

68280 & 68281 Planning and Listed Building Consent – 7 Market Place, Ramsbottom

Change of use of first floor vacant retail unit to form 1 No. apartment and subdivision of remainder of 1st floor and 2nd floor to form 2 No apartments (Total of 3 No. apartments); External alterations

The application site together with No.9 is a Grade II Listed Building and is within Ramsbottom Conservation Area.

Circa 1840 in date. The building has a plain symmetrical classical frontage forming the west side of Market Place. Ashlar stone with 3 storeys 4 sash windows (with altered glazing). It has a 20th century shopfront, framing pilaster strips, sill bands and eaves cornice. Included as part of central Ramsbottom group it has a group value with the other listed buildings surrounding Market Place as such is a strong contributor the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The buildings' heritage significance is derived from its architectural aesthetic in its plain classical form and its group value within the conservation area. The building has already been adapted internally into a mixed use of residential and retail. It is therefore considered that the interior of the building contributes little to its significance.

Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which require decision makers to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any feature of architectural or historic interest it possesses. The decision maker must also give considerable importance and weight to the desirability of preserving the setting of the listed building.

Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires Local Planning Authorities in the exercise of their planning functions to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

Paragraph 200 of the NPPF states any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.

Substantial harm to or loss of:

a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;

b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.

Paragraph 202 of the NPPF states where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

Planning Application – 68280

The change of use is acceptable as it would have no further impact on and preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The proposed adaptation of the building includes replacement of upper floor windows from timber sliding sash (not original) to black sliding sash UPVC windows to match the adjoining neighbouring windows. UPVC windows are not acceptable on listed buildings or generally in conservation areas. It is noted the neighbours windows are of a top hung opening light design and whilst the applicant has stated sliding sash windows to match the adjoining neighbour the neighbouring windows are of a top hung opening light design, are also not acceptable in conservation areas.

The proposed replacement windows would, by virtue of their design and materials represent an incongruous, contemporising and urbanising feature within that part of the conservation area that would not be expected to be present in an historic conservation area. They would neither preserve or enhance the character or appearance of it. As such the replacement windows would represent less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area and as a private venture there would be no public benefit that would outweigh the harm identified.

Therefore the proposed replacement windows would not comply with Bury adopted policies EN2/1-Character of Conservation Areas, EN2/2-Conservation Area Control and would be contrary to paragraphs 199, 200 and 202 of the NPPF.

The replacement windows should be timber sliding sash, coloured white, and if double glazed, should be slimline double glazed units. Full details of which should be approved before development commences.

Listed Building Consent – 68281

The proposed internal adaptation to facilitate the change of use is considered acceptable as the building has already been significantly adapted and its significance is derived from its external architectural aesthetic. As such it would not harm the significance of the building.

The building contributes as part of the group value of Market Place, nearby listed buildings and the character and appearance conservation area.

The proposed replacement windows would represent by virtue of their design and materials an incongruous, contemporising and urbanising feature on the listed building and on the setting of the nearby listed buildings and the group as a whole.

The architectural aesthetic of the building and the group would be severely harmed by the introduction of the proposed contemporary windows causing a loss of architectural significance without any clear or convincing justification for the harm caused. The proposal would also represent harm, for the same reasons to the setting of the listed buildings and the group as a whole causing loss of significance without and clear or convincing justification for that harm. Therefore the proposal would not comply with Bury adopted policies EN2/3- Listed Buildings and would be contrary to paragraphs 199, 200 and 202 of the NPPF.

Mark Kilby PGDip (Building Conservation & Adaptation)

Conservation Officer

08/06/2022