

M Nightingale, Dip TP, Dip Arch Cons
Heritage and Planning Consultant
8 St Peter's Road, Bury BL9 9RB

0161 761 5017 Mob 07487 590113

e-mail michaelnightingale@btinternet.com

Hough Hall, Hough Hall Road, Moston.

Heritage Statement

1. Introduction/Summary

1.1. Hough Hall is currently in a derelict and partially collapsed condition. It is thought to have been built in the C16 or C17 and altered by its owners over the following centuries. It is a grade II listed building primarily of timber frame construction built on a coursed stone plinth. Its condition has declined over the past say 15 years (or possibly longer) when the building was unused with the most serious decline during the last 5 years. In 2005 and during 2020/21 significant concern was expressed about the building's future by the local community. In July 2021 it was the subject of a Section 78 Notice under the Building Act 1984 issued by MCC and requiring the owner to "remove the danger". The new owner responded with action to undertake the work. This, together with earlier fabric loss, has sadly removed a substantial (north) part of the original main wing together with two later lateral bays, leaving the roof structure in a precarious state, and since then there has been further collapse and loss of fabric. At the same time the cross-wing was protected by scaffolding on its east elevation. The building was not recorded prior to the works to make the building safe or at any time when there was concern over its future. Whilst the demolished material is on-site there is no record of its original location within the building.

1.2. On a point of clarification. It is not the function of a heritage statement to make comment on the actions of recent owners of the Hall or those of Manchester City Council the local planning authority or any other body or individual.

1.3. In the above context and with so much building fabric being lost, the value of a heritage statement may be questionable. However, there is a small chance that something can be saved of the Hall and the statement is necessary in support of such proposals and those for the wider site. This statement will also be important in identifying any philosophy of retention and repair. The comments in this statement are based on historical information and a limited external inspection. Further investigation will be required before any final conclusions can be made. Due to the circumstances, this is not a standard heritage statement.

1.4. The requirement for a heritage statement is in support of the planning application in line with paragraph 194 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2021. Part of the paragraph states that "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".

1.5. The current proposal is for planning permission for the residential development of the site and for this development to cross-fund the retention and use of part of the hall. At this stage the work to the hall will be included in outline to proceed in detail if planning permission is granted, which will allow the funding for the hall to be released. The local planning authority will no doubt wish to link the work to the Hall to the disposal of any approved residential units. As a consequence this statement will be sufficient to establish the outline scheme for the hall and the development's impact on the setting of

the Hall. It is anticipated that a later and more detailed application for listed building consent for works to the hall will be accompanied by an additional statement.

1.6. Whilst it is expected that the heritage statement will help to guide what happens to the Hall the Council has confirmed that there is no public money to assist in the restoration proposals and therefore the level of cross funding available from the development may severely restrict the extent of the scheme.

1.7. This statement should be read in conjunction with the Renaissance Structural Engineers report 2022; the Planning and Design Statement covering the residential proposals, and the financial assessment undertaken by ...

2. History

With particular thanks to Thomas McGrath (see 6 below) for the use of his research.

2.1 Moston is a district of Manchester, about three miles to the north east of the city. It is understood that it is first mentioned in the 13th century recorded as *Mostun*. During the early life of Hough Hall the area was largely open farmland with some settlement along Moston Lane. The township expanded rapidly in the second half of the nineteenth century and in 1890 it was incorporated into the city of Manchester.

2.2 There is very little map information to refer to. Yates map 1786 does not include the Hall. Moston Lane and Kenyon Lane are shown, as is Street Fold at their meeting to the east. Nearby Moston Hall (to the east) and Lightburn Hall (later Lightbowne and south east) are included. Does this give an indication of the importance of Hough Hall? The 1848 OS map (Fig.) shows Hough Hall, and a lunatic asylum and workhouse to the north on Moston Lane with Street Fold again prominent. There is another large building shown opposite the Hall to the east on what later becomes Hough Hall Road together with a smaller building on a north/south axis to the south. All around is open land. By 1893 (Fig.) the Hall is in an open site with farmland to the south and what appears to be marshy ground or a pond. By this time there has been considerable development to the east, west and north of the Hall mainly in the form of terraced housing. At that time the building opposite and to the south of the Hall still exist. Notable buildings constructed since 1848 are the primary school on Moston Lane and the Simpson Memorial building. The 1922 map shows the Hall in reduced grounds, but also that parts of early Street Fold to the east might still remain. By 1989 the Hall site is referred to a depot with new buildings added. The building opposite the Hall is there and named as Hough House.



Fig . 1848 OS Map. Not to scale.
Crown Copyright 2022.



1893 OS Map. Not to Scale.
Crown copyright 2022.

2.3 The Manchester Evening News in 2005, in an article about Hough Hall, stated that the Hall was built in 1502 by Hugh Sherlock and in 1568 purchased by Sir William Radcliffe. The source for this is not clear and it does not fully tally with known events.

Hough Hall was possibly built by the Halgh family (their surname also sometimes spelt *Hough* or *Halgh*). During the early-sixteenth century Hough Hall was occupied by George Halgh and his wife Ann (nee Consterdine). Ann had a long-standing affair with Sir John Byron of Clayton Hall. Ann and Byron were even openly-living together at one point even though she was still married and after George's death, they eventually married. Whilst her first husband was still very much alive; the affair produced a son and a daughter. The daughter, Ann Halgh, bore George's surname but was officially recognised by Byron as his heir. This Ann, married Cuthbert Scholfield, who in 1561 filed a divorce at the Bishop's Court in Chester on the account of his wife's adulterous behaviour with a gentleman named Michael Goodricke. Rev. John Booker writing in the mid-nineteenth century delicately noted that Ann Scholfield had '*inherited her mother's frailty*'. The Hall passed to George's son on his death in 1591(?).

2.4 Captain Robert Halgh was the last in the line of the Halgh family to own the hall. As he supported the King during the English Civil War (1642-1651) he was ordered to sequester his estate during the Parliamentary years to secure his future freedom. In the end he paid a fine of £x to retain the Hall and land. He died around 1685 (there is one account that says 1678) but it seems he did not leave Hough Hall. A ghost story was recounted centuries later that Captain Halgh still roamed his former home and the estate with his phantom dogs. It was noted; '*many a Moston man has spent the night at a neighbouring inn rather than pass the hall late at night*'.

2.5 Shortly after Halgh's death in 1685 (or 1678), the hall and estate were purchased by James Lightbowne, a merchant. One account refers to it being sold to him by John Dawson, thought to be Robert Halgh's son. The family also owned Lightbowne Hall in Moston and his acquisition of the estate was likely an attempt to secure the land. Lightbowne was an early example of a merchant in Manchester who had somewhat transcended his trade origins and his wealth enabled him to buy this estate and he became a firm part of the local gentry. This was to be a story replicated many times over by merchants in Manchester in the C17 and C18.

2.6 In 1664, before James acquired Hough Hall, his daughter, Ann (d.1669) had married Thomas Mynshull (d.1698), an apothecary. They were friends of Sir Humphrey Chetham, the founder of Chetham's library. Thomas and Ann had the following children: Thomas, John, Richard and Mary. The family had numerous properties to reside in, as Thomas had purchased the Chorlton Hall estate in 1644. The Chorlton Hall estate now makes up most of Chorlton-upon-Medlock and the area occupied by MMU and parts of the UofM. Chorlton Hall itself survived as St. Luke's Rectory off Grosvenor Street until the 1930s when it was demolished.

2.7 The Hough Hall estate passed into the Mynshull family, through Thomas and Ann's descendants. To follow the story of Hough Hall onwards, we need to travel a few miles from Moston back to the Chorlton Hall estate, where the Mynshull family resided in the eighteenth century.

2.8 Thomas Mynshull (c.1700-1749) married Barbara Nabb (also spelt *Naab*) (1703-1783) in 1730 and they had a son, Thomas Samuel Mynshull (1733-1755). When Thomas Samuel Mynshull came of age in February 1754 there was great excitement in Manchester. Church bells were rung and there was a ball for a hundred couples at the old exchange on King Street. Sadly, Thomas died just a year later and his funeral was marked with great ceremony too and this somewhat shows the deference of the local population at the time to the local gentry.

Barbara Mynshull, a widow, now found herself in sole control of the vast estates which would have been inherited by her son. The family owned Chorlton Hall, Hough Hall and also Garratt Hall (Wigan?). In the late 1760s Barbara met Roger Aytoun (1749-1810). Roger who came from Fife, Scotland was *much* younger than Barbara and *The Manchester Times* noted that his 'reckless and improvident habits' led to him being nicknamed '*Spanking Roger*'.

2.9. There are three stories about how the relationship came about. One is that Barbara fell in love with Roger on Kersal Moor, where she had just seen him compete in a foot race. The second is that she advertised for a husband and he accepted the vacancy. The third is that she saw him in a parade of dragoons at St. Ann's Square, which as well as being a residential square was also the site of a

market and a parade ground for the yeomanry. As Roger was 6'4" tall, he would have cut a very dashing figure in his military uniform. Whichever story it was, a dinner was subsequently held for the officers, including Roger, at Chorlton Hall and Roger, as a bright-eyed 19 year old, was no doubt drawn to the 65 year old's vast wealth.

2.10. The couple married at the Collegiate Church (now Manchester Cathedral) on 3 February 1769 and when announced in the newspaper Barbara was described as '*an agreeable widow lady with a large fortune*'. Within a week Roger had left his wife. The couple lived at Chorlton Hall first but apparently Roger moved to Hough Hall, presumably she stayed in Chorlton Hall and both parties probably relished the several miles between them. They were trapped in marriage for 14 years. However, as this was the eighteenth century, any property or assets that Barbara had owned as a widow transferred to her husband. Therefore, she was entirely dependent on Roger and he apparently allowed her '£60 or £70 a year' but he squandered the rest of the fortune. Within just five years of the marriage the Mynshull estates had to be sold. Roger later fought in Gibraltar and he would eventually become a Major General. Barbara died in 1783 at the age of 79.

2.11. In September 1774 Hough Hall was advertised for sale along with 40 statute acres of land (which accounted for 26 'Lancashire' acres). A year later the hall had been sold for £60,000 and it was advertised to let. It was noted 'it would make a good 'Yarn Croft'.

2.12. The property was purchased by Samuel Taylor (d.1820), who was a Colonel in the Manchester and Salford Volunteers. He was also the Grand Master of the Orange Lodge in Manchester. There was significant investment and alteration during his ownership. After Samuel's death, Hough Hall continued to be owned by the Taylor family but it was not occupied by them. His son, also Samuel, had bought Eccleston Hall for his main residence. Hough Hall was let out to tenants and it became a farmhouse. This was not unusual for the period, these Elizabethan, timber-framed houses often fell out of favour among the elite classes who preferred substantial villas or country houses in Broughton, Victoria Park and elsewhere around Manchester.

2.13. From 1830 at least, Thomas Thorpe was the tenant of the Taylors at Hough Hall. The 1841 census provides a little more information about the household. Thomas was around 65 years old at the time of the census. He was living with his wife, Phoeby (Phoebe) and a daughter, Margaret, and 55 year old David Thorpe an agricultural labourer. Also living in the hall but consisting of a different household was John and Sally (Sarah) Brundit (Brundrett) and their infant daughter, Mary. John was also an agricultural labourer. Completing the household was Thomas Whitehead, a fourteen year old male servant.

2.14. Thomas Thorpe died in 1846 and Phoebe died two years later in 1848. The Brundretts were still living at Hough Hall and they subsequently took over the running of the farm, which was 39 acres in size. As well as their daughter Mary, they had another daughter, Phoebe (b.1843) and a son Samuel (b.1847). Living with them in 1851 were agricultural labourers; John Dawson and James Drope and also a domestic maid, Mary A. Maken.

2.15. The Brundetts had certainly risen in the world since the 1841 census but they had left Hough Hall by 1863 for Street Fold Farm and the farm was taken over by three unmarried sisters; Ann Mills (b.1832), Elizabeth Mills (b.1837) and Mary Mills (b.1839). The sisters ran the farm along with the help of three male live-in farm servants; John Bradley, Edward Hutchinson and Joseph Taylor. They also employed a live-in maid, Hannah Partington.

2.16. The Mills sisters were familiar with farming life. They had grown up at a farm in Moston before moving to another farm on Oldham Road in Newton. After their father's death in the 1850s their mother had taken on the running of that 27 acre farm herself and upon her retirement it passed to her eldest son. This is likely what prompted the three unmarried sisters to move to Hough Hall and run their own farm. As unmarried women they held a precarious position in mid-nineteenth-century society. Like Barbara Mynshull a century earlier, they had no legal rights but with no husbands they did not face any form of control over their individual property. However, as they were unmarried, they could have easily fallen into the typical situation of being dependent on their brother or another male relative.

2.17. In 1877 the hall was purchased by Robert Ward and Ann and Mary Mills had left Hough Hall and moved to Blue Stone Farm in 1881 and in 1891 to Street Fold Farm, both in Moston. Robert Ward (b.1830) was a manufacturer of cords, velveteens and cotton. He lived with his wife; Sarah (b.1834) and their children: Elizabeth, Alice, Mary, John, Hannah, Johanna and Amy. His elderly mother, Elizabeth Ward also lived with the family at the hall until her death in 1880. Robert's brother James lived at Hough House opposite. There was another period of investment in the building during the Ward's ownership. The family were still there 1901 and by this time they had employed a domestic servant, Agnes Downing. Robert Ward died in 1904 but Sarah and her unmarried daughter Amy continued to live at the hall until 1919.

2.18. The Hall was bought in 1921 by Dr William Struthers Moore and then in 1933 it passed on to Doctor Gerald Green. The 1939 Register shows Gerald (b.1904) and his wife Freda (b.1912) living at the Hall but Green also had his consulting rooms there too.

2.19. Shortly after the outbreak of the Second World War the hall was unoccupied for a few months before it was taken over by a cosmetics manufacturing company. The firm Eleanor Nesfield Limited produced cremes, lipstick and other beauty products. The firm had installed central heating in the hall to dry it out, as it had been unoccupied for some months before they entered the building. However, the new use of the centuries-old building did not necessarily impress local residents and there were concerns about the machinery which was installed in the various rooms of the house. In 1949, one of the directors of the firm responded to local concerns about the state of the property and some broken windows. Mr H. Glaisher stated:

"Hough Hall is in its original state now. We have installed light machinery, but there is nothing in it that could not be moved out in a couple of weeks [...] The broken windows are not a sign of our neglect. They are broken by children throwing stones and as fast as we have them mended, they are broken again. The exterior does need redecorating, but it will cost more than £100, and for that we must have a licence."

2.20. Peter Gobbi and John Leslie Clough owned the property in the 1960s and 1970s. They let out individual spaces for a variety of uses some not completely suitable for a building of heritage. There was local comment about the poor condition of the building in the 1960s. Around 1972 there was a Hough Hall festival but there is little detail on this. It received its listed building grade II status in 1974. Messrs Gobbi and Clough sold the house in 2005.

2.21. The new owner had planned to live in and restore the Hall, and arranged an open day to celebrate it, but illness intervened and the hall has remained vacant for almost 17 years. The open day was possibly attended by members of the then GMAU. Within the appendices of photographs to this statement there are a number of images of the Hall at that time and now made available by GMAAS. These appear to indicate that the Hall was in good condition at that time. The local community in the form of the Friends of Hough Hall and the Friends of Boggart Hole Clough, and other individuals and groups, have since campaigned to save the building.

Summary

Hough Hall has a clear history with links to many local families, some gentry, and other important houses. History suggests that the Hall was never in the upper group of important houses in the locality. It was built as a modest 3 bay wing one room deep, most probably as a gentleman's house or farm. It prospered and was enlarged and upgraded between C17 and early C19, and both occupied by tenant farmers and owned by farmers. Successful merchants and industrialists also made the house their home. The C20 saw a mixed range of uses generally following a pattern of decline, and with local concern about its future expressed at various points from the 1960s onwards. The Hall appears to have a strong interest for the people of Moston. It is in a location where there is little heritage to celebrate. Its history makes most sense if there is still a building remaining and it continues to occupy the site beyond the current 400+ years.

3. Architectural Significance

A number of architectural descriptions have been produced of the hall prior to its most serious deterioration. These are based on on-site surveys and are shown in italics.

3.1. Official Historic England description.

SD80SE HOUGH HALL ROAD, Lightbowne 698-1/3/728 (West side) 03/10/74 Hough Hall (Formerly Listed as: HOUGH HALL ROAD, Moston (West side) Hough Hall)

II

Farmhouse, now offices. Probably early C17; altered. Timber frame on stone plinth, with brick infilling partly rendered and all painted white; roof part slate and part corrugated asbestos sheet. Irregular L-shaped plan formed by 3-bay main range on east-west axis with short gabled projections to the north side of the centre and east bays, and a 2-bay crosswing at the east end projecting to the south. Two storeys; 3-bay north elevation with small central gable flanked by large wing gables; high stone plinth; exposed wall posts, intermediate posts and rails with angle braces, mostly of light scantling except in the centre where the timber appears to be applied, including a king-post gable truss with raked struts, whereas the wings have collars and raked struts. The left gable has an inserted doorway to the right, a small 4-pane sashed window above this, and a gable chimney; the centre has one altered window on each floor; and the right-hand gable has a 4-light casement at ground floor and an altered window above. The east side (to the street) is stepped in at the gable end, has coupled altered windows at ground floor and a pair of 2-light casements at 1st floor with leaded glazing, a narrow 2-storey gabled porch to the left with a doorway at ground floor and a small 2-light casement at 1st floor, and a large external chimney stack attached to the left of the porch. The rear of the main range has irregular framing making three wide bays, with various altered or inserted windows, and a doorway to the 3rd bay with studded batten-and-board door; the south end of the wing has been rebuilt in brick, painted in imitation of timber-framing. Interior: 3 structural bays with exposed wall-posts and principal-rafter roof trusses with raked struts and wind-braces to the purlins; C17 stop-chamfered ceiling beams and joists; 3rd bay altered as galleried entrance hall, probably in C19, with C17-style dog-legged staircase and C17-style muntin-and-rail panelling; similar panelling on both floors of centre bay; stone chamber fireplace in wing.

Listing NGR: SD8671601857

First listed Oct 1974 Amended June 1994

List Entry Number 1218710

3.2. Pevsner Updated. The Buildings of England. Lancashire: Manchester and the South East. Hartnell. Hyde and Pevsner. 2004

The only physical reminder of Moston's pre-industrial past, and interesting and well preserved house with some unusual features. Two storeys, timber-framed, late C16 or early C17 with various later C17 additions and some C19 interference. Three-bay range with irregular framing and taller two bay E cross wing, all on a stone plinth. A large stone external stack projects from the SE side of the cross wing, and beside it is a very narrow full-height projecting entrance bay with gable, also timber framed. The original S entrance with projecting porch is at the angle with the wing and surmounted by a miniature oriel. The framing of this has been interfered with to introduce larger windows to the ground floor chamber, and to light the later stair. On the N side there is an inserted entrance in the wing. Infill

between the wing and the main range on this side is in the form of two unequal gable bays. They are both timber framed and may be late C17, perhaps dating from when the hall was bought by the Lightbowne family in 1685.

Interior. Chamfered and stopped primary and secondary ceiling beams, tie beam roof with angled struts and windbraces. There are some peculiarities of plan. The S entrance gives on to a large room with a notional cross passage and a range of three doors to the right, the middle one (which corresponds to the traditional kitchen passage position) leading to a narrow passage and the E entrance. A staircase was inserted into the entrance hall perhaps c1880, when the hall was bought by the Ward family. The stair is late C17 or early C18 in style, as is the panelling but the work is crude by Victorian standards. There seems to have been a passageway n of the entrance hall, but later alteration has obscured the arrangements; this may have been the original stair position reached from a fourth door in the cross passage, as at Chorley Old Hall, Alderley Edge, Cheshire. The chamber follows, W, all panelled in the same style as the entrance hall, and with a renewed fireplace. Parlour beyond (W). The upper cross wing rooms have stone fireplaces.

3.3. The Country Houses of Greater Manchester. JSF Walker and AS Tindall 1985

Hough Hall Moston SD 86750186 Hough Hall stood just off Moston Lane in Moston, which in 1320 was a small hamlet. For many years the Hall had been the residence of a family known as Hough or Halgh, as it was commonly spelt. It remained in the family until 1678, when Robert Halgh, the last direct descendant, died. Subsequently the Hall passed to James Lightbowne, the Minshulls of Chorlton, and to Roger Aytoun, a Dragoon known to his friends as 'Spanking Roger', who married Margaret Minshull. It is difficult to determine a date of construction for the Hall, due to the lack of any date or inscription, and because the plan of the Hall appears to be of no recognizable type. This gives rise to the notion that the Hall may have been a fragment of an older and larger building. However, the Hall as it stood was believed to date from the late 16th or 17th century. It was a building of two storeys high, constructed entirely of timber on a stone base. By the beginning of the 20th century there was no sign of any decorative timber work, if any had existed. Furthermore, the front of the east wing had been faced with brick, with the addition of a bay window. The north side of the building had two timber gables. In 1774 Hough Hall was purchased by Samuel Taylor, who already owned extensive property in Moston. The Hall was said to be in a very neglected condition when he bought it, so he obviously undertook some modernisation. It remained in his family for a century until in 1880 it was bought by Robert Ward, a self-made textile businessman. He took great pride in his new possession, and made further alterations to the Hall. A third gable was added to the north side of the building around 1885, giving it a very picturesque finish. At some time a modern brick front was added to the original timber porch, and a second entrance was added on the east side, and next to it a brick chimney stack. Through such modernisations some of the original exterior features became lost, though a proportion of its character was retained. Robert Ward died in 1904, and although the Hall remained in his family for a while, it soon passed into less sympathetic hands. In the present century the Hall has been used as a doctor's surgery, for lipstick manufacture, and as offices for a coal merchant. Hough Hall is now demolished. Pevsner (1969, 336); VCH (1911, vol 4, 268)

3.4. HER building description from GMAAS

Farmhouse now offices. Probably early C17; altered. Timber frame on stone plinth, with brick infilling partly rendered and all painted white; roof part slate and part corrugated asbestos sheet. Irregular L-shaped plan formed by 3-bay main range on east-west axis with short gabled projections to the north side of the centre and east bays, and a 2-bay crosswing at the east end projecting to the south. Two

storeys; 3-bay north elevation with small central gable flanked by large wing gables; high stone plinth; exposed wall posts, intermediate posts and rails with angle braces, mostly of light scantling except in the centre where the timber appears to be applied, including king-post gable truss with raked struts, whereas the wings have collars and raked struts. The left gable has an inserted doorway to the right, a small 4-pane sashed window above this, and a gable chimney; the centre has one altered window on each floor; and the right-hand gable has a 4-light casement at ground floor; and an altered window above.

The Renaissance Structural Engineering Report 2022 also contains some descriptive material, and observations and comment on building's condition. It also refers to floor plans and includes extensive cross referenced photographs of the building within its appendix.

3.5. It is not intended to repeat the above but to pick out some elements of interest and try to identify what, if anything remains that is special and significant. So much fabric has been lost due to collapse that the above must be regarded as the best record of the building's architecture. Some of the above may also need a little interpretation and not all the above descriptions and the research information are in agreement.

3.6. The main east/west wing of the hall was built in the C16 or C17 in what is called post and truss timber frame construction. This is the most common form of timber frame in this area for that period. At that time it would have been one room deep with its main entrance at its east end. The southern external wall of this building has currently survived the collapse, including the early doorway, storm porch surround, oriel window above and part door. The porch has been altered from what appears to be an arched outer entrance and the wall framing changed to accommodate bigger windows (Fig.). The west gable of the wing has collapsed though a photograph from 2021 shows this largely to be built in 13 inch brick with no clear timber framing, and a rendered finish. Some of the rebuilt wall projects beyond the original (?) corner post in the south west corner. Photos show that the stone plinth at the south west end is of different material/bonding than for the main part of the building, suggesting a westward extension or alteration.

The north/south cross wing was added at the east end of the original wing in the C17 and is set taller than the original wing. The monumental chimney facing east is built in the same stone and coursing as the plinth so is expected to be from the original date. The brick top and hexagonal brick stacks and later cowls, and earlier stonework have been removed. A substantial part of the chimney has therefore been lost. The addition of the cross wing would have required some internal remodelling of the main wing's east end. The cross wing is currently stable on its east side but both north and south gables appear to be unstable. (Fig.).

3.7. Both wings were of the same form of construction. This involves long external walls of timber framing jointed and pegged together and (originally?) with a wattle and daub infill to each panel. In the case of Hough Hall the original wing is 3 bays long and the cross wing 2 bays. The framing is irregular and with the studding set quite wide apart and has some oddities such as the inset at the north east corner and the narrow east projecting porch/doorway. The long walls were strengthened by cross walls of the same construction, all sitting on a stone plinth, which in this case is of varying height – in the later cross wing with parts much taller and combined with the north east and south east chimney stacks. Some sections of the plinth are set forward of the timber walls above and have a splayed stone top. The pitched roofs sat on the long walls and the main support was a substantial timber truss which generally spanned across each wing at the meeting of each bay or cross wall. The early internal trusses at Hough Hall are of the one type with a large slightly arched main tie beam, principal rafters and large purlins and bracing between the tie beam and rafters and also between the purlins and rafters. All these elements are jointed and pegged together. Additional strength is given by a horizontal timber collar set above the tie beam and bracing. (Fig.). This construction detail also

features on the external face of most early gables and lateral gables, but with a less deep and straight tie beam. (Fig.). The building of chimney stacks gives added strength to the structure as would the construction of the first floor structure with a ceiling cross beam. One substantial bevelled and ceiling beam with bevelled joists remains sitting on posts with bracing within the main wing (Fig.). Evidence from images and photographs shows the roof to be covered in stone flags. With all these elements in place the building should withstand external forces created by wind and snow and the weight of the structure itself, and it did for over 400 years.

3.8. Since the building of the two wings there have been additions and alterations. Two storey projecting bays were added on the north side of the main wing, and no doubt some adjustments to the original layout would have been made to accommodate them and their use. An image from 1750 (Fig.) shows a single central lateral bay added and a lean-to in the extreme north west (the position of the taller bay on some images). This differs from at least one record that refers to both lateral bays being added in the late C17. In a photograph of 1900 (Fig.) the taller lateral bay is now there in the north west and everything about its appearance suggests construction consistent with the early timber framing. In addition, photographs (1960) and images show that this bay had an independent roof which did not fully run back into the roof of the main wing (Fig.). To add a further question, a full frontal photograph of the middle lower lateral bay taken around 2003 (Fig.) shows the construction of the outer wall to be more in line with a Victorian treatment with very straight and square framing and an odd arrangement of pegs on both parts of what would be expected to be mortice and tenon joints. This may be a re-fronting of this bay by Ward in 1885/7. Photos from the CCS Consulting 2021 report indicate that later outer framing had been applied to parts of the early frame or to later brickwork.

The 1750 image also shows projecting and braced timber wallplates at the eaves on the north gable of the cross wing. Did these have a function or were they decoration?

3.9. A photograph dated 1849 (fig.) shows that the south east gable to the cross wing has now been constructed in brick and this returns towards the original doorway in the main wing. An undated photograph c1960 shows the return on the east side also fully rebuilt in brick (Fig.). This is borne out on site with the gable built in 9 inch brickwork later rendered and painted and with timber strips with pegs clearly applied to mimic the timber framing elsewhere (Fig.). Oddly, another photograph c1960 (Fig.) shows the same gable with what must be a painted pattern of different very square and regular framing. The brick used appears to be a little larger and with cleaner lines than what appears to be earlier handmade brick found elsewhere in the rubble and within the standing panels on site. The wall is in a modified garden wall bond with five courses of stretchers to one of headers, and probably built after c1800. Therefore known evidence suggests a date between c1800 and 1849. Looking at the north east gable in the cross wing some of the framing appears to be different from that in the early photographs. The pattern is the same but the principal rafters are too flimsy and the bracing too flat. There is also the shadow of a missing timber that was once applied to the render on the gable. Exposed brick nogging in one panel shows smallish hand made bricks but to no regular pattern. This needs further investigation but it seems that the upper part of this gable has been refaced. Does this suggest that the timber forming the framing has been deteriorating for some time. Generally, where it is still in position the external timber appears to be in poor condition as does the external timber sections now found on the ground.

3.10. The same c1960 photograph in 3.9 above also shows a low two step mounting stone sitting on the pavement to the south of the Hall. This has now gone. It was at a low level and too low to use effectively. The top was either removed prior to the photo or it may be that the road and pavement level has risen considerably over the years.

3.10. A photograph of 1900 shows a new entrance in the narrow east porch but not one in the north gable of the cross wing, west of the chimney. This did also not appear in a photo of 1911 but had been installed by the time of a photo dated 1925. (Fig.)

3.11. Within the debris on site there is little/no evidence of wattle and daub from within the framing on the external walls. There is much handmade brick in the rubble and remaining in parts of the standing

external wall panels. The handmade bricks used are of different sizes. Without further study it is not possible to put a date to their manufacture/use. There is also C20 brick in the rubble. Work on the building during this century is not well recorded and it is very possible that there were a range of changes undertaken that have been lost due to the building's collapse. The Council has no records of applications for permission for alterations to the building from the original date of listing in 1974.

3.12. The scaffolding on the Hough Hall Road elevation has made it impossible to fully assess this elevation. However, photographs, 1904, 1911 and 1960 (Fig.), do raise one issue. The timber framing on the 1904 photograph is irregular whilst it is regular and square and true on the 1911 and 1960s photograph. In 1904 there was no inset shown on the north east corner and the porch projection was much deeper. One answer is that the full facade, possibly above the stone plinth, between the porch and almost to the north east corner has been refaced between 1904 and 1911. Photographs suggest that the plinth in this area has been built in brick and has long sections of a later stone splayed coping. This may also explain the odd rough render that covers that elevation.

3.13. The interior is currently not accessible. We know little about internal alterations over time. Thomas McGrath (see 6 below) wrote in connection with the staircase "We know that most of this isn't original to the property from its appearance and from John Booker who writing in 1854 stated '*the interior presents nothing worthy of notice*' and considering he wrote at length about the foundations of the house, he likely would have recorded a 200-year-old staircase." There are a number of YouTube videos, which give us a unique view inside the hall. Most appear to be undated but appear to cover the last 3 to 5 years. These show the hall at various stages of decline. These do indicate that there was a cellar within the cross wing, though very shallow and possibly a later addition – and raises issues about the stability of the stone plinths. Sadly this is now just a record of what was there. Much has gone through the collapse and looking into the interior now, as best you can, the standing parts are almost a skeleton showing its structure and largely without finishes and decoration.

Summary

3.15. This best expressed as bullet points.

- The Hall is/was a C16 or C17 grand farmhouse or gentleman's house constructed in post and truss timber framing which largely survived, with some additions, alterations and repair, until early C21.
- The condition of the building declined after 2005 and more rapidly from 2020.
- Images of the Hall show no external elaboration or decoration that would be consistent with a building of high status.
- Historic photographs show some internal features such as timber panelling, substantial floor beams and a stone fireplace that lift the quality of the building above a standard farmhouse.
- A large part of the original main wing and slightly later gabled bays were removed through partial demolition in 2021 and further significant areas of fabric has been lost through collapse. There is no detailed record of where the material now on the ground was placed in the building. That part of the building now gone is lost to the building's significance. It is not there.
- The south facade of the original C16/C17 wing and part of its interior remains standing on site and whilst there have been a number of alterations to framing and windows it would appear to be the best preserved part of the original external structure.
- The east facade of the cross wing appears to have had significant alteration with a large area of the facade being refaced or rebuilt early C20. The monumental stone chimney in this facade is the most significant feature remaining though a large section of the top of the chimney has been removed.

- The north and south gables of the cross wing appear to be much altered/rebuilt, the south gable with a possible early C19 date for the work.
- It is known that Samuel Taylor in 1774 and Robert Ward in 1877 both invested in upgrading the Hall but there is no record of what they did.
- It is probable that a number of unrecorded changes to the hall fabric took place during the C20.
- Little appears to be left in the form of walling, finishes and decoration internally though the original internal structure appears to largely remain in that part of the building still standing.
- Part 2 above describes the building's history. There is no doubt that this is important to the local community and it tells a strong story of Hough Hall and Moston through the centuries.
- Something of the Hall should be retained and used to ensure that the link between local people and 400+ years of that story is carried into the future.
- There will not be another opportunity to save something of the building.

Due to the lack of access any comments about significance must be cautious with everything to be checked when access is possible.

The overall impression is that the building's significance may be trumped by its poor and rapidly declining condition.

4. Impact on Significance

4.1. The key question is what can be saved of the Hall. Due to the urgency involved the normal tests and time taken for identifying and assessing a development's impact on the building's significance may create delay. There is a need to accept that the final solution may be less than ideal for all parties. There is an urgency for all parties to reach broad agreement on an outline approach and to move that forward without delay. The City Council's role is to seek to maximise the retention and repair of the Hall. The owner/developer will wish to operate within the development budget. If entrenched positions are taken, the building will not be saved.

4.2. There has already been a substantial loss in significance with damage to fabric over the years and then demolition and further collapse. The building has been altered over the centuries and whilst this is part of the building's story, plain C19/C20 fabric is generally less important than early C16/C17 fabric. It is necessary to be pragmatic and practical but there is a basic question. The site development cannot provide enough budget (?) to save and restore all of what remains. From what is currently known, the most important standing remains appear to be (1) the large masonry chimney and adjacent entrance porch on the east facade and the chimney/external wall on the north gable, both in the cross wing, and (2) the original C16/C17 south wall in the main wing and possibly some ground floor ceiling timbers.

4.3. The Renaissance report put forward 3 options for retaining and repairing the building. Option 1 retaining just the cross wing, 2 also including the first bay (former staircase bay) of the main wing, and 3 retaining the main wing and cross wing excluding its collapsed western end. There is no additional private money, and no public money for the scheme. This is a low value brownfield site with costly site issues to deal with. Option 3 is not affordable and may require total rebuilding and investigating this may be a distraction. Option 2 may also not be affordable but retaining just the cross wing creates a very small space with problems of access between floors. Option 2 does give greater flexibility and allows the original entrance and oriel window above to be retained. It does however appear to mean

that the very significant south wall of the main wing may in part be lost. Although sad to lose the wall it does give the development a bit more space to form a transition between new and old. Retaining the main wing and losing the cross wing would cause greater loss of significance possibly at a higher price, and would increase the incursion into the land available for housing development, thereby possibly reducing the funding available for building repair. The conclusion below in part 5 is that there will be harm to the significance of Hough Hall but this would be less harm than if the building was lost forever, and would be balanced in part by the restoration via option 2. It will be important that within the scheme there is an opportunity to tell the history of Hough Hall on site via a heritage board or phone/website link.

4.4. Further investigation is essential to guide the nature of restoration and repair. There could be a like for like repair based on sound information on either what is there now or clear information on what was there at a fixed point in the past. Restoration based on speculation should not be undertaken. If there is insufficient information, a suitable modern option should be used so that there is no confusion about the origins and character of the various parts of the building. A accredited conservation architect should be engaged to advise on this work.

4.5. The development will form the setting for the listed building and may affect its significance. The setting is currently poor with the collapsed and vandalised remains of the previous uses on site together with security fencing. On the opposite side of Hough Hall Road there is terraced housing and vacant land and close by to the north a Victorian brick built primary school with high yard walls. On the south there is further terraced housing on Whitman Street.

The development proposal involves the building of 13 three storey town houses in two terraces within a courtyard layout, and with the retained and restored Hall providing a further two units. Each town house will have parking to the front and a private garden to the rear. Ridge height will be Xm. Materials will be x and x and the design is modern not intending in any way to mimic the Hall. The nearest house gable will be Xm from the Hall.

5. Compliance with National and Local Planning Policies

5.1. Legislation

Section 16 (2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that: "In considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works the local planning authority or the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses." The 2021 NPPF and local planning policies implement this requirement.

5.2. 2021 NPPF

The 2021 NPPF largely confirms that assessments of development proposals should be in line with the policies in LPAs development plans. It does, however, give some guidance, as outline below.

For the remainder of part 5 the policies are followed by comments in relation to the submitted application and in line with the case made in parts 2,3 and 4 of this statement.

The NPPF also includes the following heritage policies relevant to the proposed development within a designated heritage asset.

197. In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:
a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets

and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness

Comment: The proposals for the Hall and the site will sustain and enhance part of the listed building and will be an important community benefit. The development overall will assist in the regeneration of this part of Moston and have a positive impact on area character.

199. 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 (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

Comment: The significance of the Hall has been central to the proposals.

200. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:

- a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;
- b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional

Comment: Losing the building would be a total loss of significance. There has already been substantial loss and considerable harm. The submitted proposal will save part of the building within the context of a very limited budget. There will be harm by losing a large part of the main wing but this is balanced by retaining and restoring the cross wing, and bringing it into use.

201. Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:

- a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and
- b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and
- c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and
- d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.

Comment: There will not be substantial harm.

208. Local planning authorities should assess whether the benefits of a proposal for enabling development, which would otherwise conflict with planning policies but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset, outweigh the disbenefits of departing from those policies.

Comment: This is not enabling development as understood by 208 above. The residential development is in principle consistent with known planning policies for the site.

5.3. Local Planning Policies

The Council has a Local Plan, adopted in 2012.

Within the Core Strategy Policy EN 3, Heritage Throughout the City, the Council will encourage development that complements and takes advantage of the distinct historic and heritage features of its districts and neighbourhoods, including those of the City Centre. New developments must be designed so as to support the Council in preserving or, where possible, enhancing the historic

environment, the character, setting and accessibility of areas and buildings of acknowledged importance, including scheduled ancient monuments, listed buildings, registered parks and gardens, conservation areas and archaeological remains. Proposals which enable the re-use of heritage assets will be encouraged where they are considered consistent with the significance of the heritage asset. Historic sites and areas of particular heritage value should be both safeguarded for the future and, where possible, enhanced both for their own heritage merits and as part of wider heritage regeneration proposals. Conservation areas (see Figure 12.2) and buildings that are statutorily listed are protected under national legislation guidance. The Council maintains information on the City's heritage assets. It is expected that developers will carry out an appropriate appraisal of issues relating to heritage assets. Re-use of empty listed buildings will be encouraged subject to consideration of the building's special interest and significance.

Comment: The proposals are consistent with EN 3.

The Council also has a policy LISTED BUILDINGS DC19.1 Which states "In determining applications for listed building consent or planning applications for development involving or having an impact on buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest, the Council will have regard to the desirability of securing the retention, restoration, maintenance and continued use of such buildings and to protecting their general setting. In giving effect to this policy, the Council will:

- a. not grant Listed building consent for the demolition of a listed building other than in the most exceptional circumstances, and in any case, not unless it is satisfied that every possible effort has been made to continue the present use or to find a suitable alternative use;
- b. not permit a change of use of a listed building, where it would have a detrimental effect on the character or appearance of the building;
- c. not permit any external or internal alteration or addition to a Listed building where, in its opinion, there would be an adverse effect on its architectural or historic character;
- d. seek to preserve and enhance the settings of listed buildings by appropriate control over the design of new development in their vicinity, control over the use of adjacent land, and where appropriate, by the preservation of trees and landscape features;
- e. permit demolition only where there are approved detailed plans for redevelopment and where there is evidence of a firm building contract;
- f. not permit alterations to a listed building which would prevent the future use of any part of the building, in particular upper floors or basements, or where poor maintenance is likely to result.

Reasons:- The above policies are to be pursued by the Council to help ensure the protection of the City's built character and its heritage. Retention and protection of this character is important in encouraging local pride, tourism and future investment in the city. The Council recognises that listed buildings can present particular problems in respect of their continuing use. A flexible approach will be taken in determining applications for uses in listed buildings. The policy gives effect to the obligation placed on the Council by statute to give particular attention to retain, restore, maintain and continue uses in listed buildings in Manchester.

Comment: The proposals will retain, restore, use and maintain part of the listed building and provide a suitable future setting. After years of decline partial demolition is the only option where funding is limited. Residential use of the Hall would not require any compromise in the correct restoration and use of the Hall.

6. Conclusions

6.1 Hough Hall is of importance to the local community and retains some of its original significance but it has declined at an increasing pace since 2005. Approximately 30% of the building has been totally lost and the remainder is in a perilous condition. It is almost beyond rescue. Decisive action is required to retain, restore and use a part of what remains. The low value of the development site limits the funding available for work to the Hall. The Option 2 scheme as put forward in the Renaissance 2022 report should be investigated as a matter of urgency by all partners. Work to develop the residential scheme for the site should continue with the aim of submitting a planning application as a matter of urgency. Further emergency works to protect that part of the building essential for the Option 2 scheme should be implemented immediately.

7. Acknowledgements

Many thanks to those who have helped in the preparation of this heritage statement through my use of their work and for their guidance.

1. Ian Miller and Ben Dyson at GMAAS for plans, documents and guidance.
2. Thomas Mcgrath for his comprehensive history research written in his Hidden Histories series.
3. MCC Planning Department for sharing photographs and
4. Renaissance Structural Engineers report 2022
5. Campaign broadsheet from the friends of Boggart Hole Clough. 21.11.2021.

MN 2 November 2022