

Heritage Statement Addendum

1NQ, Tariff Street, Manchester, M1 2FF

April 2023

Introduction

1. A full planning application for residential development on land at Tariff Street, Manchester ('the Application Site') was submitted to Manchester City Council (MCC) on Monday 5th December 2022 (Application ref no 135675/FO/2022).
2. The full description of the development is as follows:
"demolition of an existing building on site and the erection of two residential apartment buildings (Use Class C3) including a part 9, part 10 (with set back amenity level) and a separate stand-alone 12 storey building (comprising of 267 dwellings in total), with ground floor commercial units (Use Class E), associated resident's amenity space, cycle parking, landscaping, access, street loading and other associated works".
3. The application was accompanied by a Heritage Statement, prepared by Turley Heritage, dated November 2022. The Heritage Statement identified heritage assets with potential to be affected by the Proposed Development, assessed the significance and setting of those assets and the contribution made by the Application Site and culminated with an assessment of the impact of the Proposed Development, prepared to address relevant legislation and in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Historic England Guidance.
4. In January 2023 a Supplementary Heritage Statement was prepared by Turley Heritage. This was prepared to respond to feedback from MCC that an existing building at the north-east of the Application Site ('68 Port Street') has the potential to be treated as a non-designated heritage asset.
5. Since the submission of the full planning application a small number of design amendments have been made to the Proposed Development. Full details of these are provided in the Design and Access Statement Addendum and accompanying drawing pack. The changes of relevance when considering the potential for impacts on heritage assets are as follows:
 - Floor to floor heights and parapet heights for both Block 1 and Block 2 have been reduced which as a result reduces the overall height of each building. Floor to floor heights have been reduced from 3m to 2.85m and the parapet heights have reduced from 1.1m to 0.3m.
 - Block 1 has been reduced in height by 1.7m.
 - Block 2 has been reduced in height by 2.7m.

- The reduced Block 2 is now only 0.45m taller than the block proposed at this location in the Piccadilly Basin Strategic Regeneration Framework (SRF).
6. This addendum reviews the assessment and conclusions of the Heritage Statement (Turley 2022) and Supplementary Heritage Statement (Turley 2023) in the light of these design amendments to the proposals.

Updated Assessment of Impacts

7. In general, the reduction in height of both Block 1 and Block 2 of the Proposed Development would either not alter or would slightly reduce the level of effects upon the setting of proximate heritage assets. The Heritage Statement identified that the Proposed Development would cause a limited degree of harm to two Grade II* listed buildings – Brownsfield Mill and the Former Rochdale Canal Warehouse. Impacts upon these buildings resulting from the revised proposals have been reassessed.

Brownsfield Mill (Grade II* Listed Building)

8. The Application Site is located to the west of Brownsfield Mill. The mill is of significance as a surviving steam powered cotton spinning mill situated in relation to the Rochdale Canal, and providing evidence for the evolution of industrial buildings which played an important role in the history and development of Manchester.
9. Block 2 of the Proposed Development would be situated to the west of Brownsfield Mill, with Block 1 situated further beyond it.
10. The assessment, as presented in the Heritage Statement, concluded that overall there would be little effect upon the ability to understand the siting of the Mill building (its location relative to the Rochdale Canal) and its significance resulting from the Proposed Development. This would remain the case in the light of the amended proposals. Although reduced in height, it would remain the case that the proposals would have some effect upon the historic, notably greater, height and resulting local prominence of the Mill building within the local townscape. In addition, it would continue to be the case that incidental views to the mill building from Brewer Street, Tariff Street and Port Street, which are currently achievable due to the cleared open nature of the Application Site, would also be altered as a result of the Proposed Development, with the mill building largely hidden from view from these locations.
11. The Heritage Statement concluded that some harm to the significance of Brownfield Mill may result if the Proposed Development was constructed in combination with the other consented 33 storey building to the north-east and the 11-storey building to the south-east, which both form part of the SRF. The reduction in the height of Block 1 and Block 2 in the amended proposals does not affect this conclusion.

Rochdale Canal Warehouse (Grade II* Listed Building)

12. The Application Site is located to the north west of the former Rochdale Canal Warehouse, of significance as an example of an early 19th century warehouse.
13. Block 2 of the Proposed Development would be situated to the north-east of the Former Rochdale Canal Warehouse, and Block 1 would be located to the north, on the opposite side of Tariff Street.

14. The assessment as presented in the Heritage Statement noted that the Proposed Development would introduce new buildings of greater height scale and massing than both the Former Canal Warehouse building and the industrial buildings which historically occupied this area. As such, there would be some effect upon the local prominence of the Mill building. Incidental views to the mill building from Brewer Street, Tariff Street and Port Street which are currently achievable due to the cleared open nature of the Application Site would also be altered as a result of the Proposed Development, with the former canal warehouse building becoming largely hidden from view from these locations. This would remain the case in light of the amended proposals.
15. The Heritage Statement concluded that some harm to the significance of Rochdale Canal Warehouse may result if the Proposed Development as well as the other consented and intended developments included within the SRF were all constructed. The reduction in the height of Block 1 and Block 2 in the amended proposals does not affect this conclusion.

Summary and Conclusions

16. The conclusions of the Heritage Statement (Turley 2022) and the Supplementary Heritage Statement (Turley 2023) remain unchanged in the light of the amended proposals.
17. The Heritage Statement (Turley 2022) concluded the following:

“Based upon our assessment of nearby heritage assets It is concluded that that there would be no harm to the significance of Bradley House; Newton Buildings; 35 Dale Street; 45, 47 and 47a Hilton Street; 50-62 Port Street; Rochdale Canal Lock Number 83; Rochdale Canal Towpath footbridge and Associated Ramps; Rochdale Canal; Rochdale Canal Road Bridge; or Fourways House.

It is concluded that there would be some positive effects upon the experience of the approach to the Stevenson Square Conservation Area, when approaching along Port Street, through the reinstatement of a straight building line to the street, and the use of sensitively chosen red brick building materials for Block 1 of the Proposed Development.

It has been established that the Proposed Development would cause a limited degree of harm to Brownsfield Mill and the Former Rochdale Canal Warehouse (Grade II listed buildings). The level of harm is considered to be ‘less than substantial’.*

Paragraph 202 of the NPPF is therefore engaged which states the following:

‘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.’

PPG confirms that public benefits may follow from many developments and could be anything that delivers economic, social or environmental progress as described in the NPPF. Public benefits should flow from the proposed development. They should be of a nature or scale to be of benefit to the public at large and not just be a private benefit.”

A full review of the public benefits of the Proposed Development, and the balancing of identified harm with those benefits is undertaken in the accompanying Planning Statement prepared by Avison Young, bearing in mind the considerable importance and weight that must be given to the

statutory duty of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.” (Paragraphs 6.4 – 6.9 of the Heritage Statement)

18. The Supplementary Heritage Statement concluded that:

“[...] the surviving building at 68 Port Street, a small surviving portion of what was originally a much larger warehouse, which survives in an altered and dilapidated condition may not merit non-designated heritage asset status.

However, in the event that MCC concludes that the building should be treated as a non-designated heritage asset, Paragraph 203 of the NPPF would apply and states the following:

“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 surviving part of 68 Port Street, at the north-eastern corner of the Application Site, would be demolished as part of the Proposed Development resulting in its total loss. In accordance with Paragraph 203 of the NPPF, a balanced judgement will be required in relation to the harm identified and bearing in mind the very low significance of the building. This should be taken into account as an additional material consideration and proportionately addressed by MCC in the planning balance.”

Contact

Hannah Tweedie
hannah.tweedie@turley.co.uk

20 April 2023

AXIH3000