

71949 & 71950 Planning and Listed Building Consent, Bast House Cottage, 335 Manchester Road, Ramsbottom, Bury.

Replace existing windows; change window to ground floor front & side elevation to glazed door, addition of window to first floor rear elevation and increase size of window to existing ground floor rear elevation. Upgrade house insulation to improve thermal performance which will need side gable recessed bay to be insulated and rendered white externally.

The application building is a Grade II listed building the following description is from the National Heritage List for England (NHLE) – *"Probably early C18. Stone, right-hand end having brick buttressing and gable, the whole evidently once being part of larger house. Two storeys. Two windows with drip mould (right-hand one three-light with renewed stone mullions with labels, left-hand one with round-headed lights and a label, but first floor left-hand one blind and probably a date-panel). Other round-headed and mullioned windows on side walls. Slate roof. Later rear wing".*

Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states:

In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that heritage assets range from sites and buildings of local historic value to those of the highest significance, such as World Heritage Sites which are internationally recognised to be of Outstanding Universal Value. These assets are an irreplaceable resource and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations.

Paragraph 207 of the NPPF states that in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

Paragraph 210 of the NPPF states in determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Paragraph 212 of the 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 213 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 215 of the NPPF states that 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.

Listed Building.

It is accepted that the building is in a sustainable occupied residential use in the absence of any evidence to the contrary in the application details submitted.

The proposed external alterations would represent a loss of special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building.

Elements of north and east elevations are already painted, these are the parts of the elevation that are constructed from, replaced or faced in brick, although no understanding of this alteration has been advanced or a reason why these areas have being painted.

Windows.

The replacement of the existing timber window frames, although not original, with UPVC windows would not be appropriate on a listed building. Plastic

windows are not historically accurate and currently plastic frames cannot achieve the desired level of historicism with regards to design, detailing, moulding and profile and appearance and colour that would preserve the special architectural and historic interest of a listed building. The existing timber windows would offer a greater level of historicism than plastic windows and as such would at least preserve the current level of architectural and historic interest. No condition report or survey of the window frames has been submitted to justify their wholesale replacement. Even non-historic windows, especially when constructed from timber, should be assessed for repair in the first instance.

The applicants' heritage statement does not constitute a statement of significance describing the significance of the asset affected by the proposed development as required by paragraph 207 of the NPPF.

The proposal to enlarge window openings, replace window openings with new entrances and the addition of a window to a non-habitable laundry room would have the potential to harm the legibility of the building which contributes to the understanding of its significance and therefore might harm any significance that has been identified. There has been no significance identified by the heritage statement or that a very low level of significance exists.

External Render.

The proposed rendered external wall insulation system (EWI) to the south east gable would represent an incongruous feature on the building, even though it is already painted white. Painted brickwork is not an historic feature of the period of the building and as such is inappropriate and should be returned to bare brick. The additional cladding (EWI) and render although sited in the recessed part of the gable would be incongruous and contemporising causing a loss of architectural interest.

The application states that internal alterations are to be carried out. No details of the internal works have been provided and have not been included in the listed building consent application documents or its description.

Conclusion.

The proposal in its current form would cause harm to the significance of the listed building. This harm is considered to constitute less than substantial harm within the terms of the NPPF and as such requires a balancing of the harm identified against the public benefits of the proposal.

No public benefit(s) have been identified by the applicant and it is considered that as a private residence in sustainable use there would be no public benefit that would outweigh the harm identified.

From a heritage conservation point of view it is recommended that application is refused for lack of information about certain elements of the proposed scheme identified, the lack of a substantive description of significance as required by

paragraph 207 of the NPPF and use of inappropriate design and materials such as the EWI and plastic windows. Alternatively the application is withdrawn and pre-application negotiations take place to achieve a mutually agreed appropriate scheme.

Conservation Officer

19/9/25.