

Planning & Listed Building Consent – 67957 & 67958 - 3 Alba Street, Holcombe Village, Ramsbottom.

Construction of a canopy over the existing lower patio.

The application site is a Grade II Listed Building and within Holcombe Village Conservation Area where a Direction removing householder permitted rights under Article 4 of The General Permitted Development Order is in force.

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.

A heritage statement has been submitted as part of this application. It does describe the significance of the heritage assets identified and does assess the impact of the proposals on their significance, either directly or by development within their setting.

Planning Application – 67957

The proposed canopy would be visible in the street scene of that part of the conservation area. It would, by virtue of its 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 rural conservation area. It would neither preserve or enhance the character or appearance of it. As such the proposal would represent less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area and as a private residence there would be no public benefit that would outweigh the harm identified. Therefore the proposal 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.

Listed Building Consent – 67958

The building contributes as part of the group value of 1 and 3 Alba Street and the Shoulder of Mutton public house.

Its significance lies in its architectural aesthetic, simple and relative unaltered form. The planform of the group evidences the evolution of the village pre the industrial age by an almost ad hoc form of development.

The proposal would represent by virtue of its design and materials an incongruous, contemporising and urbanising feature attached to the listed building and in its setting and to the setting of the buildings identified as having group value. The architectural aesthetic of the building and the group would be severely harmed by the introduction of the proposed contemporary feature causing a loss of 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 building 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 PG Dip (Building Conservation and Adaptation)

Conservation Officer

14/03/2021