

70306 – Albion Mill, Albion Street, Bury.

Alteration to fenestration; Replace existing windows; Replace existing roof with hidden valley gutter removed.

The proposed application building is considered to be a Non-Designated Heritage Asset (NDHA). It is not within a conservation area or the setting of a listed building.

Paragraph 200 of the National Planning Policy Framework (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 201 of the NPPF states local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

Paragraph 202 of the NPPF states where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of, or damage to, a heritage asset, the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision.

Paragraph 209 of the NPPF states the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

The submitted heritage assessment does not contain an assessment of all the heritage values the building may possess that would contribute to its significance. As such the local planning authority cannot fully assess the impact of all the proposals that might affect the buildings' significance.

The proposals would directly affect the heritage asset in particular the replacement of all the windows and roof. The proposed roof replacement has not been fully explained or justified especially with regard to its proposed alterations and its architectural or historic interest has not been explored in the heritage assessment therefore the potential level of harm to its significance is not understood.

What is understood, is that the window design, proportions, material and reveal setback do provide architectural and historic interest and the legibility of an early, although be it, plain early 19th century cotton mill in Bury town centre. The building is an early example of mill architecture in the town centre and inappropriate window replacement would directly reduce the legibility of the building, its architectural aesthetic and historic interest and would represent an incongruous feature on the building leading to unacceptable harm to its significance.

The proposed window replacements should be of a timber construction and single glazed and of the same design, proportions and setback as the existing. Plans and sections would be required to show these details would comply with the existing windows together with detail of the existing window reveal setback.

Rooflights as part of roof replacement would not be an acceptable feature to the extent proposed on an historic mill roofscape and would not represent a level of historicism that would not cause an unacceptable loss of significance of the building. The original roof structure, design and covering should be retained unless a strong structural/condition justification can be produced, and is the additional natural light in the roof space required to continue the use of that part of the building in a retail storage use. Also no reason/justification has been put forward for the proposed element of demolition.

Some elements of the proposal are welcome such as the removal of roller shutters and the external steel stair case.

Mark Kilby PGDip (Building Conservation & Adaptation)

Conservation Officer

30/1/24

The applicant has submitted a new heritage assessment and statement of significance which has provided a better understanding of the buildings' heritage values and the potential impact of the proposals on the significance of it.

It has concluded that the building derives its significance mainly from the external envelope of the building by virtue of its fenestration pattern, size, proportion and retention of original stone cills and heads. Internal cast iron columns remain giving its legibility as a mill but little else of the original remains.

The external alterations to the roof do not require planning permission but would not be visible from normal vantage points and as such are acceptable in heritage conservation terms.

The applicant has proposed thin profile aluminium windows to match the existing as an alternative to UPVc frames. This would be acceptable in principle subject to precise design detail including a section plan showing the retention of the

window reveal set back. The proposed windows can either be single or double glazed standard or slimline. Glazed aluminium frames would also be acceptable for the proposed new doors subject to the same design detail requirements.

Stone samples should be submitted and approved as part of the application.

Demolition of the small single storey non-historic extension is acceptable.

The proposed roof lights would be acceptable, and a manufacturers design specification has been submitted for them which is acceptable, and which will part of the approved plans.

Revised plans should be submitted to remove the reference to UPVc windows.

The proposal will either comply with or not be contrary to paragraphs 200, 201, 202 and 209 of the NPPF and Heritage JP-P2 of the Greater Manchester Combined Authority Joint Plan – Places for Everyone (PfE).

Mark Kilby

Conservation Officer

17/4/24.