

# Heritage Statement

## Middleton Old Cemetery

The Heritage Statement is for the applicant or agent to identify the heritage asset(s) and potential for other non-designated heritage assets on the proposed development site, describe their significance and the potential impact of the proposal on that significance.

Please read the Guidance notes provided with this report to help you fill in the form correctly.

Appendix 1 is stating whether or not supporting data from the HER is required. There are 3 options:

- HER report attached
- HER report not considered necessary – email attached from HER
- HER report not required by the Local Planning Authority as detailed on the relevant website validation requirements

Please tick the relevant box at the back of this form as to which option applies.

**Both the Heritage Statement and Appendix 1 must be completed in order to meet validation requirements of the Local Planning Authority – tick the boxes on the right hand side below to confirm the sections completed.**

**Note: All fields are mandatory. Failure to fully complete all fields may result in the form not being validated by the Local Planning Authority.**

| To be completed by the applicant – please tick relevant boxes |                                     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Heritage Statement completed                               | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Appendix 1 completed                                       | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

### **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**

*The National Planning Policy Framework (Department for Communities and Local Government, March 2012) Section 128 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. 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.*

**National Planning Policy Framework:**

<http://www.communities.gov.uk/planningandbuilding/planningsystem/planningpolicy/planningpolicyframework/>

## Heritage Statement

**Site name**

Middleton Old Cemetery

**Address of site  
(including postcode)**

St Leonard's Street,  
Middleton  
M24 6DJ

**Grid Reference**

53.55231, -2.19447

### Schedule of Works

Please state the type of proposal e.g. extension to a listed building, internal alterations

The proposal is to take down the external skin approx. 12 m in length of the retaining wall sequentially in 1200 mm sections inspect the inner skin to ensure it is in an acceptable condition prior to any rebuild of the outer skin

The outer skin of the wall will be rebuilt sequentially as it was removed. All the above will be in coordination with the Rochdale BC conservation officer direction.

New coping stones will be added in line with the acceptable specification proposed

Please list the works proposed e.g. replacement windows, removal of internal wall, reinstatement of original staircase, damp proofing works to basement etc.

The removal of the external skin of brickwork sequentially to ensure safe working , Inspection of the inner leaf to ensure the condition is acceptable and no further works are required within. Once all areas are completely rebuilt coping sets will be added to complete the wall area

## Pre Application Advice

Have you consulted the Rochdale Borough Council heritage officer

☒ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, please attach any correspondence to this Heritage Statement

Have you sought pre-application heritage advice from the relevant local planning authority?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, please provide a copy of any written correspondence with reference number/contact name if applicable.

Email response

- Planning permission would be required to demolish and rebuild the retaining wall.
- As you would be working with historic fabric within the Middleton Town Centre Conservation Area, the facing materials would need to be carefully removed and retained for re-use in the reconstruction wherever possible.
- It is noted that the wall section question is angled so as to lean backwards into the slope. The design of the re-construction should reflect the same angles and proportions as the existing wall.
- An English Garden bond should be utilised to match the remainder of the retaining wall.
- In respect of the coping stones, full details of these should be included within the application.
- All materials and pointing is to be agreed with the LPA, either within the planning application or by condition.
- A basic tree survey should be carried out in respect of the tree growing to the front of the wall.
- A detailed method statement would be required as part of any application.

Michael Atkinson Smith

Have you sought pre-application heritage advice from Historic England?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, please provide a copy of any written correspondence with reference number/contact name if applicable.

**3. What heritage assets are affected by the proposals? (Please tick the relevant boxes below)**

|                                           |                                     |
|-------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1: Scheduled Monument (SM)                | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| 2. Listed Building (LB)                   | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| 3. Conservation Area (CA)                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Registered Park and Garden (RPG)       | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| 5. Historic Battlefield (HB)              | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| 6. Locally Listed Heritage Asset (LLHA)   | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| 7. Archaeological Notification Area (ANA) | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| 8 Other Non-Designated Heritage Asset     | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

**4. What is known about the affected heritage assets?**

**4 (a). Using the information obtained through research and on-site analysis provide a summary of the history of the site/building.**

Please add a summary history of the site/building including specifically the parts that will be impacted by the proposals – e.g. how the site/building was originally laid out, how it has evolved, phases of construction and/or change Please also provide information on past impacts – e.g. modern extension, drainage, former footings, recent landscaping, gardening. **Please add any research material as an appendix to this report after Appendix 1.**

The graveyard has a grid of paths that unite the various areas. The old burial ground, opposite the church, is on a central plateau and the numerous paths radiate from it to connect the outer reaches of the cemetery.

A perimeter path originally connected them at the perimeter of the site. These would have allowed access from the mill, manor house and weaver's cottage parts of the town.

The graveyard has a medium aesthetic and communal significance and a high evidential value for its span through 1000 years of burial traditions and history.

The path that ends at the southwest corner of the old burial ground connects to Long Street, opposite the later Methodist Church, via a flight of steps that cut down through the bank. The lower level has now been infilled in this area, so access is no longer possible from this point. The perimeter path and St Leonard's Street.

The Grammar School (1842) and Long Street Methodist Church (1899) are to the right. Closed off entrance from St Leonard's Street The steps have now fallen into neglect and disrepair. It is not clear why the adjacent ground was filled back to the top of the retaining wall.

The path to the left connects, via a flight of steps to Long Street and the lower end of St Leonard's Street

The perimeter wall has been extensively repaired, quite unsympathetically in places, but still retains its characteristic curved and battered form around much of the site and up to the main entrance to the cemetery, opposite St Leonard's Church.

Much of the original rich handmade brick remains although the original stone copings are missing from most of the west section. Original detailing remains where the wall continues to the east of the church.

This has a medium aesthetic value, where it is original, but is negatively impacted where it has been compromised by past interventions. Communal value is medium, reflecting its importance in linking the developing town with the medieval church and as a containment to the extensive burial ground. St Leonard's Street cuts deeply into the original Church Bank and the line of the wall is further defined by a line of mature trees and the narrow perimeter path that follows its sweep

**4 (b) What research have you undertaken to understand the significance of the heritage asset(s) affected?**

**Please tick the relevant boxes**

|                                            |                                     |
|--------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| HER                                        | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Map regression (historic maps)             | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Local Planning Authority sources           | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Historic England sources                   | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Museum or Library (please provide details) | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Other (please state)                       | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

**(Please add any research material as an appendix to this report after Appendix 1.)**

**5. What is important about the affected heritage assets ('the significance')?**

Use this space to describe the significance of the heritage assets identified in Section 3. Please see the guidance for further information on what a heritage asset is and how to define significance. Other information can be found at: <https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/hpg/generalintro/heritage-conservation-defined/>

**(Please continue on separate sheet of paper if further space is required and attach as an appendix to this report after Appendix 1.)**

Significance of the graveyard:

The church burial ground dates back to Saxon, possibly Celtic times and this, along with the wider burial ground has a high evidential value in relation to its use as a place of burial and public activity for over a thousand years. The section of graveyard close to the compromised wall, off Long Street, has burials dating from the end of the 19th century, having only been consecrated in 1861.

The burials do, however include elaborate headstones and memorials, humble 2nd class plot markers and a number of war graves and has a low aesthetic interest, due to their neglect. The war graves and a number of the notable memorials have a high historic value.

This part of the cemetery holds medium communal interest as a means of access to the graveyard and church from the town but this is currently closed off. This could, however, be re-established and the significance restored in future if desired.

## **6. How will the proposals impact on the significance of the heritage assets?**

Please discuss what impact the proposals have on the heritage asset i.e. loss or disturbance of historic building fabric, below or above ground archaeological impacts, setting or change of relationship between buildings and altering scale. **(Please continue on separate sheet of paper if further space is required and attach as an appendix to this report after Appendix 1.)**

The growth of a tree in the weathered face of the retaining wall, opposite Long Street Methodist Church and directly to the south of the Long Street steps, has severely compromised its integrity. The increase in the girth of the tree has forced the brickwork to lift and to be displaced outwards.

The brickwork above has distorted, and the outer face appears to be close to collapse above this level. Two buttresses that have been built to the ends of this section of wall also show an outward displacement to the upper sections. In addition to this, a poorly conceived replacement coping in brickwork with a tiled creasing, has also failed and has allowed freeze thaw action to displace the upper courses of brickwork.

The area directly below is used as a car park and this area should now be cordoned off, locally, to prevent injury or damage if there is a fall. The focus of the proposed works is the removal of the trees and the repair of the outer skin of the wall and inspection of the inner course to ensure stability and satisfactory condition.

## **7. How has the proposal been designed to conserve the significance of the heritage asset(s)?**

Describe how the proposal has been designed to conserve and enhance the significance of the heritage assets. Also describe how any harmful impacts have been avoided or minimised. For example, use of raft foundations, movement of the proposed extension to a less sensitive location.

**(Please continue on separate sheet of paper if further space is required and attach as an appendix to this report after Appendix 1.)**

#### REASONS FOR THE PROPOSED INTERVENTION

.Potential instability of the retaining wall and associated risks: The condition of the retaining wall appears to present an immediate risk of local collapse. The area below is used for car parking and so there is a risk of injury or damage. It was noted that much of the original mortar has weathered back and years of plant growth has reduced large sections of the bedding to a soil consistency. The detail of the concealed part of the retaining wall is unknown but the outer face has reduced integrity

**Contact details:**

County Archaeology Team  
[County.archaeology@eastsussex.gov.uk](mailto:County.archaeology@eastsussex.gov.uk)

Historic Environment Record  
[County.HER@eastsussex.gov.uk](mailto:County.HER@eastsussex.gov.uk)

Historic England  
[www.historicengland.org.uk](http://www.historicengland.org.uk)

**Local Planning Authority**

Rochdale Borough Council [development.management@rochdale.gov.uk](mailto:development.management@rochdale.gov.uk)

## Appendix 1

|                                                                                             |                                     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>To be completed by the applicant – please tick relevant boxes</b>                        |                                     |
| HER report attached                                                                         | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| HER report not considered necessary – email attached from HER                               | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| HER report not required by the Local Planning Authority as detailed on the relevant website | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |