

**APPLICATION REPORT – LBC/349489/22**  
**Planning Committee – 8<sup>th</sup> July 2026**

Registration Date: 22 July 2022  
Ward: Shaw

Application Reference: LBC/349489/22  
Type of Application: LBC

Proposal: Partial rebuild of the chapel walls, formation of salvaged stone storage enclosure within the footprint of the chapel. Restoring the existing graveyard to the front of the chapel and Refurbishment/Repair of 19thC iron railings. Erection of New Permanent Gable wall to Sunday School/Chapel. Replacement to Entrance Door Sets to Sunday School and Internal works including repairing damaged timber floors, repairs to Escape Staircase

Location: Saint Paul's Methodist Church, Rochdale Road, Shaw, OL2 8AD

Case Officer: Stephen Gill  
Applicant: Mr. Mohammed Hussain-Ahmed  
Agent: Mr. Don Hobson

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 This Listed Building Consent application is referred to Planning Committee for determination at the request of the Assistant Director Planning, Transport & Housing Delivery because of the level of concern surrounding these applications in the local community.
- 1.2 The site is located on the northern side of Rochdale Road and is flanked by Chapel Street to the east, King Albert Street to the north, and Crompton way is located to the west. The site comprises the Grade II listed St Paul's Methodist Church. The original chapel was built in 1863 and designed by architect James Simpson. The Sunday School to the rear was built in 1871 The former nursery build was a 20<sup>th</sup> century addition. The site also encompasses a previously used car park which is accessed from Rochdale Road and a further car park to the rear, accessed from King Albert Street.

## **2. THE PROPOSAL**

- 2.1 The application proposes the partial reconstruction of the Church and Sunday School buildings, including the reinstatement of a collapsed gable wall, the formation of a new permanent gable, and repairs to the structural and architectural elements. The scheme

also includes internal adaptations, a new access arrangement, and the formation of a landscaped peace garden within the existing graveyard to the front of the chapel and Refurbishment/Repair of 19thC iron railings.

### 3. PLANNING HISTORY

- PA/343832/19 - Part retrospective application for the demolition of a building previously forming part of the church- Granted- 21/11/2019
- PA/027596/91 - Removal of condition 3 in respect of lift enclosure on PA/027262/91 - Approved 11 July 1991
- PA/027262/91 - New entrance and lift enclosure with internal alterations - Approved 23 May 1991
- PA/001486/75 - Conversion of hall into church and hall - Granted- 16/04/1975

### 4. RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

- 4.1 The Places for Everyone (PfE) Plan and related documentation took effect and became part of the statutory development plan on 21 March 2024.
- 4.2 The PfE Plan must now be considered in the determination of planning applications, alongside Oldham’s Joint Core Strategy and Development Management Development Plan Document (Local Plan), adopted November 2011, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- 4.3 The following policies are relevant to the determination of this application.

#### Joint Development Plan Document

- Policy 24 - Historic Environment

#### Places for Everyone

- PfE Policy JP-P2 – Heritage

#### National Planning Policy Framework

### 5. CONSULTATIONS

Historic England	Historic England welcomes the submission of the Heritage Statement and Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment, noting these provide a comprehensive understanding of the site, including the extent of burials.
------------------	---

	They acknowledge that whilst the proposals would result in harm, the consolidation and repair of the remaining structure, retention of salvaged materials, and restoration of the graveyard and railings would deliver heritage benefits. It is regretted that the chapel is not proposed to be rebuilt. Historic England advise that the LPA should weigh harm against public benefits in accordance with the NPPF and recommend conditions to secure detailed construction, stone reuse, and repair work
Growth Lancashire	Conclude that the development would result in substantial harm to a Grade II Listed Building. Comments are discussed in detail within the report.
Shaw and Crompton Parish Council	Object due to inadequate access and parking
Greater Manchester Archaeological Advisory Services	No objection subject to conditions. Comments discussed in detail within the report.
Victorian Society	Objects to the proposals, raising concerns that further loss of historic fabric would reduce the likelihood of any future reconstruction of the chapel. They consider the scheme would effectively result in the loss of the building and advise that the application falls short of NPPF requirements due to insufficient information.
Historic Buildings and Places	Object to the proposals, advising that the proposals would consolidate the loss of the historic chapel and fail to meaningfully restore its significance. Concerns are also raised regarding the design of the proposed gable, the impact on townscape, and the potential clearance of graves. They conclude that the scheme is unacceptable in heritage terms.

## 6. PUBLICITY AND THIRD-PARTY REPRESENTATIONS

- 6.1 In accordance with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, and the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement, the application has been advertised by neighbour notification letters, display of a site notice, and publication of a press notice.
- 6.2 In response 196 representations have been received objecting to the development.
- 6.3 The grounds of objection are summarised below:
- 6.4 **Highways, Access, and Parking**
- Access/egress too close to busy crossroads with traffic lights and accident history.

- Surrounding streets too narrow for increased traffic flow.
- Risk of congestion, queuing, and restricted emergency access.
- Insufficient spaces for projected visitor numbers (some estimates up to 300–500 people).
- Loss of existing on-street parking for residents and local businesses.
- Concerns about overspill parking onto surrounding residential streets.
- Increased vehicle movements leading to congestion in Shaw centre.
- Additional air pollution and noise from traffic.
- Disruption to bin collections and service vehicles due to blocked roads.

Highways matters are not material to the Listed Building application.

#### 6.5 **Heritage and Listed Building Concerns**

- Harm to the Grade II listed building's historic fabric and setting.
- Preference for full restoration of the church to its original form and use.
- Opposition to demolition or alteration of original stonework and features.
- Perception that Shaw's heritage and architectural character are being eroded.

Heritage matters are discussed in detail in section 7 of this report.

#### 6.6 **Residential Amenity Impacts**

- Noise nuisance and disturbance from large gatherings and events.
- Loss of privacy to neighbouring properties.
- Increased general activity impacting quiet residential streets.

The above matters are not material to the Listed Building application.

#### 6.7 **Other Planning Considerations**

- Potential impact on local ecology.
- Possible contamination risks from ground disturbance.

The above matters are not material to the Listed Building application.

#### 6.8 **Religion & Disturbance to the Burial Ground**

- Perceived use of the site as a mosque or Islamic centre.
- Potential Loss of Christian heritage.
- Concerns that a Christian church and burial site would be repurposed for a different faith.
- Concerns about future use or expansion of a mosque:
- Potential inter-faith conflicts.
- Potential disrespect to the existing (Christian) burial ground.
- Belief that the site contains over 400 graves; strong opposition to disturbance.
- Calls for graves to remain undisturbed and for site to be treated as consecrated ground.

#### 6.9 **Other Concerns**

- Allegations of underhanded or non-transparent dealings.
- Claims of misinformation or contradictory plans submitted by the applicant.

- Frustration over perceived lack of meaningful public consultation from the Council.
- Desire for the building to serve wider community functions, particularly for youth.

## ASSESSMENT OF THE PROPOSAL

### 7. IMPACT TO DESIGNATED HERITAGE ASSET

- 7.1 Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that in considering whether to grant planning permission for development that affects a listed building or its setting, 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.
- 7.2 In this case the 'Development Plan' is the Joint Development Plan Document (DPD) which forms part of the Local Development Framework for Oldham. The PfE Plan must also be considered in the determination of planning applications, alongside Oldham's Development Plan.
- 7.3 Development Plan Policy 24 states (in summary) that the Council will protect, conserve, and enhance heritage assets and their settings which adds to the borough's sense of place and identity. PfE Policy JP-P2 (in summary) states that development proposals affecting designated and non-designated heritage assets and/or their settings will be considered having regard to national planning policy
- 7.4 Paragraph 210 of the NPPF outlines that in determining planning applications, local planning authorities should consider:
- a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
  - b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities and economic vitality; and
  - c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.
- 7.5 Paragraph 212 emphasises that great weight should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets, with the degree of weight increasing with the asset's significance. This applies regardless of the level of harm (substantial or less than substantial).
- 7.6 Paragraph 215 states that where a proposal would lead to *less than substantial harm*, this harm must be weighed against the *public benefits* of the proposal, including securing the asset's optimum viable use.
- 7.7 In considering the weight to be given to heritage assets within the planning balance, the judgment in *Forge Field Society v Sevenoaks District Council* [2014] EWHC 1895 (Admin) is particularly relevant. At paragraph 45 of the judgment, Lindblom LJ confirmed that:

*“There is a statutory presumption, and a strong one, against granting planning permission for any development which would fail to preserve the setting of a listed building or the character or appearance of a conservation area.”*

- 7.8 This reinforces the need for significant weight to be afforded to the conservation of designated heritage assets, in line with the statutory duties under Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and section 16 of the NPPF.

#### *Background*

- 7.9 By 2016, despite its listed status, the building had deteriorated significantly and was placed on the Historic England *Buildings at Risk Register*. Early that year, part of the roof collapsed, confirming longstanding structural concerns. Emergency works were carried out to address immediate public safety risks, including partial wall removal and the installation of external scaffolding. However, the building remained unstable, and ongoing movement placed further strain on the temporary supports. In 2019, structural professionals concluded that substantial demolition was the only viable option to eliminate the risk posed by the building.
- 7.10 The work included reducing the height of the walls to 1 metre above ground floor cill level due to the dangerous structural condition. This caused a high level of harm to the significance of the listed building, but support for the works was predicated on Historic England's (HE) expectation that the chapel would be rebuilt. The demolition was carried out under the *Ecclesiastical Exemption (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (England) Order 2010* and planning application ref: PA/343832/19.
- 7.11 Although the demolition caused substantial harm to the listed building's significance, no alternative means of stabilisation were identified. Listed Building Consent was not required due to the Ecclesiastical Exemption. While the demolition was regrettable, it was justified on grounds of structural safety and public protection.
- 7.12 The applicant purchased the site in 2023 and has advised that, at the time of purchase, conveyancing confirmed there was no legal requirement to fully reinstate the chapel building, beyond safeguarding the retained structure and preserving existing stone and building components. Following acquisition, a site clearance exercise was undertaken during which the west wall collapsed, resulting in further harm to the Listed Building. The agent for the application has also advised that the applicant was not aware of the building's listed status at the time of purchase. Notwithstanding this, the applicant has confirmed that remedial works will be undertaken, including the reconstruction of the west wall, which is addressed later in this report.

#### *Proposed Works*

- 7.13 This application proposes to bring the building back into use, which is a significant benefit of the scheme. The scheme includes constructing a new permanent stone gable wall on the south elevation of the former chapel. This wall will be built on a steel frame

supported by concrete pad foundations and helical piles. The external face will feature new ashlar stonework with moulded coping stones and a pediment that reflects the original architectural character. The wall is purposefully set forward to protect the surviving internal plaster mouldings and decorative features from further deterioration. A void would be created between the new and existing walls to allow for future maintenance, with secure internal access and a temporary decorative gate to facilitate this.

- 7.14 The west gable wall of the chapel, which as set out above collapsed as part of previous clearance work is to be reinstated up to 1 metre above ground level, using salvaged stone reclaimed from the original structure. This section would replicate the original detailing and align with the retained east wall in terms of height and appearance. Consolidation and repair of existing quoins and rubble masonry would also be carried out where necessary.
- 7.15 Repairs and alterations are also proposed to the surviving Sunday School building. Several door openings would be reinstated, including the replacement of an original timber entrance door with a frameless glass door set within an aluminium frame. Two new double doors are proposed, one replacing an unauthorised UPVC window and stone infill, and the other reinstated in a historically appropriate position, using designs that match the original. Internally, a previously removed staircase, likely dismantled during earlier demolition works, would be reconstructed using surviving elements such as the newel posts, handrail, and balustrades. The internal hardwood tongue-and-groove floor, partially removed due to damp issues, will require improved ventilation prior to reinstatement.
- 7.16 Externally, the graveyard to the front of the chapel would be cleared of overgrown vegetation, debris, and rubbish. All graves and gravestones would be retained and protected throughout. The area is to be repurposed as a community peace garden. The cast iron railings enclosing the graveyard would be repaired, refurbished, and refinished to reflect their original appearance. Additionally, new wrought iron infill panels are proposed within the chapel's former window openings to secure the structure, designed to complement the historic railings.
- 7.17 New copings, lead flashings, and rainwater goods would match the materials and profiles of the original features. Moulds would be taken of decorative elements, such as friezes, lozenges, and arch mouldings, prior to encapsulation, enabling future interpretation or reproduction if needed. Perished lime plaster would be removed and repointed using Natural Hydraulic Lime.
- 7.18 The applicant states that the overall design philosophy reflects a conservation-led approach focused on consolidating the site's historic significance rather than pursuing full reconstruction.

#### *Heritage Harm*

- 7.19 Historic England (HE) and Growth Lancashire (GL), the Council's conservation advisors, have been consulted and did raise initial concerns regarding the application

for two principal reasons. Firstly, concerns relate to the nature of the proposed scheme. Secondly, insufficient information was initially submitted to enable a robust assessment of the impact on the significance of the Grade II listed buildings, including the absence of a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) and a lack of clarity regarding the extent and phasing of works.

- 7.20 HE's concerns originate from the 2019 works, when structural professionals concluded that substantial demolition was necessary to address the chapel's dangerous condition. Demolition was undertaken under the Ecclesiastical Exemption (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (England) Order 2010, reducing the chapel walls to approximately 1 metre above ground floor cill level. Whilst this resulted in a high level of harm to the significance of the listed building, HE supported those works on the expectation that the chapel would subsequently be rebuilt.
- 7.21 In subsequent responses, HE advised that, whilst the current proposals represent an improvement on earlier iterations, the application lacked sufficient supporting information, including both a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) and an Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment. Heritage consultees raised concerns that the proposals represent a consolidation approach following earlier substantial harm, without provision for full reinstatement of the chapel.
- 7.22 Whilst these concerns are noted, the current application must be assessed on its own merits. The partial demolition pre-dates the involvement of the current applicant, who was not party to those works and is not subject to any binding requirement to reconstruct the chapel. The LPA cannot require full reconstruction and must therefore determine the acceptability of the scheme as submitted.
- 7.23 In response, the applicant submitted a HIA in May 2026, prepared by Keystone Heritage, which assesses the significance of the heritage assets and the impact of the proposed works.
- 7.24 The HIA identifies that the principal source of harm arises from the introduction of a new gable to the former chapel. This would alter the historic plan form and spatial character of the surviving ruin, resulting in some loss of evidential and historical value. However, the HIA concludes that this harm is moderated by the sensitive design approach, including the use of compatible materials, retention of surviving fabric, and the structural necessity of the intervention.
- 7.25 The HIA also identifies a range of heritage benefits, including the partial reconstruction and stabilisation of the chapel using salvaged stone, the repair and retention of historic railings, and the restoration of the burial ground as a publicly accessible 'peace garden'. These measures would enhance the condition, legibility and communal value of the site. Internal works to the Sunday School building are similarly assessed as beneficial.
- 7.26 Overall, the HIA concludes that the proposals would give rise to less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed buildings, principally arising from the intervention within the chapel.

- 7.27 Both HE and GL have been re-consulted on the submitted HIA. HE welcomes the submission of a comprehensive HIA and Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment, noting that these provide a detailed understanding of the site's significance and the extent of potential below-ground remains, including additional burials.
- 7.28 Whilst HE reiterates that the absence of proposals to rebuild the chapel is regrettable, they acknowledge that the scheme includes positive measures, including the safeguarding and reuse of masonry and the consolidation of the remaining structure, which would assist any future reconstruction.
- 7.29 HE advises that the LPA should weigh the identified harm against the public benefits of the proposal, giving great weight to the conservation of the designated heritage asset in accordance with the NPPF.
- 7.30 GL acknowledge that the HIA provides a comprehensive account of the site's history and the proposed works.
- 7.31 However, GL advise that the HIA does not adequately justify its conclusion that the development would result in less than substantial harm. In particular, it does not sufficiently address the implications of the chapel's previous collapse in 2019 or fully engage with the requirements of paragraph 214 of the NPPF, including consideration of whether the chapel should be rebuilt.
- 7.32 GL note that, when considered in isolation, the proposals may give rise to less than substantial harm, with some heritage benefits arising from the restoration of the burial ground and the limited safeguarding of surviving fabric. However, they advise that such an approach would effectively confirm the permanent loss of the chapel, which was accepted previously in 2019.
- 7.33 When assessed in its full context, including the absence of proposals to rebuild the collapsed chapel and the lack of clear justification under paragraph 214 of the NPPF, GL conclude that the development would result in a substantial level of harm to the significance of the listed building.
- 7.34 Accordingly, GL advise that the LPA must assess whether the identified substantial harm is outweighed by substantial public benefits, or whether the criteria set out in paragraph 214(a–d) of the NPPF have been met.

#### *Archaeological Harm*

- 7.35 The site is located within an area of known archaeological potential associated with the historic chapel and its graveyard. In particular, there is clear evidence that burial activity has taken place both within the external graveyard and potentially within the footprint of the later chapel building itself.
- 7.36 The application is supported by a Desk Based Archaeological Assessment (May 2026) (DBA). The DBA draws upon historic mapping, archival sources, burial records and site inspection to establish the archaeological baseline and assess potential impacts. The

Greater Manchester Archaeological Advisory Service (GMAAS) has been consulted and confirms that the submitted DBA is robust and agrees with its conclusions.

- 7.37 The DBA identifies that earlier burial ground associated with the original Bethel Chapel (shown on mapping from 1845) was partially built over by the later Methodist chapel (1881). As a result, there is potential for previously unrecorded burials, including within the southern and western parts of the chapel footprint, in addition to those known within the surviving graveyard. Burial records indicate the presence of both in-ground interments and burial vaults, although the precise locations of some of these remain uncertain.
- 7.38 GMAAS advises that the proposed groundworks, including the construction of the new south gable, clearance of internal material, and preparation of surfaces, have the potential to disturb both known and unknown burials, as well as earlier structural remains. As such, archaeological investigation and mitigation will be required.
- 7.39 In order to address this, GMAAS recommends that a programme of further archaeological works is secured by condition. This would include an initial phase of archaeological evaluation, followed where necessary by detailed excavation, recording, and appropriate treatment of any remains identified.
- 7.40 GMAAS welcomes the proposed restoration of the burial ground as a 'peace garden', subject to appropriate safeguards to ensure that gravestones and ledger stones are protected during clearance works. The recording of inscriptions is encouraged as a means of enhancing public understanding and community engagement with the site.
- 7.41 Subject to the imposition of a suitably worded planning condition securing a phased programme of archaeological investigation, recording, and post-excavation analysis, the development is considered acceptable in archaeological terms. The development would therefore accord with the requirements of the NPPF in respect of conserving and recording heritage assets.
- 7.42 The DBA concludes that the development would cause less than substantial harm to non-designated buried archaeology. GMAAS have not questioned this conclusion.

#### *Harm vs Benefits*

- 7.43 As established in *Forge Field Society v Sevenoaks District Council* [2014] EWHC 1895 (Admin), any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset must be given considerable importance and weight in the planning balance.
- 7.44 GL conclude that the development would result in substantial harm to the significance of the Grade II listed building. In such circumstances, as set out above, NPPF paragraph 214 requires that consent should be refused unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm, or that the alternative criteria (A-D) set out within that paragraph are met.

- 7.45 It is also accepted that the development would result in less than substantial harm to non-designated archaeological remains. In accordance with paragraph 215 of the NPPF, this harm must also be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
- 7.46 The identified public benefits of the scheme include:
- The repair and partial restoration of a severely damaged Grade II listed building, securing its long-term retention;
  - The reintroduction of the building's use as a place of worship, delivering social and community value;
  - The creation of a publicly accessible 'peace garden', providing communal and heritage benefits; and
  - Economic and social benefits associated with construction activity and ongoing use.
- 7.47 The identified less than substantial and substantial harm is afforded significant weight in the planning balance. It is noted that the concerns raised by HE and GL appear to be influenced, in part, by the extent of previous demolition works and the absence of proposals to fully reconstruct the chapel.
- 7.48 However, those earlier works predate the current applicant's involvement, and there is no legal requirement for the applicant to re-build the chapel in full. On that basis, the LPA must assess the application as submitted and cannot require the full reconstruction of the chapel. The assessment is therefore focused on whether the current proposals represent an acceptable and justified approach to the conservation of the remaining asset.
- 7.49 As set out above, since acquiring the site, the applicant has undertaken clearance works during which a further section of the western wall collapsed, increasing the level of harm. The current proposals however include remedial measures to stabilise and reconstruct the western wall as described above.
- 7.50 In considering the planning balance, significant weight is given to the current condition of the site. The building is in a very poor state of repair, is not publicly accessible, and currently provides no viable use, detracting from the character and appearance of the area.
- 7.51 The proposed scheme would secure the stabilisation, partial reconstruction and viable reuse of the listed building and associated Sunday School. It would significantly improve the condition and appearance of the site, secure its long-term occupation, and deliver meaningful public access and community benefit. When considered in the context of the building's current condition, it is concluded that the substantial harm identified would be outweighed by the substantial public benefits arising from the scheme.
- 7.52 On this basis, the proposal is considered to comply with the requirements of Chapter 16 of the NPPF, Policy JP-S2 of Places for Everyone, and Local Plan Policy 24.

## **8. RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIONS**

- 8.1 Many of the concerns raised through public representations, particularly those relating to heritage matters, have been addressed within the main body of this report.
- 8.2 Concerns relating to access, highway impacts, parking, residential amenity, ecology, and land ownership are not material to the determination of this application, which relates solely to works to a Listed Building. The assessment of this application focuses on heritage considerations. These matters have been considered separately under the associated full planning application (reference FUL/349488/22).
- 8.3 Concerns regarding potential disturbance to graves or burial areas have been considered by GMAAS, and further planning conditions relating to the submission of additional archaeological investigation works will ensure that this matter is dealt with thoroughly. This application does not propose to remove any buried remains from the site.

## **9. CONCLUSION**

- 9.1 In conclusion, the principle of development is considered acceptable for the reasons set out above.
- 9.2 The proposals have been assessed against the relevant legislative tests, including Sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, and the heritage policies set out in the NPPF and the Core Strategy
- 9.3 The development would result in harm to the significance of the Grade II listed building and non-designated archaeological remains. This harm has been carefully considered and is afforded considerable weight in accordance with the NPPF. However, the scheme would deliver substantial public benefits, including the repair, stabilisation and viable reuse of a heritage asset in a poor and deteriorating condition, alongside enhanced public access and community use. Subject to the recommended conditions, including archaeological mitigation, these benefits are considered to outweigh the identified harm.
- 9.4 The proposal is therefore considered to comply with the requirements of Chapter 16 of the NPPF, together with relevant local and strategic planning policies. Accordingly, the application is recommended for approval, subject to conditions.
- 9.5 On balance and having given considerable importance and weight to the preservation of the designated heritage asset, it is concluded that the proposed development is acceptable and in accordance with the development plan and national planning policy when read as a whole.

## 10. RECOMMENDATION

10.1 The application is therefore recommended for approval subject to the imposition of conditions referenced below:

1. The development must be begun not later than the expiry of THREE years beginning with the date of this permission. REASON - To comply with the provisions of Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
2. The development hereby approved shall be fully implemented in accordance with the Approved Details Schedule list on this decision notice. REASON - For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and specifications.
3. No development groundworks shall take place until the applicant or their agents or successors in title has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological works. The works are to be undertaken in accordance with a Project Design (PD) submitted to and approved in writing by Oldham Council. The PD shall cover the following:
  1. Informed by the North West Historic Environment Research Framework, a phased programme of site investigation and recording to include:
    - i. Archaeological evaluation through test-pits/trenches/strip-map areas
    - ii. (informed by i) A scheme for the detailed excavation and recording of structural remains identified, including graves, and for the removal and reburial of human remains at risk (subject of a new detailed PD)
  2. A programme of post excavation assessment to include:
    - i – analysis of the site investigation records and finds
    - ii - production of a final report on the significance of the heritage interest recorded.
  3. Deposition of the final report with the Greater Manchester Historic Environment Record.
  4. Dissemination of the results commensurate with their significance.
  5. Provision for archive deposition of the report and records of the site investigation.
  6. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the approved PD.

REASON: In accordance with NPPF Section 16, Paragraph 218 - To record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible.

4. No above-ground works shall take place until details and samples of all external facing materials have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include:
  - Samples of all stone, including type, colour and texture;

- Full details of mortar mixes; and
- A sample panel of proposed pointing.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To ensure the use of appropriate materials in the interests of retaining as far as possible the character and significance of the Listed Building in accordance with Oldham Local Plan Policy 24 and Places for Everyone Policy JP-P2.

5. Notwithstanding the submitted plans, no works relating to the reconstruction of the collapsed or reduced-height chapel walls shall take place until the proposals have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted details shall include:

- Elevations and sections;
- Details of stone coursing, bonding and jointing;
- The use, selection and placement of salvaged stone; and
- Construction and finishing details informed by site clearance and investigation works.

The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To ensure a sympathetic reconstruction of historic fabric in accordance with Oldham Local Plan Policy 24 and Places for Everyone Policy JP-P2.

6. No development shall commence until a detailed method statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The method statement shall include:

- Construction methodology for the new gable wall;
- Measures to protect retained historic fabric, including internal plasterwork;
- Details of the removal of existing lime plaster;
- Repointing methodology;
- Methodology for repair of existing railings and gates; and
- Details of the storage, handling and protection of salvaged stone.

The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved method statement.

REASON: To safeguard the historic fabric of the Listed Building during construction works in accordance with Oldham Local Plan Policy 24 and Places for Everyone Policy JP-P2.

7. Notwithstanding the submitted plans, no above-ground works shall take place until detailed drawings and specifications of the following have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

- Wrought iron infill panels;
- Boundary railings and gates (including temporary gates);

- External doors and frames;
- Ventilation grilles; and
- Rainwater goods.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To ensure all external features are appropriate to the character and significance of the Listed Building in accordance with Oldham Local Plan Policy 24 and Places for Everyone Policy JP-P2.

8. Prior to the installation of any new flooring, details of the proposed flooring works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submission shall include:
  - Materials and construction details; and
  - Justification for replacement where existing flooring cannot be retained and repaired.

The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. REASON: To safeguard historic fabric and ensure appropriate replacement works in accordance with Oldham Local Plan Policy 24 and Places for Everyone Policy JP-P2.

9. No works to the staircase within the Sunday School shall take place until detailed drawings and a method statement for its repair and reinstatement have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. REASON: To ensure the appropriate conservation of an important internal feature in accordance with Oldham Local Plan Policy 24 and Places for Everyone Policy JP-P2.
10. Prior to the commencement of works to the existing entrance structure, details of the proposed repair and refurbishment shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. REASON: To preserve the character and appearance of the Listed Building in accordance with Oldham Local Plan Policy 24 and Places for Everyone Policy JP-P2.
11. No works to the burial ground area shall take place until a detailed scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include:
  - Hard and soft landscaping details;
  - Treatment and protection of gravestones and ledger stones;
  - Surface materials; and
  - Boundary treatments where applicable.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To ensure the setting of the Listed Building is preserved and enhanced in accordance with Oldham Local Plan Policy 24 and Places for Everyone Policy JP-P2.

# SITE LOCATION PLAN (NOT TO SCALE)

Ordnance Survey (c) Crown Copyright 2022. All rights reserved. Licence number 100022432

