manageable accommodation.
- The borough has a **shortage of single-storey homes**.
- The development is **hidden from public view**, causing no harm to openness.
- The proposal represents **efficient use of land**, doubling density without landscape impact.
- The scheme delivers **biodiversity enhancement** and retains all protected trees.

The cumulative weight of these factors is substantial and demonstrably sufficient to meet the VSC test.

5. Conclusion

The proposal is a modest, well-screened bungalow that:

- Causes **no harm** to the openness or purposes of the Green Belt.
- Represents **limited infilling** within an established village frontage.
- Could be erected as permitted development but for its intended residential use.
- Meets a **clear personal and borough-wide housing need**.
- Enhances biodiversity and maintains residential amenity.
- Aligns with PfE and NPPF policy objectives.

For these reasons, planning permission should be granted.