Heritage Statement

Proposed Refurbishment

96 Lady Barn Road

Fallowfield

Manchester

M14 6YH

Date: 25th June 2026

Client: Airshack Properties Limited

Report prepared by Stephen Griffiths
Wednesday, 01 July 2026

Contents

1 Introduction 2

2 Proposals 4

3 Assessment of Heritage Sites and Impact 7

4 Local Plan Policy – 10

5 National Planning Policy Framework 12

6 Conclusion 14

7 Appendix A - Cultural Heritage Impact Tables 15

8 Appendix B – Official Listing 18

9 Appendix C – Photographs 20

Report prepared by Stephen Griffiths

Wednesday, 01 July 2026

1 Introduction

1.1 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 30 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.

1.2 Purpose of Report

The purpose of the report is to analyse the effect of the proposed works in relationship to the significance of the building.

1.3 Sources & Information Relied Upon

Simon James Architects Drawings:

19188 OS1 Location Plan
19188 GS1 Existing Ground Floor and Basement
19188 GS2 Existing First Floor and Attic
19188 ELS1 Existing North Elevation
19188 ELS2 Existing East and West Elevation
19188 ELS3 Existing East and West Elevation
19188 GA1 Proposed Ground Floor – 07.04.2026
19188 GA2 Proposed First Floor – 07.04.2026
188 GA3 Proposed Basement – 07.04.2026
19188 GA4 Proposed Attic Floor – 07.04.2026
19188 GA5 Kitchen and Garage Plan – 07.04.2026
19188 EL1 Proposed North Elevation
19188 EL2 Proposed East and West Elevation
19188 EL3 Proposed South Elevation
19188 WS1 North Elevation Window Schedule
19188 WS2 Front Elevation Window Schedule
19188 WS3 Rear/West Elevation Window Schedule
19188 WS4 South Elevation Window Schedule
19188 WS5 Window Details
19188 WS6 Door Schedule
19188 AD1 Main Building Brick Wall Details
19188 AD2 Main Building Roof & Stud Wall Details
19188 AD3 Garage Roof & Internal Wall Lining

Structural Engineer Drawings Prepared by H Long as follows:

AOL-0481 SK01B Proposed Basement Plan
AOL-0481 SK02A Proposed Ground Floor Plan
AOL-0481 SK03 Proposed Ground Floor Plan (outbuilding) – June 2026
AOL-0481 SK04A Proposed First Floor Plan
AOL-0481 SK05A Proposed Second Floor Plan
AOL-0481 SK05 Proposed Attic
AOL-0481 SK10 Typical Gable Wall Strapping Detail

2 Proposals

2.1 The Proposal

Brief History

It is difficult to know what alterations have been taken in the past to this semi-detached property we believe to be the late part of the 18th century. The building in my view has probably had a two-storey outrigger from its initial design looking at the internal fabric and the condition of the brickwork.

However, looking at the ground floor existing plan, what is now the kitchen in my view has been an extension on the property at a later stage and the attached workshop and office has obviously been constructed and subdivided as an outbuilding in the past. Date unknown but the various building fabrics would suggest anything from between the 1900's and 1960's at various times.

The building has a full-size basement to the main building but not to the single storey outrigger. Many alterations have taken place in the past, but primarily some work has been involved in building additional wall structures adjacent to the gable wall within the cellar giving structural stability to the gable wall which has a bulge. It can be seen from the photographs also as well as being ineffective lateral restraint bars have been attached to the first-floor chamber level and some angle straps to the party wall position with the adjoining property on the first floor in particular.

The structure as it stands has not had the original roof which would have been blue slate, this has been re-covered with a concrete interlocking tile which has breathable under felt and the roof structure itself has been renewed by previous owners.

Proposals

The alterations to the property are following the fact that unauthorised listed building works have been carried out to a listed building and are currently being stopped.

It is therefore a case of now re-establishing the building as far as possible to its original format, but this also involves some structural remedial works.

The structural remedial works are on the basis that the gable wall has a bulge. The reports that are attached to this statement as to why those works are to be carried out. The structural works primarily involve the construction of additional masonry within the basements intended to reinforce the structure by the construction of 221mm block pillars against an already thickened basement wall also involving the rebuilding of an internal wall that has been removed to support large oak binder beams.

There is further building up of the internal wall between the front and back cellar which is currently open. This will be in blockwork, I would suggest this should be changed to 225mm brickwork to match up to the existing masonry.

It can be seen from the existing basement plan there is a circular post which temporarily supports one of the binder beams in the rear cellar, and it is indicative to the support required for the wall which is immediately above that on the ground floor which has been currently removed although it shows on the existing plans as being there it has been removed by the current builder as part of the enforcement works and therefore will need a sub base on which to be built upon hence the reason for the construction of the wall below.

The external steps are to remain and a new door to be fitted to match that of existing.

Ground Floor

On the ground floor an opening has been made between the two reception rooms by the current owners by the insertion of a catnic lintel. This is to be reformed now as indicative of the proposed ground floor plan and this should be done in reclaimed brickwork to re-establish the integrity of the original fabric.

Further works will be the creation of a single door opening which should be positioned underneath the existing lintel as indicated on the enclosed Appendix A photographs. Further works are the reconstruction of the wall between the rear living room and the hallway in reclaimed brickwork as stated in the report.

There is to be a lobby created or a setback to be created in proposed bathroom which is currently the dining area. There is an existing old lintel which spans across this area which will be retained to form the opening and the opening from the cellar steps which have been removed in the past to create cellar steps externally near D3 is to be reformed.

The proposal also involves lightweight partitioning to subdivide the existing dining room into a bathroom which is not particularly difficult task.

The rest of the works involve whilst part of a listed building is ancillary to the main building in the sense that they have not as much significance. It does involve a larger opening in what is the current kitchen, and then the refurbishment of the ad hoc outbuilding.

This involves the insertion of several steel beams which can be seen on H. Long's drawing SK02. This involves beam MG1 over the rear wall between the outrigger and the main building, this should be carried out in such a way that allows the existing oak beam to remain if possible.

The insertion of beam G2 would mean reinstatement of the archway. The beams G3 and G4 which run parallel to the gable, these are now omitted.

The main change in the scheme on the ground floor is within the first-floor void where tie beams 3 no. are to be inserted to restrain the gable end rather than the extensive previous restraint works or potential rebuilding of the wall. This is on the basis that the tie beams are through the party wall between the two properties, restraint rather than rebuilding which is just improvement in terms of conservation.

First Floor

This involves retention of the existing attic staircase and rebuilding of the wall between the rear bedroom and the staircase. There is an existing doorway which currently leads into the bathroom could be retained which would lead into the proposed bedroom rather than create the lobby space as indicated on the proposed plan. This is now shown as an amendment on the architects' drawings.

It is intended to rebuild the wall between the hallway and rear bedroom, but it is noted that an alternative proposal to the rebuilding of the gable wall is to diaphragm the first floor by screwing plywood panels and then resin bonded bar to the gable end to give lateral restraint. There are two elements of this now that we understand from the drawings that above and over the top of the existing floorboards and to the underside of the existing floor joists are going to be plywood. That is also going to be applied to any ceiling joists and roof rafters to offer further restraint to the gable end. These will obviously be technically hidden by any proposed refurbishment to completion works.

It is assumed for the purposes the refurbishment this will also be the case in the small attic second floor where a similar work will be taken.

Other additional items are new works incorporating a new staircase to the attic room whilst retaining the existing staircase which will give better headroom, and the creation of a shower room to the front elevation. This has now been amended so there is no new staircase to the attic which means there is less disruption of the historic fabric.

External Proposals

The external walls appear to be 225mm brickwork, these have been rendered with a strong cement-based render. Unfortunately, this has cracked in several areas and requires to be re-rendered. In an ideal situation we would suggest taking off all the render, but the problem with that is it may be stronger than the base brickwork behind it destroying some historic fabric, so really it is intended to patch render in a similar material and finish as indicated on the proposed plans.

It is also intended to renew all windows with timber painted but whilst the proposal says double glazing, it would be more beneficial to do a slimline double glazing 14mm in total width. It may be necessary to condition the joinery details for both internal doors and external windows.

3 Assessment of Heritage Sites and Impact

In Appendix A are the tables which have been used to assess the impact.

Significant Assessment

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.

We consider there is no suggestion that there is any evidential within the site and certainly the proposal will not disturb any below ground archaeology although there is going to be small foundations for the internal cellar walls. Evidential value low.

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.

The pair represent very early form of built development within an area now surrounded by Victorian and Edwardian type properties, so it is a very early form of built development within the Manchester area and has been recognised as such to be listed and there is certainly evidence internally of oak beams suggesting it is very late 18th century or at the very latest very early 19th century when there will be a changeover from oak to pitch pine. So, it does have a medium historic value.

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.

The buildings are in relatively simple form, no aesthetic detailing and really it is just a case of a simple pair of semi-detached houses in the vernacular form of that period. In that respect we consider the medium.

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.

The communal value is relatively low. The buildings are set back; they are not a prominent feature within the main road. The fact that they are set back probably indicates the pre turnpike road area that it would have been possibly part of farm cottages. So, we consider the communal value to be low.

Summary of Significance of Heritage Asset

Regarding table 3.1 of the cultural impact tables, we consider that it is low in that it is an asset of importance of elements of evidential, historical, aesthetic, although no communal value.

But then referring to table 3.2 it is a designated asset of regional quality and does contribute to regional research objectives in the sense it is a building that would have been one of the earliest buildings in the South Manchester area prior to the Victorian and Edwardian redevelopment of the area.

In conclusion we consider the value to be medium.

Magnitude of Impact

The building has been altered over a period and not in a particularly sympathetic way. There are several outbuildings which have been added on in an ad hoc arrangement to the rear.

Whilst there has been some damage by the works that have been currently carried out, the proposed works do consider re-stablishing walls in the position that they would have been originally which is a positive aspect.

Considering the building was listed in 1972, it is difficult to know whether there has been much alteration in that period. Obviously prior to the current ownership there was a reroof, and whether the dormer was there to the rear of the building in 1972 is debateable, certainly the roof has been re-covered utilising breathable felt which has only been available probably around the year 2000. So at least the roof has been re-covered since the listing, and one would expect the roof then to have been of blue slate.

The impact of the proposal in terms of the structural remedial works is not as extensive as the original scheme, in fact the introduction of the tie bars appears to be a reasonable solution in terms of its reliance upon the party wall, which we understand will be subject to a party wall agreement which is outside the scope of this heritage statement.

With regard to the notes made on the architects drawings regarding reinstatement of rendering with lime pointing, I do have reservations that would still hold true to the fact that often the soft brick which is a handmade brick underneath the rendering will be potentially damaged by the removal of the strong

sand and cement render. So, I would advise there needs to be sample panels to be carried out before extensive damage to the brick, or at least have sufficient stock brick reclaimed of a similar style to replace the bricks that are damaged.

I would conclude that whilst the reinstatement of most of the windows, rendering system, internal plastering and subject to an approval of internal joinery would be a welcome change from some of the rather poor-quality internal finishes is a welcome improvement.

However, the impact would be slight.

By applying the medium value against the slight impact, the magnitude will therefore be slight and minor.

Significance of the Effect

By applying the medium value against the slight impact, the magnitude will therefore be slight and minor.

4 Local Plan Policy

4.A Manchester's Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Adopted 11th July 2012

POLICY EN1 Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas

Southern Area

In my view, this geographical area of development between 1750 to early 1900, the policy on this does not really represent anything related to this development as it refers to new development which is not the case as this exists as a building.

POLICY EN3

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 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.

This is not a new development, so it does not really apply affecting or preserving the historical environment and character, setting or accessibility of areas and buildings of acknowledged importance.

4B Save Unitarian Development Plan for Manchester Save UDP Policies

The following Save UDP policy are relevant:

Policy DC19 Listed Buildings

The policy for the council is about the desirability of securing the retention, restoration, maintenance and continued use of such buildings to protect their general setting in giving effect to this policy.

A and B of this policy relate to demolition of a building or change of use, both of which are not applicable.

Section C does not permit any external or internal alterations or addition to a listed building where there it is the opinion that it would have an outburst effect on its architectural or historical character.

Much of the character internally has been lost to the property with poor quality alterations over a period. The proposals however will at least re-establish the room shape and historical special significance with the appropriate internal finish to be agreed would not preserve but would at least bring back the building as close as possible to its original format.

F Not permit alterations to a listed building which would prevent the future use of any part of the building in upper floors or basements or where poor maintenance is likely to result.

The alterations that are going to take place are not going to prejudice future use. It is going to remain as a single residence.

4C The Places for Every One Plan Joint Development Plan Document for 9 of the 10 Boroughs which make up Greater Manchester, Adopted 21.03.2024.

Policy JP2

The policy for the council is about the desirability of securing the retention, restoration, maintenance and continued use of such buildings to protect their general setting in giving effect to this policy.

The proposals are in the main to reinstate the building as it would have been originally constructed, albeit that the single storey extensions to the rear and ad hoc outbuilding bases are not part of the original historic fabric.

It is my view that the structural restraint works involving insertion of beams as per the proposed plan would have a detrimental effect on the character of the building and this is where an alternative would be to reconstruct the gable end completely utilising the same construction technique of 225mm solid brickwork involved with the appropriate lime mortar, and leaving the brickwork exposed rather than rendered as per the bond of the brickwork to the adjoining property.

Removal of the rendering to the front would also be an improvement, albeit that the strong cement render may pull away some of the bricks, it may be a useful improvement to the building.

5 National Planning Policy Framework

5.1 207

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. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

We consider an inspection of the premises and the assessment of the building's historic fabric along with studying proposed plans and proposed structural remedial works has been sufficient to assess the significance of the proposals and the buildings.

5.2 210

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;

The property is currently empty and appears to have been vacant for some time, so bringing the property back into residential use as a single dwelling is to be welcomed. Unfortunately, works have been carried out that have been unauthorised involving the removal of some historic fabric which is now to be reinstated. An appropriate method statement relating to the remedial works and the materials to be used would be beneficial in terms of sustaining rather than enhancing the significant of the heritage asset.

b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and

Whilst the property would be considered sustaining communities in the sense that it is being put back into residential use.

c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Not applicable.

5.3 215

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

I consider that the general reinstatement of the walls that have been removed and the reo-establishing of traditional materials to be used could be considered a slight enhancement as some of the work that has been carried out previously was of poor quality.

Retention as much as possible of the historic fabric that exists will be welcome. The structural remedial works in the revised scheme are less intrusive , retain historic fabric and have minnal intervention internally.

6 Conclusion

The property has been poorly maintained over the years and works have been carried out such as the reroofing which are not appropriate to the status of the building, but these have been carried out some time ago. So, the reinstatement of the walls to re-establish the original layout.

The cellar front light well is to be reinstated, together with the internal staircase being reinstated, not in quite the same format, but at least within a similar position within the building.

I consider that the main issue that the main issue in the past has been the structural remedial works which have been inconclusive as to whether the gable end required rebuilding in terms of its misalignment regarding its horizontal and vertical status. In this case, modifications have been made to reduce the impact in terms of structural remedial works by the insertion of tie bars.

Furthermore, whilst there are extensive works to the outbuildings which are not considered as significant as the original building itself, the internal arrangements have been modified in such a way as to minimise the loss of historic fabric. Albeit that extensive alterations unauthorised have already been carried out, the reinstatement works now specify with the use of lime plaster are welcomed in terms of restoring the building as far as possible to its original condition.

The replacement of windows, all of which are of various patterns and with minimal double-glazed units, is also a welcomed improvement to the maintenance of the building.

A schedule of work really is required to be agreed as to what the nature of the reinstatement works are to be.

7 Appendix A - Cultural Heritage Impact Tables

7.1 Table 3.1

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.

7.2 Table 3.2

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 severely compromised or have little or no historical interest.

7.3 Magnitude of Impact

Magnitude of Impact	**Typical Criteria Descriptors**
Substantial	Impacts will damage or destroy cultural heritage assets; result in the loss of the asset and/or quality and integrity; cause severe damage to key characteristic features or elements; almost complete loss of setting and/or context of asset. The assets integrity or setting is almost wholly destroyed or is severely compromised, such that the resource can no longer be appreciated or understood. (Negative) The proposals would remove or successfully mitigate existing damage and discordant impacts on assets; allow for the restoration or enhancement of characteristic features; allow the substantial re-establishment of the integrity, understanding and setting for an area or group of features; halt rapid degradation and/or erosion of the heritage resource, safeguarding substantial elements of the heritage resource. (Positive)
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)

7.4 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

8 Appendix B – Official Listing

Official list entry

Heritage Category: **Listed Building**

Grade: **II**

List Entry Number: **1219280**

Date first listed: **21-Jul-1972**

List Entry Name: **96 AND 98, LADYBARN LANE**

Statutory Address 1: **96 AND 98, LADYBARN LANE**

Location

Statutory Address: **96 AND 98, LADYBARN LANE**

The building or site itself may lie within the boundary of more than one authority.

District: **Manchester (Metropolitan Authority)**

Parish: **Non Civil Parish**

National Grid Reference: **SJ 85849 93572**

Details

MANCHESTER

SJ8593 LADYBARN LANE, FALLOWFIELD 698-1/23/836 (West side) 21/07/72 Withington Nos.96 AND 98

GV II

Pair of small houses. Late C18 or early C19; altered. Red brick in Flemish bond (No.96 cement-washed and painted white), C20 pantile roof. Double-depth plan, each house single-fronted, with back extensions (and various C20 additions to rear). Gothick style in some details. Two storeys with cellars; each has doorway to right with C20 door and small porch, and one segmental-headed transomed 6-light casement on each floor, those to No.96 with C20 small-pane glazing and pseudo-shutters, and those to No.98 with original very thin intersecting glazing bars. Rear and interior altered.

Listing NGR: SJ8584993572

Legacy

The contents of this record have been generated from a legacy data system.

Legacy System number: **388255**

Legacy System: **LBS**

Legal

This building is listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for its special architectural or historic interest.

9 Appendix C – Photographs

Photograph 1



Carefully remove existing render and re-render, may have to be based on the existing render, remove shutters, renew window with a slimline double glazed unit maximum 14mm in total thickness due to wet rot (W2).

Photograph 2



Remove shutters, new window with 40mm thick double glazed unit due to wet rot (W1).

Photograph 3



Wet rot to W1.

Photograph 4



Carry out patch pointing in lime based mortar to stack, do not rebuild.

Photograph 5



Cracks in render therefore loose, carefully re-render in same mix.

Photograph 6



Wet rot to porch, splice in new timbers.

Photograph 7



Replace fully glazed door with upper glazed solid bottom panel.

Photograph 8



Loose render around W3, remove and re-render in same mix.

Photograph 9



Loose render, hack off and renew in lime based render.

Photograph 10



Expose lintel to determine appropriate replacement and re-render.

Photograph 11



Reopen window opening.

Photograph 12



Extend rainwater pipe in cast iron.

Photograph 13



Rotten window to W9.

Photograph 14



Rotten window to W9.

Photograph 15



Rotten window to W8.

Photograph 16



Ineffective thread in stainless steel bars not retaining gable wall.

Photograph 17



Deflection in original beam, replace with 150mm by 75mm Douglas fir timber.

Photograph 18



Remove catnip lintel, rebuild wall in reclaimed brickwork in lime mortar complete natural bonding technique.

Photograph 19



Remove catnip lintel, rebuild wall in reclaimed brickwork in lime mortar complete natural bonding technique.

Photograph 20



Remove inner fireplace and infill brick, clean and re-plaster with recess.

Photograph 21



Reposition door as under original lintel.

Photograph 22



Retain, reassess and re-plaster.

Photograph 23



Utilise existing oak lintel to create offset lobby opening.

Photograph 24



Replace oak binder beam affected by rot, replace with similar in Douglas fir. Replace 2nd joist from the gable external wall and splice in as necessary.

Photograph 25



Open up old opening staircase from cellar.

Photograph 26



Ineffective lateral restraint in hallway.

Photograph 27



Existing attic staircase.

Photograph 28



Built up chimney breast.

Photograph 29



Rear elevation indicating new rafters prior to alteration.

Photograph 30



New timber purlin.

Photograph 31



Wall to be rebuilt in reclaimed brickwork.

Photograph 32



Front binder beam to chimney breast to be replaced. Party wall lateral restraint strap previously installed.

Photograph 33



Large oak binder beam in cellar trimmed back in the past, supported by a brick pillar.