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APPENDIX CA1

ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE IN TERMS OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT WORKS
1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This Heritage Statement accompanies an application for planning permission and listed building consent in respect of the programme of external works at Preston Bus Station, that are required to provide a modern, safe coach and bus station.

1.2 The works form part of an ongoing programme to restore the Bus Station to its deserved position at the heart of the public transport network of the City of Preston. It follows on from previous applications for the refurbishment and long term protection of the car park, the refurbishment and adaptation of the concourse, and Preston Youth Zone. An application for the creation of an area of public realm will follow.

1.3 The extent of the external works does not lie within a conservation area, but does partly overlap with the listed building. It is therefore appropriate to consider the impact upon this heritage asset. Accordingly, this statement examines the heritage issues pertaining to the proposed development, concluding that the proposal is fully justified and, as part of an overall programme of works to Preston Bus Station, will have a positive and beneficial impact upon the heritage asset. The impact is far less than substantial and is more than outweighed by the public benefits of the proposed development.
2.0 PRESTON BUS STATION

INTRODUCTION

2.1 Preston Bus Station was opened in October 1969. It was intended to reflect a new age in public transport, bringing some of the glamour of air travel to the more mundane use of public transport.

2.2 A detailed description of the key heritage features of the Bus Station is set out in the Conservation Management Plan which accompanies these applications and this Statement, rather than repeat the contents of the Management Plan, concentrates on the key elements as far as they will be impacted upon by the proposed development works.

PRE 1960’S HISTORY OF PRESTON BUS STATION

2.3 The site of Preston Bus Station, sits alongside Tithebarn Street, the route of which was well established by the late 1700s [Fig. 1].

Fig. 1 North Preston - Lang 1774 [PBS Conservation Management Plan]
2.4 At the time, Tithe Barn Street [or Tythe Barn Street as it was then spelt] ran from the built up area of the growing market town towards an area of gardens and meadows which no doubt contributed produce to the town’s markets.

![Fig. 2 North Preston - Shakeshaft 1808 [PBS Conservation Management Plan]](image)

2.5 By the early 1800’s, Shakeshaft’s map [Fig. 2] showed the extent of the growing street pattern but with the meadow lands still evident to the north, including a bowling green, perhaps an indication of changes in society with a limited number occasionally having the opportunity for leisure activities.
2.6 As the 19th Century progressed, the extent of development in the vicinity of what is now the bus station continued to increase [Fig. 3], in particular with development along the line of North Road of what would eventually run under the line of the bus station.
As high density urban development continued well into the middle of the 19th Century, the vicinity of the future bus station became dominated by terraced back to back housing, particularly in an area known as Everton Gardens which was eventually to be cleared to enable the bus station to be developed [Figs. 4 and 5].
Fig. 5 Photo of Everton Gardens [taken in 1939] [Preston Digital Archive]
Fig. 6 North Preston – 1892 [PBS Conservation Management Plan]
2.8 By the end of the 19th Century [Fig. 6], Tithebarn Street had developed as a market, including a Pig Market and associated Market Hall. By this time the area also contained a brewery, a coach house and a growing number of theatres.

Fig. 7 North Preston – 1938 [PBS Conservation Management Plan]
During the early part of the 20\textsuperscript{th} Century [Fig. 7], further development took place on Tithebarn Street and the former market buildings became absorbed into the overall built up area. Alongside further theatres, a Bus Station had arisen just to the south of Lord Street on the site of what is now the Guild Hall [Fig. 8].

![Fig. 8 Ribble Motor Services Ltd Bus Station Tithebarn Street 1930 [Preston Digital Archive]](image)

By the 1960’s much of the housing [Fig. 9], including that of Everton Gardens, had been cleared.

![Fig. 9 1960s Aerial View of Bus Station Site [PBS Conservation Management Plan]](image)
BIRTH OF A MEGASTRUCTURE

2.11 In 1959 Preston Corporation sought to reduce congestion on Preston’s roads and replace the four existing bus stations operating in the City by commissioning what were originally Grenfell Baines and Hargreaves [later to become Building Design Partnership - BDP] with a brief for a bus station and car park for 500 cars on a site next to the existing shelters serving several private bus operators.

2.12 Over the following years, the brief changed with the future role of the bus station becoming more significant and offices being added to the bus station. Further to this a demand for more car parking led to a proposal for a circular multi-storey car park with the Bus Station, although for a time this evolved into a wholesale fruit and vegetable market to be constructed above the bus station. This process of revision and change to the original brief took a total of six years with the final proposal for a bus station for eighty vehicles, a concourse for passengers, offices and a car park for 1100 cars.

2.13 The development of the Bus Station became one of the first examples of an integrated design team with BDP working alongside E H Staziker, the Borough Engineer and Surveyor, and Ove Arup & Partners, to design and build the new bus station, car park, and taxi rank. The contractor was Laings who used Glass Reinforced Polyester (GRP) manufactured by Glasdon of Blackpool for casting the moulds for the compound curves of the shapes required and provided a smooth surface finish rather than a board marked finish. Using this technique approximately 2,800 concrete elements were cast in just under 12 months. Due to its low maintenance requirements GRP was also utilised for signage and fittings.

2.14 The significance of the bus station was summarised in the 2013 report by English Heritage [now Historic England] who stated:

“Preston Bus Station was significant ‘in the context of the emerging plans for the Central Lancashire New Town of which Preston would form the core. The bus station was devised to provide the added facilities needed to serve the new town as well as long-distance services made possible by the opening of the M6 that gave Preston a unique place in coach travel. It should be seen in the context of a prevailing optimism in progress and modernity and an acceptance that the public sector had a responsibility to deliver large infrastructure projects for the public good. The grand scale of this ‘megastructure’ reflects both the anticipated growth of Preston and the confidence in what was being achieved.

Unlike train stations, very few bus stations have been favoured with much in the way of architectural interest. This low status of the building type has also been reflected in the facilities made available to travellers. The design at Preston consciously sought to offer bus passengers greatly enhanced comforts. From a situation where many passengers at many bus stations waited in open fronted shelters, (where
they had shelters at all), passengers at Preston were being offered clean modern facilities, with refreshments and heated waiting rooms, separated by sliding doors from the buses outside. This was a bus station which overtly aspired to some of the glamour of air travel; combining rational modernity with expressive architectural forms.’

FORM AND FUNCTION

2.15 The Bus Station represents an example of the Brutalist style of architecture, which emerged from the modernist architectural movement and is a term coined by British architects Alison and Peter Smithson in 1953. The name derives from the French ‘béton brut’, or “raw concrete”, a phrase used by the Architect Le Corbusier to describe the board-marked poured concrete with which many of his post-World War II buildings were constructed. It is a 170m long linear structure consisting of a ground floor Bus Station Concourse providing 40 gates for double decker buses to both its east and west bus aprons which, when opened in 1969, was the biggest bus station in Europe, only recently being overtaken by Finland’s Kamppi Centre.

2.16 Above the bus station is a split level car park with four decks to either side, providing a total of 1,100 car parking spaces accessed from ramps to the north and south of the bus station.

2.17 The building was previously proposed to be demolished as part of the now abandoned Tithebarn redevelopment scheme for central Preston but was listed and given Grade II status in 2013 following a long running campaign by the Twentieth Century Society and Historic England.

2.18 Originally owned by Preston Corporation [who subsequently became Preston City Council], the building was taken over by Lancashire County Council in 2014.

2.19 In the early 1970s a pedestrian walkway was added to connect the complex with the newly built Guild Hall.

2.20 The taxi rank is no longer in use and is in a state of disrepair, with the majority of late night taxis now being located on Church Street where there is a greater concentration of pubs and clubs.

2.21 The eastern Bus Apron consists of concrete hardstanding, delineated with bus bays. The external boundaries are formed by a mixture of overgrown trees and hedges, strengthened with Heras fencing and rails/gates, ultimately leading to an unattractive appearance.
3.0 DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

3.1 This application for planning permission listed building consent proposes the following works:

“Reordering of the eastern bus apron and installation of new gates and railings to provide 33no. bus bays in line with operator requirements.”

3.2 A full description of the proposed development works is set out in the Design and Access Statement.
4.0 HERITAGE POLICIES

4.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the Government’s planning policies for England. In respect to heritage matters the following paragraphs are particularly relevant:

17: [Core planning principles] conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life for future generations.

128: 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.

131: In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- The desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable use consistent with their conservation;
- The positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- The desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

132: When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost though alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting.

134: Where a development proposal will lead to harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.

137: Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites and within the setting of heritage assets to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset should be treated favourably.
4.2 Policy 16 of the Central Lancashire Core Strategy seeks to protect the historic environment by safeguarding heritage assets from inappropriate development, whilst supporting development that enhances the local character, setting, management and historic significance of heritage assets.

4.3 Policy EN8 of the Preston Local Plan supports development that:

- “accord with national policy on the historic environment and the relevant English Heritage guidance;

- take full account of the information and guidance in the Council’s Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans and other relevant policy guidance on the historic environment;

- make a positive contribution to the character and local distinctiveness through high quality new design that responds to its context;

- act as a catalyst for the regeneration of the area in accordance with the Council’s objectives for regeneration;

- are accompanied by a satisfactory Heritage Statement that fully explains the impact of the proposal on the significance of the heritage asset and;

- sustain, conserve and, where appropriate, enhance the significance, appearance, character and setting of the heritage asset itself and the surrounding historic environment and where they have consideration for the following:

- the scale, layout, and appearance to the heritage asset and its setting;

- the proposed use of the heritage asset being appropriate in relation to its significance.”
5.0 HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

METHODOLOGY

5.1 Paragraph 128 of the NPPF states that in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of the heritage assets affected, including the contribution made by their setting. Expanding on this, para. 129 of the NPPF requires applicants to identify and assess the particular significance of heritage assets or their setting, and take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal in order to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset’s conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

5.2 Taking this guidance into account, the following approach was therefore undertaken to first of all evaluate the heritage value of Preston Bus Station as a basis for producing the Statement of Significance of the Bus Station which is set out in the accompanying Conservation Management Plan:

- Desktop study of existing literature including Preston Bus Station history, description and associated documents;
- Site visit to review the context in respect of the existing state of the development site; and
- Assessment of the results of the first two stages to establish the significance of the site, and its constituent parts.

5.3 Taking the results of this research, Historic England have provided guidance [2008] as to how Assets and their contribution should be evaluated. The guidance looks at the value of the asset in the following manner:

Evidential Value

Historic England suggests that “Evidential value derives from the potential of a place to yield evidence about past human activity”.

Historical Value

Historic England suggests that “Historical value derives from the ways in which past people, events and aspects of life can be connected”.

Communal Value

Historic England suggests that “Communal value derives from the meanings of a place for the people who relate to it, or for whom it figures in their collective experience or memory”.
Aesthetic Value

Historic England suggests that “Aesthetic value derives from the ways in which people draw sensory and intellectual stimulation from a place”.

5.4 The significance itself of a heritage asset may comprise a number of factors, which are similar to the criteria for listing and including, but not restricted to:

- Age and rarity: most buildings built before 1700 which survive in anything like their original condition are listed, as are most built between 1700 and 1840;

- Architectural interest: through architectural design, decoration and craftsmanship and also important examples of particular building types and techniques;

- Historic interest: encompassing buildings which illustrate important aspects of the nation’s social, economic, cultural or military history, or close historical association with nationally-important people or events; and/or

- Group value: especially where buildings are part of an important architectural or historic group or are a fine example of planning (such as squares, terraces and model villages)

5.5 Taking these factors into account, the relative significance of the elements of the site/area can be assessed, using the following scale:

- High significance – buildings/features which make an important contribution to the architectural and historic interest and character of the site/area, through age, rarity, architectural merit or historical association or group value, and whose preservation and enhancement is considered essential;

- Medium significance – those making a lesser contribution, but which nevertheless are also considered worthy of preservation or enhancement; and/or

- Low significance – those making only a limited contribution to the site/area overall, although not necessarily detracting from it.

5.6 The Statement of Significance takes these elements and considers the extent to which each aspect of the Bus Station makes a contribution to the particular values identified.
SIGNIFICANCE STATEMENT

5.7 The Methodology was used as a basis to prepare the original Statement of Significance [set out in the Conservation Management Plan]. Taking this methodology into account, it is acknowledged that the site adjoins a Grade II listed building that has largely remained unchanged for almost 50 years, and is therefore itself a heritage asset of national significance. The individual elements of the listed building and their relative significance are set out in the Statement of Significance.

5.8 Three aspects of the building were identified as being of Exceptional Value, all of which related to the Design Concept and its Aesthetic Value. The particular elements of Exceptional Value identified related to the following elements:

- The unity of an unadorned Mass, Horizontality, Monumentality, Scale and Length which presents as one, very large, unified object, reinforced by relentless repetition.

- The Curved Motif, [namely the car deck parapets/ramps/taxi rank/seating units]. The initial concept is strictly rectangular but having established the rectangular shape of the building many subsidiary elements provide a playful counterpoint using curved forms as a motif. Loss or removal of these elements would degrade the architecture to simple monumental brutalism without joy.

- The unified concept – consisting of a 'Giant order' glazed ground floor with subsidiary upper floors, expressed as an extrusion. A simple concept which is powerful and monumental and possibly influenced by Le Corbusier and Paul Rudolph.

5.9 A further eleven aspects of the building were identified as being of High Significance:

- Design Concept – Aesthetic/Historic quality of the concourse. The original designers were consciously aiming to provide the qualities of an airport; by providing a fully enclosed concourse with service facilities and clearly identified boarding gates.

- Window/Curtain Walling - Aesthetic. The main body of the ground floor is enveloped in a curtain wall system where the transparency and delicacy of the facade treatment contrast with the curve canopy above and comprises the major part of the building's external material character and architectural identity.

- Internal/External Lighting – Aesthetic. The original design incorporated a continuous run of internally illuminated box signs over the boarding doors.
Design Team - Historic, associative. The integrated approach of Architecture/Structural Engineering/Fittings/Typography was a successful product of BDPs 'multi-disciplinary' philosophy valuing the contribution of all parts of a team. BDP’s architect acknowledged the role of Arup engineers in conceiving the curved parapets which are the signature feature of the building. The structure is clearly on show and the results of an on-site modular factory process can be seen. The original seating units follow the curve motif. Whilst the use of Helvetica font is typical of the time it is carried throughout and remains substantially intact. The utilitarian nature of the building means that the construction is fully expressed and there are few areas concealed by cladding, ceilings or boxings. This allows a clear ‘reading’ similar to a factory or medieval stone building.

Volumes - Aesthetic, Technical. The layout allows for a clear interrupted perimeter for the bus bays, together with ancillary spaces in central spine. This simple arrangement that is visible from the exterior is carried into the interior with the uninterrupted views of the entire length and height of the ground floor providing legibility. The mezzanine structure is a corresponding simple concept of an extruded enclosure within the volume.

Modular construction - Aesthetic, Technical. The unified character of the building is defined by geometric precision, derived from car parking spaces and bus bay widths, which is carried through the principal elements of columns, beams, glazing mullions and tiling in a 40ft grid with 4ft modules [imperial measurements].

Design Concept - Aesthetic, Technical. The end elevations represent an extruded cross-section of the structure as a whole and therefore retain the integrity of the composition. This is due to the curved parapets of the half level car decks being exposed to view and the tiled panels serving as ‘stop ends’.

External Finishes – Aesthetic - Insitu Exposed Aggregate Concrete Columns. A strong contrast is established between the heavy weight elements expressed as rough exposed aggregate, and the lighter weight parapets expressed as smooth moulded concrete. This contrast is the essence of the building.

Internal Finishes - Aesthetic technical. The Structural Soffit of precast concrete tee beams provide a clear expression of the exposed and unadorned elements of structure which is also the essence of the building, standing in the Modernist tradition of truth to materials and the ‘machine aesthetic’ which proposed that buildings should be designed in a logical and functional manner which would also give them a robust beauty similar to machinery or civil engineering works.
• Lighting Aesthetic - Side lighting. The original design relied on lighting concealed inside and uplighters on top of the continuous band of signage over the bus boarding doors.

• Staircase / Lifts – There are three stair and lift cores serving the car park decks. These tile-clad shafts punctuate the roof line, and are an integral part of the structure but are not clearly expressed internally.

5.10 Other aspects of the building were considered to be of moderate or low significance. The elements of moderate significance included the flooring, the tiles, the barriers, seating units and clocks. The elements of low significance included the iroko bus bay doors which were identified as being:

“... part of a limited palette of materials [that] have proved difficult in service and do not meet current operational requirements.”

IMPACT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

5.11 In accordance with the requirements of para. 134 of the NPPF, any harm to a heritage asset must be considered against the public benefit of a development, including the continued use of a heritage asset. In this case the proposed development will have no direct physical impact upon the Bus Station but it is acknowledged it will have a visual impact due to its proximity. The impacts are summarised in Fig. 10 with a full version in Appendix CA1.
## Heritage Statement

### Categories | Value | Elements | Impact |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Concept</td>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>Unity of unformed Mass, Horizontality, Monumentality, Scale &amp; Langth</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Concept</td>
<td>Aesthetic, Historic Technical</td>
<td>Curved Moll, e.g. car deck parapet/ferris rail, rakemaking units. The initial concept is a strictly rectangular but having established the rectangular shape of the building many subsidiary elements provide a playful counterpoint using curved forms as moll.</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Concept</td>
<td>Aesthetic, Historic Illustrative</td>
<td>Unified concept - giant star glazed ground floor with subsidiary upper floors, expressed as an extension.</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Concept</td>
<td>Aesthetic, Historic Illustrative</td>
<td>Concourse</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window/Curtain Walling</td>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>The main body of the ground floor is enveloped in a curtain wall system</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal/External Lighting</td>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Team</td>
<td>Historic, cocoasive</td>
<td>Integrated Design of Architecture / Structural Engineering / Fittings / Typography</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volumes</td>
<td>Aesthetic, Technical</td>
<td>Internal Planning: clear uninterrupted perimeter for bus bays, ancillary spaces in central spine</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modular construction</td>
<td>Aesthetic, Technical</td>
<td>Uniform controlling 4ft grid and 4x modules.</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Concept</td>
<td>Aesthetic, Technical</td>
<td>E20 Elevations</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Finishes</th>
<th>Aesthetic</th>
<th>Exposed Aggregate Concrete Columns</th>
<th>Not Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal Finishes</td>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>Structural Design of Precast Concrete Beams</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>Exit Lighting</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staircase / Lifts</td>
<td></td>
<td>Three stair and lift cores serving car park decks</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage / Graphics</td>
<td>Aesthetic, Historical, Illustrative</td>
<td>Uniformity of Prescriptive Font throughout; colours vary with scaled</td>
<td>Not Significant - Updates to and replacement of the existing signage will be dealt with as part of a separate application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original purposes</td>
<td>Evidential</td>
<td>Integrated Bus, Coach, Car and Taxi</td>
<td>Low (positive) - Improvements to infrastructure will encourage more sustainable travel methods such as cycling and walking by making them easier and safer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Historic, technical</td>
<td>Precast Concrete, Precast moulded Units</td>
<td>Moderate - It is imperative that improvements are made to the layout of the retained bus aprons in order to meet the standards expected of a modern transport facility, complying with regulations in relation to accessibility and pedestrian safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Finishes</td>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>Exposed, Unpainted Precast &amp; Insitu Concrete, Tiled Internal Columns &amp; Walls</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Finishes</td>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>Tiled</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megastructure</td>
<td>Evidential</td>
<td>Bus station, bus aprons, underpasses, multi-storey car park and associated ramps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority of the key features of significance, particularly internally will be unaffected by the proposed development. There will also be a particular benefit in terms of the evidential nature of the megastructure. The consequential result of the development will be the closure of the western apron of the bus station which will improve the opportunities for viewing the bus station from safe, public viewpoints. The use of an integrated Design Team simply replicates the approach taken with the original development of the Bus Station but with the addition of a dedicated town planning team.

In respect to those elements where there will be an impact, none of these are considered to be more than minor:

- Design Concept – Unity of Unadorned Mass - The unity of the megastructure will be unchanged. The mass will continue to be unadorned, although there will be new gates adjacent to, but separate from, the concourse.

- Volumes – The sheer scale and mass of the bus station will remain as existing with all key design elements retained in situ.

The listing description summarises the reasons for designation as:
“Preston bus station and car park is listed at Grade II for the following principal reasons: * Planning interest: the bus station and car park remains a little-altered and remarkably good example of integrated 1960s traffic planning that still functions as originally intended. As a 1960s ‘megastructure’ combining several functions it was designed to recreate a sense of the monumental within the British town scene; * External design interest: the curved concrete front to the car park decks are major architectural features of the design and focus attention on the building’s great length whilst creating an elegant light and dark horizontal banding effect along the entire main east and west elevations; * Architectural innovation: the building displays an unusual blend of New Brutalist architecture (influenced by late Le Corbusier) that is mellowed by an inspired application of upturned curves to the main elevations, sweeping car park ramps and the curved ends of the former taxi rank; * Structural interest: by using techniques such as GRP pre-cast moulding it was possible to create a design which both serves the function of the building as well as contributing to its aesthetic power; * Integrated Design: it represents an important stage in the evolution of integrated design in England pioneered by Building Design Partnership with architecture, interior design, engineering, quantity surveying, landscaping, graphic and typographic design working to a common goal; * Fittings of note: the fitting out of the building as specified by BDP survives well with original features such as floor finishes, signage and barriers making an important contribution to its aesthetic impact.”

5.15 It is noteworthy that the summary of reasons for designation refer to the external design interest, in respect to the design and form of the concrete decks to the car park; innovation, in respect of the marriage of New Brutalist architecture mellowed by the curves of the main elevations and curved ends of the lozenge-shaped taxi rank; and fittings of note in respect to the floor finishes, signage and barriers. No mention is made of the bus aprons although these of course originally formed part of the function of the Bus Station whilst reinforcing its lack of accessibility from the adjacent town centre.

PLANNING BALANCE

5.16 The guidance set out in the NPPF establishes that substantial harm to a Grade II listed building should be exceptional [para. 132]. Clearly in this case, the proposed development works would not result in substantial harm and therefore para. 132 does not apply.

5.17 Where less than substantial harm to a designated asset will be caused, the NPPF, para. 134 requires that:

“this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.”
5.18 The starting point for all of the works at Preston Bus Station is to create the best possible bus station, fit for the twenty first century, and as an integral part of the City Deal providing the public transport hub for the city and the county beyond. The provision of safe and secure access to the retained eastern bus apron will form a fundamental element of this.

5.19 Given the lack of significant and substantial harm and the clear benefits of the proposed facility, it is considered that in heritage terms the application is entirely compliant with planning policy.

5.20 For these reasons it is considered that there are no heritage reasons why planning permission and listed building consent should not be granted.
6.0 CONCLUSION

6.1 An application for planning permission and listed building consent is being made for external works on land adjacent to Preston Bus Station which is a grade II listed building and a notable heritage asset.

6.2 This statement draws upon the Preston Bus Station Conservation Management Plan in identifying the significant aspects of the heritage asset and considers the proposed development works against these elements.

6.3 There will be benefits to the heritage value of the bus station in that with the improvements to the eastern bus apron, there will be a greater opportunity for the general public to experience a high quality travel experience, which at present is tempered by sub-standard and outdated external facilities, and pedestrian safety.

6.4 It is therefore concluded that there are no heritage reasons why planning permission and listed building consent should not be granted.
APPENDIX CA1

ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE IN TERMS OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT WORKS
**PRESTON BUS STATION EXTERNAL WORKS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Potential for intervention</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Concept</td>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>Unity of undulating Mass, Horizontality, Monumentality, Scale &amp; Length</td>
<td>Exceptional. The simple single form of the building creates a very powerful presence of one, very large, unified object, which is modified by variations in height which echoes the rhythm of manufacture. Interrupting the form would seriously damage the concept.</td>
<td>Extremely High. The removal of a substantial length or removal of our desk would not be acceptable. Construction of obtrusive external elements such as rail and lift towers or vehicle ramps may be possible with careful design as an alternative.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Concept</td>
<td>Aesthetic, Historic</td>
<td>Curved roof, the arch of a large, undulating, arched roofing unit. The arch is not a straight line but having established the rectangular shape of the building many subsidiary elements provide a playful treatment using curves as the motif.</td>
<td>Exceptional. The curved roof on the pediment is an essential quality of the design. The sweep or removal of them would degrade the architecture. The monumental scale should not be altered. Other elements such as the ramp, similarly raise the value of the composition beyond the average.</td>
<td>Removal of these elements should be considered only in response to fundamental repair, health and safety or operational needs.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Concept</td>
<td>Aesthetic, Historic</td>
<td>Unified concept, ‘star shape’ at ground level, with subsidiary upper floors, expressed as an extension.</td>
<td>Exceptional. The simple concept is powerful and monumental, possibly influenced by the Cornbury House (1592) and other mega-structures such as Paul Rudolph’s Temple St, Parking Garage, New Haven (1969).</td>
<td>The quality of the facade is of secondary importance to the entrance and so, should be preserved. Amendment to the planting can be considered but will require visually light-weight and preferably glassy. Masonry should be retained. Exterior walls are treated as part of the curtain wall.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Concept</td>
<td>Aesthetic, Historic</td>
<td>Concourse</td>
<td>High-DOP’s designers were consciously aiming to provide the quality of an airport, a fully enclosed concourse with service facilities and clearly defined boarding gates.</td>
<td>The protection from weather, clarity of circulation and easy access to passenger facilities should be maintained and improved wherever possible. The existing barriers between gates should be retained. A second in appropriate locations where new seating arrangements are introduced.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window/Curtain Glazing</td>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>The main body of the ground floor is enveloped in a steel wall system</td>
<td>High. The transparency and delivery of the look are essential to the treatment of the building. The ceiling, unlike the columns, is not a central feature, and comprises the major part of the building’s external material character and architectural identity.</td>
<td>The selection of doors and windows is not an essential component of the architecture and could be altered. Any new or replacement cladding should be visually lighter, regular and relate to the modular grid. There is scope for a limited palette of material, pattern and finish as part of the curtain walling. Glazing could be tinted but not reflective. Mullions would be a less serious or gates first. Maximise transparency consistent with the internal use is preferred.</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal/External Lighting</td>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>High. The original design incorporated a continuous run of horizontally illuminated box signs near the boarding gates. This should be retained and if possible the lighting repositioned. This will provide a pleasant ambient mood light and reduce contrast against the bright sky outside.</td>
<td>High. The transparency and delivery of the look are essential to the treatment of the building. The ceiling, unlike the columns, is not a central feature, and comprises the major part of the building’s external material character and architectural identity.</td>
<td>The inclusion of ambient lighting does not enhance the building. A second Advent in appropriate locations where new seating arrangements are introduced.</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Team</td>
<td>Historic, associative</td>
<td>Integrated Design of Architecture</td>
<td>High. Successful product design with a coherent philosophy making the contribution of all parts a team. 40% of the wall knowledge is achieved by using mutually reinforcing a central narrative in choosing the central narrative which is the signature of the building. Structure is defined by the same. The use of the vertical is typical of the time but carried throughout and remains substantially intact.</td>
<td>The inclusion of ambient lighting does not enhance the building. A second Advent in appropriate locations where new seating arrangements are introduced.</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Heritage Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Aesthetic, Technical</th>
<th>Internal Planning clear uninterrupted perimeter for bus bays, ancillary spaces in central spine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High. The simple arrangement facilitates from the external carparking area to the interior. The uninterrupted views of the length and height of the ground floor provide legibility. The mezzanine structure is a contemporary simple concept of an enclosed structure within the volume.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The long views are an important part of the concept and should be retained if at all possible. Possible overlooking considerations would be the safety of visitors essential to the continued aesthetic use of the building. Preparing the long internal views on one side may be an acceptable strategy, subject to the impact of any interventions on the character of the building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modular construction</th>
<th>Aesthetic, Technical</th>
<th>Uniform controlling 49 grid and 49 modules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High. The unified character of the building is defined by geometric precision, derived from the parking spaces and bus bays widths, which is carried through the principal elements of columns, beams, glazing mullions and tiling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interventions should preferably conform to the controlling grids to preserve a uniformity. The mezzanine enclosure does not conform as easily to the simple curvilinear geometry as the rest of the building nor does it exhibit the playful curves of other elements. The irregular mezzanine plan form and irregular spacing of columns (remnants of (La Charite's) La Tourelle monastery) set it apart stylistically and as a less successful. Alteration or replacement may be acceptable and an opportunity for creative revitalisation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Concept</th>
<th>Aesthetic, Technical</th>
<th>End Elevations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High. The end elevations represent articulated cross-sections and therefore retain the integrity of the composition. The curved parapets of the half level car decks are exposed to view and the tiled panels serve as 'stop ends'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The extraction could be extended with the On-line construction. Openings in the tiled panels should be carefully considered to conform to the grid. Stairways, advertising or graphics on the large scale of the panels may be acceptable, preferably adopting the geometric theme. The panels are obtained by (a) the central division of car decks and by (b) exposing the curved parapets. They form a hard and solid which should remain. Any MMA to the cable should contrast with the solid white surface.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Finishes</th>
<th>Aesthetic</th>
<th>Multi Exposed Aggregate Concrete Columns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High. A strong contrast is established between the heavy weight elements expressed as rough exposed aggregate, and the lighter weight parapets expressed as smooth finished concrete. This contrast is the essence of the building.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The parapets have been painted but this is acceptable because it respects the smooth character. It would be not acceptable for the columns except in the case of overly large edges for corrosion protection. Paint should be of a uniform finish throughout and closely relative to the mastic joints of masonry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Finishes</th>
<th>Aesthetic, technical</th>
<th>Structural baffle of steel concrete beams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High. The clear expression of the exposed and unadorned elements of structure is the essence of the building. It stands in the Edwardian tradition of truth to evidence, and the 'machine aesthetic' which proposed that buildings should be designed in a logical and functional manner, which would also give it a robust beauty similar to machinist and old engineering works.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited. The repetitive rhythmic of the beams should be readily seen and enhanced by lighting. It can appear stark in contrast to view from the sky. It could be kept from below as the original design. Acoustic panels or signs could be introduced but must follow the geometric grid. Some 'sound' (white) areas of suspended ceiling may be acceptable but should not extend across the room span of the beams.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lighting</th>
<th>Aesthetic</th>
<th>Side lighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High. The original design relied on lighting concealed device and adopters on bar of the continuous band of parapet signs over the bus boarding areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The installation of high-levels lighting has lost the quality of side-lighting should be removed and the original scheme reinstated. This will need careful planning with electronic information boards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staircase / Lifts</th>
<th>Aesthetic</th>
<th>Three stair and lift doors serving our park decks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High. The staircases are integral to the main plan, they are an integral part of the structure but are not clearly expressed visually.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>These staircases are integral to the main plan, they are an integral part of the structure but are not clearly expressed visually.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The public stairs and lifts, within the shafts, are not a successful part of the design and could be improved or possibly supplemented by expressed features (subject to fire and structural considerations).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signage / Graphics</th>
<th>Aesthetic, Historical, Illustrative</th>
<th>University of Herbetos Font throughout various cuts with aged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate Helvetica [1967] is an elegant minimilist typeface contemporary with the building. It is used for directional signs and box gates, predominantly in a utilitarian black on white, with the exception of the boarding doors where it is orange on white and back illuminated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consistent use of this typeface for bus and all other (un apopt) is an opportunity to enhance the building. The range available from black, light, light, arted, textured together with colours provide a palette for many uses. Examples of its use elsewhere include, VASA and IWM, Southampton, Panasonic, Microsoft. There is a great scope and need for the design to be rationalised and be presented. The font is more important than the actual signs which are not fully integrated into the building.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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### Original purposes

- **Evidential**
  - Imagined Bus, Coach, Car and Taxi
  - Moderate: The building is notable as an example of the use of traditional design elements in response to the demand for additional road and parking spaces in towns. It is also noted for its preservation of traditional design elements and the use of traditional materials and techniques. The building is significant as an example of the use of traditional design elements in response to the demand for additional road and parking spaces in towns.

- **Thematic**
  - Proposed for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Parks and Gardens
  - Moderate: The building is notable as an example of the use of traditional design elements in response to the demand for additional road and parking spaces in towns. It is also noted for its preservation of traditional design elements and the use of traditional materials and techniques. The building is significant as an example of the use of traditional design elements in response to the demand for additional road and parking spaces in towns.

- **Evidential**
  - Proposed for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Parks and Gardens
  - Moderate: The building is notable as an example of the use of traditional design elements in response to the demand for additional road and parking spaces in towns. It is also noted for its preservation of traditional design elements and the use of traditional materials and techniques. The building is significant as an example of the use of traditional design elements in response to the demand for additional road and parking spaces in towns.

### Structure

- **Historic, Architectural**
  - Floors / Roof / Basement: Sections
  - Moderate: The building is notable as an example of the use of traditional design elements in response to the demand for additional road and parking spaces in towns. It is also noted for its preservation of traditional design elements and the use of traditional materials and techniques. The building is significant as an example of the use of traditional design elements in response to the demand for additional road and parking spaces in towns.

### Internal Finish

- **Aesthetic**
  - Exposed, Unfinished: Roof, Walls
  - Complete: Sections
  - Moderate: The building is notable as an example of the use of traditional design elements in response to the demand for additional road and parking spaces in towns. It is also noted for its preservation of traditional design elements and the use of traditional materials and techniques. The building is significant as an example of the use of traditional design elements in response to the demand for additional road and parking spaces in towns.

### Megastructure

- **Evidential**
  - Bus station, bus apron, underpass, multi-storey car park and associated ramp
  - Moderate: The scale and ambition of the ensemble reflects the high expectations of the design. The building is notable as an example of the use of traditional design elements in response to the demand for additional road and parking spaces in towns. It is also noted for its preservation of traditional design elements and the use of traditional materials and techniques. The building is significant as an example of the use of traditional design elements in response to the demand for additional road and parking spaces in towns.

### Fixtures & Fittings

- **Display railings, lights**
  - Moderate: Many features of the original design remain in situ and should be retained. In new locations if necessary, as part of the operational bus station. The building is notable as an example of the use of traditional design elements in response to the demand for additional road and parking spaces in towns. It is also noted for its preservation of traditional design elements and the use of traditional materials and techniques. The building is significant as an example of the use of traditional design elements in response to the demand for additional road and parking spaces in towns.

### Archaeological Interest

- **Historic, archaeological**
  - The site’s archaeological potential is limited: it is situated outside the boundaries of the area either as an original installation or in the form of a new structure. The building is notable as an example of the use of traditional design elements in response to the demand for additional road and parking spaces in towns. It is also noted for its preservation of traditional design elements and the use of traditional materials and techniques. The building is significant as an example of the use of traditional design elements in response to the demand for additional road and parking spaces in towns.

- **Supergraphics**
  - Low: Historical icons used at scale, eg car park arrows
  - Moderate: The building is notable as an example of the use of traditional design elements in response to the demand for additional road and parking spaces in towns. It is also noted for its preservation of traditional design elements and the use of traditional materials and techniques. The building is significant as an example of the use of traditional design elements in response to the demand for additional road and parking spaces in towns.

- **Car park decks**
  - Low: With the exception of the curved balustrades the interior of the car park decks is typical of many car parks (enclosing the external ramp)
  - Moderate: The building is notable as an example of the use of traditional design elements in response to the demand for additional road and parking spaces in towns. It is also noted for its preservation of traditional design elements and the use of traditional materials and techniques. The building is significant as an example of the use of traditional design elements in response to the demand for additional road and parking spaces in towns.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Significance Colour Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doors</td>
<td>Low: Although part of a limited palette of materials, the doors have proved difficult in service and do not meet current operational requirements.</td>
<td>Replacements should have regard to the the proportions of thick rails and slender transoms used in the original design.</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mezzanine</td>
<td>Auxiliary accommodation</td>
<td>The central spine of accommodation, whilst clearly functional, detracts from the dramatic large volumes and views. The detailing is good quality but the irregularity compromises the simplicity of the design. In particular the bay housing the stairs to staff servery actually compromises circulation in the passenger waiting area.</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>Low: Granite setts form landscaped mounds to discourage pedestrian sounds across the vehicle area.</td>
<td>The landscape around the building is excluded from the listing but forms a very minor part of the setting.</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significance Colour Rating**

- **E** Exceptional: Rare or extremely important spaces or elements which directly contribute to the importance of the space and to the Grade II listing. Items of this significance should be retained and remain unaltered. Where changes are necessary they should be reversible.
- **H** High: Items or spaces which positively contribute to the character of the site. Retention and conservation are preferable, though in extreme cases change should be allowed.
- **M** Moderate: Of some importance to understanding the heritage of the site. A reasonable level of change should be acceptable.
- **L** Low: Items of historical significance, removal or change permissible.
- **I** Insignificant: Elements which do not impact the heritage value of the site.