

HERITAGE & CONSERVATION CONSULTATION RESPONSE

Application Details

Heritage, Conservation & Design team officer

Catherine Fenghour

Date

17 April 2026

Application reference

PL/2026/0212

Address

The Old Duke, 10 Ealees, Littleborough, OL15 0HJ

Proposal

Re-roofing works, including removal of previously installed spray foam insulation.

Affected Heritage Assets

Designated heritage assets

- The Old Duke, 10 Ealees (grade II)

Non-designated heritage assets

-

Summary

In principle there are no objections but some amendments are required.

Assessment

Site description and significance

The Old Duke was built in 1820 for a local engine maker, known as Edward Kershaw. In the 1850s three workers' cottages were built to the rear in the 1850s. The building started to be used as a public house in the 1860s and continued in this use until the mid-20th century, when it was converted into a dwelling.

The building is constructed in hammer-dressed watershot stone, with a graduated stone slate roof. Based on the distinctive run of windows at upper floor, it is likely that this originally functioned as a workshop. Following the grant of listed building consent, most of the windows have been reopened.

The building is listed at grade II, meaning it is of significance in the national context, owing to its architectural and historic interest. It is a good example of a local vernacular building, using local materials. It is also of historic significance noting its connection to the locally important engine maker.

Relevant legislation and planning policy

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Section 16(2) - in considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works the local planning authority [...] 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.

National Planning Policy Chapter 16 deals with conserving and enhancing the historic environment. At a local level Rochdale Core Strategy policy P2 and Places for Everyone policy JP-P2 apply.

Assessment of proposals

The proposal is for the reroofing of the existing building, owing to its poor condition. Some of the existing slates have slipped and others have fallen from the roof. Mortar is also missing from the chimneys, ridges and verges.

The submitted information confirms that the existing slates would be reused where possible. A condition should be imposed requiring the existing slates to be put aside in a secure location for reuse. A sample of new slates should also be required by condition. These should match the existing precisely in terms of appearance, size, material and colour. It is important that the reinstated slates are laid to match the existing graduated pattern.

An NHL 3.5 lime mortar mix is proposed for the chimney and ridge repairs. Code 6 lead is proposed for the flashings. These are both considered to be appropriate, and the works should be conditioned to be carried out in accordance with the details as shown on the approved plans.

Given the condition of the existing roof, it is considered that the proposed works would help to preserve the building, preventing further deterioration.

The submitted plans also show for new insulation to be installed, to replace the expanding foam. It is understood that the foil backed insulated plasterboard has already been installed. Prior to the installation of the foil backed plasterboard, it is understood that the expanding foam was visible from within the room. There are no records of when this expanding foam was installed, although the heritage statement estimates that it may have been c.2000.

The removal of the expanding foam is welcomed, as this is not an appropriate material for use on historic buildings. There are also no objections to the principle of installing insulation to improve the thermal efficiency of the building. However, this insulation should be breathable. The specified Kingspan should be changed to a breathable product. Foil backed plasterboard is not a product which is considered suitable for historic buildings, as it is not breathable. Ideally, this element of the proposal would be changed to a breathable product, such as a wood fibre board with a lime plaster

finish. However, it is noted that the roof has an existing spray foam insulation, which in addition to not being breathable, is also inappropriate in terms of its appearance.

The plans should be updated to replace the Kingspan with a breathable product. Ideally the plasterboard would also be updated to ensure that the building breathes and prevent any issues with moisture becoming trapped. However, it is not any more harmful than the previous arrangement with the expanding foam.

Subject to the above amendments and conditions, it is considered that the proposal would preserve the special interest of the building.

Re-consultation

Yes