

71928 – 1 The Rock, Bury.

Listed building consent for change of use of basement, rear of ground floor and 1st/2nd/3rd/4th floors from commercial (Class E) to 10 no. self-contained flats with external alterations.

The application represents a significant increase in the number of proposed flats granted consent under planning and listed building consents 68111 and 68112 from 7 to 10.

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 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.

- There is no schedule of works, details of repairs, replacements, scope or impact.
- The schedule of works and repairs details should include the works referred to in the design and access statement and heritage statement and should, along with annotations on the submitted plans pinpoint the exact area and extent of the repairs and alterations. This is for both internal and external works.
- A window schedule should be provided for the window repair and replacement.
- Windows will need to be maintained or replaced timber single glazing.
- Details of internal secondary glazing should it be required should be provided.
- A condition survey of the existing windows will inform the amount of repair and replacement.
- Additional light wells will not be supported.
- Internal false walls installed to the inside of exterior walls are unlikely to be supported without justification.
- Removal/loss of original skirting will not be supported.
- There are two schemes proposed for the rear elevation. This needs clarification.

The application submission for listed building consent does not provide sufficient information with regard to the amount, scale, scope, type, method and precise location of repairs or refurbishments required to be carried out to enable the

proposed residential conversion to be carried out, or for their appropriateness to be fully assessed for both their impact on the special architectural or historic interest of the listed building or their requirement or otherwise for listed building consent.

In its current form the application would not satisfy the relevant policies of the NPPF listed above, adopted UDP policy EN2/3 – Listed Buildings or Environment Policy JP-P2 of the Greater Manchester Combined Authority Joint Plan – Places for Everyone.

Conservation Officer

1/9/2025