



Urban Design and Conservation Consultation Response

Address: Chatham Mill, 8 Chester Street, M1 5QF
Application Ref.: 136997/LO/2023
Proposal: Listed Building Consent for change of use of lower ground floor to incorporate restaurant / bar areas with associated kitchen and storage / prep rooms.
Case officer: Max Gibson
Consultee: Jackie Whelan
Site Visit: 17/2/2025
Date: 18/2/2025

1. Introduction

A cotton-spinning mill built in 1820, 6 storeys high constructed in brick with slate roof. The interior has wooden floors supported by cast iron columns other than ground floor which has been altered with concrete floor. A typical and coherent example of an early C19 mill, in which a single range has been extended to form an L-plan, itself a typical pattern of growth.

Part of mill was refurbished for office use on first and second floors, the original floor, brick walls and other core elements of the interior, including roof structure, steelwork and cast-iron columns remain exposed, with a positive impact on the special significance of the listed building. The ground floor is subdivided into separate cellular office spaces which has concealed within partitions original columns.

The application seeks to convert the ground floor into a restaurant with karaoke area which will require removal of existing partitions and part subdivision of the ground floor into 6 Karaoke Pods.

2. Policy Context

2.1. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021)

Para 202 - Heritage assets should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance.

Para 207 - 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 sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance.

Para 208 - LPAs should ensure that any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal is avoided or minimised.

Para 210 - In determining applications, LPA's should take account of, the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Para 212 - 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.

Para 213 - Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification.

Para 215 - Proposals of less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset should be weighed against the wider public benefits of the proposal.

Para 219 - Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance

2.2. Manchester City Core Strategy

Policy CC9 – Design and Heritage

Policy EN3 – Heritage

2.3 Places for Everyone

JP-Strat2 – City Centre

Policy JP-P1 – Sustainable Places

Policy JP-P2 – Heritage

2. Discussion

The removal of the modern partitions and subdivisions is supported and accepted in principle as would reveal the open character of the space including existing cast iron columns. There would be visual improvements to the large new restaurant area which will be open plan and part of bar/karaoke area. However, as the proposed use would reinstate some partitions for the karaoke pods the benefits would be limited, with potential additional harm due to new location of the proposed partitions, requiring new interventions into original/historic fabric. Some of the harm can be mitigated with appropriate details and finishes.

The drawings and details submitted are limited in detail in order to fully assess the impact of the proposals on heritage significance. More detail is required with respect to the following.

- Pods are to be constructed with concrete blocks which is a bulky intervention and less irreversible. Have other methods of subdivision been considered such as plasterboard subdivision with acoustic panels.
- Pod partitions come close to cast iron columns, would require more detailed plan and elevation drawings to ensure adequate spacing to ensure visual prominence of columns with space for maintenance of columns.
- Section drawing not adequately detailed, and space between pod ceiling and existing ceiling minimal this could impact on ME and services generally.
- More information required as to how independent wall with sliding section will be fitted on rear window wall of pods.
- Details required for all internal finishes to new and historic fabric and fixing

- details including acoustic ceiling to restaurant area.
- Elevation required of glazed feature wall to between restaurant and karaoke area and fixing details.
 - More information on the M&E services and drainage would be required, including any external inputs/outlets of new installations.

Rear extension is of medium/low significance and is intended to accommodate the kitchen and storage areas. It holds some evidential value as evolution of the site, estimated to date from the second half of the twentieth. It is not of a high quality in either design or built form. The insertion of kitchen area and storage would in principle be suitable in this area but again as above scant details have been submitted with respect to detail of subdivisions, finishes and fixings. Notation on plan drawing for extract ducting with no plan or elevation details is not sufficient to assess impact.

External

The external shutter to the main entrance should be removed, with the graffiti removed and the surround redecorated with appropriate materials/finishes to match. Ideally repairs to windows and doors should also form part of the submission including any advertising/signage.

3. Position

As currently submitted, there is insufficient detail to assess impact on heritage significance and special interest of the listed building and cannot thereby be supported. The works would fail to conserve the heritage asset and amount to less than substantial harm that would not be offset by public benefits as required by the NPPF and contrary to PfE Policy JP-P2.

Jackie Whelan

Planning Officer (Heritage and Urban Design)