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SUMMARY

In response to a request from Hodder Associates, acting on behalf of Maryland Securities Ltd, Oxford Archaeology North (OA North) carried out an archaeological desk-based assessment of a site straddling Breslyn Street in the Strangeways area of Manchester (centred on SJ 83787 99035). The study aimed to assess the potential for significant buried archaeological remains on the site, and was required to support and inform a planning application for the redevelopment of the site. The development proposals allow for the demolition of all standing structures on the site, and the erection of a residential building with ancillary accommodation.

Map regression analysis has demonstrated that the site was essentially undeveloped, rural throughout the later post-medieval period, and there is no evidence for any earlier activity on the site, although the route of a Roman road between Manchester and Ribchester is projected to take a course immediately to the east. The study area retained a semi-rural aspect on the fringe of Manchester until the late eighteenth century, when the surrounding land was subject to urban development. The actual study area, however, was not developed until the early 1830s, when the present streets were laid out and buildings had been erected by the early 1840s. Vestiges of these buildings are incorporated in the fabric of the structure that survives on the eastern side of Mirabel Street, within the area of the proposed development, although the building has been remodelled extensively and is of no archaeological interest.

The proposed development scheme area has a high potential to contain the buried remains of nineteenth-century workers’ housing, which are considered to be of Low Local archaeological importance. The site also has some potential to contain the physical remains of the Roman road between Manchester and Ribchester, which would be considered as being of Local/Borough importance, although given the intensive development of the site during the nineteenth century, any survival of this road will, at best, be fragmentary.

Development of the site may have a moderate archaeological impact on buried remains, involving their damage or destruction as a result of ground-reduction works, and is likely to require a mitigation strategy. An archaeological watching brief maintained during construction work is considered to be an appropriate mitigation strategy. This should be targeted the projected course of the Roman road in the eastern part of the site, and the former cellar dwellings on the eastern side of Boundary Street.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 CIRCUMSTANCES OF PROJECT

1.1.1 Maryland Securities Ltd has proposed a residential building with ancillary accommodation on Breslyn Street, in the Strangeways area of Manchester (Fig 1), and commissioned Oxford Archaeology North (OA North) to undertake an archaeological desk-based assessment to support and inform the planning application. The principal aim of the assessment was to identify, as far as possible, the nature and significance of the cultural heritage and sub-surface archaeological resource within the study area, and to establish the impact of the proposed development upon this resource. The resource has been examined to see if it includes Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas, Registered Parks and Gardens, Registered Battlefields, hedgerows of historic importance, and non-designated features of regional or local archaeological or historical interest and value.

1.1.2 This report sets out the results of the desk-based assessment, along with a gazetteer of archaeological sites of interest within the study area and its immediate environs. The report also includes a statement of the archaeological potential and significance, in which an assessment of the impact of the proposed development on the historic environment is taken into account.

1.2 LOCATION, TOPOGRAPHY AND GEOLOGY

1.2.1 The study area (centred on SJ 83787 99035) is situated in the Strangeways area of Manchester, on the north side of the city centre (Plate 1). The site lies on the east bank of the Irwell, a short distance to the north of the confluence with the river Irk, at a height of c.25m above Ordnance Datum (OD).

1.2.2 The study area straddles Breslyn Street, which is bounded by New Bridge Street and Great Ducie Street to the north and east respectively. The river Irwell is some 35m to the west, and the Manchester Evening News (MEN) Arena and Victoria railway station lie immediately to the east, with a railway viaduct forming the southern boundary of the study area (Fig 1). The site is situated beyond the north-western boundary of the Cathedral Conservation Area.

1.2.3 The development proposals concern two plots of land, which comprise some 190 square metres on the west side of Breslyn Street, and approximately 520 square metres on the east side. The western plot is occupied presently by a two-storey building, and the eastern plot has been cleared of buildings and surfaced with hardcore.
1.2.4 Topographically, the Manchester Conurbation as a region is within an undulating lowland basin, which is bounded by the Pennine uplands to the east and to the north. The region as a whole comprises the Mersey river valley, whilst the rivers Irwell, Medlock, and Irk represent the principal watercourses in Manchester (Countryside Commission 1998, 125).

1.2.5 The underlying solid geology of the area consists mainly of Bunter sandstones of Permo-Triassic age, which were deposited under the marine conditions of the period, between 280 and 195 million years ago (ibid). The local bedding dips to the south-west, towards the centre of the Cheshire Basin (Geological Survey of Great Britain, Sheet 85, Solid Edition). The overlying drift geology is composed of essentially Pleistocene boulder clays of glacial origin, and sands, gravels, and clays of fluviatile/lacustrine origin, which form an extensive spread around the lower Irwell and Mersey valleys (Hall et al 1995, 8).
2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 DESK-BASED ASSESSMENT

2.1.1 The assessment has focused on the site of the proposed development, although information for the immediate environs has been considered in order to provide an essential contextual background. The assessment was carried out in accordance with the relevant IFA and English Heritage guidelines (Institute of Field Archaeologists 2001, Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Desk-based Assessments; English Heritage 2006, Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment (MoRPHE)). The principal sources of information consulted were historical and modern maps, although published and unpublished secondary sources were also reviewed. The following repositories were consulted during the data-gathering process:

- **Greater Manchester Heritage Environment Record (HER):** the Greater Manchester Heritage Environment Record (HER), held in Manchester was consulted to establish the sites of archaeological interest already known within the study area, and information from up to 0.25km around was obtained as a background. The HER is a Geographic Information System (GIS) linked to a database of all known archaeological sites in Greater Manchester, and is maintained by the Greater Manchester Archaeological Unit (GMAU);

- **Archives and Local Studies, Manchester Central Library (MCL):** the catalogue of the Archives and Local Studies section of Manchester Central Library was searched for information relating to the study area, and relevant data was incorporated into the report. All available Ordnance Survey maps for the study area were also examined, covering the period from 1850 to 1992;

- **Greater Manchester County Record Office, Manchester (GMRO(M)):** the catalogue of the Greater Manchester County Record Office was searched for information relating to the study area, and relevant data was incorporated into the report;

- **Lancashire County Record Office, Preston (LRO(P)):** before the county boundaries were changed during the mid-1970s, Manchester lay within the county of Lancashire and, therefore, some primary sources relevant to the present study are held in Lancashire County Record Office in Preston;

- **Oxford Archaeology North:** OA North has an extensive archive of secondary sources relevant to the study area, as well as numerous unpublished client reports on work carried out both as OA North and in its former guise of Lancaster University Archaeological Unit (LUAU). These were consulted where necessary.
2.2 PLANNING BACKGROUND AND LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK

2.2.1 National Policy Framework: in considering any planning application for development, local planning authorities are bound by the policy framework set by government guidance. This guidance provides a material consideration that must be taken into account in development management decisions, where relevant. In accordance with central and local government policy, this assessment has been prepared in order to clarify the study site’s archaeological potential and to assess the need for any further measures to mitigate the impact of the proposed development.

2.2.2 National planning polices on the conservation of the historic environment are set out in Planning Policy Statement PPS 5 Planning for the Historic Environment, which was published by the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) in March 2010. The policies set out in PPS5 also apply to the consideration of the historic environment in relation to other heritage-related consent regimes for which planning authorities are responsible under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Annex 2 of PPS 5 defines as a heritage asset ‘a building, monument, site, place, area or landscape positively identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions’; heritage assets are also defined as ‘valued components of the historic environment’.

2.2.3 In summary, PPS 5 provides a framework that:

- requires applicants to provide proportionate information on heritage assets affected by the proposals and an assessment of the impact of the proposed development on the significance of the heritage asset;
- has a presumption in favour of the conservation of designated Heritage Assets, which include World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Protected Wreck Sites, Registered Parks and Gardens, Registered Battlefields or Conservation Areas;
- protects the settings of such designated heritage assets;
- takes into account the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets;
- where the loss of whole or part of a heritage asset's significance is justified, provides for the recording of assets and for publication of the resulting evidence.

2.2.4 With reference to specific policies, PPS 5 Policy HE6.1 states that local planning authorities ‘should require an applicant to provide a description of the significance of the heritage assets affected and the contribution of their setting to that significance’. Policy HE6.1 also recommends that ‘where an application site includes, or is considered to have the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where desk-based research is insufficient to properly assess the interest, a field evaluation’.
2.2.5 **Regional Policy Framework:** the approved Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) for the North West (The North West Plan) was adopted in September 2008. The RSS replaces the Regional Planning Guidance 13 for the North West (RPG 13), together with the relevant County Structure Plans. Policy EM1 (C) embedded within the RSS contains policies relating to the historic environment, and specifies that plans, strategies, proposals and schemes should protect, conserve and enhance the historic environment supporting conservation-led regeneration in areas rich in historic interest and, in particular, exploiting the regeneration potential of:

- the maritime heritage of the North West coast, including docks and water spaces, and coastal resorts and piers;
- the Pennine textile mill-town heritage that exists in East Lancashire and Greater Manchester; and the textile mill-town heritage of East Cheshire;
- Victorian and Edwardian commercial developments in Liverpool and Manchester city centres;
- the traditional architecture of rural villages and market towns of Cumbria, Cheshire and Lancashire;
- the historic Cities of Carlisle, Chester and Lancaster; and the Lake District Cultural Landscape.

### 2.3 Site Visit

2.3.1 A rapid inspection of the study area was carried out as part of the desk-based research in order to relate the past landscape and surroundings to that of the present. It also allowed for a rapid appraisal of the extant buildings, and the modern ground surface.

### 2.4 Archive

2.4.1 Copies of this desk-based assessment will be deposited with the Greater Manchester Historic Environment Record, maintained by the Greater Manchester Archaeological Unit (GMAU).
3. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

3.1 INTRODUCTION

3.1.1 The following section presents a summary historical and archaeological background of the general area. This is presented by historical period, and has been compiled in order to place the study area into a wider archaeological context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palaeolithic</td>
<td>30,000 – 10,000 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesolithic</td>
<td>10,000 – 3,500 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>3,500 – 2,200 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
<td>2,200 – 700 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td>700 BC – AD 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romano-British</td>
<td>AD 43 – AD 410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Medieval</td>
<td>AD 410 – AD 1066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Medieval</td>
<td>AD 1066 – AD 1540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>AD 1540 – c1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Period</td>
<td>cAD1750 – 1901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>Post-1901</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Summary of British archaeological periods and date ranges

3.2 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND TO MANCHESTER

3.2.1 Prehistoric Period: there are relatively few sites known from this period in the vicinity, although general patterns of settlement locations that have been identified indicate that the Irwell valley would have been a favourable location for occupation and transport routes, whilst a small group of prehistoric finds have been discovered during archaeological excavations in the Castlefield area (Nevell et al 2003). The upland areas of the surrounding moors may have been exploited for hunting, but the poor drainage of the Pennines and spread of blanket peat at higher altitudes would have discouraged any settlement (Hall et al 1995, 117). There is no known evidence for prehistoric activity in proximity to the present study area.

3.2.2 Roman Period: the first military occupation of Manchester was established during the governorship of Agricola (AD 77-84), and commenced with a five-acre wooden fort, known as *Mamucium*, apparently meaning ‘a breast shaped hill’ (Brunton 1909). The site of this encampment is marked today by Camp Street in Castlefield, situated on the opposite side to the city centre from the present study area.

3.2.3 The fort was supported by a substantial extramural settlement, or *vicus*, that developed in both a northerly direction and along the line of Chester Road to the south (Grealey 1974, 11). It seems that this settlement originated largely during the early second century, and incorporated numerous buildings and a concentration of iron-working hearths or furnaces. Much of the current understanding of the Roman *vicus* in Manchester is derived from three major excavations, which have all focused on the area to the north of the fort:
excavations on the southern side of Liverpool Road, centred on the former White Lion Street in 1972 (ibid), excavations on Tonman Street (Jones and Reynolds 1978), and an excavation between Liverpool Road and Rice Street (Gregory 2007).

3.2.4 The Roman road between the forts at Manchester and Ribchester (Site 01) is known to cross the river Irk and continue northwards, approximately along the line of Bury New Road (Margary 1957). The precise route of this road from its bridging point across the river Irk is uncertain, although it is likely to have taken a course followed by Great Ducie Street, immediately to the east of the present study area.

3.2.5 **Early Medieval Period:** the area around Manchester came under the control of several kingdoms during this period. In AD 620, Edwin conquered and occupied Manchester, and it may have been during this period that settlement was established on both banks of the river Irwell, close to its confluence with the river Irk (Farrer and Brownbill 1908). A small church, probably on the site of the cathedral, may have been a focus for the settlement. However, the physical remains of this period are rare in the North West as a region (Newman 1996), and this is certainly the case in Manchester (Walker 1986). One of the few artefacts in the city known to be of an Anglo-Saxon origin is the so-called ‘Angel Stone’, or effigy of the Archangel Michael, which was unearthed by workmen repairing the South Porch of the cathedral in 1871 (Kidd 1996). Another remnant of the period is a Saxon-style funerary urn of probable sixth-century date, which was found to the north of Red Bank in Cheetham during construction work in c 1850 (Morris 1983).

3.2.6 **Late Medieval Period:** following the Norman Conquest, William I assigned most of the land between the Ribble and Mersey rivers to Roger of Poitou, who retained the manor of Salford demesne, but divided his other newly-acquired land into several fiefdoms (Kidd 1996, 13). The largest of these was the landholding centred on Manchester, created by the grant of extensive lands in the hundreds of Salford, Leyland and West Derby to Albert Grelley (Tupling 1962, 116).

3.2.7 In 1222 Manchester was granted an annual fair, and in 1301 Thomas Grelley was granted the Great Charter of Manchester by Edward I, and thus it became a free borough (Hartwell et al 2004, 256). By this date, the Grelley family had established a manor house at the confluence of the rivers Irwell and Irk, and the medieval town grew up around it (ibid). The manor house was bounded on the south by a huge ditch, the route of which is followed by the present Hanging Ditch; the remains of one of the arches of a bridge across the ditch survives in the Garden of Rest behind Mynshall House.

3.2.8 It is likely that the study area lay beyond the urban area of Manchester throughout the medieval period, forming part of an agricultural landscape. There is no known evidence for medieval activity in proximity to the study area.
3.2.9 **Post-medieval Period:** by 1539, John Leland was able to describe Manchester as the ‘finest and busiest town in the whole of Lancashire, with the best buildings and the greatest population’ (Chandler 1993, 263), at a time when the textile industries in south Lancashire were beginning to flourish. From the early seventeenth century, Manchester emerged as a centre for the textile finishing processes, as woollen cloth was brought in from outlying areas for bleaching and dying. Most importantly, however, Manchester expanded its role as a market centre for textiles produced in the region and, by the 1790s, Manchester’s thriving export market was beginning to displace London as a centre of overseas trade in cotton cloth (Edwards 1967, 176).

3.2.10 **The Industrial Period:** in his tour of the country in the 1720s, Daniel Defoe (1971, 219) noted that Manchester had ‘extended in a surprising manner, being almost double to what it was a few years ago’. This was facilitated by great improvements to the transport network across the North West. Of great importance was the opening of the Mersey Irwell Navigation in 1734, which formed an efficient link to the expanding port of Liverpool, and enabled sea-going vessels to sail up the Irwell into Manchester (Nevell 2004, 31). Wharfage facilities for boats of up to 50 tons were provided by a quay established in 1735 at the bottom of what in that year became Quay Street, strategically located to carry much of the town’s trade, with a river frontage of 136 yards (George and Brumhead 2002, 22).

3.2.11 The extent of the town by the late eighteenth century is depicted on several maps, included that produced by Tinker in 1772 (Plate 2). This shows the study area to have been undeveloped, and was essentially a rural area, although some settlement on the north bank of the river Irk is shown. However, Manchester expanded dramatically from the late eighteenth century, coupled with a rapid growth in the town’s population; in 1773, an estimated 22,481 people lived in Manchester, but this figure had tripled to 75,281 by 1801 (Lloyd-Jones and Lewis 1993).

Plate 2: Extract from Tinker’s map of Manchester and Salford, 1772
3.3 DEVELOPMENT OF THE STUDY AREA

3.3.1 The development of the study area may be traced reasonably well from the sequence of available historic mapping. The earliest maps of Manchester, including a map of c. 1650 (Fig 2), Casson and Berry’s plan of 1741, and Tinker’s map of 1772 (Plate 2), show the study area to have been undeveloped land on the northern fringe of the expanding town. The map of c. 1650 shows the site to have been situated a short distance to the west of a large property marked as ‘Knowles House’ (Fig 2). Little, if anything, is known about this property, although it was probably a large farmhouse.

3.3.2 Casson and Berry’s map of 1741 (Fig 3) similarly shows the study area to have comprised undeveloped land. A group of buildings that correspond broadly to the position of Knowles House is depicted a short distance to the east, and an east/west-aligned track leading to the river Irwell is shown immediately to the north of the study area. The eastern end of this track connected with the main thoroughfare, known as Strangeways, heading north from the bridge over the river Irk. However, whilst this road is not shown on the map of c. 1650, it was almost certainly in existence at that date.

3.3.3 In 1794, William Green published his detailed map of Manchester and Salford (Fig 4), which shows buildings to have been erected immediately to the north and east of the study area, reflecting the dramatic expansion of Manchester during the late eighteenth century, and the initial urbanisation of land to the north of the river Irk. Green’s map also shows the Manchester Union Workhouse to have been built to the east of the study area. The detail provided by Green’s map is replicated on several maps of the area that were published during the first decade of the nineteenth century, including Aston’s plan of 1804 (Plate 3), and Pigot’s plan of 1808, although these were all produced at a small scale, and cannot be relied upon for analysing individual buildings.

Plate 3: Aston’s plan of Manchester and Salford, 1804
3.3.4 These early nineteenth-century maps all show the study area to have remained undeveloped, whilst Green’s map identifies Lord Ducie as the landowner. Bancks and Co’s *Map of Manchester and Salford*, published in 1831, provides the first detailed nineteenth-century survey of the study area (Fig 5). This shows that considerable development to the north of the river Irk had been carried out, and Great Ducie Street and New Bridge Street had been laid out. This seemingly necessitated the demolition of the buildings shown on Green’s map immediately to the north and east of the study area. Moreton Street, forming the western boundary of the study area, is also shown on Bancks and Co’s map to have been laid out, although it is unnamed. The study area remains undeveloped, although the laying out of the streets implies that planned development was imminent.

3.3.5 Infilling of the plot bounded by New Bridge Street, Great Ducie Street and Moreton Street had certainly commenced by 1841, as buildings are shown in the area on Pigot’s map of that year (Plate 4). Pigot’s map was produced at a small scale, precluded any detailed assessment of individual structures, although it is clear that a block of buildings had been erected along the Moreton Street frontage, and another block of slightly larger buildings along the Great Ducie Street frontage. The southern part of the study, however, had seemingly not been developed by 1841.

*Plate 4: Extract from Pigot’s map of Manchester and Salford, 1841*
The layout of the study area during the mid-nineteenth century is depicted on two detailed plans: the Ordnance Survey 60": 1 mile map of 1850 (Plate 5), and Adshead’s *Plan of the Townships of Manchester*, published in 1851 (Fig 5). These maps show the study area to have been developed entirely, and a new street, known as Sion Hill/Boundary Street, to have been laid out. The Ordnance Survey map shows the buildings fronting onto Moreton Street, in the south-west corner of the study area, to have comprised five properties, the central three of which appear to have been houses. The size of these suggest that they were each two-roomed dwellings, with privies and a small yard to the rear. The function of the other two buildings is uncertain, although all five properties appear to have incorporated cellars, as indicated by the apparent cellar lights shown on the map. A small timber yard occupied the area to the rear of these properties, infilling the land up to Sion Hill. A row of four houses is shown to have occupied the eastern side of Sion Hill, and similarly appear to have incorporated cellars. These appear to have been single-roomed dwellings, with separate access to the cellars from Sion Hill. The buildings fronting onto Great Ducie Street are considerably larger, and may have small commercial properties, or artisans’ workshop dwellings.
3.3.7 The layout of the buildings in the study area shown on the Ordnance Survey map is largely confirmed by Adshead’s map of 1851 (Fig 6). The annotation on Adshead’s map, however, marks all of the properties fronting onto Moreton Street, and the single-roomed properties on the eastern side of Sion Hill, as private residences. The larger buildings lining the western side of Great Ducie Street are marked as ‘places of business’. Further details on the types of business carried out in these properties is provided by the entries in contemporary trade directories (eg Slater 1879; Table 2):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>Telegraph engineers</td>
<td>Shoe and clog maker</td>
<td>Cabinet maker</td>
<td>Beer retailer</td>
<td>Hairdresser</td>
<td>Tobacconist</td>
<td>Butcher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Entries in a directory for Great Ducie Street properties in the study area for 1879

3.3.8 In 1892, the Ordnance Survey published the First Edition 25”: 1 mile map of the area, which was surveyed in 1888 (Fig 6); the survey was also published in 1891 at a more detailed scale of 10’: 1 mile. These maps show little change to the configuration of the buildings in the study area during the second half of the nineteenth century, although the timber yard to the rear of the properties on Moreton Street has been developed. The detail shown on the 10’: 1 mile map confirms that the buildings fronting onto Moreton Street, and those on the eastern side of Boundary Street, all had cellars. Sion Hill is now marked entirely as Boundary Street.

3.3.9 The next available map of the area is that published by the Ordnance Survey at a scale of 25”: 1 mile in 1908 (Fig 8). This shows little change to the properties within the study area, although the buildings fronting onto the south side of New Bridge Street have evidently been replaced by a motor works.

3.3.10 Useful details of the buildings in the study area are provided by Charles Goad’s insurance plan, produced in 1901 and subject to several revisions. The revision of 1913 shows all the buildings occupying the block of land between Moreton Street and Boundary Street to have been of two storeys, although those in the southern part of the block have three-storey outshuts. The buildings fronting onto great Ducie Street comprised a combination of two- and three-storey structures. The four single-roomed dwellings on the eastern side of Boundary Street (nos 2 – 8) are all shown to have been of three storeys.

3.3.11 The same layout of buildings is shown on the Ordnance Survey map of 1922 (Fig 9). Entries in trade directories for this period, however, indicate that the single-roomed dwellings on the eastern side of Boundary Street (nos 2 – 8) had been converted for use as commercial premises; the properties are all listed as being occupied by Klepper, Small & Co, waterproof garments makers (eg Slater 1920).

3.3.12 During the second half of the twentieth century, Boundary Street was re-named Breslyn Street, and Moreton Street was re-named Mirabel Street. Most of the buildings on the Great Ducie Street frontage, and on the eastern side of Mirabel Street were demolished during this period, the later most recently being replaced by a multi-storey block.
3.4 SITE VISIT

3.4.1 The site visit confirmed that the western part of the study area, situated between Mirabel Street and Breslyn Street, is occupied by a two-storey structure (Plates 6 and 7). In summary, the building is of little, or no, archaeological interest.

3.4.2 The extant building comprises mould-thrown, hand-made bricks, bonded with a lime-based mortar, typical of early to mid-nineteenth-century construction; the building almost certainly incorporates the vestiges of 14 – 22 Moreton Street, depicted on Pigot’s map of 1841, although it has clearly undergone substantial remodelling.

3.4.3 The original roof appears to have been replaced and the former three-storey outshuts reduced in height, or replaced entirely, subsequent to Goad’s insurance plan of 1913 (Section 3.3.10 above). No 20 has been reduced to a single storey. None of the properties retain any firm evidence for cellars implied from the detail shown on historical mapping (Section 3.3.6 above), although the physical remains of cellar lights may have been obscured by a modern pavement re-surfacing. The rear elevation of the building (Plate 8) has similarly been remodelled considerably, creating a single block parallel to Breslyn Street.

Plate 6: Looking east at 14 – 20 Mirabel (formerly Moreton) Street
3.4.4 The proposed development site on the eastern side of Breslyn Street, occupying two plots either side of a single structure fronting onto Great Ducie Street, has been cleared entirely of buildings. Both cleared plots are surfaced with hardcore, with small patches of asphalt.
Plate 9: Looking east across the southern plot

Plate 10: Looking east across the northern plot
4. GAZETTEER OF SITES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Roman Road Alignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site number</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGR</td>
<td>SJ 8352 98957 – 83685 99348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HER no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Type</td>
<td>Projected route of Roman road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Designation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>HER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>The projected route of a Roman road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>The projected line of the Roman road lies immediately to the south of the proposed development area. However, the exact route of the road awaits confirmation, and could pass through the proposed development area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Hunts Bank Bridge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site number</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGR</td>
<td>SJ 8380 9900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HER no</td>
<td>272.1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Type</td>
<td>Bridge (Site of)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Designation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>HER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>A medieval bridge across the river Irk, known to have been in existence in 1473. Thought to have been constructed on the route of the Roman road from Manchester to Ribchester (Site 01).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>The site lies outside of the application area, and development is likely to have a negligible archaeological impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Long Millgate Cross</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site number</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGR</td>
<td>SJ 8397 9888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HER no</td>
<td>409.1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Type</td>
<td>Cross base (Site of)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Designation</td>
<td>Lies within the Cathedral Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>HER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>A stone cross situated originally at, or near, the bend in Long Millgate. The cross may have been one of a series marking the privileged ground around the church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>The site lies outside of the application area, and development is likely to have a negligible archaeological impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Manchester Castle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site number</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGR</td>
<td>SJ 8392 9890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HER no</td>
<td>2020.1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Type</td>
<td>Castle (Site of)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Designation</td>
<td>Lies within the Cathedral Conservation Area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Manchester Castle Inner Ditch

**Site Name**: Manchester Castle Inner Ditch  
**Site number**: 05  
**NGR**: SJ 8392 9888  
**HER no**: 2020.1.1  
**Site Type**: Earthwork  
**Period**: Medieval  

**Statutory Designation**  
Lies within the Cathedral Conservation Area.

**Source**  
HER

**Description**  
A rock-cut channel noted by antiquarians, though to have formed an inner ditch associated with the castle (Site 03) defences. The ditch was investigated archaeologically in 1983 by the Greater Manchester Archaeological Unit in the narrow area between the rear of the palatine buildings and the west precinct wall.

**Assessment**  
The site lies outside of the application area, and development is likely to have a negligible archaeological impact.

---

### Free Grammar School

**Site Name**: Free Grammar School  
**Site number**: 06  
**NGR**: SJ 8398 9889  
**HER no**: 2020.1.3  
**Site Type**: Building (Site of)  
**Period**: Post-medieval  

**Statutory Designation**  
Lies within the Cathedral Conservation Area.

**Source**  
HER

**Description**  
The site of a free grammar school, founded by Hugh Oldham in 1515 and rebuilt in 1776-7. The building was bombed during the 1940s, and rebuilt in brick, sandstone and breezeblock. The site was built over subsequently.

**Assessment**  
The site lies outside of the application area, and development is likely to have a negligible archaeological impact.

---

### Chetham's Hospital

**Site Name**: Chetham's Hospital  
**Site number**: 07  
**NGR**: SJ 8390 9890  
**HER no**: 2020.2.0  
**Site Type**: Building  
**Period**: Post-medieval  

**Statutory Designation**  
Grade I Listed Building; lies within the Cathedral Conservation Area.

**Source**  
HER

**Description**  
In 1421, Thomas de Warre re-founded the church as a college, which was based in the converted manor house. In 1547, the college was dissolved, and became a residence of the Earl of Derby. The buildings were acquired by Humphrey Chetham in 1653, who founded a school or hospital for 50 poor boys, and endowed the library, which was the first free public library in Europe.

**Assessment**  
The site lies outside of the application area, and development is likely to have a negligible archaeological impact.
### Site Name: New Fleet Prison
- **Site number:** 08
- **NGR:** SJ 8386 9892
- **HER no:** 406.1.0
- **Site Type:** Building (Site of)
- **Period:** Post-medieval
- **Statutory Designation:** Lies within the Cathedral Conservation Area.
- **Source:** HER
- **Description:** A house of correction established in 1580 on the site occupied presently by the Palatine Building and the hotel between the Chetham Library and Hunts Bank. The prison was rebuilt and enlarged in 1774, but was superceded in 1790 by the New Bailey Prison in Salford, and demolished in c 1835.
- **Assessment:** The site lies outside of the application area, and development is likely to have a negligible archaeological impact.

### Site Name: Victoria Station
- **Site number:** 09
- **NGR:** SJ 83985 99040
- **HER no:** 1392.1.0
- **Site Type:** Railway Station
- **Period:** Industrial
- **Statutory Designation:** Grade II Listed Building
- **Source:** HER
- **Description:** Designed by Robert Stephenson for the Manchester and Leeds Railway Company in 1844, and opened in 1845, this was the largest railway station of its day. The station was altered and enlarged substantially in 1909 for the Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Company.
- **Assessment:** The site lies outside of the application area, and development is likely to have a negligible archaeological impact.

### Site Name: Manchester Parcel Post Office
- **Site number:** 10
- **NGR:** SJ 83739 99021
- **HER no:** 15544.1.0
- **Site Type:** Building
- **Period:** Industrial
- **Statutory Designation:** Grade II Listed Building.
- **Source:** HER
- **Description:** A former parcel sorting office erected in 1894, and sited strategically between the Exchange and Victoria stations, representing a key component of the extensive network of transportation and storage facilities in late nineteenth-century Manchester. The building was used subsequently as a wholesale warehouse. The building has an irregular plan on a triangular site bounded on the south-west side by the river Irwell, on the north side by New Bridge Street, and on the south-east side by Mirable Street. The building is of three storeys with attics above two basement levels. Listed in January 2002.
- **Assessment:** The site lies outside of the proposed development area and will not be affected directly by the works, although the setting of the listed building should be taken into account.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Knowles House</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site number</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGR</td>
<td>SJ 8385 9906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HER no</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Type</td>
<td>Building (Site of)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designation</td>
<td>Map of c 1650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Green’s map, 1794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>A large house depicted on a map of c 1650.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>The site lies outside of the application area, and development is likely to have a negligible archaeological impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Manchester Workhouse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site number</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGR</td>
<td>SJ 8393 9924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HER no</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Type</td>
<td>Building (Site of)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designation</td>
<td>Green’s map, 1794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>The site of the Manchester Workhouse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>The site lies outside of the application area, and development is likely to have a negligible archaeological impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE REMAINS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

5.1.1 In total, 12 sites of archaeological interest were identified within the environs of the study area during the desk-based assessment (Fig 10), including a Listed Buildings (Site 10). However, none of these sites lie within the boundary of the proposed development, although the possibility that the Roman road between Manchester and Ribchester (Site 01) crosses the eastern edge of the site cannot be discounted.

5.2 CRITERIA

5.2.1 Where sites do not possess a statutory designation their value as a heritage asset has been determined with reference to the Secretary of State’s criteria for assessing the national importance of monuments, as contained in Annexe 1 of the policy statement on scheduled monuments produced by the Department of Culture, Media, and Sport (2010). These criteria relate to period, rarity, documentation, group value, fragility/vulnerability, diversity, and potential. The site identified within the Scheme Area (Site 01) has been considered using the criteria, with the results below.

5.2.2 Period: the archaeological remains within the boundary of the proposed development date largely to the nineteenth century, although there is some potential for fragmentary remains from the Roman period (Site 01).

5.2.3 Rarity: in broad terms, the fort represents the dominant type of site associated with the Roman occupation of the North West. Some of the associated settlements, cemeteries, and roads have also been excavated, although the remains of the road from Manchester to Ribchester has not been discovered within Manchester, and its precise route awaits confirmation. In this respect, any physical remains of the road would be considered to be rare.

5.2.4 Although there was a large number of terraced housing constructed in Manchester during the nineteenth century, it was a relatively short-lived type of structure in the city centre. Slum clearance from the end of the nineteenth century onwards meant that many of these types of properties were demolished. Therefore any buried remains of the foundations and cellars of these buildings are of potential interest to the archaeological record.

5.2.5 Documentation: the historical development of the study area from the early nineteenth century can be traced reasonably well from cartographic sources and entries in commercial trade directories. Further documentary research may furnish additional evidence, including more precise dating of the construction of the relevant buildings, although this is unlikely to alter the outline presented in this assessment.
5.2.6 **Group value:** the buried remains form a contemporary group of workers’ housing and small commercial units in the area.

5.2.7 **Survival/Condition:** the extent to which any buried archaeological remains survive beneath the modern ground surface is unknown. However, the intensive development of the study area during the nineteenth century is likely to have obliterated any surviving remains from earlier periods, although the foundations of nineteenth-century buildings may survive reasonably intact.

5.2.8 **Fragility:** any surviving buried remains may be adversely affected by development, dependent upon the nature of design proposals.

5.2.9 **Diversity:** the remains relate mainly to residential use from the nineteenth century.

### 5.3 SIGNIFICANCE

5.3.1 Table 3 shows the sensitivity of a site scaled in accordance with its relative importance using the following terms for the cultural heritage and archaeology issues, with guideline recommendations for a mitigation strategy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Examples of Site Type</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>Scheduled Monuments (SMs), Grade I and II* Listed Buildings</td>
<td>To be avoided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional/County</td>
<td>Conservation Areas, Registered Parks and Gardens (Statutory Designated Sites), Grade II Listed Buildings Sites and Monuments Record/Historic Environment Record</td>
<td>Avoidance recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/Borough</td>
<td>Sites with a local or borough value or interest for cultural appreciation Sites that are so badly damaged that too little remains to justify inclusion into a higher grade</td>
<td>Avoidance not envisaged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Local</td>
<td>Sites with a low local value or interest for cultural appreciation Sites that are so badly damaged that too little remains to justify inclusion into a higher grade</td>
<td>Avoidance not envisaged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Sites or features with no significant value or interest</td>
<td>Avoidance unnecessary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3: Criteria used to determine Importance of Sites**

5.3.2 Using the above criteria, and particularly rarity, survival/condition and potential, the proposed development area is likely to contain non-statutory remains of Low Local significance, although the presence of any surviving Roman remains would be of Local/Borough importance.
6. LIKELY IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT

6.1 IMPACT

6.1.1 Current planning policy guidance for the historic environment, embodied in PPS 5, advises that archaeological remains are a continually diminishing resource and should be seen as finite, and non-renewable resource, in many cases, highly fragile and vulnerable to destruction. Appropriate management is therefore essential to ensure that they survive in good condition, although recognising that change is inevitable. Thus, whilst it is considered right to provide protection and support for our past, this must be managed intelligently, with an appropriate balance of priorities and an understanding of what could be gained or lost. It has been the intention of this study to identify the archaeological potential of the Scheme Area, and assess the impact of the proposed development, allowing the advice of PPS 5 to be enacted upon.

6.1.2 Planning guidance also considers that loss affecting any designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification, and ‘substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance should be wholly exceptional’. The guidelines state that there should be a presumption in favour of the preservation of designated heritage assets, and that these policies should also be applied to non-designated sites of equivalent significance. Where the loss of part of a heritage asset is considered to be justified, the developer is responsible for recording and advancing understanding of the site.

6.1.3 The impact is assessed in terms of the sensitivity or importance of the site to the magnitude of change or potential scale of impact during future redevelopment scheme. The magnitude, or scale of an impact is often difficult to define, but will be termed as substantial, moderate slight, or negligible, as shown in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale of Impact</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td>Significant change in environmental factors; Complete destruction of the site or feature; Change to the site or feature resulting in a fundamental change in ability to understand and appreciate the resource and its cultural heritage or archaeological value/historical context and setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Significant change in environmental factors; Change to the site or feature resulting in an appreciable change in ability to understand and appreciate the resource and its cultural heritage or archaeological value/historical context and setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>Change to the site or feature resulting in a small change in our ability to understand and appreciate the resource and its cultural heritage or archaeological value/historical context and setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible change or no material changes to the site or feature. No real change in our ability to understand and appreciate the resource and its cultural heritage or archaeological value/historical context and setting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Criteria used to determine Scale of Impact
6.1.1 The interaction of the scale of impact (Table 4) and the importance of the archaeological site (Table 3) produce the impact significance. This may be calculated by using the matrix shown in Table 5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Value (Importance)</th>
<th>Scale of Impact Upon Archaeological Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional/County</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/Borough</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Local</td>
<td>Intermediate/Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5: Impact Significance Matrix*

6.1.2 The extent of any previous disturbance to buried archaeological levels is an important factor in assessing the potential impact of the development scheme. This is essentially unattested, although it seems probable that significant archaeological remains of the Industrial Period survive, namely the remains of workers’ dwellings. Conversely, the intensive development of the site during the nineteenth century will have had a substantial impact on any buried archaeological remains of earlier periods, and their potential is therefore considered to be low across the majority of the site. In particular, the detail provided by the Ordnance Survey map of 1850 shows the buildings within the study area that fronted onto Moreton (Mirabel) Street, Boundary (Breslyn) Street and Great Ducie Street all had basements, the construction of which will have destroyed any buried archaeological remains within their footprint.

6.2 **STANDING REMAINS**

6.2.1 The proposed development area contains one standing building, situated on the east side of Mirabel Street, which will be demolished as part of the proposed development. The building is of nineteenth-century origin, but appears to have been remodelled extensively, and is of negligible archaeological interest. It is thus considered that the proposed development will have a neutral archaeological impact on the standing remains on the site.

6.3 **SUB-SURFACE REMAINS**

6.3.1 Redevelopment of the site may have a direct negative impact on any buried remains that survive *in-situ* in the study area, involving their damage or destruction as a result of ground-reduction works. The buried archaeological remains that are likely to be destroyed include the foundations and cellars of nineteenth-century dwellings, although there is a low potential for the remains of a Roman road to survive.
6.4 **IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

6.4.1 Following on from the above considerations, the significance of impact has been determined as substantial based on an assumption that the extant building will be demolished, and that there will be substantial earth-moving works associated with the development. The results are summarised in Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Significance of Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roman road (Site 01)</td>
<td>Local/Borough</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nineteenth-century housing</td>
<td>Low Local</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td>Intermediate/Minor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 6: Assessment of the impact significance of development on each site*
7. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ARCHAEOLOGICAL MITIGATION

7.1 INTRODUCTION

7.1.1 Current legislation draws a distinction between archaeological remains of national importance and other remains considered to be of lesser significance. Those perceived to be of national importance may require preservation in-situ, whilst those of lesser significance may undergo preservation by record, where high local or regional significance can be demonstrated.

7.1.2 No sites have been identified within the proposed development area that may be considered as being of national importance and therefore merit preservation in-situ. However, the study area has a potential to contain in-situ buried remains of Low Local importance, which would require preservation by record should they be directly affected by redevelopment. The scope and details of any archaeological recording required in advance of redevelopment would be devised in consultation with the County Archaeologist for Greater Manchester, although it is likely that an archaeological watching brief maintained during construction work would be an appropriate mitigation strategy.

7.2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL WATCHING BRIEF

7.2.1 Any earth-moving works associated with the proposed development will have a negative impact on the sub-surface archaeological resource. In order to mitigate this impact, it is recommended that an archaeological watching brief is maintained during the earth-moving works. The watching brief should be targeted on those parts of the site closest to Great Ducie Street, where there is some potential to identify the fragmentary remains of the Roman road, and on the eastern side of Breslyn Street, to provide a record of the single-roomed cellars.
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