

RESEARCH REPORT SERIES no. 14-2012

THE OLD MANOR HOUSE, ROSEBERY ROAD, MANNINGHAM, BRADFORD, WEST YORKSHIRE AN HISTORICAL AND ARCHITECTURAL SURVEY

HISTORIC BUILDINGS REPORT

Allison Borden and Colum Giles



This report has been prepared for use on the internet and the images within it have been down-sampled to optimise downloading and printing speeds.

Please note that as a result of this down-sampling the images are not of the highest quality and some of the fine detail may be lost. Any person wishing to obtain a high resolution copy of this report should refer to the ordering information on the following page.

**THE OLD MANOR HOUSE
ROSEBERY ROAD, MANNINGHAM
BRADFORD, WEST YORKSHIRE**

AN HISTORICAL AND ARCHITECTURAL SURVEY

Allison Borden and
Colum Giles

NGR: SE 15070 34716

© English Heritage

ISSN 2046-9799 (Print)

ISSN 2046-9802 (Online)

The Research Report Series incorporates reports by the expert teams within the Investigation & Analysis Division of the Heritage Protection Department of English Heritage, alongside contributions from other parts of the organisation. It replaces the former Centre for Archaeology Reports Series, the Archaeological Investigation Report Series, the Architectural Investigation Report Series, and the Research Department Report Series.

Many of the Research Reports are of an interim nature and serve to make available the results of specialist investigations in advance of full publication. They are not usually subject to external refereeing, and their conclusions may sometimes have to be modified in the light of information not available at the time of the investigation. Where no final project report is available, readers must consult the author before citing these reports in any publication. Opinions expressed in Research Reports are those of the author(s) and are not necessarily those of English Heritage.

Requests for further hard copies, after the initial print run, can be made by emailing:

Res.reports@english-heritage.org.uk

or by writing to:

English Heritage, Fort Cumberland, Fort Cumberland Road, Eastney, Portsmouth PO4 9LD

Please note that a charge will be made to cover printing and postage.

SUMMARY

The Old Manor House probably originated in the early 16th century as a hall-and-cross-wing timber-framed house. Fragmentary evidence (comprising two arcade plates and part of the original roof structure) indicates that the main range, only one full bay of which remains, was aisled to both front and back and provided an open hall or, to use the local term, housebody, probably with a dais canopy at its west end. The details of the plan of this range are not recoverable. Its roof, however, survives in part and is of collar-rafter form, relatively unusual in this area, dominated by the use of king-post trusses. Internal evidence suggests that the housebody abutted a cross wing, but nothing of this structure survives. The suggested plan of the building – an aisled house of hall-and-cross-wing form – places it in a group of late-medieval houses of a well-established type in West Yorkshire, conventionally thought to represent the dwelling type adopted by the wealthiest yeomanry, especially in the Pennine region and associated with the wealth generated by engagement in the manufacture of woollen cloth. The owner and occupier of the Old Manor House in the medieval period has not been established.

The original house was modified in a number of phases. The first identifiable phase of modifications took place in the mid 17th century when the building was encased in stone on a hall-and-cross-wings plan, a floor was inserted into the hitherto open housebody to give a first-floor chamber, and the accommodation upgraded to give a number of heated rooms on two floors. These changes represent common post-medieval improvements in living standards and demonstrate that the Old Manor House continued to accommodate a family at the upper levels of yeoman society. A tentative identification of this family is offered by the returns of the 1672 Hearth Tax, in which John Denton is recorded as paying tax on five hearths: Denton was earlier shown on a map of 1613 as the occupier of land in the area of the Old Manor House.

The present form of the house was contrived in the 19th century. There is evidence that the dwelling was subdivided, perhaps when the adjacent new Manor House was built c.1830. The widening of Skinner Lane (renamed as Rosebery Road) c.1890, indicative of the township's transformation from a rural character to an intensively built-up quarter of Bradford, caused the loss of the lower end of the Old Manor House: this necessitated additions and alterations to the remaining structure. The house has been unoccupied for some decades and has fallen into poor condition, although there have been recent failed attempts to restore it as a family dwelling.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks are due to Bradford MDC's conservation officer, Jon Ackroyd, and the property owner, Rehman Aziz, for arranging access to the building. George Sheeran at the University of Bradford kindly shared his preliminary research on the Old Manor House. Work within English Heritage was a team effort, involving staff from the former Research and Standards, Planning and Development and the Conservation Departments. The project team consisted of researchers, including the authors (Allison Borden and Colum Giles) and Simon Taylor; Allan Adams, who helped survey the building and produced the archive drawings and reconstructions; and photographers, including Bob Skingle, Simon Taylor and Allison Borden. Ian Tyers from the Sheffield Dendrochronology Unit undertook sampling with assistance from the author. Staff liaising with the local authority included Trevor Mitchell

(Historic Buildings Inspector), Richard Jaques (Historic Buildings Architect), and Jon Kiely (Senior Quantity Surveyor). Adam Menuge, Allan Adams and Simon Taylor commented on earlier drafts of this report. Kate Bould collated the text and illustrations to produce the final report

ARCHIVE LOCATION

English Heritage Archive, The Engine House, Fire Fly Avenue, Swindon, SN2 2EH

DATE OF SURVEY

Survey was undertaken in August, September and November 2008

CONTACT DETAILS

English Heritage, 37 Tanner Row, York, YO1 6WP
Simon Taylor; (01904) 601915; simon.taylor@english-heritage.org.uk

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Documentary Evidence	1
Description	4
The Medieval House	5
The 17th-century Phase	8
Nineteenth-century Modifications	16
The Old Manor House in the 21st Century	18
NOTES	21
APPENDIX: RECORD DRAWINGS	23

Introduction

The Old Manor House lies in the former township of Manningham, now a suburb of Bradford, West Yorkshire. It lies on a minor road near the centre of the township and formed part of a village settlement, later subsumed within the expanding city. The Old Manor House is the oldest identified building in the township and now lies within a landscape shaped by 19th century expansion. It was investigated and recorded as part of research for an English Heritage Informed Conservation publication on Manningham, prompted by anticipated redevelopment and regeneration of this historically important suburb.¹ The resulting report is also intended to support the local planning authority's efforts to ensure the conservation of the building, which is currently in poor condition.

References to the Old Manor House in documentary sources are limited. In the absence of any substantial existing record, a Level 3 analytical record was undertaken, comprising measured drawings and photographs, as well as an account of the building's origins, development and use.² The scope of the report is limited to the standing structure, and does not address the potential survival of below-ground archaeological remains on the site.

Documentary Evidence

The ownership, occupation and structural development of the Old Manor House are only partially recoverable from easily accessible documentary sources, and the fullest evidence comes, unsurprisingly, from the later periods of the house's history. The family responsible for constructing the house in the later middle ages has not been identified. The building's modern name offers false prospects of copious manorial records, but as far as is known the house has never been the centre of a manor: the township was one of six dependencies within the Manor of Bradford in the middle ages.³ The date at which the house became known as the Old Manor House is not certain: an article in the Bradford Illustrated Weekly Telegraph of 16 March 1889 clearly states the lack of evidence for early manorial status but, without making clear the basis upon which it uses the term, it applies the name 'The Manor House' in its recounting of the building's 18th century history and illustrates the building with a caption giving it its present name.⁴ However, a little later, in 1896, the township's historian, William Cudworth, suggested that a local woolstapler, John Denby, gave the name 'Manor House' to the immediately adjacent villa, which he modernised, on its purchase in 1845.⁵ From this, the name of the Old Manor House might easily be applied, however erroneously, to what remained a substantial yeoman house, one of the earliest in the fast-changing township.

The earliest likely identification of the Old Manor House dates from 1613, when Robert Saxton surveyed his map of Manningham (see Figure 1).⁶ The map shows the whole of the township in detail, with field boundaries, roads and depictions of houses. Fields are distinguished by colour as either 'old' or 'new' copyhold or freehold, and notes on the map identify the uses of some fields as meadow, arable or pasture. The map is sufficiently accurate and comparable to later and modern maps to allow confident identification of the location of the Old Manor House, and Saxton included a conventional representation of a house, as a simple single-storeyed rectangle with door




Fig 1: Excerpt from Saxton's map (1613)

and chimney, on a copyhold plot labelled Lilliecrofte Meadowe, held either by Joh(n?) Denton or Nycholas Hollins. The doubt about identification revolves around the placing of the lettering of the two names: both closely about the depiction of the dwelling.

Support for the identification of John Denton, or much more likely his son or grandson, as the owner or occupier of the Old Manor House is provided by later documentation. In the 1672 Hearth Tax Returns for Manningham, John Denton, although not named as resident at the Old Manor House, was assessed for tax on five hearths. Only two people in the township were assessed on larger totals, indicating that Denton was one of the most substantial yeomen in the community.⁷ This picture of his status would be consistent with what we know about the Old Manor House in this period, in terms of both the likely provision of heating in the house itself and the house's relationship to other vernacular buildings of the region: discussion of the surviving house will demonstrate that the Old Manor House represented a standard of living enjoyed by the uppermost tiers of yeoman society.

The claims of Nicholas Hollins, however, cannot be discounted entirely. An account of the Old Manor House written in 1889 associates it with the Bolling family. Without citing its sources, the account states that the Old Manor House came into the possession of William Bolling of Chellow c.1726, when he bought it from a previous occupier named Smith. Bolling died in 1731 and the house passed c.1765 to William Bolling of Ilkley.⁸ No corroboration of this descent has been traced, but it is possible, although perhaps highly unlikely, that the surnames Hollins and Bolling were confused at some point, either in 1672 or later, and that Nicholas Hollins was indeed the occupier in the late 17th century.

The Old Manor House next appears in the documentary record in 1786, when it passed from the ownership of Benjamin Bartlett of Lambs Conduit Street, London (but then of Hertford) and his only son and heir Benjamin Newton Bartlett to Jonas Booth, a

stuffmaker of nearby Shipley Fields. The property is described as ‘all that messuage, dwellinghouse and tenement ... with one barn and other outbuildings ... and also all those three several closes ... commonly known by the ... names of the Lamb-Croft and the two Lilly crofts ... now in the possession, tenure or occupation of John Popplewell and his undertenants’.⁹ Cudworth states that Booth, ‘one of the old race of stuff-makers’, occupied a square house in Skinner Lane with a warehouse to the rear.

Booth died in 1837 and legal documents recording the sale in 1844 provides positive identification of this property with the Old Manor House.¹⁰ Houses, cottages and land were sold by Sarah Booth, widow, to John Denby of Manningham, woolstapler. The description of the property gives important information about changes made since 1786: the holding was described as ‘all that newly erected messuage or dwellinghouse ... lately in the occupation or tenure of Catherine Booth but now of the said John Denby and also all those five cottages or dwellinghouses in Manningham with one barn and other outbuildings ... four of which cottages were some time ago formed out of an ancient messuage or dwellinghouse ... and the remaining cottage out of the said barn’.¹¹ The document shows, first, that the modest villa adjacent to the Old Manor House had been built by 1844 and that it was then described as ‘newly erected’ (although quite how new the house was cannot be established definitively). It also clearly identifies the Old Manor House as ‘an ancient messuage’ and records its subdivision, presumably following the completion of the adjacent villa, into four cottages. Cudworth states that John Denby named his new dwelling the ‘Manor House’.¹² This is the first known association of the name with the location. From this date Booth’s former home, the ‘square house’, was presumably known as the ‘Old Manor House’.



Fig 2: Excerpt from Gott's map (1878)



Fig 3: 1889 sketch

Important visual evidence for the form of the house before major alterations of the late 19th century is provided by a map of 1878 and by a sketch published in the *Illustrated Weekly Telegraph* in 1889.¹³ The 1878 map (Fig 2) shows the plan of the house as a range lying on the west side of Skinner Lane, with a slight projection from the south elevation for the west cross wing and additions of minor structures against the west and north sides of the early building. The plan also shows that the house was then subdivided into two dwellings. The 1889 view (Fig 3) is what appears to be an accurate representation of the south elevation of the house, showing it to be of hall-and-cross-

wings form with two-storeyed wings flanking a central hall range, the low eaves of which indicate the former existence of an aisled structure in this part of the building. This drawing will be used in the discussion of the building's evolution.




Fig 4: Ordnance Survey map (1889-91)

The gradual assimilation of Manningham into the built-up area of Bradford in the late 19th century necessitated some changes to the ancient road pattern, some streets being widened and straightened to ease the movement of traffic. The Old Manor House suffered through the widening and re-alignment of Skinner Lane (re-named Rosebery Road⁴) c.1890, a change that caused the loss of the lower (east) end of the house. The Ordnance Survey map (Fig 4), surveyed 1889-91, shows the result:

a truncated dwelling abutting the newly created road.

The later history of the house is not known but its reduction in size, its subdivision and its location within an increasingly urban environment indicate a clear decline in status from the later decades of the 19th century. In recent years it has changed ownership on a number of occasions, has been unoccupied for an extended period, and has suffered structurally and aesthetically from the loss of early roof slates and internal alterations. There has been an active repair order on the property since 2002. In 2006, planning permission was granted for renovations to the Old Manor House and construction of a retail unit within its grounds, but at the time of survey (2009) the house remained unoccupied and in poor condition.

Description

The Old Manor House is a stone house, largely of 17th-century date, incorporating fragments of an earlier building, probably timber-framed and of aisled form, dating



Fig 5: Old Manor House from the south (DP065450 © English Heritage)

perhaps to the early 16th century (Fig 5). Substantial alterations were made to the house in the 19th century when its east end was demolished and when additions were made to the rear. Originally set in a rural location, perhaps the focus of a modest agricultural holding in Manningham township, the house has been surrounded by later buildings signifying the township's incorporation into greater Bradford during the city's growth as a major manufacturing centre.

The development of the house will be described in three phases: medieval, 17th century, and later (19th and 20th centuries).

The Medieval House

The medieval house survives in only extremely fragmentary form, but from the few remaining timbers an interpretation of form and context can be offered. The early timbers are located, apparently in situ, in the main range of the house in the area occupied by the principal room, the housebody. Here, two arcade plates span the length of the truncated housebody and support a collar-rafter roof (see Appendix, sections A-AI, B-BI).

The arcade plates run in an east-west direction, spanning between the later end wall of the house to the east and the 17th-century cross wing to the west. Keyed scarf joints (see sketch detail, Appendix) at the east end of both arcade plates indicate that the plates continued further east, into that part of the building which was lost when Rosebery Road was created (Figs 6, 7). Both plates show a consistent pattern of pegged mortices in their soffit: approximately one-third along their length from the west is a single-pegged



Fig 6: south arcade plate, view from north (DP071430 © English Heritage)



Fig 7: detail of scarf joint in arcade plate (DP071435 © English Heritage)

mortice for the tenon of a main post (see Appendix, a, b on plan) demarcating a bay division, and double-pegged mortices, angled on the side towards the post, took braces between post and plate. A further angled mortice at the east end of both plates, close to the scarf joints, shows the position of a brace down to a main post (c, d on plan), lost when the east end of the building was demolished. Each plate shows, on its upper side above the positions of the lost posts, shouldered dovetail seatings for tie-beams (a-b and c-d on plan). Bay divisions in this range were, therefore, marked by main posts and tie-beams, and the plates indicate that within the surviving building there was a full-width bay and, at the west end, a part bay, approximately one-third the length of the full bay.

The roof of the surviving bays has substantial rafters with pegged and jointed collars, notch-lapped to the rafters. This is likely to be the original roof structure. How this marries with the evidence of tie-beams at the main bay divisions is not clear, although it might be suggested that the tie beams, rather than indicating the position of main roof trusses, were used simply to maintain the relative position of the arcade plates and thus

guarantee structural stability. Collar-rafter roofs are not common in Pennine West Yorkshire, where king-post trusses are the dominant form in later medieval buildings. As a result of the lack of comparative examples, it is difficult to date the structure on stylistic grounds. Examination of the timbers of the medieval building failed to offer a good prospect of accurate dendrochronological dating and the most that might be hazarded is that the roof, and the building which it served, date from the late-medieval period, perhaps from the early 16th century.

The principal horizontal timbers in the main range have, up to this point, been described without explanation as arcade plates, with the clear implication that they formed part of an aisled structure. Two features of the plates support this deduction. First, the plates show no evidence in their soffits for timber-framed walls: they lack any mortices apart from those already noted for main posts and braces up from those posts. The plates, therefore, formed part of a structure which allowed the spaces (aisles) to north of the line b-d on plan and south of the line a-c to be undivided from the main area between them. The plates supported roof timbers at a point two-thirds down the roof slope which continued down beyond the plates to a low eaves at single-storey height. The present form of the roof, unaltered on the south side in this bay but slightly modified on the north side, preserves this arrangement and demonstrates how an aisled structure permitted a range of considerable depth to be housed beneath a simple roof form.

The second piece of evidence is inferential rather than conclusive. If the plates do not represent the remains of a medieval aisled structure, what might they be for and at what date might they have been employed? It is extremely unlikely that a house newly built in the mid-17th century, the date of the main stone phase at the Old Manor House, would have adopted what was by that period the antiquated and inconvenient form of an aisled building, and indeed the 17th-century alterations to the Old Manor House, it will be suggested, were specifically designed to remove the inconveniences of the aisled form and provide a dwelling of more modern form. The only other explanation for the plates is that they are re-used from an aisled building, but there is enough credible evidence, in particular the survival of the medieval roof supported on the arcade plates and the consistency of the evidence in both north and south plates, to be confident that the plates are in their original positions and that they clearly indicate that the Old Manor House originated as an aisled building.

Later continuity of use and their position within the complex demonstrate that the bays which survive in fragmentary form comprised the housebody of the dwelling, open to the roof and with low aisles to front and rear. Typological comparison, internal evidence, and the evidence of the 1889 sketch contribute to a confident interpretation of this room. Aisled houses are a recognised dwelling type in West Yorkshire, particularly of the Pennine region, and have been interpreted as the dwellings of the wealthiest yeomen, especially those engaged profitably in the woollen textile industry as co-ordinating manufacturers.¹⁵ In these houses, the central room, the housebody, was the principal living space, open from ground to roof and heated by a firehood at its lower end, the firehood backing on to a cross passage. At the Old Manor House, the bay containing the firehood and passage has been lost: it lay immediately to the east of the surviving housebody bay. However, the 1889 sketch shows that the 17th-century house

conformed to type in having a combined heating and entrance bay at the 'lower' end of the housebody. The sketch shows a chimney stack at the east end of the central range and a two-light mullioned and transomed window (a 'fire window') lighting the fire area in the housebody. Immediately to the east of the fire window is the principal entrance to the house, doubtless opening into a passage contained within the rebuilt east wing. The evidence of the sketch suggests strongly that the rebuilding of the house in stone in the 17th century preserved an earlier relationship between the housebody, its heating, and the entrance to the house. Most medieval Pennine aisled houses began as simple linear buildings or as houses of hall-and-cross-wing plan. No examples are known with cross wings at upper and lower ends of the central range. The 1889 sketch shows that the Old Manor House had two cross wings, but it is highly probable – although not provable – that the lower (east) wing was constructed during the 17th-century rebuilding in stone and replaced a linear continuation of the aisled main range. The existence of an upper cross wing in the medieval house can, however, be suggested on the basis of the evidence of the bay divisions in the housebody. The arcade plates within the housebody demonstrate that (leaving aside the fire area to the east) the main part of the room was of a single main bay (a-c, b-d on plan) with a short or part bay at the upper (west) end, to the west of the line a-b. There is no clear evidence that there was a closed truss between main and part bay (a-b on plan): it is probable, therefore, that the short bay formed an integral part of the room. The short bay terminates against the side wall of the later cross wing.

The question arises: was this part bay originally of full length, truncated on the construction of the cross wing in the 17th century? Or was there always a short bay at the upper end of the housebody? To suggest that the bay was originally of full length implies that the housebody was originally of two full bays, reduced in size when the west cross wing was built in the 17th century. While structurally possible, this appears unlikely: there are no known examples of aisled houses with a two-bay housebody. Other medieval Pennine aisled houses offer an explanation for the incorporation of a short bay at the upper end of the room. In medieval houses, especially those of the wealthy levels of society, the upper end of the main room was regarded as the superior end, the place where the head of the household sat. It conventionally provided a dais, sometimes with a dais bench and sometimes with superior finish to timberwork. In some houses, particularly those of the gentry, the status of the dais end was emphasised by a canopy, sometimes of textiles but in other houses of timber, often painted. Some of the Pennine aisled houses, although built by yeomen, had a canopy at the upper end of the housebody in imitation of the style of life of gentry families.¹⁶ In some of these houses, the dais occupied a short bay at the upper end of the housebody, and the end wall of the room was formed by the side wall of a cross wing. This wall was used to support the base of a canopy which rose to a head-beam supported on the arcade plates at the junction of main bay and short bay. These known forms, therefore, make it likely that the short bay at the Old Manor House was a dais bay, that this bay had a canopy rising to a head beam indicated by the shouldered dovetail seatings on the line of the notional bay division a-b, and finally, and by inference and in the absence of any other means of supporting it, that the canopy sprang from the side wall of an original cross wing. Casting some doubt on this interpretation is the total absence of recognisable structural evidence for such a cross wing. In other houses where a cross wing formed part of a

medieval aisled house, timbers from the wing were retained in later casings in stone, but at the Old Manor House there are no remains and the evidence for the wing is purely inferential.

The plan of the Old Manor House may, on the evidence cited, be tentatively reconstructed (Fig 8). The building was of hall-and-cross-wing form, with an aisled main range providing an open housebody, of one full bay and a short dais bay, heated by a firehood backing on to a cross passage at its lower (east) end. The lower end of the building, below the passage, was, in all likelihood, a linear continuation of the aisled range and may have given service rooms or a workshop or both. At the upper end of the house was a cross wing, but it is not clear what form this took: it probably provided a parlour on the ground floor and the best chamber on the first floor. The house was, therefore, substantial, far above the minimum standard of living, and it is probable that the builder was a prominent yeoman, perhaps with a substantial agricultural holding but perhaps more likely engaged profitably in the woollen textile industry, the mainstay of the local economy in the later middle ages.

The final aspect of the medieval building which requires discussion is the nature of its building materials. What survives of the internal frame (the arcade plates and rafters) is of timber, but what of the external walls? Only inferential evidence may be brought to bear on this question. The present stone walls and the features within them (the windows) date credibly from a mid-17th century rebuilding of the medieval house: there is nothing to suggest that they are substantially earlier. Had the medieval house been of stone, it might be expected that later improvement would have been less sweeping in its nature, with the retention of original masonry in both main range and cross wing. The apparent absence of medieval masonry may be taken, therefore, as the best evidence for the idea that the Old Manor House was built as a timber-framed structure, doubtless of typical Pennine form with heavy close-studded walls with, perhaps, some decorative diagonal bracing in the cross wing.¹⁷

The 17th-century Phase

A number of major modifications were made to the Old Manor House during the 17th-century. The house was rebuilt in stone, probably to a similar plan in the area of the housebody and upper cross wing but with the rebuilding of the lower end as a second cross wing (later lost when Rosebery Road was created). The aisled form of the central part of the house was retained, with low eaves to the front elevation, but internally the medieval housebody was ceiled to give a single-storey ground-floor room and a low chamber over.

The date at which the house was rebuilt in stone may be estimated by a combination of stylistic comparison and scientific dating. Features of the building – masonry, windows, fireplace, form of roof trusses – make an early/mid-17th-date of construction likely, and this is supported by dendrochronological analysis of roof timbers in the wing, which on structural grounds is known to have been built at the same time as the main range. A number of core samples taken from the wing indicate felling dates of timbers between 1617 and 1649, making a mid-17th-century date of construction most likely.¹⁸






Fig 8: reconstructed plan, isometric view and cut-away drawing of the medieval house (© English Heritage)



Fig 9: south elevation, with cross wing to left and housebody to right (© English Heritage)

The 17th-century house survives substantially in the area of the housebody and upper cross wing (Fig 9). The cross wing projects slightly from the main range and is gabled to north and south, and the main range has, on the south front, a long stone-slate roof rising from the low eaves above the housebody window. The masonry of both ranges is of shallow-coursed sandstone with gritstone quoins to the corners of the wing, and the wing has shaped kneelers on the main elevation (Fig 10). The bonding of the masonry at the junction of main range and wing indicates that the two parts were rebuilt at the same time. The windows, where they survive in part on the south front, have gritstone surrounds and simple hood moulds. On the south elevation ground-floor windows were



Fig 10: west wing, west wall, showing quoined masonry and external stack (© English Heritage)



Fig 11: west wing, south wall: formerly mullioned and transomed window (© English Heritage)

mullioned and transomed, but the first floor was lit by simple mullioned windows. The surrounds indicate that mullions and transoms were deeply recessed rather than flush with the wall face (Fig 11).

The rebuilt house provided a ceiled housebody in the central range and heated parlours and chambers and other rooms in the two wings. The open housebody of the medieval house, with its suggested dais canopy, was altered by the insertion of a ceiling to give a



Fig 12: the housebody, view to west into parlour wing (DP071447 © English Heritage)

single-storey room. The ceiling is formed of spine beams, stop-chamfered at their west ends, and plain unchamfered joists (Fig 12). The arcade posts of the aisled structure were removed to clear space, although - certainly to the front, perhaps also at the rear - the area of the former aisle was included as part of the room. Perpetuating the likely layout of the medieval room, the housebody was heated by a fireplace or firehood at its lower (east) end, the fire area being lit by the two-light mullioned and transomed window shown on the 1889 sketch. This end of the room was lost on the truncation of the building when Rosebery Road was created. It is likely that the housebody continued to provide the principal living room of the house, albeit in modernised form, just as it had done in the medieval period: in the absence of an identifiable kitchen elsewhere in the house in its 17th century form, it is probable that the housebody also retained the principal cooking hearth.

The upper (west) wing of the house was divided from the central range by a timber screen formed of planks, or planks and muntins, held at top and bottom in grooves in horizontal beams (section B-B1, Appendix). The upper beam between housebody and wing on the ground floor has pegholes for two heavier studs, one of which survives. It is likely that these studs formed doorposts providing two doorways in the screen wall, one at the south end, and one at the north end.

The upper wing was of three bays, at least as defined by the ceiling beams on the ground floor. The southern two bays formed a parlour heated by an externally projecting stack



Fig 13: west wing, parlour, showing fireplace on west wall (DP071440 © English Heritage)

on the west wall: the fireplace survives and has a straight-arched head within a massive triangular lintel and a moulded surround over lintel and jambs (Figs 13, 14). The single ceiling beam is stop-chamfered at both ends. It is likely that a timber screen divided the parlour from the northern bay of the wing: a re-set ceiling beam in this area has a groove in its soffit for such a screen and may well have been part of this dividing wall. The northern bay provided a small unheated room to the west and a stair to the east. The western room has received many later modifications but may originally have been a small unheated parlour or service room. Within its western wall is a timber lintel for a wooden-mullioned window (Fig 15), possibly re-set in its present position but if in its original site indicating that the superior fenestration of the south elevation, where ground-floor windows had deeply recessed stone mullions and transoms, was not carried round to the sides and rear of the house. The stair area, in the north-east corner of the wing immediately beside the connecting door to the housebody, was lit by a small rectangular window, now blocked, in the wing's north wall (Fig 16). The original stair has been replaced, but its position, close to the housebody, is a well-established plan feature giving easy access between the main living room and the chambers.

The first floor of the wing replicated the plan of the ground floor, with a larger heated chamber to the south and the stair and a smaller room to the north. At this level,



Fig 14: west wing, parlour, detail of fireplace (DP071442 © English Heritage)



Fig 15: lintel of timber-mullioned window, west cross wing, west wall north end (© English Heritage)

however, the division is centrally placed, giving bays of equal size to north and south of the main roof truss. The tie-beam of the truss has a groove in its soffit for a plank screen, the groove ending to allow a doorway connecting the stair landing with the main chamber. This room is heated by a fireplace in the west wall: the fireplace surround has a simpler finish to that of the parlour fireplace, having a plain broad chamfer. The fireplace lintel has been removed (Fig 17).



Fig 16: west wing, north wall, blocked raised window for original stair (© English Heritage)

The wing is roofed in two bays with a substantial central king-post truss. The truss has heavy principal rafters, three raked struts, and a brace from king post to ridge. The joints are all unpegged apart from those at the junction of king post and principal rafters (Fig 18).

The lower (east) end of the house took the form of a second cross wing, the only evidence for which is the apparently accurate sketch of 1889. It is not clear whether the lower wing was constructed at the same time as the masonry casing of the main range but it is possible that it was built later, perhaps in the late 17th century, as an expansion of a former linear end retained in the first phase of 17th century rebuilding.

The 1889 sketch of the house before the loss of its east end (See Figure 3) allows a speculative reconstruction of the plan and function of the east wing. The wing included the main entrance to the house: a door with shallow-arched head lay adjacent to the firewindow of the housebody and doubtless led into a passage behind the reredos of



Fig 17: west wing, south chamber: detail of fireplace (DP071424 © English Heritage)



Fig 18: west wing, central roof truss, view from north (DP071455 © English Heritage)

the housebody's firehood in the standard local pattern of 'hearth passage' plans. The inclusion of the entrance and passage demonstrates that the wing took within its plan one half of the bay which, in its other half, contained the firehood heating the housebody in the medieval building. This subsuming of the entrance and passage within a wing, while not unknown, is unusual and may, in the case of the Old Manor House, be connected with the retention in the 17th-century rebuilding of the aisled form of the main range.

As well as providing the entrance and cross passage, the wing clearly had heated rooms, probably on both ground and first floors, for the sketch shows two projecting stacks, each with two chimney pots, on the east side wall. The ground-floor window on the south front was mullioned and transomed, indicating that the room which it lit was a parlour, probably smaller than that in the west wing. The heated ground-floor room at the rear of the wing was probably a third heated parlour, for the chimney stack shown on the 1889 sketch is not so large as to indicate the presence of a kitchen internally. The household's main cooking activities may, therefore, have remained in the housebody. It is possible that the parlour in the east wing acted as a specialised dining room, leaving the west wing parlour as the principal private withdrawing room and the sleeping room for the head of the family. At first-floor level, the east wing provided superior accommodation, for the sketch suggests the existence of two heated chambers, certainly by the 19th century and probably also in the 17th century.

Two aspects of the 17th-century house remain to be discussed: the provision of service rooms and the chamber over the housebody. The south front of the house was lined with the main living rooms, and service rooms must, therefore, have been positioned at the rear of the house. If cooking was, as suggested, undertaken still in the housebody, service rooms are likely to have been provided close by at the rear, possibly within a partitioned-off rear aisle or outshut or in an expanded service wing.

Later rebuilding in this area has prevented certain identification of the nature of any service rooms here.

The chamber over the housebody was newly created on the rebuilding of the house



Fig 19: Old Manor House from north-east: the aisled structure of the medieval house was retained in the 17th century rebuilding in the area of the housebody: the roof sweeps down to single-storey height to both north and south (© English Heritage)

in stone. The form of the medieval aisled house was, however, perpetuated in part: despite the removal of the arcade structure, the front aisle was contained within the housebody and the sweeping roof line of the medieval house was retained on both north and south roof slopes in the surviving housebody bay (Fig 19). Because the south wall of the housebody was not raised to two-storey height, the newly-created chamber was contained within what was, effectively, the roof space, akin to an attic. It provided adequate headroom only in the central area and was clearly a room of low status. If a firehood heated the housebody below, the chamber must have been unheated, and may have been used principally as a storeroom, a common use for housebody chambers in local houses. The 1889 sketch, however, suggests that heating was later provided, for the chimney stack serving the central range has two chimney pots, one certainly serving the housebody fireplace and the other probably for a fireplace in the chamber. How the chamber was lit is not clear. A dormer window in the south roof slope provides lighting today, but on the evidence of its stonework this appears to date only from the 19th century (Fig 20). It is likely that it replaced an earlier means of lighting the room. Also unclear is the means of access to the chamber. Present-day access from the west wing is a later contrivance, created by inserting a doorway in the wing's side wall (necessitating the removal of part of the timber wall and the cutting of the wing's wall plate). It is probable, therefore, that the



Fig 20: detail of dormer window lighting housebody chamber (© English Heritage)

room was reached from the east wing.

In summary, the 17th-century house was a substantial yeoman house providing sophisticated accommodation (Figure 21). The main living room continued to be the housebody, but two heated parlours, one of which may have been a dining room, and two or perhaps three heated chambers demonstrate high standards of comfort, privacy and specialisation. The probable location of the main cooking hearth in a kitchen is another indication of advanced planning and increased specialisation in room use. The form of the house was heavily influenced by the partial retention of the medieval aisled building, but despite this the resulting accommodation and plan compared closely to houses built from new in this area in the same period. The evidence indicates that the Old Manor House might well have been the dwelling of John Denton, assessed for tax on five hearths in 1672:¹⁹ the house was certainly the home of one of the most substantial yeoman families of the township.




Fig 21: the house in the late 17th century (redrawn from 1889 sketch © English Heritage)

Nineteenth-century Modifications

A number of changes were made to the Old Manor House in the 19th century and the house's status was affected by the construction, or expansion, of an adjacent dwelling, which came to be known as the Manor House; by subdivision into two cottages; and by the loss of the east end of the dwelling on the occasion of the widening of Rosebery Road.

The township's 19th-century historian, William Cudworth, states that the adjacent villa was purchased in 1845 and given the name of the Manor House (see above and Fig 22). The legal documents recording its purchase also indicate that the Old Manor House had,

Fig 22: the Manor House, with the Old Manor House to the right (© English Heritage)



by that date, ceased to be a dwelling of any prestige. It is likely that the construction of the Manor House, perhaps a decade or more before its sale, led to the abandonment of the Old Manor House by the family which owned the estate, and in 1844 the house was occupied as four cottages. Subdivision necessitated the insertion of new doorways to at least some of the individual cottages: doorways with monolithic jambs were inserted into the north and south walls of the west wing. Internal alterations were also required: a new kitchen was created at the rear of the west wing, where a fireplace was added to the west wall, causing the blocking of an earlier window. The later loss of part of the house, together with the removal in modern times of some features, makes it impossible to determine the precise configuration of the house in its subdivided form.

An internal change which appears to be inconsistent with the status of the house as

Fig 23: west wing, view to north-east showing inserted stone stair with iron balusters (DP071458 © English Heritage)





Fig 24: large stair window in west wing, north wall (© English Heritage)

a divided dwelling was the replacement of the original stair in the west wing with a larger stair in the same position (Fig 23). A new and larger stair window was inserted in the north wall of the wing, above the earlier smaller window which was blocked at the same time (Fig 24). The stair itself has stone steps with a rounded-nose profile, a rounded handrail, and a balustrade with alternate straight and wavy iron balusters of slender section. The balusters are not convincingly of 19th century date, but the stair itself, and its stair window, are credibly of this date, but later in the century rather than earlier. It is possible that this alteration was made either very late in the period of the house's subdivision, or perhaps even after the loss of the east end of the house, when the reduced Old Manor House may have reverted to single occupation.

The major change to the house in the late 19th century was the loss of its eastern end on the occasion of the widening of Rosebery Road c.1890. The cross wing and part of the housebody range shown on the 1889 sketch were removed at this date. A new east wall was constructed to close the truncated building; the wall includes a re-set 17th-century doorway. The main range retained its aisled form at the rear, but the north wall was rebuilt to provide a larger outshut behind the former housebody (Figs 25, 26). This alteration may have caused the re-positioning at a higher level of the north arcade plate of the medieval structure, but the medieval roof was retained.

The Old Manor House in the 21st Century

The most recent phase of work at the Old Manor House dates from the first decade of the 21st century. Unauthorised work on the building was carried out in 2002. Roughly half of the stone slate roof was lost in 2003 and was replaced by a tarpaulin in an attempt to keep the building watertight. Planning permission was granted for changes to the property in 2006.

All the exterior structures attached to the west wall of the building have been demolished, the interior has been stripped of early finishes and a modern fitting out was begun. A breeze-block wall has been inserted to separate the north aisle and outshut from the main range and the housebody and parlour of the cross wing have been made effectively one large room by the removal of the original timber screen walls.

Modern stud work has replaced most of the 17th-century interior partitions, modern plaster finishes have gone onto some walls and ceilings and a new staircase north of the king-post truss runs up to a new loft space in the north bay of the upper cross wing.



Fig 25: east wall, built on the truncation of the house c.1890 (DP065452 © English Heritage)




Fig 26: the Old Manor House, isometric view showing the form of the house after the loss of the east end (© English Heritage)


At the time of writing the building is unoccupied and for sale. During a visit in August 2008, broken windows and open doorways had been secured; however, there was evidence of a fire in the roof of the upper cross wing and areas of dry and wet rot in different areas of the building. At the time dendrochronological sampling was carried out in December 2008, much of the tarpaulin covering the roof had either shifted or been shredded by the weather and the building's condition had deteriorated significantly. At the time of writing, swift action needs to be taken to ensure that what remains of the Old Manor House is conserved.



NOTES

- 1 Now published as Simon Taylor 2010 *Manningham: character and diversity in a Bradford suburb* (Swindon: English Heritage)
- 2 English Heritage. *Understanding Historic Buildings: A Guide to Good Recording Practice* (Swindon: English Heritage, 2006), 14.
- 3 Taylor 2010, 7. The name the Old Manor House may date only from the early 19th century, applied to the building when the immediately adjacent diminutive villa, the Manor House, was constructed c.1830
- 4 *Illustrated Weekly Telegraph*, 19 March 1889
- 5 William Cudworth, *Manningham, Heaton and Allerton (Townships of Bradford) Treated Historically and Topographically* (Bradford: W. Cudworth, 1896), 122-3
- 6 Robert Saxton, *A plat of all the landes within the Towneship of Manninggum wherein the old land freehold is colored with red and the old land coppihold with grene the new land coppinghold with yelowe and the new land frehoulde lefte white the old land on the East side of the towne being colored with grene and red is meadow arable the fields old land siting on the weste side the towne is arable and pasture taken by me Robert Saxton An^o : Dm 1613.* (Bradford Libraries, Archives and Information Service)
- 7 David Hey, Colum Giles, Margaret Spufford and Andrew Wareham, eds. *Yorkshire West Riding Hearth Tax Assessment Lady Day 1672* (London: British Record Society, 2007), 271-272. The average number of hearths in Manningham houses was 1.8. Of the 119 houses assessed, only five were rated at 5 or more hearths: three houses had 5 hearths, one house had 6 and one house had 7.
- 8 *Illustrated Weekly Telegraph*, 19 March 1889
- 9 West Riding Registry of Deeds, CS372/561
- 10 William Cudworth, *Manningham, Heaton and Allerton (Townships of Bradford) Treated Historically and Topographically* (Bradford: W Cudworth, 1896), 121-3
- 11 West Riding Registry of Deeds, OY/664/649
- 12 Cudworth 1896, 122
- 13 Charles Gott, *Bradford Street Improvement. Rhodes and the Corporation* (Bradford: S. O. Bailey Lithographers, 1878). *Illustrated Weekly Telegraph*, 19 March 1889
- 14 Presumably named after the prominent Liberal politician Archibald Primrose, 5th Earl of Rosebery
- 15 RCHME *Rural Houses of West Yorkshire, 1400-1830* (London: HSMO, 1986), 27-37.
- 16 RCHME 1986, 30-1

- 17 See RCHME 1986, 9,28 for the style of medieval timber-framing in West Yorkshire
- 18 Ian Tyers, Old Manor House, Manningham, Bradford: dendrochronological analysis of oak timbers: scientific dating report (English Heritage, Research Department Report no 4-2010)
- 19 The number of hearths assessed for the Hearth Tax (five) is not consistent with the numbers indicated by the 1889 sketch, which shows at least eight chimney pots: if the identification of the house with John Denton is correct, some hearths must have been added after 1672, the date of the Hearth Tax assessment

APPENDIX: RECORD DRAWINGS







ENGLISH HERITAGE RESEARCH AND THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

English Heritage undertakes and commissions research into the historic environment, and the issues that affect its condition and survival, in order to provide the understanding necessary for informed policy and decision making, for the protection and sustainable management of the resource, and to promote the widest access, appreciation and enjoyment of our heritage. Much of this work is conceived and implemented in the context of the National Heritage Protection Plan. For more information on the NHPP please go to <http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/professional/protection/national-heritage-protection-plan/>.

The Heritage Protection Department provides English Heritage with this capacity in the fields of building history, archaeology, archaeological science, imaging and visualisation, landscape history, and remote sensing. It brings together four teams with complementary investigative, analytical and technical skills to provide integrated applied research expertise across the range of the historic environment. These are:

- * Intervention and Analysis (including Archaeology Projects, Archives, Environmental Studies, Archaeological Conservation and Technology, and Scientific Dating)
- * Assessment (including Archaeological and Architectural Investigation, the Blue Plaques Team and the Survey of London)
- * Imaging and Visualisation (including Technical Survey, Graphics and Photography)
- * Remote Sensing (including Mapping, Photogrammetry and Geophysics)

The Heritage Protection Department undertakes a wide range of investigative and analytical projects, and provides quality assurance and management support for externally-commissioned research. We aim for innovative work of the highest quality which will set agendas and standards for the historic environment sector. In support of this, and to build capacity and promote best practice in the sector, we also publish guidance and provide advice and training. We support community engagement and build this in to our projects and programmes wherever possible.

We make the results of our work available through the Research Report Series, and through journal publications and monographs. Our newsletter *Research News*, which appears twice a year, aims to keep our partners within and outside English Heritage up-to-date with our projects and activities.

A full list of Research Reports, with abstracts and information on how to obtain copies, may be found on www.english-heritage.org.uk/researchreports

For further information visit www.english-heritage.org.uk

