

MOUNTEER LIMITED

Heritage Statement

426 Wilmslow Road

Withington

M20 3BW

Client: Mr Arif Munir

Maximising the Value of Heritage Assets
www.mounteer.co.uk

Mounteer Limited co. 9352984 Registered in Cardiff
e|smg@mounteer.co.uk t| +44(0) 7826 938 315
Trading: The Business Centre, Hyde Park House, Cartwright Street, Hyde, Cheshire, SK14 4EH
Registered: Heron House, 39 Higher Bents Lane, Stockport, Cheshire, SK6 1EE

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Proposal	3
3	Cultural Heritage Impact Methodology	4
4	Withington Conservation Area Appraisal.....	9
5	National Planning Policy Framework.....	10
6	Conclusion	11
7	Appendix A - Photographs.....	12

1 Introduction

Author Profile

I am a chartered building surveyor elected in 1983, forming my own chartered building surveying practice since 1984. Since that period I have dealt with projects in the heritage sector both in terms of survey analysis reports. I was commended in the 1991 first RICS conservation awards and some 7 years ago took a Master's Degree in the Care of the Historic Environment. I am an RICS registered conservation surveyor, and dealing with heritage statements regarding listed buildings scheduled, ancient monuments, conservation areas and other associated heritage issues.

Purpose of Report

To identify the impact of the proposed alterations on the conservation area/heritage assets.

References

JAAN Architects Existing and Proposed Plans

2 Proposal

Brief Development of the Site

We understand that alterations to open up the shop were carried out in the 1970's/1980's together with some structural work to the basement.

The staircase I suspect will probably have travelled up the party wall of the building within the outrigger but the layout has changed to the first, second and third floor have had the internal loadbearing removed, so all the internal walls to create the flats have been formed in timber studding, with floors having a clear span from party wall to party wall.

The other alteration is the staircase situated in the outrigger, some of which is original, so it may well have been that some of the staircases were in fact at the rear of the building but still on the party wall position.

There are no proposed alterations internally except for the slight change in the staircase designed from the ground to first floor.

The external aspect of the building has been unaltered showing a long window at the rear to give light into part of the stairwell and that remains unaltered, and the dormer to the front is original.

Most of the properties on this row have had rooflights installed over a period of time.

The single storey extensions to the rear are difficult to age. They appear to have been built rather crudely off the yard walls, and looking at the building materials such as the roof of mineral felt, it has probably been carried out in the 1970's/1980's.

All the properties in the past have had four pot chimney stacks as can be seen from the archive photograph attached in Appendix B.

Proposals

It is intended to create an additional dormer to the front elevation and a recessed entrance to the flat to the rear.

The proposals are relatively insignificant particularly to the rear as they have no impact on the architectural merits of the building to which the entrance is currently through a single storey extension to a two storey outrigger.

Whilst the internal alteration is minimal, it has got to be taken into context as it is not a listed building or locally listed.

The roofline of the main building is intercepted by a single dormer to most of the properties except for number 420, and it can be seen that rooflights have been also installed in most of the buildings along that line. Therefore, the question as to whether the two dormers rather than one has a detrimental upon the street scene of the property.

3 Cultural Heritage Impact Methodology

3.1 Significant Assessment

3.1.1 Heritage Values

English Heritage guidance on heritage assessment is set out in Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the Protection of the Historic Environment (EH, 2008) which identifies a series of “heritage values” against which a site's heritage significance should be assessed.

Evidential Value

Evidential value derives from the potential of a place to yield evidence about past human activity and can be natural or manufactured. Very often archaeological deposits are of evidential value as they are the primary source of human activity for a particular place and period. However, other types of asset can also be of evidential value where the written or drawn record may be incomplete. Age is a strong indicator of relative evidential value but is not paramount while the evidential value of an asset tends to be diminished in proportion to the extent of its removal or replacement. There is a certain degree of overlap with historical value, discussed below.

Historical Value

Historical value derives from the ways in which past people, events and aspects of life can be connected through a place to the present. It tends to be either illustrative or associative. Illustrative value relates to the way a place may provide a tangible link to illustrate aspects of history or prehistory. This relies on visibility and may relate to distinctiveness of a regional tradition or an aspect of social organisation. Associative value is concerned with links with a notable family, person, event, or movement. Buildings or designed landscapes may relate to a particular person and the way in which they were designed, laid out or furnished may reflect that person's personality or needs. Buildings or landscapes may also be associated with notable art, literature music or film and they may derive associative value from this.

Aesthetic Value

Aesthetic value derives from the ways in which people draw sensory and intellectual stimulation from a place; it can be because of conscious design or can arise fortuitously because of the development and use of a place over time, or from a combination of the two factors. Where aesthetic value derives from conscious design, this may relate to aspects such as form, proportions, massing or of views and vistas, and the retention of the value relies on maintaining the integrity of the concept. Fortuitous aesthetic values may involve the organic form of a rural or urban landscape and reflect the appearance of a place as it has developed over a period. Aesthetic value resulting from the passage of time on human works, the “patina of age” may overlie the values of conscious design and may enhance or detract from them.

Communal Value

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. Communal values are tightly bound up with historical (particularly associative) and aesthetic values but tend to have additional and specific aspects. This may relate to commemorative or symbolic places, or places which contribute to a sense of identity. Communal values may tend to relate more to an activity associated with the place rather than the physical buildings themselves and is thus less reliant on the physical survival of historic fabric.

Table 3.1 Summary of the Significance of Heritage Assets

Heritage Significance	Summary Rationale
High	Asset has importance for an outstanding level of evidential, historical, aesthetic, or communal value or a high level of more than one value, resulting in a high level of architectural or historic interest.
Medium	Asset has importance for a high level of evidential, historical, aesthetic, or communal value or several elements of more than one value.
Low	Asset has importance for elements of evidential, historical, aesthetic, or communal value.
Negligible	Asset has little importance for elements of evidential, historical, aesthetic, or communal value due to its nature or form/condition/survival.

Other Criteria Used

Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment Methodology

No standard method of evaluation and assessment is provided for the assessment of significance of effects upon cultural heritage, therefore a set of evaluation and assessment criteria have been developed using a combination of the Secretary of State's criteria for Scheduling Monuments (Scheduled Monument Statement, Annex 1), Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, Volume 11, Part 3, Section 2, HA 208/07, Transport Analysis Guidance (TAG Unit 3.3.9, Heritage of Historic Resources Sub-Objective) and English Heritage Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets. Professional judgement is used in conjunction with these criteria to undertake the impact assessment.

Value

The table below provides guidance on the assessment of cultural heritage value on all archaeological sites and monuments, historic buildings, historic landscapes, and other types of historical site such as battlefields, parks, and gardens, not just those that are statutorily designated.

Value	Examples
Very High	World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments of exceptional quality, or assets of acknowledged international importance or can contribute to international research objectives. Grade I Listed Buildings and built heritage of exceptional quality. Grade I Registered Parks and Gardens and historic landscapes and townscapes of international sensitivity, or extremely well-preserved historic landscapes and townscapes with exceptional coherence, integrity, time-depth, or other critical factor(s)

High	Scheduled Monuments, or assets of national quality and importance or that can contribute to national research objectives Grade II* and Grade II Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas with very strong character and integrity, other built heritage that can be shown to have exceptional qualities in their fabric or historical association. Grade II* and II Registered Parks and Gardens, Registered Battlefields and historic landscapes and townscapes of outstanding interest, quality and importance, or well preserved and exhibiting considerable coherence, integrity time-depth or other critical factor(s)
Medium	Designated or undesignated assets of regional quality and importance that contribute to regional research objectives Locally Listed Buildings, other Conservation Areas, historic buildings that can be shown to have good qualities in their fabric or historical association Designated or undesignated special historic landscapes and townscapes with reasonable coherence. integrity, time-depth or other critical factor(s)
Low	Undesignated assets of local importance Assets compromised by poor preservation and/or poor survival of contextual associations but with potential to contribute to local research objectives. Historic (unlisted) buildings of modest quality in their fabric or historical association Historic landscapes and townscapes with limited sensitivity or whose sensitivity is limited by poor preservation, historic integrity and/or poor survival of contextual associations. Assets that form a resource within the community with occasional utilisation for educational or recreational purposes.
Negligible	Assets with little or no surviving cultural heritage interest. It is a building of no architectural or historical note. The Landscape has been severely fragmented, and the contextual associations are compromised due to the demolition of the main hospital complex.

3.1.2 Magnitude of Impact

Magnitude of Impact	Typical Criteria Descriptors
Moderate	Substantial impact on the asset, but only partially affecting the integrity; partial loss of, or damage to, key characteristics, features or elements; intrusive into the setting and/or would adversely impact upon the context of the asset; loss of the asset for community appreciation. The assets integrity or setting is damaged but not destroyed so understanding and appreciation is compromised. (Negative)

	Benefit to, or restoration of, key characteristics, features or elements; improvement of asset quality; degradation of the asset would be halted; the setting and/or context of the asset would be enhanced and understanding, and appreciation is improved; the asset would be bought into community use. (Positive)
Slight	Some measurable change in assets quality or vulnerability; minor loss of or alteration to, one (or more) key characteristics, features or elements; change to the setting would not be overly intrusive or overly diminish the context; community use or understanding would be reduced. The assets integrity or setting is damaged but understanding and appreciation would only be diminished not compromised. (Negative) Minor benefit to, or partial restoration of, one (more) key characteristics, features or elements; some beneficial impact on asset or a stabilisation of negative impacts; slight improvements to the context or setting of the site; community use or understanding and appreciation would be enhanced. (Positive)
Negligible/No Change	Very minor loss or detrimental alteration to one or more characteristics, features or elements Minor changes to the setting or context of the site. No discernible change in baseline conditions (Negative). Very minor benefit to or positive addition of one or more characteristics, features or elements. Minor changes to the setting or context of the no discernible change in baseline conditions. (Positive)

When assessing the magnitude of impact table, we consider there is some minor measurable change in the asset, but there is no loss of historic fabric.

We consider that the changes are very minor/slight alterations to the characteristics and features, although the introduction of a second dormer could be argued either way, as it is not in the original concept but there are examples as attached and the photograph of two dormers in the line and the window above. So there is some measurable change in the asset's quality, the asset's integrity and setting is not damaged and would only be diminished not compromised, so we consider it to be slight and negative.

3.1.3 Significance

With reference to the heritage values described above, the heritage significance of the individual buildings has been assigned to one of four classes, as set out in Table 3.1. In this respect, the heritage table indicated under cultural heritage impact assessment methodology. We consider this is an undesignated asset, compromised by poor presentation in terms of contextual association particularly with the rear extensions. We also consider it is within a conservation area which is not of particular high importance with very few listed buildings. We do accept obviously that it is however part of the street scene of Withington in terms of its late Victorian architecture, particularly the relatively unaltered first, second and third floor of the street scene. In that respect we consider the heritage value to be low.

Evidential Value - negligible

Historic Value - low

Aesthetic Value - medium

Communal Value-low

Summary – we consider the building to have **Low heritage value**.

3.1.4 Significance of Effect

By combining the value of the cultural heritage resource with the predicted magnitude of impact the significance of the effect can be determined. This is undertaken as the table below:

Significance of Effects	Magnitude of Impact			
Cultural Heritage Value	Substantial	Moderate	Slight	Negligible/No Change
Very High	Major	Major Intermediate	Intermediate	Minor
High	Major Intermediate	Intermediate	Intermediate Minor	Neutral
Medium	Intermediate	Intermediate Minor	Minor	Neutral
Low	Intermediate Minor	Minor	Minor – Neutral	Neutral
Negligible	Minor-Neutral	Minor-Neutral	Neutral	Neutral

We consider that the significance of Effect is minor on the basis of Low historical value and **slight** magnitude of impact.

4 Withington Conservation Area Appraisal

Control of Development

This states the design should take into account the alterations that may have an impact upon the appearance of the building, particularly the character of the building including the entire street or view down long vistas, especially if the site has been at conjunction of two streets.

This particular block is fairly prominent and is opposite a listed building, so the particular view is an important one and there is some questions as to whether two dormers as traditional as they may be, will have a significant impact.

It is our view that whilst it will have a minor impact will be not significant enough to spoil the area and by the introduction of another architectural feature, similar to one that is already there could be argued to improve rather than be negative.

Improvement and Enhancement

What is relatively complete with this block is the first and second floors have original architectural details and mostly sliding sash windows and the shop fronts are of a variety of styles, and you can see from the archive footage that there would have been canopies. However, I think it is fair to say the shop fronts are not of particular good quality and retain little of the Victorian originality.

The viability as suggested of residential use above the commercial use, would only be substantiated by good quality entrances and the existing entrance to the flats is of poor quality and shares with the commercial backyard, and therefore the alterations proposed to the rear are essential, and cannot be incorporated adequately within the shop frontage.

Therefore, the introduction of the second dormer could be considered contentious, but also introduces a strong feature traditional to the area.

Local Development Plan Policy Manchester Core Strategy 2012-2027

Policy EN3

This is to state that the council wish to preserve and possibly enhance the historical environment.

We consider that the installation of a dormer is not significant to affect the street scene and the alterations to the rear are insignificant in terms of the impact of poorly extended and designed rear sections of the building.

5 National Planning Policy Framework

5.1 197

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.

It is important to remain in viable use in the first, second and third floor of these buildings and the alterations that are proposed are to refurbish those and give maximum headroom and usage, hence the reason for the dormer at the front and the rear arrangement of the entrance to the rear. We therefore consider this meets with those requirements.

6 Conclusion

Whilst there is some debate about the additional dormer to the front, at least the design of this is similar to the one which is already there and creates a strong feature in the street scene which is commensurate with the age of the property, whilst other significant characteristics such as loss of chimney stacks has already occurred.

The redesign of the entrance to the rear is not significant, it does not have any effect on the setting of the building or on the conservation area itself. Therefore, on balance we consider that these proposals are negligible and have a neutral impact.

7 Appendix A - Photographs

Photograph 1



Archive Photograph

Photograph 2



Example of Double Dormer

Photograph 3



Group of buildings 420, 422, 424, 426 and 428 forming the old bank building constructed in 1876.

Photograph 4



Group of buildings all of the same construction period, although the far left hand building appears that the brickwork has been painted, good quality Tuscan style archways in contrasting brick, indications there have been dormers on all five properties in the past.

Photograph 5



Subject property no alterations to the first, second or third floor, however there is single storey extensions which appear to have been built off the original yard walls including blockwork and poor quality mineral felt roof. The entrances therefore are not to be altered in the sense, but there will be internally behind the left hand side gate and internal which would give access to the flats.

Photograph 6



Doorway to the left to be entrance to flats, no significant alterations.

Photograph 7



Current dormer detail to property with rooflights to the left and right.