

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Helen Pressley	Date of report: 17/10/2025	Ref: 70803/FUL
Registration: 10/09/2024	LDfC: 10/10/2024	Expiry Date: 05/11/2024
Site Visit: 17/09/2024	Site Notice: 17/09/2024	Press Date: 19/09/2024
Objections: 0	Con Area: BURY	Adv Type: LBCA
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: COUS

Proposal: Change of use to create 9no. apartments (Class C3) including internal alterations; Existing timber framed windows to be replaced

Location: Former Barclays Bank, 26 Silver Street, Bury, BL9 0DH

Description

The application relates to a Grade II Listed Building located in Bury Town Centre Conservation Area. The building is a two storey property constructed from ashlar with enriched classical detail. The property is located on a corner plot on the junction of Bank Street and Spring Street and was constructed in 1868. The site was first listed in 1981. The site is currently vacant, and was last utilised as a bank.

Pedestrian access to the building can be gained directly from Silver Street. A secondary access to the rear of the site is available from Bank Street, adjacent to Bank Chambers.

As well as being listed, and located within the conservation area the property is attached to another Grade II Listed building to the rear, Bank Chambers, a 3 storey annexe to the former bank. Further Grade II Listed Buildings No. 2 - 8 Bank Street are also located to the rear of the site on Bank Street. The site is also attached to No. 24 Silver Street, which is not Listed but is included within the Draft Local List and is identified within the Bury Conservation Area Appraisal as a significant unlisted building that makes a positive contribution to the character of the conservation area.

Lutyens War Memorial to Lancashire Fusiliers a Grade II* Listed Building is located with Gallipoli Gardens which faces the site, and the Grade II Listed Arts and Crafts Building is located to the east of this.

Planning permission is sought for the change of use of the former bank to create 9 no. apartments (Class C3). The proposal seeks to implement internal reconfiguration of the building including subdivision of the former banking hall to create 2no. separate units. In total the proposal seeks to create 5no. 2 bed units and 4no. 1 bed units. Cycle storage and bin storage is proposed to the rear of the site, accessed from Bank Street.

Listed Building consent 70804 has been submitted for consideration in tandem with this application.

Relevant Planning History

19098 - Toilet block at rear - Approve 29/01/1987

19478 - Automatic Teller Machines - Approve 28/05/1987

19479 - 2 automatic teller machines - Approve 30/07/1987

27188 - Listed Building Consent to erect a telecommunications aerial - Approve

28/05/1992

37355 - Internally illuminated individual letters fascia signs and projecting sign - Approve with Conditions 21/03/2001

37356 - Listed Building Consent to display advertisements - Approve with Conditions 21/03/2001

39805 - Listed Building Consent - bird control measures to include spikes, wires and netting - Approve with Conditions 08/11/2002

39934 - Installation of external ramp to provide disabled access - Withdrawn

39935 - Listed Building Consent - External ramp to provide disabled access - Withdrawn

40860 - Provision of external ramp to provide disabled access - Withdrawn

42487 - Installation of disabled access ramp to front - Refused 14/06/2004

42488 - Construction of disabled access ramp to front entrance (Listed Building Consent) - Refused 14/06/2004

42870 - Listed Building Consent - replacement of existing ATMs at reduced height; partial reduction of floor level within bank and removal of stone step - Approve with Conditions 17/08/2004

43075 - Disabled Access Ramp to front of building - Withdrawn

43077 - Listed Building Consent - Disabled access ramp to front entrance. Lowering of entrance door and insertion of new panel above to match existing frame. Re-modelling of lobby to accommodate new access ramp - Withdrawn

43831 - Internal and external access ramp and relocation of ATMS (Resubmission) - Approve with conditions 11/02/2005

43832 - Listed Building Consent - Access ramp (internal and external) and relocation of ATMs in respect of works to provide access for disabled users (Resubmission) - Approve with Conditions 11/02/2005

43932 - Installation of 7no. air conditioning systems, 7no. condensing units to be located on the rear external walls of the building - Approve with Conditions 09/03/2005

43933 - Listed Building Consent - Installation of 7no. air conditioning units, 7no. condensing units to be mounted to the rear external wall - Approve with Conditions 09/03/2005

52972 - Listed Building Consent for the removal of automated teller machines (ATMs) and reinstatement of void left by their removal - Approve with Conditions 24/09/2010

53396 - Change of use from (Class A2 Bank) to A3 (Restaurants and Cafes) and A4 (Drinking Establishments) - Approve with Conditions 14/01/2011

53530 - Listed Building Consent - Re-paint all window frames, front door (and frame) and hand railings on Silver Street - Approve with Conditions 03/02/2011

57636 - Change of use of ground floor and part of first floor to restaurant (Class C3); Subdivision of building to form offices at ground, first and second floors (Class B1); New entrances formed on Bank Street and Silver Street; Internal alterations - Approve with Conditions 30/07/2014

57645 - Listed building consent for change of use of ground floor and part of first floor to restaurant (Class C3), subdivision of building to form offices at ground, first and second floors (Class B1), new entrances formed on Bank Street and Silver Street and internal alterations - Approve with Conditions 30/07/2014

70804 - Listed building consent for change of use from former bank to 9 no. apartments (Class C3) including associated works to the rear of the building to provide bin/cycle storage; Replacement of existing timber framed windows; Internal alterations including mezzanine floors and roof lights - Pending

Publicity

Neighbour Letters sent 11th September 2024.

Site Notice Posted to the front of the site 17th September 2024.

Press Notice published in the Bury Times 19th September 2024

No representations received.

Amended plans were accepted amending the layout on the scheme on the 6th October 2025. No additional publicity was undertaken as the proposal would not increase the number of units proposed.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

Traffic Section and Waste Management - No formal recommendation made whilst waiting on a potential amended scheme confirming number of units proposed. Would not resist the principle but would like to confirm the bin storage, and refuse collection arrangements that would utilise a narrow ginnel from Bank Street. Would need to minimise the use of the adopted highway for the storage of bins on collection day on Bank Street.

Environmental Health - Pollution Control - No objections raised.

Conservation Officer - Objection. The proposal in its current form would not bring the listed building back into a use that would be compatible with its conservation unless there are identified public benefits that would outweigh the harm identified to its significance.

Drainage Section - No response

United Utilities (Water and waste) - No response

Greater Manchester Fire - No response

Greater Manchester Police - designforsecurity - No response

Victorian Society - Whilst we do not object to the principle of converting the building into apartments, more information is required to determine the impact the proposal will have on the significance of the listed building.

Historic Buildings and Places - HB&P recognise the need to find a sustainable use of this listed former bank building and do not object to the principle of the change of use. However, we must object as the proposed alterations to the ground floor, particularly within the former banking chamber, are highly damaging and harm the special historic and architectural interest of this heritage asset.

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant

Development Plan and Policies

EN1/2 Townscape and Built Design

EN2/1 Character of Conservation Areas

EN2/2	Conservation Area Control
EN2/3	Listed Buildings
EN6/3	Features of Ecological Value
EN7/2	Noise Pollution
EN7/5	Waste Water Management
EN8/2	Woodland and Tree Planting
H1/2	Further Housing Development
H2/1	The Form of New Residential Development
H2/2	The Layout of New Residential Development
H2/4	Conversions
HT2/4	Car Parking and New Development
JP-G8	A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity
JP-H1	Scale of New Housing Development
JP-H3	Type, Size and Design of New Housing
JP-H4	Density of New Housing
JP-P1	Sustainable Places
JP-P2	Heritage
JP-C1	Our Integrated Network
JP-C2	Digital Connectivity
JP-C5	Streets For All
JP-C6	Walking and Cycling
JP-S2	Carbon and Energy
JP-S4	Flood Risk and the Water Environment
JP-S1	Sustainable Development
SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
SPD11	Parking Standards in Bury
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework

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 (Residential)

The National Planning Policy Framework (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 under-delivery 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 sets out the latest housing supply position, which is made up of sites that have an extant planning permission 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 joint Places for Everyone Plan allocates significant strategic sites for housing within Bury and will accelerate housing delivery within the Borough to meet housing needs.

Following the adoption of Places for Everyone, the Council is able to demonstrate a deliverable 5-year supply of housing land with a 20% buffer (as currently required in Bury due to past under delivery) when assessed against the adopted PfE 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.

NPPF paragraph 80 requires the latest published HDT results to be used. However, the Government is currently operating to a delayed publication timetable for the HDT, and although the latest published results for 2023 are below 75%, based on the current HDT rulebook Bury's result for 2024 will be above 75% and the tilted balance will no longer be triggered by the housing delivery test result.

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.

As a result of the latest published HDT result the 'tilted balance' applies and planning permission should be granted unless the above points Para 11(d) i or ii apply.

In this instance however the site relates to a Listed Building and so therefore paragraph 11 (d)(i) applies, and the proposal needs to be assessed against the relevant heritage policies.

Heritage and Design

The application site is a Grade II listed Building and is located within Bury Town Centre Conservation Area.

Policy

UDP Policy EN2/3 confirms that the Council will actively safeguard the character and setting of Listed Buildings by not permitting works, alterations or changes of use which would have a detrimental effect on their historical or architectural character and features.

As the site is located within the Conservation Area it is necessary to consider the proposal in terms of UDP Policies EN2/1 and EN2/2 that seek to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Borough's Conservation Areas.

These policies are further supported by PfE Policy JP-P2 that seeks to pro actively manage and work with partners to positively conserve, sustain and enhance the historic environment and heritage assets and their settings.

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.

Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states: In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any of the provisions mentioned in subsection (2), special attention shall be paid to the desirability

of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

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 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.

In addition to the Heritage policies set out above UDP Policies H2/1 and H2/2 provide the assessment criteria for detailed matters relating to height, appearance, density and character, aspects and finishing materials for new residential developments. PfE Policy JP-H3 - Seeks to provide an appropriate mix of dwelling types and sizes reflecting local plan policies and having regard to relevant local evidence. Development across the plan area should seek to incorporate a range of dwelling types and sizes, including for self-build. 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. PfE Policy JP-P1 Sustainable Places aims to promote a series of beautiful, healthy and varied places.

When assessing conversions UDP Policy H2/4 , has regard to factors including effect on the amenity of neighbouring properties, impact on the general character of the area and existing concentration of flats, amenity of occupants, effect on the street scene of any changes to the external appearance and car parking and servicing requirements.

Significance

The submitted Built Heritage Statement describes the heritage significance of the listed building and assesses the amount and level of harm the proposal represents to its heritage significance.

The Heritage statement confirms that the building was constructed in 1868, by Blackwell and Son and Booth, of Manchester and Bury, with sculpture by Joseph Bonehill. The building is two storey ashlar with enriched classical detail. The windows have been replaced, but are presently timber. The present building replaced an earlier bank on the site after its owners, the Bury Banking Company (originally Grundy and Wood, of The Wylde), outgrew their offices. The Bury Banking Company merged with the Lancashire and Yorkshire Bank in 1888, later becoming Martin's Bank and, later still, Barclays. The upper floors were once used as Bury's council chamber and Town Clerks Department. The building was Listed in 1981. The Heritage Statement confirms that the building retains architectural detailing, with some areas of localised deterioration related to weather action, moss/lichen built up and failure of rain water products.

The Heritage Statement also confirms the location of the adjoining Bank Chambers Building, a Grade II Listed Building that is now in separate ownership, but was originally an annexe to the bank building. and other designated Heritage Assets within the proximity of the site including 2 - 8 Bank Street, War Memorial to the Lancashire Fusiliers and Bury School of Arts and Crafts on Broad Street and the Bury Town Centre Conservation Area.

The attached premises at No.24 Silver Street also needs to be taken into consideration as a significant unlisted building within the Conservation Area and a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA). Built as a hotel between 1893 and 1910 this premises is faced in ashlar sandstone, which chimes with the listed Barclays Bank next door. Neo-classical block with Elizabethan and Dutch influences, including stone mullions and a pedimented Flemish gable. On the Silver Street elevations this premises has an ornate carving over central entrance door and carved panels above the ground floor windows.

The site therefore is located within a grouping of identified buildings that have historic significance, as well as being sited within the Conservation Area.

The listed building to which this application relates possesses architectural and historic interest. Externally the building is intact and relatively unaltered preserving its architectural significance in the enriched classical style. Internally the building has been adapted and there has been some loss of historic fabric causing a loss of significance however the former banking hall to the south side of the building remains relatively intact particularly in terms of scale, and retains a decorative ornate ceiling.

There is no objection from the LPA in principle to the conversion of the listed building into apartments as this would bring a vacant building back into use, however in accordance with Framework guidance, and as confirmed with the Applicant's own Heritage Statement any harm should require clear and convincing justification demonstrating that the proposals represent the optimum viable use for securing the refurbishment and re-use of the building.

Banking Hall

The main banking hall area on the ground floor southern end of the building possesses the most significance with its enriched classical decorative plasterwork to the ceiling. Elsewhere in the building there has been a loss of the original decorative plasterwork through adaptations that have been made. The applicant has agreed to repair and preserve the remaining elements of the decorative historic plasterwork, and to fully restore the plasterwork in the banking hall which is relatively intact.

The Heritage Statement identifies that this space "*The space retains a deep coffered ceiling with finely detailing plasterwork incorporating acanthus leaf mouldings, ceiling roses, medallions, cornice and coving incorporating ventilation holes. The plasterwork is in relatively good condition with localised areas of paint decay and water damage. No fixtures*

or fittings are retained within the space and modern interventions have included the addition of suspended lighting, the relining of wall coverings and laying of a concrete screed floor. The west internal wall retains blocked off opening which originally linked with the Bank Chambers annex. The north internal wall has two large openings added at a later date with the original openings to the space no longer evident."

The Heritage Statement submitted with the application sets out in paragraph 4.16 several recommendations relating to the application including the retention of original decorative elements within internal spaces "where practical" particularly within the former main banking hall. It also notes that "details, including sections, of the method for the encapsulation of decorative elements and margins where new walling intersected with these elements should be provided and assessed." Such details, however, have not been provided in support of the application. The List Entry Description highlights the interior as possessing "highly enriched plasterwork" and is seen as making a significant positive contribution to the significance of the listed building. This decorative plasterwork ceiling within the former banking hall appears to be the most intact element retained within the building and as such any conversion or adaptation of this space needs to be carefully considered.

The proposal would create two, two level apartments at ground floor level in the banking hall. This would require the installation of a mezzanine floor which would obscure a majority of the historic decorative plasterwork resulting in a loss of significance and cut across the window openings internally causing harm to the aesthetic of the building constituting less than substantial harm but at the higher end of that spectrum.

Drawing SK115 does include indicative details in relation to the interaction between the proposed dividing wall between Units 02 and 03 and the decorative ceiling within the banking hall. This intervention has not been fully detailed, and it is unclear if this would be an intervention that could be reversed or whether it has potential to cause permanent damage to the banking hall ceiling. In addition, within the individual units it is proposed to divide the mezzanine floor into 2no. bedrooms. No sections have been provided to suggest how this would be accomplished. Section B-B however shows that the front bedroom walls would also intersect the ceiling and no details have been provided as to how this would be achieved or the impact this would have on the plaster work. It is considered that these details should accompany the application to fully inform decision makers about the impact the proposal will have on the listed building and its significance.

Acoustic Wall linings, plaster board to external walls and timber stud walls are also proposed to be installed within the banking hall which has the potential to impact on the decorative plaster elements that have been retained on the walls - particularly in the corners of the former banking hall. It would appear that this decorative plaster is proposed to be removed in its entirety at ground floor, and obscured at mezzanine level in the north west corner of Unit 02 within the former banking hall to allow these interventions and conversion with no assessment made in relation to the impact of this loss. Plate 4 within the submitted Heritage Statement does indicate that there has been some damage to this plasterwork when closing the access to the adjacent Banking Chamber but this has not been fully detailed.

It is also considered that the subdivision proposed within this space would have a profound and negative impact not only on the decorative plasterwork but also on the proportions of the room, and the ability to understand the former, historic use of the space. Further, the mezzanine level would brutally cut across the windows, requiring an insert which would change their proportions and inappropriately impact the overall appearance of the bank within the streetscape and will be discussed further below. Being the only principal internal space that retains the original decorative plasterwork, efforts must be made to sensitively adapt this space for a new use, not to carve it up in the manner proposed.

Northern section of the building and First floor

In addition to the 2no. units within the banking hall the applicant seeks to provide the

following units within the northern section of the building:

Unit 01 - Ground floor

Unit 04 - Ground floor mezzanine

Unit 05 - First Floor

Unit 06 - First Floor and first floor mezzanine

Unit 07 - First floor and first floor mezzanine

Unit 08 - First floor and first floor mezzanine

Unit 09 - First floor

The Heritage Statement confirms that at ground floor "the space to the north of the main hall retains no significant original decorative detailing and has been vertically sub-divided to the accommodate a mezzanine floor level to the Silver Street frontage. The main space has a modern suspended ceiling and later lift and stairwell, the latter set against the north wall. A cashier's office is retained to the west accessed via a linking corridor to the rear outbuildings which contained the bank vaults. The spaces have been modernised and retain no significant decorative elements or fixtures and fittings. Areas of steel framing and blockwork walling indicate later construction."

In order to create access to the proposed first floor, and northern units the proposal would remove the existing stairs to the northern side of the site and a new central staircase installed and lift. The Heritage Statement considers that this stair was likely added in the latter half of the 20th Century. The Heritage Statement notes that the installation of the new stairs and lift would require sections of the original ceiling and flooring to be removed, but that this would not result in the loss of significant decorative detailing.

Given the close proximity of this area of works to the banking hall ceiling it is considered that the details of the extent of the fabric removed and how the ceiling will be maintained and preserved needs to be submitted. Greater justification would also be sought in regards as to why the lift must be installed in this section of the building and why the present lift and staircase cannot be reused as part of the proposed scheme - other than the potential need to reduce the number or layouts of the flats proposed.

On the Case Officer's and Conservation Officer's visit to the site, with the applicant's agent and heritage advisor it was noted that there had been more interventions in the northern section of the building and at first floor in order to create offices and ancillary rooms within the wider bank building. There are a number of false ceilings installed, and dividing walls that have impacted on some of the original decorative plaster features. Floors have also been introduced that intersect existing windows are visible from outside of the building. The Heritage Statement acknowledges that cornice work and ceiling roses are visible through exposed sections but they are in poor condition.

The applicant has however failed to provide details relating to the condition of the decorative plasterwork throughout this area of the building, a condition survey, scope of repairs and restoration and methodology should be provided to inform whether the harm caused by further interventions would be acceptable. Further details would also be required to understand how the building will be serviced and whether water and electricity services would further impact the remaining plasterwork, how the floors and existing walls are to be treated to deal with fire and acoustic separation and how that may affect the remaining historic building fabric.

Whilst acknowledged that the conversion works required in these areas of the building would have a lesser degree of impact than the proposals within the former banking hall due to the later interventions and adaptations the proposal does still wish to retain some of the more harmful elements such as mezzanine floors that cut through the windows, that are visible from Silver Street. By not addressing these more harmful elements the proposal has missed some opportunities to secure elements of enhancement to this Heritage Asset.

Whilst some of the details above in relation to method statements for restoration for

example, could potentially be secured by condition it is considered that, that initial step to detail the existing retained historic fabric needs to be undertaken so that appropriate and proportionate details can be conditioned.

Windows and Facade

The existing windows are not original, and the Heritage Statement confirms that the windows are in a poor aesthetic condition and whilst refurbishment may be possible it is recommended that consideration be given to replacement windows that seek to match the existing framing style and be constructed in timber.

The submitted elevation plans state that all first floor and ground floor windows would be replaced. Sections and details have been provided of some of the proposed windows and subject to suitably worded conditions it is likely that timber replacements would be acceptable in principle.

The mezzanine level within the proposed banking hall, and within the existing building would brutally cut across the windows, requiring a blanking panel on the principle Silver Street elevation. The existing mezzanine level is already visible from Silver Street representing an element of harm and the addition of further poor design on this elevation, that would change the window's proportions would inappropriately impact the overall appearance of the bank within the streetscape and as such would not only cause harm to the listed building but would fail to preserve the character of the Conservation Area.

Rooflights are now proposed within the main roof of the bank. No details or assessment has been made in relation to this proposed intervention on the Listed Building, or the Conservation Area.

No further external interventions are shown on the external elevations however the Heritage Statement does identify some areas that would need repair. It is considered that a schedule of repairs for the external elements of the building may be suitable for condition if these elements for repair can be adequately identified.

It is noted however that costing quotation submitted as part of the viability information includes external lighting, a gate to the bin walkway, works to the bin walkway, a new main entrance door, works to the roof and building signage the details of which have not been submitted with this application, or the Listed Building consent (70804) that accompanies this proposal.

Conclusion

It is considered that the proposal in its current form would not bring the listed building back into a use that would be compatible with its conservation unless there are identified public benefits that would outweigh the harm identified to its significance. Special regard cannot be given where there is insufficient information provided on features that have been highlighted as potentially of architectural and historic interest.

The submitted Heritage Statement assesses the harm to be less than substantial harm. It is agreed that the level of harm that would be caused by the proposal would represent less than substantial harm to its significance within the terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated asset, should require clear and convincing justification and a balancing of identified public benefit against the harm identified.

Public Benefits and Viability

The applicant has not provided an updated statement in relation to any public benefits of the proposal following submission of amended plans, but has provided viability information which has been reviewed. The Heritage Statement originally submitted with the application identifies that in accordance with Paragraph 202 of the Framework, the less than substantial harm identified should be balanced against the public benefits of the proposal.

The Heritage Statement considers these benefits include the heritage benefits, of bringing the building back into active use and securing necessary repairs to original fabric. Regard should also be had to the current and ongoing vacancy of the building and the desirability of securing a new adaptive re-use. The Heritage Statement states that this would also be addressed further within the Planning Statement.

The Planning Statement does address this to some extent in that they concur with the findings of the heritage statement, and confirm that the building has been vacant since 2010 with alternative proposals not implemented. The Planning Statement considers that the provision of housing should be afforded significant material weight in favour of the proposal - however this contradicts paragraph 11d(i) of the NPPF that confirms that the tilted balance would not apply to this site.

In summary the Planning Statement gives the following public benefits:

- The regeneration of a designated heritage asset that is beginning to fall into disrepair and continued vacancy could lead to dereliction.
- A sympathetic and high-quality residential design and re-use of the building resulting in an uplift in the visual character of the site and surrounding area.
- A use which is compatible with the surrounding uses and will not give rise to any harmful amenity impacts.
- Economic benefits through construction and visitor spend.
- A positive contribution to the housing requirement.
- High quality housing of a mix and type for which there is an identified need.

The above report already acknowledges that there is no objection from the LPA in principle to the conversion of the listed building into residential use as this would bring a vacant building back into use, however the other public benefits listed above would not outweigh the identified harm to the Listed Building.

The Planning Statement also sets out that *"the optimum viable use of this site is a residential redevelopment the benefits of which clearly outweigh the identified level of harm to the designated heritage asset"* however, no alternative uses for the whole, or part of the building have been assessed.

A different design concept for the banking hall of modular units that would preserve the significance of the decorative plasterwork has been put forward during discussions with the applicant/agent in relation to the conversion of the building but has been dismissed by the applicant on the grounds of viability.

A market appraisal has been submitted in support of this dismissal that appears to have been conducted by someone utilising Right Move rather than someone who knows the Bury Town Centre market conditions. In terms of comparables for the proposed development, the market appraisal references 2 flats within a Grade II Listed Building in Summerseat which is a vastly different location than Bury Town Centre and one new build that again is no where near the town centre. A cursory glance at sales for 1/2 bed apartments in the wider Borough of Bury indicates that the prices vary considerably depending on the area of Bury you are in. Given the unique nature of the development, for a conversion of a Listed Building within the Town Centre it is considered that a more bespoke approach to market appraisal, in order to inform viability would be required. The dwellings put forward within the Market Appraisal are therefore considered not to be a fair comparison to the proposal site.

It should also be noted that again no alternative uses, within the banking hall or wider building have been reviewed in order to inform this assessment - eg a mixed use scheme retaining the banking hall in an alternative use and the revenue this may provide. Given the sustainable Town Centre location, residential conversion is not the only use that could be easily accommodated at this site and this needs to be comprehensively reviewed in any supporting information.

The applicant has also submitted a costing quote for the conversion of the building for both the scheme that has been put forward for determination, and a modular design within the banking hall that sets out a list of works proposed. Outside of the concerning elements that include the installation of sprinklers that are not shown on any plans, and the reference to "hack off plaster from internal face of walls" these quotes do not contain or consider any reference to any bespoke restoration or repair works that may be required for a Listed Building.

The appraisal of options also fails to provide a comprehensive overview of the viability of the scheme and does not address any abnormalities for example.

It is considered that the applicant has failed to fully explore the viability of proposed revised scheme putting forward only broad costings and opinion on market demand viability. Lack of viability or otherwise is not a clear or convincing justification in the public interest for allowing the harm identified to the listed building.

In conclusion, the applicant has not put forward a cogent statement of public benefit to enable any balancing against identified harm to be made or provided a full and accurate viability appraisal. As such, there is insufficient information in these submitted documents to either support or object to the application as it stands. Given the above assessment in relation to the Heritage aspects of the building, and the viability information submitted at the legislative level, the information provided does not allow for the LPA to carry out its statutory duty, specifically in having special regard to the desirability of preserving the building and any features of architectural or historic interest which it possesses and as such the proposal can not be supported.

Layout

PfE Policy JP-H4 - Requires new housing development to be delivered at a density appropriate to the location, reflecting the relative accessibility of the site by walking, cycling and public transport and the need to achieve efficient use of land and high quality design. Policy JP-H4 sets out minimum densities that should be considered. Therefore in accordance with Policy JP-H4 regard should be had to a minimum net residential density of 120 dwellings per hectare at this site. The submitted application form states that the site is 0.10 hectares. Based on 9no. dwellings therefore this would provide a density of 90 dwellings per hectare.

JP-H4 also states that lower densities may be acceptable where they can clearly be justified that:

1. Local housing market issues, such as a demonstrable need for a particular type of housing that cannot be delivered at a higher density; or
2. Site-specific issues, such as the design context and any potential impact on the wider landscape or townscape including heritage assets and green infrastructure

Whilst not addressed directly within the submitted Planning Statement given the sensitive nature of the site, and the need to retain and restore historic fabric within this heritage asset it is accepted that a lower density may be appropriate at this site. The planning statement does address housing mix, and states that one and two bedroom apartments are needed locally but does not appear to quantify this statement. The Bury Housing Needs and Demand Assessment Table 7.4 does however provide this evidence at a sub-area level and shows where there is sufficient supply (green) of 1 bedroom flats within Bury sub area, and an insufficient supply (red) of 2 bedroom flats within the Bury sub-area. Given that this data is available it would have been useful to provide an analysis in relation to the need for the types of dwellings proposed, especially considering the viability and public benefit cases that were made.

PfE Policy JP-H3 also states that all new dwelling must:

1. Comply with the nationally described space standards (NDSS); and
2. Be built to the 'accessible and adaptable' standard in Part M4(2) of the Building

Regulations unless specific site conditions make this impracticable.

The proposed floor plan drawing gives the overall GIA, and number of bedrooms and persons proposed per unit. The floor plans do not detail areas or widths of the bedrooms, or the area of storage proposed however as there is a scale on this drawing the Case Officer can undertake this assessment on a unit, by unit basis as set out below:

Unit 1 - 1 bed, 2 person unit. Single storey. At 87 square metres exceeds the minimum GIA standard of 50 square metres. Bedroom floor area of approximately 17 square metres, and 3.7 metres in width exceeds the double occupancy bedroom standards. Storage cupboard of approximately 1.5 square metres meets required standards.

Unit 2 - 2 bed, 4 person unit. Two storey (mezzanine). At 93 square exceeds the minimum GIA standard of 79 square metres. Both bedrooms meet minimum floor areas and widths for double occupancy. No in built in storage annotated but there is a space with doors opening out into the hallway of the unit that could be storage. This area measures approximately 1.26 square metres. Additional built in wardrobes appear to also be indicated within bedroom 1 which would measure approximately 1.5 metres and as such storage standards would be met.

Unit 3 - 2 bed, 4 person unit. Two storey (mezzanine). At 91 square metres exceeds the minimum GIA standard of 79 square metres. Both bedrooms meet minimum floor areas and widths for double occupancy. No in built in storage annotated but there is a space with doors opening out into the hallway of the unit that could be storage. This area measures approximately 1.26 square metres. Additional built in wardrobes appear to also be indicated within bedrooms 1 and 2 which would allow this unit to meet storage standards.

Unit 4 - 1 bed, 2 person unit. Single storey. At 104 square metres exceeds the minimum GIA standard of 50 square metres. Bedroom floor area and width would meet minimum standards for double occupancy. In built storage shown accessed from the kitchen measures approximately 0.94 square metres which is below the 1.5 square metres required for NDSS compliance.

Unit 5 - 1 bed, 2 person unit. Single storey. At 58 square metres exceeds the minimum GIA standard of 50 square metres. Bedroom floor area and width would meet minimum standards for double occupancy. In built storage from the hallway exceeds minimum standards.

Unit 6 - 2 bed, 3 person unit. Two storey (mezzanine). At 70 square metres this unit would appear to meet the minimum GIA standard. It is however unclear if the head height for over 75% of this unit would exceed 2.3 metres due to the accommodation within the roof/mezzanine and lack of proposed sections for this area of the proposed conversion. It is also unclear if all of the floor area in the proposed bedrooms would exceed 1.5 metres in height to assess floor areas or GIA. The existing section B-B however would appear to suggest that overall heights could be achieved if the floor levels do not changes. Bedroom 1 would comply with double occupancy standards. Bedroom 2 would comply with single occupancy standards. No in built storage shown.

Unit 7 - 2 bed, 3 person unit. Two storey (mezzanine). At 70 square metres meets the minimum GIA standard. As above in terms of sections and overall head heights. Bedroom 1 would comply with double occupancy standards. Bedroom 2 would comply with single occupancy standards. No in built storage shown.

Unit 8 - 2 bed, 3 person unit. Two storey (mezzanine). At 70 square metres meets the minimum GIA standard. As above in terms of sections and overall head heights. Bedroom 1 would comply with double occupancy standards. Bedroom 2 would comply with single occupancy standards. No in built storage shown.

Unit 9 - 1 bed, 2 person unit. Single storey. At 53 square metres exceeds the minimum GIA standard of 50 square metres. Bedroom meets minimum standards for area and width. In built storage shown accessed from the hallway measures approximately 1.3 square metres which is below the 1.5 square metres required for NDSS compliance.

Whilst a change in layout of the proposed units could address the lack of storage in units 6, 7, 8 and 9 and the submission of additional sections could address the issue in relation to ceiling heights considering the issues set out above these amendments and additional information have not been requested. It is unclear if there would be any under stairs storage for units 6, 7, and 8 which may count towards NDSS inbuilt storage standards. It is also acknowledged that there appears to be a ground floor, shared store for any future residents however NDSS does not have a standard for communal storage for compliance to be assessed against.

It is unknown if Part M4(2) can be complied with in this instance, and would usually be secured by condition. However given the sensitive nature of the site it may be that site specific conditions would make this impracticable. This particular policy has not been addressed within the Planning Statement.

Amenity

In addition to UDP Policy H2/4 referenced above UDP Policy H1/2 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 EN1/2 requires the Council to assess the relationship of the proposal to the surrounding area. There are no adopted aspect standards for new build residential properties however, Supplementary Planning Document 6 provides guidance on aspect standards between residential properties and as such, would be a reasonable guide in this case.

For clarity the following aspect standards would be applicable:

- 20 metres between directly facing habitable room windows;
- 13 metres between an existing habitable room window and a proposed two storey blank wall
- 6.5 metres between an existing habitable room window and a proposed single storey blank wall
- 7 metres between a proposed first floor habitable room window and a directly facing boundary with a neighbouring property.

The front windows onto Silver Street would face toward Gallipoli Gardens, with the Fusilier beyond, and 21 Silver Street. The windows are existing, and are separated from these directly facing properties by a highway. As such no undue overlooking is foreseen.

Similarly, the side windows onto Bank Street would face towards Library Gardens and would be separated from this area by a highway. As such no undue overlooking is foreseen.

A new window, within the existing fabric of the building is proposed to be introduced to serve the bedroom for unit 5. This window would be sited approximately 2.95 metres from the shared boundary with No. 24 Silver Street and whilst not detailed on an extended site plan showing the neighbouring properties it and would appear to face a courtyard area for this property. This distance is below the 7 metres required by SPD 6 and as such the bedroom window would rely on views over land outside of the applicant's ownership contrary to guidance. This window would also face towards existing windows within the side elevation of No.24 and it does not appear that a separation distance of 20 metres can be provided.

The habitable bedrooms for units 6, 7 and 8 would be served only by rooflights and would

have no outlook. This proposed layout would lead to a poor amenity for the future occupiers of these units which would not be acceptable.

The bedrooms for units 2 and 3 would also not have a direct outlook onto Bank Street or Silver Street as they are set back from the windows however it appears glazing has been introduced on these bedrooms to allow for an outlook and natural light. It is also acknowledged that this arrangement of windows has followed an attempt to retain some of the historic features within the former banking hall.

No extensions are proposed as part of the proposal.

Noise

PfE Policy JP-P1 aims to create a livable city region, and requires developments to provide comfortable and inviting indoor and outdoor environments offering a high level of amenity that minimises exposure to pollution. UDP Policy EN7/2 - Noise Pollution that restricts development that would lead to an unacceptable noise nuisance to nearby occupiers and/or amenity users.

A noise survey has been submitted in support of the application that concludes that based on the noise risk assessment matrix, taking account of the measured noise levels and the context of the site, this site is subject to noise that generates a high risk of an adverse effect. A high risk suggests that there is an increased risk that the development may be refused on noise ground. As such, consideration should be given to how noise affects the site and any future developments.

The submitted noise survey states that *"the development should take account of that noise risk in the form of a detailed Acoustic Development Statement which reflects good acoustic design principles in the layout of dwellings and the use of space, confirming that adverse impacts will be mitigated and minimised."*

This body of work has not been undertaken. It is noted that drawing SK1115 references acoustic lining within the banking hall however, the applicant has not provided evidence of why this is required in this particular area of the building or whether any further mitigation would be required for the other units on the site.

The noise assessment also acknowledges that internal noise levels are below the LOEAL set for this site. LOAEL – Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level – Internal noise levels achieve the requirements of the BS 8233:2014 standard assuming windows are closed, and an additional source of ventilation is provided. No details of alternative ventilation systems have been included within the application.

The assessment also demonstrates that, following incorporation of the alternative glazing and ventilation strategy, predicted internal noise contributions from the neighbouring premises in the most noise sensitive room are predicted to meet the Noise from Pubs and Clubs guidance of NR25 during the daytime and, whilst they do not meet the recommended NR20 during the night-time, the exceedance is expected to be negligible within the context of this site. This assessment is of particular relevance given that the lawful use of the attached No. 24 is a nightclub. Again, no details of alternative glazing or ventilation have been submitted as part of this application.

Whilst no objections have been raised by Environmental Health, given the sensitive nature of the host site it is considered that information in relation to any additional glazing, ventilation systems and mitigation would be required as part of the assessment process of the application and could not be dealt with by condition. The applicant has therefore failed to demonstrate that the proposal would comply with the above noise policies.

Access and Parking

UDP Policy EN1/2 requires the consideration of the design and appearance of access,

parking and service provision. This is further supported by UDP Policy H2/2 that requires proposals to demonstrate adequate car parking provision, access for both vehicles and pedestrians, and provision for public transport and the existence of any public rights of way. PfE Policies JP-C5 and JP-C6 require streets to be well designed and managed to make a significant positive contribution to the quality of place and support high levels of walking, cycling and public transport.

PfE Policy JP-C1 requires developments to be located and designed to deliver a significant increase in the proportion of trips that can be made by walking, cycling and public transport. This is further supported by PfE Policy JP-C8 which requires new development to be located and designed to enable and encourage walking, cycling and public transport use and to reduce the negative effects of car dependency.

Pedestrian access can be gained at the front of the site, utilising the existing front door. Given the location of the front door it is considered that there is suitable natural surveillance for the main access to the site.

In terms of parking standards UDP Policy HT2/4 requires all applications for development to make adequate provision for their car parking and servicing requirements . Supplementary Planning Document 11 provides parking standards for developments.

The site is located within Zone 1 as set out within SPD 11. For flats within Zone 1 disabled parking only should be provided. Given the sustainable location of the site, which is approximately 140 metres from the boundary of Bury Interchange and approximately 15 metres from the main shopping area (identified under UDP Policy S1/1) the lack of onsite parking is considered to be acceptable.

For cycles SPD 11 requires 1 secure, covered space per unit. The floor plans show that this can be accommodated at ground floor adjacent to the bin storage.

Bin storage is shown on the proposed plans. For flats generally the applicant would need to provide 1x 240ltr bin for general waste, and 2 x 120 bins one for each of the recycling schemes per unit.

It is considered likely that these bins can be stored within the curtilage of the site. Should the principle of development the site in heritage terms be acceptable discussions could have been undertaken to provide an off street bin area for collection day.

Ecology

Policy JP-G8 states that through local planning and associated activities a net enhancement of biodiversity resources will be sought. This is supported by Policy EN6/3 that seeks to retain, protect and enhance the natural environment and seeks to retain features of ecological or wildlife value. Paragraph 187 of the NPPF states that the planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment. Policy EN8/2 supports and encourages new woodland and tree planting within the borough.

The site is very constrained by other built development, with no real outdoor space. It is considered that the introduction of bat and bird boxes on the elevations may impact on the character of the Listed Building and as such would not be required.

The application is exempt from statutory BNG due to the de-minimus exemption (less than 25 square metres of habitat lost).

Carbon And Energy

JP-S2 - Carbon & Energy sets out the steps required to achieve net zero carbon emissions.

The applicant has not demonstrated how they would meet the requirements of this policy.

Digital Connectivity

JP-C2 - Digital Connectivity - this policy requires development to have full fibre to premises connections unless infeasible or unviable, with multiple-ducting. The policy supports the provision of free, secure, high-speed public wi-fi connections, particularly in the most frequented areas.

The applicant has not demonstrated how they would meet the requirements of this policy.

Other Matters

The applicant's agent was made aware of the LPA's fundamental concerns with the application prior to determination of the scheme. The LPA seeks to determine applications within the statutory timescales, unless an extension of time is genuinely required and it is acknowledged a number of extensions of time have been agreed, and a Planning Performance Agreement has been signed in relation to this application.

Government guidance is clear that it is at the discretion of the LPA whether to accept changes or additional information to submitted applications. The LPA also has discretion to determine if the changes need to be re-consulted on, or if the proposed changes are so significant as to materially alter the proposal such that a new application should be submitted.

For clarity in relation to the timelines of this application the application was validated on the 10th September 2024. A meeting was conducted with the Conservation Officer, Case Officer, Applicant's nominated Agent and their heritage advisor in October 2024 and this was followed up by Consultation responses from The Victorian Society, HB&P and the Conservation Officer in October and November of that year that raised a number of issues.

The main issue in relation to this site however, as set out above was the subdivision of the banking hall and the harm this would cause to the Listed Building

Extensions of time were agreed to allow for resubmission of further information and redesigns of the scheme and serious concerns were set out in writing by the Case Officer in January of 2024 that the application was not progressing towards a decision. Following this a PPA was signed in March with a timetable set out by the Applicant's agent. This PPA also included a number of documents that the LPA wished to be submitted with the application. The timetable within this agreement for submission of information was not met, and an amended timetable was agreed in writing in May 2025.

There was a subsequent delay in submission of information for comment, which was followed up by a meeting on the 2nd July 2025. This meeting included a discussion in relation to the submission of supporting viability information, to inform the balance that needed to be reviewed in relation to the identified harm however the meeting was not restricted to this issue.

No further contact was made directly by the applicant following this meeting and the Case Officer contacted the agent requesting a further EOT, and confirmed that all further information should be submitted by the 5th September. Again this deadline was missed and no further contact was made until w/c 29th September. The applicant's agent submitted amended drawings and viability information on the 6th and 7th October which the LPA have accepted and the LPA has made the decision to proceed to determination on this basis. It is acknowledged that the applicant has since sought to withdraw the submitted plans and submit a modular design instead however this would conflict with the viability information submitted by the applicant in support of the current layout and therefore the LPA has not accepted this amendment.

Unfortunately in relation to this application, continued delays have led to a number of EOTs and revised timetables being agreed. No real progress in relation to the submission of information has been made since the initial concerns raised in 2024. At the legislative level,

the information provided does not allow the LPA to carry out its statutory duty, specifically in having special regard to the desirability of preserving the building and any features of architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Given the time lapsed, extended periods of no contact from the applicant/agent and the quality of the information that has been submitted the LPA has decided to proceed to determination within the agreed extension of time with no further negotiations.

The LPA however would invite the applicant/agent to front load any further applications at this site and engage in a meaningful pre-application enquiry that seeks to address all of the issues raised above, and during the course of this application.

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 proposal would result in the loss of significant features of a Grade II Listed Building to the detriment of its appearance, character and historic interest, principally within the former banking hall. The proposal would not bring the Listed Building back into a use that would be compatible with its conservation and the harm to the Listed Building is considered to be less than substantial harm. The applicant has failed to demonstrate a clear and convincing justification or balancing of identified public benefit against the harm identified. The proposal would therefore conflict with the following policies of the Development Plan: EN2/3 Listed Buildings, JP-P2 - Heritage and Chapter 16 -Conserving and enhancing the historic environment of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 2 The proposed windows, by reason of the introduction of blanking panels, are detrimental to the character and special architectural interest of this, the adjacent listed buildings and would fail to preserve the Bury Town Centre Conservation Area. The proposal would therefore conflict with the following policies of the Development Plan: EN2/3 Listed Buildings, JP-P2 - Heritage, EN2/1 - Character of Conservation Areas, EN2/2 - Conservation Area Control and Chapter 16 -Conserving and enhancing the historic environment of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 3 Insufficient information has been submitted with the application to enable the Local Planning Authority to fully determine the effect of the proposal upon the appearance, character and historic interest of a Grade II Listed Building. The information provided does not allow for the Local Planning Authority to carry out its statutory duty, specifically in having special regard to the desirability of preserving the building and any features of architectural or historic interest which it possesses. The proposal would therefore conflict with the following policies of the Development Plan: EN2/3 Listed Buildings, JP-P2 - Heritage and Chapter 16 -Conserving and enhancing the historic environment of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 4 The applicant has failed to demonstrate that they would be able to provide adequate noise mitigation within the proposed development without detriment to a Grade II Listed Building and the Conservation Area within which the site is located, which

would be seriously detrimental to the residential amenities of future occupiers by reason of the noise. The proposed development therefore conflicts with the following policies of the Development Plan: EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design, EN7/2 - Noise Pollution, JP-P1: Sustainable Places EN2/3 Listed Buildings, JP-P2 - Heritage, EN2/1 - Character of Conservation Areas, EN2/2 - Conservation Area Control and Chapter 16 -Conserving and enhancing the historic environment of the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 5 The location of the bedroom window for Unit 05 would result in an unacceptable reduction in the level of privacy currently enjoyed by the occupiers of No. 24 Silver Street by reason of the sub-standard distances between habitable windows and the shared boundary and between existing windows at No. 24 Silver Street. The proposed development therefore conflicts with Development Plan Policies H1/2 - Further Housing Development, EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design, H2/4 - Conversions, and Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties.
- 6 The proposed dwellings would fail to meet Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS) for in built storage for units 6, 7, 8 and 9. The proposal would therefore fail to comply with Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Policy JP-H3: Type, Size and Design of New Housing.
- 7 The proposed development by virtue of the insertion of rooflights to serve bedrooms within Units 06, 07 and 08 would provide poor, inadequate and sub-standard living conditions for future occupiers by virtue of very limited natural light and restricted and poor outlook and ventilation. The proposed development therefore conflicts with Development Plan Policies H1/2 - Further Housing Development, EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design, H2/4 - Conversions, and Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties.
- 8 The application and submitted plans and supporting statements contain insufficient information to enable the local planning authority to assess whether the proposal would maximise reductions in carbon emissions, as required by Policy JP-S2 - Carbon and Energy of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan.
- 9 The application and submitted plans and supporting statements contain insufficient information to demonstrate that the proposal would comprise high quality digital infrastructure, as required by Policy JP-C2 - Digital Connectivity of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
HP 17/10/2025		HL - 22/10/2025	