

Minshull Street Crown Court, Manchester
Proposed Secure Dock Installation

Design and Access Statement incorporating Summary Statement of Significance
Revision A
November 2012

buttressfulleralsopwilliams · architects

CONTENTS

Introduction

History

Significance

Proposals

Summary

Options Appraisal and Justification of Interventions

GLOSSARY

Appendix: Listing

buttressfulleralsopwilliams · architects
31-33 Princess Street, Manchester, M2 4BF · telephone +44 (0)161 236 3303
Fax +44 (0)161 236 3603 · website: www.bfaw.co.uk · email: contact@bfaw.co.uk

Introduction

This report follows the principles established in the English Heritage Publication "Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment" 2008, as well as reference to the Planning Policy Statement 5. Planning Policy Guidance 15 is also considered.

Buttress Fuller Alsop Williams architects have been commissioned by Her Majesty's Courts Service as the appointed Specialist Conservation Consultant to produce and develop a Summary Statement of Significance.

Buttress Fuller Alsop Williams architects are appointed Specialist Conservation Consultant to Her Majesty's Courts Service for the North of England – and as such have an overview of all listed court buildings in the region. This report will be used as a direct reference for the consideration of future works at the court, but can be read separately.

Photographic Images

While it is common practice to enclose photographs of elements of historic buildings affected by listed building consent applications, on this occasion the secure nature of the proposals has prevented the submission of images which would then be placed in the public domain. Should the case officer wish to visit site or review images of the affected spaces, the agent would be happy to assist.

buttressfulleralsopwilliams · architects
31-33 Princess Street, Manchester, M2 4BF · telephone +44 (0)161 236 3303
Fax +44 (0)161 236 3603 · website: www.bfaw.co.uk · email: contact@bfaw.co.uk

History

Manchester Minshull Street Crown Court was built in 1868-71 to a design by Thomas Worthington and was originally the City Police and Sessions Courts. It was built in the Italian Gothic style around the same time as Manchester's Town Hall and like that building, was commissioned following a competition (Worthington actually lost out to Alfred Waterhouse in the Town Hall competition). The building is characterised by its corner clock tower, central campanile chimney and prominent gables, with its brickwork finish punctuated by stone dressings. Internally the building housed several courtrooms, arranged in pairs on each floor, with the central courtyard and offices/corridors separating the courts. While the Court remains a significant landmark of High Victorian architecture in Manchester and is comparable with the Town Hall, it should be noted that the former's construction cost was considerably less at £81,000.



Reproduced by Permission of English Heritage. NMR

The Crown Court was extended in the mid 1990s by the Hurd Rolland Partnership. This added six new courtrooms and provided a covered atrium to rationalise the circulation of the building. The massing of the extension followed that of the Worthington building and introduced simplified gabled forms. Hurd R olland also preserved the original courtrooms and removed C.20th suspended ceilings from some spaces as part of the refurbishment works. The building continues to be used as a Crown Court.



The docks to which the proposals relate to are relatively unaltered both physically and in their relationship with the rest of the building. Societal changes over the course of history have resulted in them being managed in a slightly different way in terms of personnel and seating provision etc,

buttressfulleralsopwilliams · architects
31-33 Princess Street, Manchester, M2 4BF · telephone +44 (0)161 236 3303
Fax +44 (0)161 236 3603 · website: www.bfaw.co.uk · email: contact@bfaw.co.uk

but the character of the docks is ostensibly the same. The existing panelling and grilles from the historic dock ceilings have been removed and there is now steel framed glass panelling used as a measure to prevent escape. Below is an image of a courtroom in use (this may be Court 8 due to the curved panelling to the rear of the dock). The date is unknown but the style of dress on those present suggests the image is possibly from the late Victoria/early Edwardian era.



buttressfulleralsopwilliams · architects
31-33 Princess Street, Manchester, M2 4BF · telephone +44 (0)161 236 3303
Fax +44 (0)161 236 3603 · website: www.bfaw.co.uk · email: contact@bfaw.co.uk

Significance

Below, the significance of Minshull Street Crown Court is measured by using the principles established in the English Heritage Publication "Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment" 2008, It should be noted that the overall significance of the building cannot be calculated by simply adding the constituent elements listed below – often buildings are considered of greater value than the sum of their parts – as such the summary statement of significance is written to bring a conclusion to this. It should be noted that the two main sections of the building have varying degrees of significance, due to their differing ages and architectural treatment. However, despite this the building is listed holistically and the modern elements should still be given the same consideration.

Evidential Value

Evidence of the Victorian Police and Sessions Courts. The original courtrooms have generally been altered little as a result of the modern extension and elements of generally lesser significance were removed. There is still a significant amount of historic detailing, such as joinery and stained glass windows which enables interpretation of the building's historic development. The modern extension is obviously relatively new and has had little time for its evidential value to be altered – in addition, the amount of interpretation that can be gathered from these elements is limited in comparison with the original areas of the building. The Evidential Value is Medium/High.

Historical: Illustrative Value

The court illustrates the importance of Manchester in the context of the judicial system (the city has two Crown Courts). It also signifies the evolution of the justice system in this country and how court uses have changed – the building was first built as a Police and Sessions Court. The addition of additional courtrooms as a result of the 1990s additions also illustrates the importance of the building as a Court.

Historical: Associative Value

buttressfulleralsopwilliams · architects
31-33 Princess Street, Manchester, M2 4BF · telephone +44 (0)161 236 3303
Fax +44 (0)161 236 3603 · website: www.bfaw.co.uk · email: contact@bfaw.co.uk

As with all court buildings Minshull Street Crown Court will be associated with particularly notorious crimes throughout its history. This is emphasised by its status as a Crown Court which means that trials for the most serious crimes generally take place there. Minshull Street Crown Court's associative value is also enhanced by its original design by Thomas Worthington, who was a prominent architect locally around that time (the Memorial Hall and Albert Memorial being two of his well known works in the city centre). The overall Historical Value is Medium/High.

Aesthetic: Artistic Value

The court is a good example of a High Victorian municipal building and is reflective of the Italian Gothic style which was prevalent in Manchester at that time. Its prominent clock tower provides it with a strong civic presence within the city centre. The modern extension is arguably of a lesser aesthetic value than the original structure – however this reflects a sensitive approach to this type of intervention and in itself also displays a strong municipal character. The Aesthetic Value of the Court is High.

Communal: Symbolic Value

Symbolic of a seat of justice – Minshull Street Crown Court is symbolic of the judicial system within Manchester. All courts (historic or modern) play a strong symbolic role in modern society.

Communal: Social Value

Court buildings are generally considered to be of high social value due to the role that they play in modern society. Given Minshull Street Crown Court's prominent location within the city centre it is likely that the building's social status as a court is appreciated by many of Manchester's residents. Overall Communal Value is High.

Summary of Significance

There are several court buildings within Manchester, and presently Minshull Street is separated geographically from the other buildings of this type around the Spinningfields/Crown Square area. However the heritage value of Minshull Street is arguably greater than these other buildings and it has more significance as a heritage asset, reflected in its status as a Grade II* listed building. The extension of the 1990s has undoubtedly had an impact on the original building, however it could

buttressfulleralsopwilliams · architects
31-33 Princess Street, Manchester, M2 4BF · telephone +44 (0)161 236 3303
Fax +44 (0)161 236 3603 · website: www.bfaw.co.uk · email: contact@bfaw.co.uk

also be argued that this has enabled the historic court to adapt to modern requirements without significantly compromising the historic character. Indeed, the modern elements are now covered by the listed status and as such are subject to similar considerations and scrutiny in terms of interventions. Overall the significance of the Crown Court is high.

buttressfulleralsopwilliams · architects
31-33 Princess Street, Manchester, M2 4BF · telephone +44 (0)161 236 3303
Fax +44 (0)161 236 3603 · website: www.bfaw.co.uk · email: contact@bfaw.co.uk

Options Appraisal and Justification of Interventions

As part of the proposed works a detailed appraisal of options has been carried out to consider the appropriate level of intervention required. The need for intervention is essentially to safeguard the security and safety of court users and members of the public. The building's use as a Crown Court inevitably means that at some point there will be defendants standing trial who have committed serious crimes which potentially carry long custodial sentences. The very nature of some of the crimes that are considered means that these defendants potentially pose a serious threat of harm to members of the public or security staff, particularly in sensitive and highly emotive cases. This coupled with the threat of longer custodial sentences heightens the risk of attempted escape from the dock by a defendant who may be feeling extreme anger, upset or desperation. There have been several attempted escapes from the docks at Minshull Street Crown Court in recent years (exact figures can be provided by the Ministry of Justice on request by the case officer). EU Human Rights guidance rules that those standing trial are innocent until proven guilty and are 'defendants' rather than 'prisoners', so they are granted basic human rights and should not be cuffed while in the dock. However it should be noted that a successful escape attempt results in the wasting of police and security company resources, disruption to court proceedings and most importantly a very real risk of injury and worse for those trying to prevent this.

Do Nothing/Do Minimum

In line with recognised conservation philosophies the preferred course of action in dealing with historic buildings (particularly those that are subject to statutory protection through listing) is to carry out the minimum amount of intervention possible and ideally to do nothing to change the character of the building or element.

It is quite clear that this approach in this case would not be satisfactory in preventing attempted escapes from the dock and the courtroom. The existing secure dock glass panelling (probably contemporaneous with the 1990s redevelopment works) is of an inadequate height to prevent someone climbing or vaulting over the dock walls. Indeed, at the front of the dock it is approximately chest height for a standing adult.

It could also be argued that the existing arrangement is relatively visually intrusive given the steel framing is visible throughout the courtroom and the glass panels are reflective which potentially provides an issue as the judge is required to be able to see the full courtroom unhindered.

buttressfulleralsopwilliams · architects
31-33 Princess Street, Manchester, M2 4BF · telephone +44 (0)161 236 3303
Fax +44 (0)161 236 3603 · website: www.bfaw.co.uk · email: contact@bfaw.co.uk

A ‘Do Minimum’ approach will not address the risk of escape at all and in considering the long term safety of court staff, security staff and members of the public this approach should be discouraged.

Reconfiguration of Existing Details

There is currently a series of glass panels that would have served as a secure dock previously. This construction dates from the last twenty or so years. Consideration was given to reconfiguring this installation to provide the secure dock. However, it is arguably not in keeping with the historic context of the courtrooms and has a rather incongruous appearance as it stands. It would also be extremely difficult to alter these existing details without ending up with cumbersome junction details, and it is most likely that the glass panels would have to be replaced to achieve this anyway. Therefore, rather than attempt to reconfigure fabric of little or no historic significance, it would be more appropriate to revisit the secure dock design.

Reinstatement/Reinterpretation of Historic Details

Given the argument given above, a level of intervention is required in order to prevent escape attempts from the existing dock. One method adopted in interventions on historic buildings is to reinstate or reinterpret historic details. This ensures that the intervention will sit harmoniously within its context, reinforced by a proven historic record where necessary.

Research has been carried out on archive images and documentary evidence that describes the courtrooms. It is clear that the existing docks have not been altered significantly during the history of the building. However there were historically grille and ceiling configurations on the ‘roof’ of the docks as the image below illustrates. It is difficult to tell from the image what the material of the grilles was, but it is likely from observing other details within the courtroom that it would be either iron or brass. The timber panels to the ceiling are a continuation of that to the dock ‘walls’.

While it may be based on historic records and would sit comfortably within the historic context of the courtroom, reinstating this dock lid/ceiling configuration would not have any benefit from the point of view of preventing escape attempts. The front section of the dock was historically open and the grilles/panelling only covered the stairs down to the cell areas. Therefore there would be

buttressfulleralsopwilliams · architects
31-33 Princess Street, Manchester, M2 4BF · telephone +44 (0)161 236 3303
Fax +44 (0)161 236 3603 · website: www.bfaw.co.uk · email: contact@bfaw.co.uk

no advantage in doing this and as a result, it could be argued that there is less of a justification than for a contemporary intervention that would actually prevent escape.



Secure Dock Intervention (not encapsulated)

The only meaningful way to prevent escape attempts from the dock is to install a 'secure dock'. In order to comply with court design guidelines this would need to:

- Be of adequate height to prevent climbing or vaulting from the dock.
- Be transparent enough for the judge to see the defendant clearly, and also not to impede his/her overall view of the courtroom.
- Prevent escape attempts but at the same time providing secure and comfortable facilities for the defendant standing trial.
- Allow the defendant to be heard clearly by people in the courtroom and vice versa.
- Have a lockable door with vision panel to enable security staff to access the secure dock from the courtroom in the event of an emergency or to help restrain a violent defendant (not to be openable from the inside of the dock).

In order to achieve the above, it would be appropriate to install a glazed secure dock. Not only does this provide clear views across the courtroom, it significantly mitigates against the visual

buttressfulleralsopwilliams · architects
31-33 Princess Street, Manchester, M2 4BF · telephone +44 (0)161 236 3303
Fax +44 (0)161 236 3603 · website: www.bfaw.co.uk · email: contact@bfaw.co.uk

impact of the installation on the historic space. The glass therefore needs to be toughened which generally results in thicknesses of over 20mm, and as a result a significant weight load. In order therefore to stop the swinging or movement of such a heavy piece of material (and potential breakage through flexing) it is required to install a top rail to provide rigidity to the overall structure. In addition the glass is required to be non-reflective in order to prevent the view of the judge being impeded in any way. Small gaps between the glass panels also allow sound to travel (although this would be supplemented by an audio system) to and from the defendant during proceedings.

A secure dock that is not encapsulated (i.e. it has no lid/ceiling) does not fully address the risk of potential escape however. As alluded to above, defendants who intend to escape from the dock are potentially in such a state of mind that even screens of over 3m are not enough to prevent them escaping. Indeed, it has been noted in other court buildings that defendants have used seating or partitions to provide a vaulting point to scale the secure dock screens. In a court the size of Minshull Street which deals with serious cases and has such a history of recent escape attempts it is imperative that all reasonable measures are taken to prevent this and therefore an encapsulated dock would be more appropriate.

Secure Dock Intervention (encapsulated)

An encapsulated secure dock is essentially the same as that described above, but with a lid/ceiling incorporated. This would be housed within the profile of the top rail spanning the edge of the secure dock, and it is proposed that this should be a clear, transparent polycarbonate. This is because this material weighs less than glass and therefore transmits less loading on the secure dock structure. In addition it is unlikely to be subject to the same kinds of impact that would be experienced by the glass walls during an escape attempt. Furthermore, a fully transparent lid will negate the need for services to be installed to provide light fittings for the dock – this intervention would allow the existing lighting in the courtroom to illuminate the dock also.

Works to Existing Dock Doors

As described above, a door is required to be fitted as part of the installation. The existing doors to the dock walls are approximately chest height in Court 5, and around 1.75m high in Court 8. Neither of these heights are ideal, and the latter currently has hazard warning tape to the frame above it. It would make sense from the point of view of minimising intervention to position new

buttressfulleralsopwilliams · architects
31-33 Princess Street, Manchester, M2 4BF · telephone +44 (0)161 236 3303
Fax +44 (0)161 236 3603 · website: www.bfaw.co.uk · email: contact@bfaw.co.uk

doors in the existing openings, rather than irreversibly lose historic fabric by creating new openings. With this in mind, consideration was given to reconfiguring the existing doors to serve the new secure dock installations. It was found that the work required in reconfiguring the doors to preserve their character actually has the effect of diluting their historic value (the doors are of inadequate strength to support a toughened glass vision panel and the work in splicing in the glass, additional timber supports and fitting locks would result in the loss of historic fabric and affect the value of the door itself). Therefore it is proposed to carefully remove the existing doors and to put them into storage for potential future reinstatement. In their place would be new doors incorporating glazing panels and locks which will replicate the existing timber panelled detail. The door to Court 8 would be replaced with a taller version – again replicating the timber panelling but also avoiding the need for intrusive hazard warning tape due to the more generous headroom.

buttressfulleralsopwilliams · architects
31-33 Princess Street, Manchester, M2 4BF · telephone +44 (0)161 236 3303
Fax +44 (0)161 236 3603 · website: www.bfaw.co.uk · email: contact@bfaw.co.uk

Proposals

Summary and Justification

Proposal: It is proposed to install secure docks in courtrooms 5 and 8.

Justification: There are currently modern secure docks in place within the two courtrooms (possibly contemporaneous with the 1990s refurbishment works), however it should be noted that these are not compliant with HMCTS's court design guidelines. They are of varying heights given the level changes within the dock and are generally around chest height, which does not provide adequate security against escape attempts. It has been reported by HMCTS over the last 12 months that there have been several escape attempts from the existing docks in these courtrooms. Given the nature of the trials heard at Minshull Street Crown Court it is therefore likely that some defendants who do escape could pose a very serious threat to the health and safety of security staff, witnesses and members of the public.

Proposal: It is proposed to replace the existing modern installations with new secure docks which will ostensibly be of a similar new design, adapted to suit the geometry of the two existing docks. The new secure docks will be of a minimum 3.5m height above the dock floor and will be fully encapsulated, i.e. they will have a ceiling. As with the existing modern installations, the new secure docks will be independent from the structure of the existing historic docks. A new steel support frame will be built up to the top of the dock panelling, where 21mm toughened glass panels will be mounted. The glass panels will have 25mm gaps between which will allow communication between outside and inside, but prevent items being transferred in and out of the dock. The glass will also be non-reflective so as not to hinder the view of the judge into the dock and to the galleries beyond. There will be a steel rail securing the panels at the top which is to be supported on steel posts at each corner of the dock. The top rail will be concealed by a timber rail which will be stained to match existing joinery. The lower steel frame supporting the glass will also be concealed by stained timber panelling to match the existing dock.

Justification: To mitigate against the visual impact of the proposals. Above the existing court wall level the glass will have a frameless appearance and its non-reflective nature will enhance its transparency. The top rail is a necessity to prevent the movement of the glass given its weight and high centre of gravity. The construction of the secure dock means that the historic joinery is

buttressfulleralsopwilliams · architects
31-33 Princess Street, Manchester, M2 4BF · telephone +44 (0)161 236 3303
Fax +44 (0)161 236 3603 · website: www.bfaw.co.uk · email: contact@bfaw.co.uk

predominantly unaffected physically by the proposals. The proposals are also 'of their time' and do not seek to become a pastiche of historic periods.

Proposal: The ceilings of the secure docks will consist of transparent polycarbonate panelling.

Justification: This will allow a lightweight structure with little visual impact, but also ensures security of the dock. This also negates the need for additional lighting within the dock space.

Proposal: The existing secure panels are to be removed and disposed of offsite.

Justification: These are of little significance and contribute little to the historic character of the courtrooms. The existing metal handrails topping the existing dock sides will not be altered. It should also be noted that the approach to the configuration of the proposed secure docks is essentially the same.

Proposal: The existing doors are to be removed and full height glazed doors (which replicate the existing timber panelling) are to be installed in their place.

Justification: A lockable door is required should security staff need to access to the dock during court proceedings. It is not possible to reconfigure the existing doors without significantly compromising the heritage value of them, and a reversible replacement is seen as a more sensitive intervention.

Summary

While it is appreciated that the introduction of secure docks into these historic courtrooms will have a visual impact on the spaces, this is mitigated by the considered design of these installations. As a result, the main supporting frame below the glass will not be visible from outside the dock, leaving a predominantly transparent (and non-reflective) installation, with a thin timber top rail. This ensures that the impact on the historic character of the spaces is kept to the minimal level possible (and is completely reversible) while also ensuring that the health and safety of security staff, witnesses and members of the public is protected. Overall it is anticipated that the installation will also act as a deterrent to potential escapees and prevent any future security issues occurring.

The proposals will not affect the accessibility of the existing spaces.

buttressfulleralsopwilliams · architects
31-33 Princess Street, Manchester, M2 4BF · telephone +44 (0)161 236 3303
Fax +44 (0)161 236 3603 · website: www.bfaw.co.uk · email: contact@bfaw.co.uk



buttressfulleralsopwilliams · architects
31-33 Princess Street, Manchester, M2 4BF · telephone +44 (0)161 236 3303
Fax +44 (0)161 236 3603 · website: www.bfaw.co.uk · email: contact@bfaw.co.uk

GLOSSARY

This section includes words used in a specific or technical sense. The Oxford English Dictionary definition otherwise applies.

Access

All of the ways in which people can engage with our heritage and get the maximum benefit from their involvement with the heritage.

Activity Plan

Heritage Lottery Fund's term for the specific document in which you set out everything you want to do in your project that is not capital works or physical works to the heritage.

Alteration

Work intended to change the function or appearance of a place.

Archaeological interest

An interest in carrying out an expert investigation at some point in the future into the evidence a heritage asset may hold of past human activity. Heritage assets with archaeological interest are the primary source of evidence about the substance and evolution of places, and of the people and cultures that made them. These heritage assets are part of a record of the past that begins with traces of early humans and continues to be created and destroyed.

Architectural and Artistic Interest

These are interests in the design and general aesthetics of a place. They can arise from conscious design or fortuitously from the way the heritage asset has evolved. More specifically, architectural interest is an interest in the art or science of the design, construction, craftsmanship and decoration of buildings and structures of all types. Artistic interest is an interest in other human creative skill, like sculpture.

buttressfulleralsopwilliams · architects
31-33 Princess Street, Manchester, M2 4BF · telephone +44 (0)161 236 3303
Fax +44 (0)161 236 3603 · website: www.bfaw.co.uk · email: contact@bfaw.co.uk

Authenticity

Those characteristics that most truthfully reflect and embody the cultural heritage values of a place.

Brief

A brief is used to commission work from a consultant such as a conservation management plan. It should contain enough detail to allow the consultant to identify the scope and cost of the work and if possible it should identify the budget for the work.

Condition: Very bad

A building where there has been structural failure or where there are clear signs of structural instability; where, for roofed buildings, there has been loss of significant areas of roof covering, leading to major deterioration of the interior; or where there has been a fire or other disaster affecting most of the building.

Condition: Poor

A building or structure with deteriorating masonry and / or, where roofed, leaking roof and / or defective rainwater goods, usually accompanied by dry rot outbreaks within and general deterioration of most elements of the building fabric, including external joinery; or where there has been a fire or other disaster which has affected part of the building.

Condition: Fair

A building or structure which is structurally sound, but in need of minor repair or showing signs of a lack of general maintenance.

Condition: Good

A building or structure which is structurally sound, weathertight and with no significant repairs needed.

buttressfulleralsopwilliams · architects
31-33 Princess Street, Manchester, M2 4BF · telephone +44 (0)161 236 3303
Fax +44 (0)161 236 3603 · website: www.bfaw.co.uk · email: contact@bfaw.co.uk

Conservation

The process of managing change to a significant place in its setting in ways that will best sustain its heritage values, while recognising opportunities to reveal or reinforce those values for present and future generations and where appropriate enhances its significance. Conservation is all of the activities needed to care for the heritage, including work such as maintenance, repair and restoration. Conservation management can include other activities such as interpretation, creating new facilities, managing visitors, providing access, setting aside resources and involving people.

Conservation Area

'An area of special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance', designated under what is now s69 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Conservation Statement

This is an outline version of a conservation management plan. It is not as detailed as a conservation management plan and is often done on the basis of existing knowledge.

Conservation Management Plan

A document that sets out the significance of a heritage asset and how that significance will be retained in any future use, alteration, management or repair. Includes information about the site, why it is important, what is happening to it and what policies are in place to manage and maintain it, and to ensure that new work is appropriate. Involves consultation with stakeholders.

Context

Any relationship between a place and other places, relevant to the values of that place.

Designated Heritage Asset

buttressfulleralsopwilliams · architects
31-33 Princess Street, Manchester, M2 4BF · telephone +44 (0)161 236 3303
Fax +44 (0)161 236 3603 · website: www.bfaw.co.uk · email: contact@bfaw.co.uk

A World Heritage Site, Scheduled Monument, Listed Building, Protected Wreck Site, Registered Park and Garden, Registered Battlefield or Conservation Area designated as such under the relevant legislation.

Designation

The recognition of particular heritage value(s) of a significant place by giving it formal status under law or policy intended to sustain those values.

Fabric

The material substance of which places are formed, including geology, archaeological deposits, structures and buildings, and flora.
(BS 7913:1998) Physical material of which a building or artefact is made.

NOTE. Its state at any time will be the product of the original design and of everything to which it has been subject in the course of its history, including deliberate alterations based on well considered secondary or subsequent designs, careless changes, the effects over time of weather and use, damage and decay.

Harm

Change for the worse, here primarily referring to the effect of inappropriate interventions on the heritage values of a place.

Heritage

All inherited resources which people value for reasons beyond mere utility.

Gazetteer

A database or list of the different elements that make up the heritage, such as the features in a landscape, the rooms in a building, or the main parts of a collection. It is a useful way to organise complicated information about the heritage in a way that a manager can use.

buttressfulleralsopwilliams · architects
31-33 Princess Street, Manchester, M2 4BF · telephone +44 (0)161 236 3303
Fax +44 (0)161 236 3603 · website: www.bfaw.co.uk · email: contact@bfaw.co.uk

Heritage

Heritage Lottery Fund defines heritage as what we have inherited from the past, value and want to hand on to the future.

Heritage Asset

A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape positively identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions. Heritage assets are the valued components of the historic environment. They include designated heritage assets (as defined in this PPS) and assets identified by the local planning authority during the process of decision-making or through the plan-making process (including local listing).

Heritage, cultural

Inherited assets which people identify and value as a reflection and expression of their evolving knowledge, beliefs and traditions, and of their understanding of the beliefs and traditions of others.

Heritage, natural

Inherited habitats, species, ecosystems, geology and landforms, including those in and under water, to which people attach value.

Heritage Impact Assessment

This is simply a formal title for the common-sense process of thinking about how new work will affect heritage and how any potential problems can be avoided. It is a form of risk assessment.

Historic Environment

All aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and places through time, including all surviving physical remains of past human activity, whether visible, buried or submerged, and landscaped and planted or managed flora. Those

buttressfulleralsopwilliams · architects
31-33 Princess Street, Manchester, M2 4BF · telephone +44 (0)161 236 3303
Fax +44 (0)161 236 3603 · website: www.bfaw.co.uk · email: contact@bfaw.co.uk

elements of the historic environment that hold significance are called heritage assets. [PPS5]

Historic Environment Record (HER)

A public, map-based data set, primarily intended to inform the management of the historic environment. Historic environment records are information services that seek to provide access to comprehensive and dynamic resources relating to the historic environment of a defined geographic area for public benefit and use. Typically, they comprise databases linked to a geographic information system (GIS), and associated reference material, together with a dedicated staffing resource. [PPS5]

Historic Interest

An interest in past lives and events (including pre-historic). Heritage assets can illustrate or be associated with them. Heritage assets with historic interest not only provide a material record of our nation's history, but can also provide an emotional meaning for communities derived from their collective experience of a place and can symbolise wider values such as faith and cultural identity. [PPS5]

Integrity

Wholeness, honesty.

Intervention

Any action which has a physical effect on the fabric of a place.

Maintenance

The routine work need to care for the heritage including regular inspections and minor work. Routine work regularly necessary to keep the fabric of a place in good order.

Management

buttressfulleralsopwilliams · architects
31-33 Princess Street, Manchester, M2 4BF · telephone +44 (0)161 236 3303
Fax +44 (0)161 236 3603 · website: www.bfaw.co.uk · email: contact@bfaw.co.uk

Management is all of the operational activities your organisation does, including business planning, setting priorities, working with partners, activities and caring for the heritage.

Material

Relevant to and having a substantial effect on, demanding consideration.

Natural change

Change which takes place in the historic environment without human intervention, which may require specific management responses (particularly maintenance or periodic renewal) in order to sustain the significance of a place

Object

Anything not (now) fixed to or incorporated within the structure of a place, but historically associated with it

Place

Any part of the historic environment, of any scale, that has a distinctive identity perceived by people

Planned maintenance

(BS 8210:1986)
Maintenance organized and carried out with forethought, control and the use of records, to a predetermined plan based on the results of previous condition surveys.

Preserve

To keep safe from harm.

Preservation

buttressfulleralsopwilliams · architects
31-33 Princess Street, Manchester, M2 4BF · telephone +44 (0)161 236 3303
Fax +44 (0)161 236 3603 · website: www.bfaw.co.uk · email: contact@bfaw.co.uk

(BS7913:1998)
State of survival of a building or artefact, whether by historical accident or through a combination of protection and active conservation.

Proportionality

The quality of being appropriately related to something else in size, degree, or other measurable characteristics.

Public

Of, concerning, done, acting, etc. for people as a whole

Renewal

Comprehensive dismantling and replacement of an element of a place, in the case of structures normally reincorporating sound units.

Repair

Work to an existing item, site or place in order to remedy deterioration. It may involve a small amount of restoration or reinstatement. Work beyond the scope of maintenance, to remedy defects caused by decay, damage or use, including minor adaptation to achieve a sustainable outcome, but not involving restoration or alteration.

(BS 7913:1998) Work beyond the scope of regular maintenance to remedy defects, significant decay or damage caused deliberately or by accident, neglect, normal weathering or wear and tear, the object of which is to return the building or artefact to good order, without alteration or restoration.

NOTE. Most repair work should be anticipated and planned, but occasionally it can be required in response to a specific event, such as a storm or accident.

Restoration

buttressfulleralsopwilliams · architects
31-33 Princess Street, Manchester, M2 4BF · telephone +44 (0)161 236 3303
Fax +44 (0)161 236 3603 · website: www.bfaw.co.uk · email: contact@bfaw.co.uk

To return a place to a known earlier state, on the basis of compelling evidence, without conjecture (BS7913:1998) Alteration of a building, part of a building or artefact which has decayed, been lost or damaged or is thought to have been in appropriately repaired or altered in the past, the objective of which is to make it conform again to its design or appearance at a previous date.

NOTE: the accuracy of any restoration depends on the extent to which the original design or appearance at a previous date is known, or can be established by research.

Reversible

Capable of being reversed so that the previous state is restored

Setting

The surroundings in which a place is experienced, its local context, embracing present and past relationships to the adjacent landscape. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral. [PPS5]

Significance [of a place]

The sum of the cultural and natural heritage values of a place, often set out in a statement of significance. The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. [PPS5]

Level A, (7-9): High Level of Significance
The element is relatively intact, has a special interest, and makes an important contribution to the wider significance of the site.
Level B, (4-6): Medium Level of Significance
The element has been altered, has less special interest, and its contribution to the wider significance of the site is less important.
Level C, (1-3): Low Level of Significance

buttressfulleralsopwilliams · architects
31-33 Princess Street, Manchester, M2 4BF · telephone +44 (0)161 236 3303
Fax +44 (0)161 236 3603 · website: www.bfaw.co.uk · email: contact@bfaw.co.uk

The element has been significantly altered, has a low level of integrity, the special interest has been lost and it makes little contribution to the wider significance of the site.

Neutral:

The element is historically unimportant but does not have a negative visual impact on the surrounding buildings.

Intrusive:

The element is historically unimportant and has a negative visual impact on the surrounding buildings.

Significant place

A place which has heritage value(s).

Stakeholders

A stakeholder is anyone with an interest in a heritage asset. They must be involved in the project if your project is going to succeed. They might be: owners or those who manage the heritage; neighbours; people who visit or use the site; specialist interest groups who know about a particular kind of heritage; statutory agencies who may be involved in applications for consent or other negotiations such as the agencies for natural heritage or the historic environment in England, Wales, Scotland or Northern Ireland; any group who have historical or cultural associations with the site.

Statement of Significance

A statement of significance explains why people value the heritage. If the heritage is formally protected – for example a Site of Special Scientific Interest or a listed building – the statement should explain why it is protected. However, most heritage is also valued for other reasons. The statement should explain all of the ways in which the heritage is important and to whom. That might include natural, architectural, archaeological, historical, social, community, scientific, archaeological or educational values.

Sustain

Maintain, nurture and affirm validity

buttressfulleralsopwilliams · architects
31-33 Princess Street, Manchester, M2 4BF · telephone +44 (0)161 236 3303
Fax +44 (0)161 236 3603 · website: www.bfaw.co.uk · email: contact@bfaw.co.uk

Sustainable

Capable of meeting present needs without compromising ability to meet future needs

Transparent

Open to public scrutiny.

Value

An aspect of worth or importance, here attached by people to qualities of places

Value, aesthetic

Value deriving from the ways in which people draw sensory and intellectual stimulation from a place.

buttressfulleralsopwilliams · architects
31-33 Princess Street, Manchester, M2 4BF · telephone +44 (0)161 236 3303
Fax +44 (0)161 236 3603 · website: www.bfaw.co.uk · email: contact@bfaw.co.uk

Appendix: Listing

Location: City Police Courts, Minshull Street
Date Listed: 3rd October 1974
Grade: II*

City police courts. 1868-71, by Thomas Worthington. Red brick with sandstone dressings, steeply-pitched slate roofs. Rectangular plan on corner site. Italian Gothic style. Two-and-a-half storeys over basement, plus tower at north-west corner, 1:3:3:3:1 bays, the centre gabled, the left end formed by the tower and the right-hand end with a turret; with moulded stone plinth, impost bands, enriched 1st-floor sill-band, Lombard frieze, and stone parapet stepped up to the centre gable with tourelles at the corners of this. Central 2-centred arched doorway with gabled surround including shafts with carved crocket caps; three 2-centred arched 2-light windows above the doorway, and arcaded 5-light attic window in gable; 2, 3 and 2-light windows to both floors of the side ranges, with shafts and 2-centred arched lights with linked hoodmoulds; another doorway to the right-hand end, which has slightly different fenestration to the main floors, arcaded 7-light attic window, and saddle-back roof. Very tall octagonal chimney behind ridge. Tall square tower to left, with bands, 3-light window to 1st floor with balcony, 2 small lancets to next stage, clockface in arched surround, elaborate stone top stage with corner tourelles and arcaded belfry, and slated pyramidal roof. Left return (to Bloom Street) in similar style, with central doorway, windows of 3, 3, 2, 3 and 3 lights, and 2 large gables each with a 2-centred blank arch containing two 2-light windows. Interior not inspected, but probably contains features of equivalent quality.

buttressfulleralsopwilliams · architects
31-33 Princess Street, Manchester, M2 4BF · telephone +44 (0)161 236 3303
Fax +44 (0)161 236 3603 · website: www.bfaw.co.uk · email: contact@bfaw.co.uk