

**MOUNTEER LIMITED**

## **Heritage Statement**

### **Proposed Change of Use from Public House to Apartments**

**1 Reed Hill**

**Rochdale**

**OL16 1DF**

**Client: Brightwise Properties**

**Date: 9<sup>th</sup> November 2024**

**Revision Date: 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2025**

Maximising the Value of Heritage Assets  
[www.munteer.co.uk](http://www.munteer.co.uk)

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

# Contents

|   |                                            |    |
|---|--------------------------------------------|----|
| 1 | Introduction.....                          | 2  |
| 2 | Proposals .....                            | 3  |
| 3 | Cultural Heritage Impact Methodology ..... | 5  |
| 4 | National Planning Policy Framework .....   | 16 |
| 5 | Conclusion .....                           | 18 |
| 6 | Appendix A – Photographs .....             | 20 |
| 7 | Listing.....                               | 26 |

# 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

To identify the impact

## 1.3 Sources & Information Relied Upon

Historic plans of how the building was developed over a period since construction.

### Create It Studios

#### **Proposed Drawings:**

Proposed South Elevation – A1559(02)AP008  
Proposed West Elevation – A1559(02)AP009  
Proposed North Elevation – A1559(02)AP007  
Proposed East Elevation – A1559(02)AP006

#### **Proposed Plans:**

Proposed Basement Plan – A1559(02)AP002  
Proposed Ground Floor Plan – A1559(02)AP003  
Proposed First Floor Plan – A1559(02)AP004  
Proposed Second Floor Plan – A1559(02)AP005

Location & Existing Site Plan – A1559(02)AP001  
Existing Ground Floor Plan – A1559(02)AP002  
Existing Basement Plan – A1559(02)AP003  
Existing First Floor Plan – A1559(02)AP004  
Existing Second Floor Plan – A1559(02)AP005  
Proposed Site Plan – AP1559(02)AP001

## 2 Proposals

### 2.1 The Proposal

#### Brief History

From the information that we feel necessary at the moment to determine the application, the building appears to have been constructed around the late 18<sup>th</sup> century. Looking at the brick bonding and the architectural detailing, it may be very early 19<sup>th</sup> century.

It has been built as one central block with some single storey outriggers/buildings to the side, and the extension which is to the right hand side looking at the front, appears to have been constructed in the 1980's/1990's.

The building is very central to Rochdale and backs onto part of what is now the Rochdale Shopping Centre, although the immediate buildings to the side are of a similar period.

Internally, alterations have taken place, in that I believe that the internal alterations have taken place on the ground floor as with most public houses, mainly because of social changes between the two world wars, the requirement for additional toilet facilities which would probably have been originally incorporated in what is now the kitchen on the plans and possibly outside urinals.

This means that quite a few of the internal walls have been removed immediately to the left of the entrance, and it may be that the bar area was incorporated in what is the existing wc's.

Most of these alterations would have been carried out probably between the 1920's and 1960's, with the lower bar area probably being in the 1980's.

On the first floor, it was quite common place to have function room on the first floor of public houses and where there is an existing living room, kitchen and bedroom 3, the internal walls there are of modern timber studding, so that would have been an open area at one stage.

Also, the bathroom which is next to bedroom 01 will have been created and a lobby together with the entrance area above bedroom 02 again is timber studded between the entrance and bedroom 02 to accommodate the fire escape route from the first to the ground floor.

On the second floor there are a number of en-suites being created which would not have been original, as would the entrance area, because that would have been needed to give a fire escape route.

#### Proposals

##### Basement

Within the basement area there are two apartments that are to be created, mainly utilising the existing framework of internal 225mm brick walls.

Alterations have already taken place within the area of the apartment 1 bedroom to wc.

The apartment 1 kitchen utilises an existing stairwell which is to be converted now into a window.

Apartment 2 is to utilise the existing barrel drop to the side elevation and creating a lightwell also to the front elevation.

There is evidence of a lintel and old window opening to the left of the main front entrance which would be utilised for the bedroom to apartment 2.

## Ground Floor

There has been several alterations to the internal layout of the public house on the ground floor which is synonymous with the change in public houses over a period of time.

The apartment 4 utilises a wall which has been removed in the past and therefore will be put back into its original configuration. The recess at the back of the existing staircase which is to remain unaltered is to be utilised to link to the bedroom with the creation of an additional window opening along the side elevation wall.

The apartment 3 is in an existing lean to building of not any particular significance in terms of the public house, which is already relatively open as a catering kitchen so the subdivision has not removed any historic fabric as such.

The apartment 5 is created from the existing extension, together with a small extension after removal of the staircase.

## First Floor

Apartment 7 is to be created with a kitchen which is currently the corridor area, which is serving the fire escape which will now be removed to improve the external appearance of the building, and utilises all the existing walls together with the creation of a stud wall to create a bathroom.

Apartment 8 bedroom 2 and the actual kitchen, the whole of that plus the bedroom 1 and bathroom to apartment 7 would have been in my view one open public room, as all the internal walls currently are timber stud wall. The proposed bathroom is in the place where the existing one is, and therefore no particular alterations.

## Second Floor

Most of the existing walls are used in this particular area. There is some removal of walls in Apartment 9 to create the open kitchen/lounge, but that was partially subdivided in any case to service the fire escape which will now be removed.

## External Detailing

It is proposed that all the windows will be changed to the sliding sash to match what would have been original to the property and therefore improve its external appearance together with the removal of the fire escape will bring the property as near as possible back to its original format.

You will note how the proposals have now taken into account as far as possible without prejudicing the square footage required for flats to minimise the loss of historic fabric.

## 3 Cultural Heritage Impact Methodology

### 3.1 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.

***There are no intentions to expose any potential archaeological aspects to the building with the cellars or any underground evidence will be unlikely to draw any evidential value.***

#### 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 building does have some historical value, it is a well planned late Georgian/early Victorian building in a prominent location, and therefore forms part of the historic centre of Rochdale.***

#### 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 property does have a good aesthetic value. It is a balanced elevational Georgian style building with good symmetry, and with the proposed removal of the fire escape and matching up of windows, it is considered that can be improved.***

#### 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 property does have quite a strong communal value having been a public house in the centre of Rochdale over a long period of time, and only recently ceased trading.*

### 3.2 Summary of the Significance of Heritage Assets

**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.                                                                 |

#### Other Criteria Used

#### Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment Methodology

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

**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.<br><br>Grade I Listed Buildings and built heritage of exceptional quality. |

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

*We consider that the property from table 3.1 has an importance for a high level of evidential, historic, aesthetic and communal value or several elements of more than one value. We consider that it does have historic, aesthetic and communal value and therefore meets the criteria to be classed as medium.*

*Using the second table, it is in my view a designated asset of regional quality but outside a conservation area.*

*By combining the value of the property, the heritage value to be **medium**.*

### **3.3 Magnitude of Impact**

| <b>Magnitude of Impact</b> | <b>Typical Criteria Descriptors</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Moderate                   | <p>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)</p> <p>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)</p>    |
| Slight                     | <p>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)</p> <p>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)</p> |
| Negligible/No Change       | <p>Very minor loss or detrimental alteration to one or more characteristics, features or elements Minor changes to the setting or context of the site.</p> <p>No discernible change in baseline conditions (Negative).</p> <p>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)</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |

*We consider there is some measurable change in some loss of internal fabric, but not particularly significant as there has been substantial alterations to the ground floor already. The first floor would have been open plan with the public area, so whilst there is a negative aspect of some walls being removed, the positive aspect of getting removal of the fire escape and external appearance regarding the sliding sash windows measures out that the impact is relatively **slight**.*

### 3.4 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              |

With the *value of medium* and the *slight* change, we consider the impact to be *minor*.

## 4 National Planning Policy Framework

### 4.1 207

*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.*

A site visit has been carried out and photographs taken with a view of studying the existing layout and the proposals.

### 4.2 210

*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;*

It is known that public houses are closing on a regular basis, we feel that the provision of residential use within the town Centre is good alternative and this will sustain with this viable use the future of the building.

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

The heritage asset is important in sustainable communities including their economic vitality, particularly in the centre of Rochdale within this area.

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

### 4.3 214

*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.*

We consider that there is very little harm to the building from the proposal in consideration of its potential for all other uses which are limited. I feel that there is a public benefit to the community by the provision of housing.

#### **4.4 215**

*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.*

We consider that there is very little harm to the building from the proposal in consideration of its potential for all other uses which are limited. I feel that there is a public benefit to the community by the provision of housing.

## 5 Conclusion

Taking into account local plan policy, national policy, and the relatively slight alterations to the public house, we consider this is not harmful, enhances the area by refurbishment providing a good provision for housing and it will be maintained as a prominent building. You will note how the proposals have now taken into account as far as possible without prejudicing the square footage required for flats to minimise the loss of historic fabric.

### Georgian Society Comments

You will note that there are some historical plans that are now provided on the application that relate to how the building is developed over a period of time.

It is evident there has been probably three different periods of development to the original layout consisting of in effect a stairwell and five rooms which have had some of the original walls remaining. But there are however fairly significant alterations as to most public houses, particularly on the ground floor with subdivisions to create toilets, as the hotel will have developed sanitary provisions for toilets, bathrooms etc. But also from the historical plans seen that there are a number of areas where it is evident that subdivisions have taken place particularly to the first floor to create bathrooms, wc's.

There is some remaining cornices which show the outline of rooms, particularly there is one room as previously stated in the original report on the first floor that is likely to have been a function room which you can see the cornice has been intersected by the introduction of timber studded walls.

The regard to the proposed ground floor layout, it has not been possible to retain all the existing walls, but the majority of those walls of originality have been retained, or at least the outline of those masonry to indicate where the walls were, in particular in apartment 6.

The elements of subdivision to create apartment 4 are in effect to have removed some of the later timber studded walls in any case, so in that respect there has been little in terms of loss of historic fabric.

Whilst there has been some opening in apartment 6 on the ground floor, some of the masonry has been retained around what would have been the bar servery area, so at least you can see the outline of that particular room.

Apartment 3 and 5 are part extensions, the majority of apartment 5 being within the extension which was probably built since the 1980's/1990's.

With regard to the proposed basement plans, these in the majority retained existing walls, chimney breasts as part of the scheme, utilising the cellar drop which would have been a later addition to the original hotel which is now to be utilised the stairwells.

With regard to the first floor, there has been the removal of an original timber studding to create apartment 8 as can be seen by the historic plan, but generally retentions of original walls have remained.

With regard to the second floor, again the majority of these walls have been retained with the only wall having been removed is in apartment 9.

With regard to the specific comments made by Thomas Whitfield, Conservation Adviser for Georgian Group, we would comment as follows:

- *The extensive demolition of internal partition walls and increased subdivision of historic rooms has the potential to erode the legibility of the planform and spatial hierarchy of the building. It*

*will also result in irreversible loss of historic fabric and potentially disrupt historic decorative schemes where surviving.*

There are no decorative schemes surviving, there are some cornices and there is some debate as to whether the fireplaces which appear original have not been superseded by reclaimed pieces.

- *The relocation and blocking up of doorways will also disrupt legibility of the historic access patterns.*

It is not conceivable that the conversion of this public house would not have some alterations to make it comply with modern requirements for internal floor space for flats. We have minimised the input of this by analysing the original walls and those alterations to show where some areas of loss of historic fabric are not as extensive as suggested.

- *We register concern that no discussion is offered of any damp proofing measures or other proposals to improve habitability of the basement.*

I suspect that this will be subject to condition or will be part of a building application in due course.

- *Formation of multiple openings in the original north-west (rear) external wall of the building at GF level which would result in the irreversible loss of historic fabric and disrupt historic access and flow patterns.*

The multiple openings I do not quite understand where this comment has come from.

- *Demolition of a considerable portion of the GF external wall of the rear outrigger which is shown on the 1st edition Ordnance Survey Town Plan. Neither the age or significance of this outrigger is explained.*

We do not know what the age and certainly the brickwork is, not dissimilar to that of the original building, but may have been an additional building. It certainly contains what appears to be a chimney breast, although there is no external stack. The significance of this building in any case is to be retained. The infill of this to create addition to this on the ground floor is not considered to have a significant effect on the significance of the building.

- *The Group registers no objection to the proposed lightwells and windows to the basement, or the reopening of blocked windows.*

It is welcomed that the group registers no objection to the lightwells or the removal of the staircase which is considered to be a substantial improvement to the building.

- *We welcome the proposal to remove the external metal staircase.*

## 6 Appendix A – Photographs

Photograph 1



Existing lintel to old lightwell to be utilised.

Photograph 2



Open up built up window opening at the first floor and second floor level.

Photograph 3



Current archway to be opened up where the barrel drop is to create a lightwell on the right hand side elevation.

Photograph 4



Modern type windows to be changed to Georgian style openings throughout.

Photograph 5



Fire escape to be removed to improve the appearance of the property.

Photograph 6



If possible, retain and clean existing lobby tiling and image.

Photograph 7



If possible, retain door and ironmongery on entrance to public house.

Photograph 8



Existing staircase to remain.

Photograph 9



Utilise head to form new window opening after removal of fire escape.

## 7 Listing

### Official list entry

Heritage Category: **Listed Building**

Grade: **II**

List Entry Number: **1038323**

Date first listed: **12-Feb-1985**

List Entry Name: **THE REED HOTEL**

Statutory Address 1: **THE REED HOTEL, REED HILL**

### Location

Statutory Address: **THE REED HOTEL, REED HILL**

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

District: **Rochdale (Metropolitan Authority)**

Parish: **Non Civil Parish**

National Grid Reference: **SD 89696 13588**

### Details

SD 81 NE ROCHDALE REED HILL (south-west side) 10/87 The Reed Hotel

G.V. **II**

Hotel, now public house. Late C18. Brick with stone dressings and slate roof. 2 rooms wide by 2 deep with central door. 3 bays wide and of 3 storeys and basement. Hipped roof. Door has cast iron overlight, pilasters and cornice. Left hand ground floor corner is rounded off and stone moulded corbel carries brickwork above. The right corner has a stone quoin. Windows have stone wedge lintels and sills, the first floor having a sill band and a central blind window.

Listing NGR: SD8969613588

### Legacy

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

Legacy System number: **358917**

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.