

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Claire Booth	Date of report: 04/06/2026	Ref: 72784/FUL
Registration: 09/04/2026	LDFC: 06/05/2026	Expiry Date: 04/06/2026
Site Visit: 20/05/2026	Site Notice: N/A	Press Date: N/A
Objections: 1	Con Area:	Adv Type: N/A
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: MIDW

Proposal: Erection of 1 no. dwelling

Location: Underhill, Redisher Lane, Ramsbottom, Bury, BL8 4HX

Description

The application site is a large detached dwelling located on Bolton Road, Hawkshaw/Holcombe Brook. The site is located on the corner of Redisher Lane. Redisher Lane, is a single track road that provides access to a number of farms and properties. Redisher Lane is also a definitive Public Right of Way (Bridleway no. 14RAM).

The site is allocated within the adopted Development Plan as Green Belt and is within Holcombe to Greenmount and Higher Summerseat Pennine Foothills (West/South Pennines) Landscape Character Area.

Relevant Planning History

54878 - Single storey extension at rear; Raising of garage roof with front and rear dormer; New roof to porch and new front entrance/drive off Bolton Road with automatic gates - Approved with Conditions, 02/07/2012

55762 - Two storey/single storey front extensions - Approved with Conditions, 27/11/2012

57218 - Two storey extension at rear, single storey side extensions and external alterations - Approved with Conditions, 19/03/2014

57816 - Single storey extension at side and rear - Approved with Conditions, 05/09/2014

60902 - Variation of condition no. 2 following grant of planning permission 54878 for new entrance/drive to be moved over by 5.5 metres - Approved with Conditions, 26/01/2017

Publicity

The nearby neighbours have been consulted by letter. One representation has been received raising the following objections:

- Proposal harmful in the Green Belt;
- Space on site overly tight to accommodate the proposal, or even a small bungalow
- Proposal detrimental to the visual amenity and the character of the area; and
- Overshadowing and loss of daylight and sunlight to their property due to the proposed proximity of the dwelling, its height and its proposed projection beyond their front elevation.
- Advises their property is set approximately 1m lower than the application site
- Asserts the 3 storey dwelling would be overbearing and oppressive

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

Traffic Section - Raises objections

Waste Management - No comments or observations.

Borough Engineer - Drainage Section - No objections subject to conditions securing a satisfactory surface water drainage scheme.

Environmental Health - Contaminated Land - No objections, subject to planning conditions to ensure the site is safe to occupy.

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit - No objections, subject to a net gain to biodiversity (BNG) being provided.

United Utilities (Water and waste) - No objections, subject to a condition securing a satisfactory foul and surface water drainage scheme.

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant.

Development Plan and Policies

H1/2	Further Housing Development
H2/1	The Form of New Residential Development
H2/2	The Layout of New Residential Development
EN1/2	Townscape and Built Design
EN1/7	Throughroutes and Gateways
EN7/2	Noise Pollution
EN7/5	Waste Water Management
OL1/2	New Buildings in the Green Belt
HT2/4	Car Parking and New Development
HT5/1	Access For Those with Special Needs
JP-S2	Carbon and Energy
JP-S3	Heat and Energy Networks
JP-S4	Flood Risk and the Water Environment
JP-S5	Clean Air
JP-H1	Scale of New Housing Development
JP-H3	Type, Size and Design of New Housing
JP-H4	Density of New Housing
JP-G1	Landscape Character
JP-G8	A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity
JP-G9	The Green Belt
JP-P1	Sustainable Places
JP-C1	Our Integrated Network
JP-C2	Digital Connectivity
JP-C4	Strategic Road Network
JP-C6	Walking and Cycling
JP-C8	Transport Requirements of New Development
SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
SPD8	DC Policy Guidance Note 8 - New Buildings in the Green Belt
SPD11	Parking Standards in Bury
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NPPG	National Planning Policy Guide

Issues and Analysis

The following report includes analysis of the merits of the application against the relevant policies of both the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document (PfE) and the saved policies within the adopted Bury Unitary Development Plan (UDP), together with other relevant material planning considerations.

The policies of the UDP that have been used to assess this application are considered to be in accordance with the NPPF and as such are material planning considerations. For simplicity, just the UDP and PFE Policies will be referred to in the report, unless there is a particular matter to highlight arising from the NPPF where it would otherwise be specifically mentioned.

Equality Act 2010: All planning applications are considered in light of the Equality Act 2010 and associated Public Sector Equality Duty, where the Council is required to have due regard for:

The elimination of discrimination, harassment and victimisation;

The advancement of equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and person who do not share it;

The fostering of good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and person who do not share it; which applies to people from the protected equality groups.

Human Rights: All planning applications are considered against the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998.

Under Article 6 the applicants (and those third parties who have made representations) have the right to a fair hearing and to this end full consideration will be given to their comments.

Article 8 and Protocol 1 of the First Article confer a right to respect private and family life and a right to the protection of property, ie peaceful enjoyment of one's possessions which could include a person's home, and other land and business assets.

In taking account of the Council policy as set out in the Bury Unitary Development Plan 1997 and all material planning considerations, it is concluded on balance that the rights conferred upon the applicant/ objectors/ residents/ other interested party by Article 8 and Article 1 of the First Protocol may be interfered with, since such interference is in accordance with the law and is justified in the public interest. Any restriction of these rights posed by refusal/ approval of the application is legitimate since it is proportionate to the wider benefits of such a decision, is based upon the merits of the proposal, and falls within the margin of discretion afforded to the Council under the Town & Country Planning Acts.

The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 imposes (without prejudice to any other obligation imposed on it) a duty upon the Council to exercise its functions and have due regard to the likely effect of the exercise of its functions on, and the need to do all that it reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder in its area. In so doing and on making planning decisions under the Town and Country Planning Acts, the material Planning considerations shall have due regard to the provisions of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and its implications in the exercise of its functions.

Principle of Development

Site's location within the Green Belt

The site is designated as Green Belt under PFE JP-G9.

Paragraph 152 of the NPPF states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

NPPF Paragraph 153 states that when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly

outweighed by other considerations.

Paragraph 154 of the NPPF makes it clear that development in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless one of eight exceptions apply:

- a. buildings for agriculture and forestry;
- b. the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use), including buildings, for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;
- c. the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;
- d. the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;
- e. limited infilling in villages;
- f. limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites); and
- g. limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land (including a material change of use to residential or mixed use including residential), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt.
- h. Other forms of development provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. These are:
 - i. mineral extraction;
 - ii. engineering operations;
 - iii. local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location;
 - iv. the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction;
 - v. material changes in the use of land (such as changes of use for outdoor sport or recreation, or for cemeteries and burial grounds); and
 - vi. development, including buildings, brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order or Neighbourhood Development Order.

The proposal does not meet any of the criteria to be acceptable in principle. As, in accordance with the NPPF Glossary definition of what constitutes Previously Developed Land, the application site forms part of a residential garden within the built-up areas of Holcombe Brook/Greenmount, it does not constitute previously developed land. Whilst the proposal would not result in substantial harm to the Green Belt, it fails to meet the requirements of criterion (g) due to the site not being classified as previously developed land.

The proposal also fails to satisfy criterion (e) of the planning statement, as the dwelling is located outside Hawkshaw Village and therefore cannot be considered "limited infilling within a village."

Paragraph 155 of the NPPF states that development in the Green Belt should also not be regarded as inappropriate where all the following apply:

- a. The development would utilise grey belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan;
- b. There is a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed;
- c. The development would be in a sustainable location, with particular reference to paragraphs 110 and 115 of this Framework; and
- d. Where applicable the development proposed meets the 'Golden Rules' requirements set out in paragraphs 156-157.

Grey Belt is defined by the NPPF as "land in the Green Belt comprising previously

developed land and/or any other land that, in either case, does not strongly contribute to any of purposes (a), (b), or (d) in paragraph 143. 'Grey belt' excludes land where the application of the policies relating to the areas or assets in footnote 7 (other than Green Belt) would provide a strong reason for refusing or restricting development."

The application site does not impact assets referred to in footnote 7. As such, the first test is to determine whether the land does or does not contribute strongly to any purposes (a), (b) or (d) of paragraph 143.

Paragraph 143 of the NPPF states that Green Belt serves 5 purposes, and those of relevance are:

- a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; and,
- c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

Planning guidance published on 27th February 2025 for assessing a site against these purposes is relevant to determine whether the land constitutes grey belt for decision making (Paragraph: 005 Reference ID: 64-005-20250225). As such, the site's contribution to these purposes is considered below.

- a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; and
- b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Purpose (a) - unrestricted sprawl?of large built-up areas _

The development is enclosed between existing residential properties on the edge of a built-up area and is both visually and physically contained. As such, it would not lead to unrestricted urban sprawl in this respect. Therefore, it is considered that the site makes a limited contribution toward Purpose (a).

Purpose (b) - Prevent neighboring towns merging

The guidance specifies this is in reference to the merging of towns, not villages. The site does not form a substantial gap between any towns. The site would be able to be developed without any significant impact on the visual separation of towns. As such it is considered that the site makes a weak contribution toward purpose (b).

Purpose (c) - to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment:

The proposal sits tightly between two residential properties within the curtilage of an existing dwelling and would therefore safeguard the countryside at the rear of the application from encroachment.

Grey Belt conclusion

As the site does not make a strong contribution to the Green Belt purposes (a), (b) or (c), the site falls within the definition of Grey Belt Land. However, for the proposal to be considered as not inappropriate development within the Green Belt it must satisfy all of the criterion, a to c, listed in NPPF paragraph 155.

Criterion A: Considering the impact on the remaining Green Belt in the plan area

This criterion requires that the development would not fundamentally undermine, the purposes, when taken together, of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan. The guidance (Paragraph: 008 Reference ID: 64-008-20250225) adds that in reaching this judgement, authorities should consider whether, or the extent to which, the release or development of Green Belt land would affect the ability of all the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan from serving all five of the Green Belt purposes in a meaningful way.

The only other Green Belt purpose which would be breached by the proposal is Purpose C

safeguarding the countryside from encroachment as the development would represent an irreversible encroachment of built form into the countryside. However, the area to be lost is small in relation to the totality of the remaining Green Belt land both in the local area, and the wider plan area. Consequently, the overall effect on the countryside would be moderate.

Therefore, it is considered that the development of the site in principle, which represents a small part of this parcel, would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan.

Criterion B: Demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed.

This criterion requires there to be a demonstrable unmet need, which in the case of applications involving the provision of housing, means:

- A lack of a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, including the relevant buffer where applicable; or,
- Where the Housing Delivery Test is below 75% of the housing requirement over the previous three years.

Five-year supply

The NPPF is a material planning consideration in planning decisions and emphasises the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. The Framework states that local planning authorities should identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites to provide a minimum of five years' worth of housing, with either a 5% buffer to ensure choice and competition in the market for land, or a 20% buffer where there has been significant undelivery of housing over the previous three years. As set out in NPPF paragraph 78, the supply of housing must be assessed against the housing requirement set out in adopted strategic policies where these are less than five years old.

The joint Places for Everyone Plan was adopted with effect from 21 March 2024 and sets the up-to-date housing requirement for Bury against which the deliverable supply of housing land must be assessed. PfE Policy JP-H1 sets the following stepped targets for Bury:

- 246 homes per year from 2022-2025;
- 452 homes per year from 2025-2030; then
- 520 homes per year from 2030-2039.

Bury's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment is an assessment of potential sites for residential development and is used to assess the housing land supply. It includes sites that have an extant planning permission, sites allocated through the joint Places for Everyone Plan and sites that have potential to obtain planning permission in the future. This shows that there are a number of sites within the Borough with the potential to deliver a significant amount of housing. However, not all of these sites will contribute to the deliverable land supply calculations as many sites will take longer than five years to come forward and be fully developed.

The Council has carried out an assessment of the housing land supply to determine whether sites meet the deliverability tests in the NPPF and can contribute to the five year supply of housing land. Based on the 2025 5-year supply statement, the Council has demonstrated a 4.3 year supply of housing land. This includes a 20% buffer (as currently required in Bury due to past under delivery) and accounts for past oversupply when assessed against the adopted PfE housing requirement. The Council is therefore currently unable to demonstrate a deliverable five-year supply of housing land against the adopted housing requirement.

Housing Delivery Test

The National Planning Policy Framework also sets out the Housing Delivery Test (HDT), which is an assessment of net additional dwellings provided over the previous three years against the homes required. Where the test indicates that the delivery of housing was

substantially below (less than 75%) the housing requirement over the previous years, this needs to be taken into account in the decision-taking process. The latest results published by the Government (the 2023 measurement published on 12 December 2024) show that Bury has a HDT result of less than 75%, and therefore, this needs to be treated as a material factor when determining applications for residential development.

Paragraph 11(d) of the National Planning Policy Framework states that where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, planning permission should be granted unless:???

- i. The application of policies in the Framework that protect areas, or assets of particular importance, provide a strong reason for refusing the development proposed; or???
- ii. Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination.

Unmet Need Conclusion

As a result of the lack of five-year supply and the latest published HDT result the 'tilted balance' currently applies, and planning permission should be granted unless the above points set out in para. 11(d) i or ii apply.

In this case, the site is located within the Green Belt so therefore paragraph 11 (d)(i) applies, and the proposal needs to be assessed against Green Belt policies. The five year supply position and latest published HDT result for Bury also mean that NPPF paragraph 155(b) is triggered, and there is a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed.

Criterion C: Sustainable Location

NPPF paragraph 155(c) requires consideration of whether the development would be in a sustainable location, with particular reference to paragraphs 110 and 115 of the Framework.

Paragraph 110 states that the planning system should actively manage patterns of growth to support the sustainable transport objectives in paragraph 109. Development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. Paragraph 115 states that development should ensure that sustainable transport modes are prioritised and safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users. Green Belt guidance (Paragraph: 011 Reference ID: 64-011-20250225) also states that when making decisions regarding planning applications on grey belt land, authorities should ensure that the development would be in a sustainable location.

In this regard, PfE Policy JP-C1: An Integrated Network sets relevant advice, supporting:

- Patterns of development that minimises both the need to travel and the distance travelled by unsustainable modes to jobs, housing and other key services, including healthcare, education, retail, recreation and leisure facilities, green space and green infrastructure; and,
- Locating and designing development, to deliver a significant increase in the proportion of trips that can be made by walking, cycling and public transport;

The site is located north of Bolton Road and accessed via a driveway. The site is located near the amenity centres of Holcombe Brook and Greenmount, with everyday services and amenities, including convenience supermarkets, schools, and pharmacies, within at least 1 mile or a 15-minute walk of the site.

There is also bus stops located within 0.1 miles of the site that provide services to Bolton and Bury hourly. While the services are not frequent, they enable public transport options nearby the site.

The proposed development would therefore be in an area that is sustainable. It would enable a development which would not be wholly dependent on car use. As such, the proposal meets criterion C of the NPPF paragraph 155.

Conclusion - Principle of Development in the Green Belt

In conclusion, based on all of the proposal is considered to be appropriate in the Green Belt as it satisfies criterion a-c noted above. The proposed development is therefore acceptable in principle.

The impact of the dwelling on the openness of the Green Belt is therefore not a consideration in the assessment of this proposal.

Site Safety and Stability

It is a requirement of the NPPF paras. 187, 196 & 197 that the applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the LPA that the application site is safe, stable and suitable for development.

The application site currently comprises a large residential garden. The application is supported by a document entitled Preliminary Risk Assessment. This document does not meet the requirements of a Preliminary Risk Assessment (PRA) as laid out by Land Contamination Risk Management (Environment Agency, 2025). It is also uncertain whether the author could be considered to be a competent person to undertake a PRA. Further information on PRAs can be found in Bury Council's Developers Guide.

Due to the sensitivity of the proposed land use, as a minimum, a Desk Study and Preliminary Risk Assessment will be required; the submitted document is not sufficient.

In line with the National Planning Policy Framework, the site is proposed for a sensitive end use the Council's Environmental Health Contaminated Land Officers recommend that the following contaminated land conditions are placed on any grant of permission:

CL01 - SITE CHARACTERISATION & RISK ASSESSMENT
CL02 - REMEDIATION STRATEGY & VERIFICATION
CL03- REMEDIATION & VERIFICATION
CL04 - UNEXPECTED CONTAMINATION
CL05 - IMPORTED SOIL

Air Quality

PfE Policy JP-S5: Clean Air seeks new developments to support improvements in air quality, focusing particularly on locations where people live, where children learn and play, where there are impacts on the green infrastructure network.

The site is not located within an Air Quality Management Area. Due to the scale of the development, it is considered very unlikely that the development would create an increase of more than 500 AADT (annual average daily traffic). Therefore, in line with the EPUK Guidance, an air quality assessment will not be required.

However, Bury Council has been identified by DEFRA as an area requiring to significantly improve air quality. To support the principles of the Greater Manchester Clean Air Plan in reducing levels of nitrogen dioxide and in order to manage current and future levels of air pollution Bury Council is encouraging the retention of trees and the use of cleaner vehicles.

The proposed development will have off-street parking. Bury Council has been identified by

DEFRA as an area requiring to significantly improve air quality. To support the principles of the Greater Manchester Clean Air Plan in reducing levels of nitrogen dioxide and in order to manage current and future levels of air pollution Bury Council is encouraging the use of cleaner vehicles. As such and in line with the requirements of SPD11 infrastructure for the charging of electric vehicles), should be incorporated into schemes.

Landscape Character and Visual Amenity

PfE Policy JP-G1: Landscape Character designates the site as within Holcombe to Greenmount and Higher Summerseat (LCA22), which falls within the Pennine Foothills (West/South Pennines) character type. Development in this area is required to reflect and respond to the special qualities and sensitivities of the key landscape characteristics of its location, including having regard to, amongst other things:

- Settlement, road pattern and rights of way; and
- Views and perceptual qualities.

The interface of any new development on this site with the surrounding countryside/landscape is of particular importance. These transitional areas will require well-considered and sensitive treatment. In particular, opportunities to improve the intactness and condition of the landscape should be taken.

UDP Policy EN1/2 seeks to ensure that development proposals would not have a detrimental effect on the visual amenity and character of a particular area. UDP Policies H2/1 and H2/2 provide the assessment criteria for detailed matters relating to height, appearance, and character, aspects and finishing materials for new residential developments.

Paragraph 129 d) of the NPPF states that LPAs should take into account "the desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character and setting (including residential gardens)". The need for carefully designed open spaces, and gardens is also highlighted in the MHCLG National Design Guidance

The character of this stretch and side of Bolton Road on the west side of Redisher Lane is of large detached dwellings set in generous sized plots with spaces present between each of the properties.

Underhill is a large detached dwelling sat in a plot that runs parallel with Redisher Lane. It appears that Underhill and 520 Bolton Road was originally one plot of land. The two dwellings resulted in subdivision of the original plot.

The application site is wider at the front of its plot than the rear, therefore the shared boundary of Underhill and 520 Bolton Road is angled so the frontage of Underhill is wider than 520 Bolton Road. However the rear garden area of Underhill is narrower than the rear garden area of Underhill.

520 Bolton Road is set back from the frontage of Underhill. Underhill is set on at a higher level than the land on which 520 Bolton Road is on. 520 Bolton Road therefore appears lower in height than the property Under hill. Its attached garage, partly used as a habitable room, is sited close to the shared boundary, is also at lower level than the property, 'Underhill'. Whilst no streetscene drawings accompany this application showing the proposal fully in context with this neighbouring property, given the neighbours property being at a lower level than the application site and that the proposed dwelling would sit forward of the principal elevation of 520 Bolton Road and slightly forward of the property known as Underhill and that the proposed dwelling would have the same eaves height as Underhill, the proposed development by virtue of the loss of the existing space between the two neighbouring houses, its suburban appearance and elevational language, with its gable elevation frontage conflicting with the neighbouring roof form, the proposed dwelling would

result in an overtly stark, cramped, unsympathetic and incongruous form of development, and would be of detriment to the visual amenities of the area and the character of this semi-rural landscape in this transitional area between the established settlement of Holcombe Brook and the wide open countryside/ Green Belt that extends beyond the western boundary of no. 320 Bolton Road. The proposal would appear as a discordant development within this semi-rural street scene, in this transitional area between the edge of the settlement, on the opposite side of Redisher Lane to the application site to the detriment of visual amenity and the landscape character of this locality.

To reiterate, the proposed dwellinghouse would appear incongruous and be seriously detrimental to the visual amenity and character of the streetscape by reason of its siting, layout and lack of space around it. The proposed development therefore conflicts with UDP policies EN1/2 Townscape and Built Design, H2/2 The Layout of New Residential Development, PfE Policy JP-G1: Landscape Character, guidance within SPD 8 New Buildings and Associated Development in the Green Belt and 16 Design and Layout of New Development in Bury and Paragraph 129 d) of the NPPF.

Impact on neighbouring dwellings

UDP Policy H1/2: 'Further Housing Development' states that the Council will have regard to various factors when assessing a proposal for residential development, including whether the proposal is within the urban area, the availability of infrastructure and the suitability of the site, with regard to amenity, the nature of the local environment and the surrounding land uses.

UDP Policy H2/1 - 'The Form of New Residential Development' requires the Council to consider the impact of developments on residential

The proposed development is set between two dwellings; Underhill, within the submitted blue edge, and 520 Bolton Road.

520 Bolton Road sits slightly behind the frontage of Underhill. The proposed dwelling would be very close to the shared boundary as at its closest it would be within 0.9m metres of the boundary and approximately 1.8m of 520 Bolton Road.

Nearest to the shared boundary with the application site is a garage/ habitable room that contains a TV and a row of kitchen units and a small settee which is used by the neighbours children as a separate living room and as a garage when needed. A window serves this room but as is stated within SPD6, side windows within gables (or as in this case an ancillary garage that has incidental residential use) cannot be protected. The main habitable bedroom above has windows facing north and south and would not be impacted to any significant degree.

The dormer windows serving the nearest bedroom to the site face north and southwards, the proposal would result in some loss of mid-late morning light to the front dormer window serving the bedroom. However the degree of impact would not be so significant to justify refusal on planning permission on this point.

Biodiversity

Paragraph 180 of the NPPF states that the planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment and should achieve net-gains to biodiversity.

PfE Policy JP-G8: 'A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity' requires development to follow the mitigation hierarchy of avoiding significant harm to biodiversity through consideration of alternative sites, then adequately mitigating and compensating for any remaining harm. It also requires development to avoid fragmenting or severing connectivity between habitats and to achieve a net gain in biodiversity of no less than 10%.

This reflects national statutory mandatory requirements. The policy also requires proposals to make appropriate provision for long-term management of habitats and geological features connected to the development. This is supported by UDP Policy EN6/3: 'Features of Ecological Value', that seeks to retain, protect and enhance the natural environment and seeks to retain features of ecological or wildlife value.

The Council's mapping system indicates that the application site is a site containing protected species. As a result the Council has sought advice from Greater Manchester Ecology Unit, who raise no objections to the proposed development given the external fabric of Underhill would not be changed as a result of this proposal.

Wildlife Issues

The Council's Ecology advisors have advised that there are unlikely to be any ecological issues associated with this development, the footprint of the development would be restricted to existing lawn and whilst the proposed new building would be relatively close to the existing dwelling, the Council's Ecology Advisors are satisfied that the risks of disturbance to bats or birds that may roost or nest in the existing dwelling is very low. Were the LPA minded to support the application, an informative would be imposed reminding the applicant that under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 as amended.

Contributing to and Enhancing the Natural Environment & Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)
Section 187 of the NPPF 2024 states that the planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment. 10% BNG is mandatory under Schedule 7A of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021).

The development will result in the loss of a small area of garden to development. There are unlikely to be any wildlife issues requiring mitigation.

Biodiversity Net Gain

As the application was made after 2 April 2024, it is subject to the provisions in Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (the Act) relating to "Biodiversity Net Gain in England" which "makes provision for grants of planning permission in England to be subject to a condition to secure that the biodiversity gain objective is met". The general condition of planning permission relating to biodiversity gain is set out in paragraph 13(2) to Schedule 7A of the Act and states that:

- (2) The condition is that the development may not be begun unless-
- (a) a biodiversity gain plan has been submitted to the planning authority (see paragraph 14), and
 - (b) the planning authority has approved the plan (see paragraph 15).

Policy JP-G8: 'A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity' also seeks to conserve or enhance biodiversity, seeking measurable net gains, and Paragraph 187 d) of the NPPF requires developments to provide net gains for biodiversity.

As more than 25sqm of vegetation is being lost the development is subject to 10% BNG. A small metric has been provided, which given the habitat lost and small area is reasonable despite the proximity to the WPM SSSI. This indicates 10% net gain cannot be achieved on site, hence the red error message, with a shortfall of 0.0687 units to achieve 10% net gain. The figures for the habitats lost in the metric appear reasonable. The Council is therefore satisfied that no further information is required and given the nature of the development, 10% net gain is not achievable on the site. Purchase of 0.0687 units will therefore be required. The statutory Biodiversity Gain Condition will therefore be applied to the planning permission, should it be granted.

As no habitats exist on site, no habitat management and monitoring plan is required. Any soft landscaping measures can be dealt with via a standard landscape condition, where the

LPA is minded to approve the application.

In order to discharge the statutory biodiversity condition, the applicant would need to provide:

- The final version of the metric and
- The biodiversity gain plan utilising the defra template and
- Have purchased the required number of off-site units with the purchase registered with defra.

With regards to wildlife, the Council's Ecology advisors also recommend one bat brick and one bird brick on suitable elevations as enhancements. These can be secured by planning condition, where the LPA is minded to approve the application.

Highway Safety

The proposal seeks to erect a non-associated dwelling at the side of the dwelling, called 'Underhill' via creating a shared driveway before splitting off to serve both the existing dwelling and proposed dwelling. Two car parking spaces are proposed to serve the proposed 5 bedroom dwelling. The submitted Proposed Site Plan indicates that the existing dwelling, Underhill, would have 3 car parking spaces. It is unknown how many bedrooms the property 'Underhill' has, however the planning history for this property indicates it is has been extended to ceate a 4-bedroom dwelling.

The application sites primary access would be from the existing gated access off the A676 Bolton Road, Hawkshaw, which was approved by planning application no. 54878, dated 02/07/2012 which serves the large, detached dwelling 'Underhill'. The A676 Bolton Road (Hawkshaw) is a key Class 1 Primary transport route between Ramsbottom and Bolton. This highway is very busy during the morning and evening rush hours and speeds exceed the speed limit in this location.

SPD11: 'Parking standard in Bury' identifies the application site as being within Parking Zone 4. It sets out standards for both car parking and cycle parking provision, electric vehicle charging provision, as well as parking bay sizes and manoeuvring space(s). It identifies that for properties that are 4 bedrooms or larger, at least 3 car parking spaces should be provided. Based on this, the proposed dwelling would fail to provide sufficient car parking provision in this location, contrary to the requirements set out in SPD11. Given the size of the property proposed it is likely that future occupants and visitors to the proposed dwelling would need to park on the highway outside the property, or across the road from the property, which would disrupt the free flow of traffic along this stretch of Bolton Road. This would be detrimental to highway safety and demonstrates that the proposal would result in an over intensive use of the site, contrary to the principles of well-designed development. The proposal is therefore contrary to PfE Policy JP-C8.

The submitted Proposed Site Plan shows that the existing dwelling, Underhill, would have 3 car parking spaces, thus complying with the car parking standards stated within SPD11, however the application fails to demonstrate that cars could enter and leave their proposed plots in a forward gear. Given the nature of Bolton Road, described above, this would lead to conditions detrimental to highway safety.

Turning to the proposed shared access; the proposal seeks to share the entrance onto Bolton Road with the application property and the area to the front of the application site would be split up into two, to provide a separate driveway to both the proposed dwelling and existing property. Comparing the existing and proposed site plans, it is clear that the existing car parking provision for Underhill would remain as existing in the same location. However, its access and manoeuvring space would be compromised by the proposed subdivision of the plot. The proposal fails to demonstrate that all vehicles, for both the proposed dwelling and existing dwelling could manoeuvre within their respective plots to enable all future occupants and visitors to the existing dwelling could be undertaken in a

forward gear. This is clearly harmful to highway safety on this A Road. This also demonstrates this proposal is poorly designed, contrary to the requirements of the NPPF and UDP Policy EN2/2.

SPD11 also requires that for every dwelling with allocated car parking, at least one parking space shall be provided with an active EV charge point and that all dwellings provide covered and secure cycle parking/ storage provision within the curtilage of proposed developments. The proposed development fails to demonstrate these things will be provided. The proposal therefore fails to accord with Policy JP-C8 and SPD11.

To conclude, the proposed access to both the application site and existing dwelling 'Underhill' would be substandard and thus unsafe. The development fails to provide sufficient car parking, electric vehicle charging provision and covered and secure cycle parking provision, contrary to the requirements of SPD11 and PfE Policy JP-C8 and would lead to cars parking on the A676 Bolton Road, to the detriment of highway safety. In addition, the proposed intensification of use of the access point onto the A676 Bolton Road (Hawkshaw and failure to provide sufficient car parking and manoeuvring provision for both the existing house and proposed dwelling would lead to cars parking on this key transport route, preventing the free flow of traffic and thus would lead to conditions detrimental to highway safety, contrary to the requirements of PfE Policies C1, C5 and C8 and the NPPF.

Carbon and Energy

PfE Policy JP-S2: 'Carbon and Energy' requires new development to be net zero carbon in relation to the developments operational carbon emissions. Policy JP-S2 expects all new development to be net zero carbon. The expectation from the adoption of the PfE Development Plan is that net zero carbon should be achieved for regulated carbon emissions; from 2028 for all emissions in construction; and from 2025, development should calculate and minimise carbon emissions from unregulated emissions.

The submitted Energy Statement outlines an overall commitment to reducing energy consumption under occupancy through the adoption of enhanced insulation standards and improved HVAC & lighting efficiencies, together with the installation of low carbon and renewable technologies.

The methodology used herein is consistent with the widely regarded energy hierarchy approach to improving the energy performance of buildings and Approved Document L 2021 of the Building Regulations.

The submitted report demonstrates that the proposed development would be net zero carbon with predicted overall carbon dioxide emissions of -72.54 kg/year, whilst the residential aspect would also have a space heating demand of 19.79 kWh/m²/year, together with a 68.12% reduction in the energy required for water heating.

This submitted report states this will be achieved through enhanced insulation standards, the installation of an MCS approved Air Source Heat Pump (ASHP), together with a PV array with a minimum output capacity of 6.80 kWp. It is initially thought that the PV installation will comprise of 8 x 400 W panels being installed on the West-facing pitched roof to the front and a further 9 x 400 W panels on the East-facing pitched roof space to the side, equating to approximately 34.00 m² of roof space in total. In the circumstances, the proposed energy strategy and predicted energy performance of the proposed development is therefore deemed to satisfy the requirements of PfE Policy JP-S2: Carbon and Energy.

It is noted that to achieve compliance with PfE Policy JP-S2, the applicant seeks to install an air source heat pump and solar panels. No information is contained within the submitted Site Plan and Elevations of where either of these two things would be located and no Noise Assessment has been submitted or indeed if it would be required. Given the proximity of the proposed dwelling to the neighbouring dwelling 520 Bolton Road this is concerning and therefore insufficient information accompanies this application.

PfE Policy JP-S2 also requires new development to incorporate adequate Electric Vehicle Charging (EVC) points for its occupants. In this case, a minimum of one EV charging point will be required.

The proposed layout fails to incorporate Electric Vehicle Charging provision for the proposed dwelling. However, this could be conditioned.

The proposal fails to provide the necessary 3 car parking spaces and fails to demonstrate that all cars could enter and leave both the application site and the property Underhill, within the submitted blue edge, in a forward gear, this could not be secured by planning condition. This fact further demonstrates that the proposal would not result in well-designed development, as required by Section 12 of the NPPF.

Digital Connectivity

PfE Policy JP-C2 - 'Digital Connectivity' requires all new development to have full fibre to premises connections unless technically infeasible or unviable. A statement accompanies this application advising the proposed dwelling would receive full fibre connectivity. This statement would be on the list of any subsequently approved plans and documents should the LPA be minded to approve this proposal to ensure this would be incorporated into the development. On this basis, the proposal would accord with the requirements of this policy.

Design and Layout

The National Planning Policy Framework and National Design Guide both seek to secure well-designed development.

UDP Policy EN1/2 seeks to ensure that development proposals would not have a detrimental effect on the visual amenity and character of a particular area. UDP Policies H2/1 and H2/2 provide the assessment criteria for detailed matters relating to height, appearance, and character, aspects and finishing materials for new residential developments.

PfE Policy JP-H3 requires all new dwellings to:

1. Comply with the nationally described space standards and
2. Be built to the 'accessible and adaptable standard in Part M4(2) of Building Regulations unless specific site conditions make this impracticable.

The application is accompanied by a Space Standards table which demonstrate that the proposal would provide rooms that are larger than the Nationally set space standards requirements. No information has been submitted relating to whether the proposal would be built to the accessible and adaptable standards required by Building Regulations Part M4(2). This could be secured by planning condition.

In terms of the design and layout of the development, it has been demonstrated through the matters already considered that the proposal fails to sit comfortably within this side garden of the property known as Underhill and would appear incongruous and discordant within the street scene, to the detriment of the visual amenities of this locality.

It is also clear that the proposal fails to provide sufficient car parking provision for the proposed dwelling and fails to provide a safe access and manoeuvring facilities and also fails to provide electric vehicle charging provision. Moreover, the proposal would also cause harm to the amenity of the occupiers of 520 Bolton Road. These demonstrate that the proposed layout and design cannot be safely and sympathetically accommodate the proposed development.

Planning Balance and Conclusions

As a result of the lack of the Council having a deliverable five-year housing supply the 'tilted balance' currently applies, and planning permission should be granted unless the points set

out in NPPF paragraph 11(d) i or ii apply. By virtue of the application site being classed as Grey Belt land It has been demonstrated that

Due to the proposal being within the curtilage of an existing dwellinghouse on the edge of the settlement of Holcombe Brook which contains a number of shops and services, the application site is considered to be Grey Belt and to accord with paragraph 155 of the NPPF and therefore development of Grey Belt land.

Whilst this is the case, it has been demonstrated that the proposal results in substantial harm to visual amenity and the landscape character of this semi-rural area, there would not be such a significant harm to the amenity of neighbouring residents (a ground floor window on the side elevation of their dwelling). Due to the failure to provide any details of the noise output and positioning of the Air Source Heat Pump referenced within the submitted Energy Statement, and by virtue of the failure to demonstrate a safe access and manoeuvring space within the application site and the dwelling 'Underhill' and failure to provide sufficient car parking provision for a 5 bedroom dwelling, the proposal would result in poor design and demonstrable harm to highway safety and the safety of all users of the highway network, the existing occupiers of 'Underhill' and any occupiers of the proposed development. All of these harms clearly outweigh the minimal benefits of providing one dwelling. Accordingly, it is recommended that this application be refused.

Statement in accordance with Article 35(2) Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment) Order 2015

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. The Local Planning Authority has therefore implemented the requirement in Paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Recommendation: Refuse

Conditions and Reasons:

- 1 The proposed development would, by reason of its scale, design, massing and siting, be a prominent and intrusive feature in the street scene and would therefore, be seriously detrimental to the visual amenities of the area, that fails to achieve a high quality design and layout that adequately reflects the local character and vernacular of this semi-rural transitional location. The scheme is thus considered detrimental to the visual amenities of the area, contrary to Policy JP-C1: Landscape Character of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, Policies EN1/2: Townscape and Built Design and Policy H2/2: The Layout of New Residential Development of Bury Unitary Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 2 The proposal would result in the intensification of use of the existing single dwelling gated access onto a classified road at a hazardous position on the local highway network, which would result in a substandard and unsafe access for two dwellings that is likely to lead to conflicts on the A676 Bolton Road in close proximity to the transition in speed limits and junction with Redisher Lane, to the detriment of highway safety and the free flow of traffic on the adjacent classified road. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy H2/2: The Layout of New Residential Development of Bury Unitary Development Plan, policies JP-C5: Streets for All and C8: Transport Requirements of New Development of the Greater Manchester Places

for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 3 The proposed internal vehicular and pedestrian access arrangements are substandard and are likely to lead to conflicts at the interface with the adopted highway between vehicles generated by the proposed development and pedestrians, and vehicles associated with the existing dwelling, to the detriment of road and pedestrian safety and the free flow of traffic on the adjacent classified road. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy H2/2: The Layout of New Residential Development of Bury Unitary Development Plan, policies JP-C5: Streets for All and C8: Transport Requirements of New Development of the Greater Manchester Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 4 The proposal does not provide suitable accommodation for vehicles to enter and leave the site in a forward gear and therefore is detrimental to road safety and maintaining the free flow of traffic. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy H2/2: The Layout of New Residential Development of Bury Unitary Development Plan, policies JP-C5: Streets for All and C8: Transport Requirements of New Development of the Greater Manchester Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 5 The application contains insufficient information relating to either the Air Source Heat Pump or Solar Panels referred to within the submitted Energy Statement. The application and submitted plans contain insufficient information to enable them to be properly assessed. The proposal could therefore cause harm to the amenity of existing neighbours and future occupiers of the proposed development and could cause further harm to visual amenity. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policies H2/1: The Form of New Residential Dwellings, H2/2: The Layout of New Residential Development and Policy EN7/2: Noise Pollution of the Bury Unitary Development Plan, Policy JP-S2 - Carbon and Energy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
CB	04/06/2026	DM	4/6/26