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Introduction

Design and Access Statement (DAS) are required for applications for major development, as defined in article 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure (England)) Order 2015; as well as for applications for listed building consent.

This Conservation plan including DAS includes an explanation of the design principles and concepts that have been applied to the proposed works, and how they have taken account of:

(a) the special architectural or historic importance of the building;

(b) the particular physical features of the building that justify its designation as a listed building; and

(c) the building’s setting.

It also explains how issues relating to access to the building have been dealt with.

The documentation and description of the renovation and redevelopment of the site has been broken down into four parts. This in part reflects the phased construction of the original development but also the applicant’s approach to the renovation which will be phased. This is to assist development finances but also to reflect the immediate need for brewery and office accommodation for the business.

The four parts are as follows:

- The 1823 Spinning Mill, the original building on the site and on the southern side bound by Greenacre street and Woolme Lane; this is likely to be the last building to be renovated.

- New Mill, the second mill on the site built parallel to the 1823 mill on the north side. This phase actually includes a spinning mill, engine and beam houses as well as a chimney and warehouse. This part is likely to be developed first as it houses the brewery, which is temporarily located in the Weaving Shed.

The third significant component is the Weaving Shed, with the largest floor plate this is the part of the site that has been altered most and has less historical merit than the rest of the site. As part of the Weaving Shed is providing ancillary accommodation to the spinning mill as well as a new 3 storey fire exit this area is included within the new mill.

The gatehouse, boundary walls and external works are included within the final section and this will be undertaken in parallel with the New Mill development.

For each part there is a set of as existing plans and elevations. A set of proposed plans showing the final layout and a set of plans showing the extent of alteration, demolition, including fixtures, ground floor drainage and excavation for foundations required for remedial works. Also there is a set of proposed elevations that combine the proposed with a description of the alterations.

In addition for each part there is a conservation plan, this identifies on an item by item/ floor by floor basis the extent of alteration, repair or demolition with an indication of impact on historic character, need for approval and other requirements.

To support the application there are technical reports.

These are site specific and refer to the site in its entirety. These include:

- a transport assessment provided by Croft Transport Solutions with input from LCC;

- a phase one ecology study undertaken by Urban Green;

- a flood risk assessment undertaken Flood Risk Consultancy Ltd;

- an archaeological building investigation undertaken by Oxford Archaeology North. This was not commissioned by the applicant but has been used from the outset as a reference identifying those parts of the building and fittings that are most significant.
Applicant

Holmes Mill is a grade II listed mill which has recently been purchased by Emporia Leisure Limited, which has an extensive portfolio of historic listed properties. Ensuring heritage assets ‘pay their way’ is the most viable way to ensure that costly historic assets receive the maintenance, management and upkeep they require.

The properties are managed by James’ Places a North West based chain of hotels, entirely owned by Emporia Leisure limited. James Places currently employs over 300 full and part time staff and the success is largely dependent on the character and charm of the properties coupled with matching customers high expectations for service and comfort.

It is expected that Holmes Mill will create another 100 full and part time jobs once the whole development has been completed.

Consultation

The future of the mill has been much discussed between the building owner and the local authority over the last six months. There have been meetings on site with planning and conservation officers on 2nd July and 5th of August 2015 and a meeting was held on the 9th of September 2015 with RVBC senior management including Marshal Scott Chief Executive, Stuart Hirst, Leader of the Council, Colin Hirst, Head of Regeneration & Housing and John Macholc Head of Planning Services.

At the meeting the ambition and challenges of the site were discussed.

Stanton Andrews Architects is a North-west architecture practice with nearly 10 years’ experience in the care, repair and adaptation of historic buildings and places, together with the design of new buildings for sensitive sites. Our approach to conservation is as a catalyst for regeneration and renewal.

Our positive, proactive approach goes beyond conservation and repair; we use our understanding of historic buildings to guide and support new interventions that enhance and sustain successful places. This approach has made us trusted by a wide range of clients, including hotel chain, charities and homeowners.

Recent listed building projects include the recently extended Grade 2* listed Mitton Hall, the Grade 2* listed Huntingdon Hall, the Grade 2 listed Falcon Manor Hotel in Settle and Eaves Hall Hotel in West Bradford as well as other smaller listed properties.

Since our beginnings in 2006, we have taken a sustainable approach to design and conservation - not least through the re-use of existing buildings. We pay particular attention to selecting locally-sourced materials that have low embodied energy, and incorporating energy-efficient technologies into existing and new buildings.

Stanton Andrews Architects operates a Quality Assurance System. We are an RIBA Chartered Practice.

![Mitton Hall and Eaves Hall](image)

Mitton Hall and Eaves Hall, two successful listed properties within the Emporia Leisure portfolio
Planning

In assessing the planning merits and acceptability of any particular, it is necessary to consider the relevant policies of the Development Plan together with other material considerations, which include national policy as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and other supplementary planning guidance.

Local Planning Policy

Planning authorities have a duty under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to designate as conservation areas any "areas of special architectural or historic interest, the character of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance".

Where it is considered that an area has special architectural or historic interest, a conservation area character appraisal is a way of recording this. The Clitheroe Conservation Area was designated in October 1973 and extended and given the then status of Outstanding Conservation Area in December 1979. A Conservation Area Appraisal undertaken in 1994 and then again in 2005. This recommended the extension of the conservation area to include Holmes Mill which at that time was unlisted. This was confirmed in 2007.

Designation of a conservation area provides the foundation for the application of conservation policies set out within the Ribble Valley Local development Framework which enables any change to be controlled.

In dealing with all the conservation areas in the Borough the following adopted Core Strategy policy apply:

POLICY ENV16

Within conservation areas development will be strictly controlled to ensure that it reflects the character of the area in terms of scale, size, design and materials. Trees, important open spaces and natural features will also be protected as appropriate. The desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area will also be a material consideration in deciding development proposals outside the designated area which would affect its setting or views into or out of the area.

POLICY ENV17

Applications for planning permission within or affecting conservation areas will be required to be accompanied by sufficient additional information in the form of sketch elevations of the proposed buildings, means of access and (where appropriate) landscaping of the site.

POLICY ENV18

There will be a presumption in favour of the retention of buildings which make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of a conservation area. Consent to demolish any building in a conservation area will not be granted unless a suitable detailed planning application for the re-use of the site has been approved and a contract let for the carrying out of the works of redevelopment.

In addition the following listed building policies apply

POLICY ENV19

Development proposals on sites within the setting of buildings listed as being of special architectural or historic interest which cause visual harm to the setting of the building will be resisted. In assessing the harm caused by any proposal the following factors will be taken into account:

i) The desirability of preserving the setting of the building
ii) The effect of the proposed development on the character of the listed building
iii) Any effect on the economic viability of the listed building
iv) The contribution which the listed building makes to the townscape or countryside
v) The extent to which the proposed works would bring substantial benefits to the community including economic benefits and enhancement of the environment.
Planning

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

The NPPF was adopted in March 2012 and sets out the Government’s planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. As per Chapter 2 of the Framework and Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, it is to form a material consideration in planning decisions.

Sustainable development is broadly defined in Paragraph 7 of the Framework as having three dimensions; namely economic, social and environmental. The golden thread running throughout the NPPF is the Government’s presumption in favour of sustainable development whereby proposed developments which correctly balance the requirements of economic, social and environmental issues should be granted permission unless there are overriding reasons that would suggest that permission should be withheld.

Section 12 of the NPPF sets out national guidance for ‘Conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Paragraph 131 establishes the obligations of planning authorities in making a decision on determination of applications for works to a heritage asset.

PARAGRAPH 131

In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;

the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality;

and

the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

The NPPF also introduces the concept of proportionality in assessing the effect of development proposals on the significance of “designated heritage assets.” This assists in making the judgment also required by the NPPF (paragraphs 133 and 134) of whether there will be harm to the asset and if so whether it constitutes “substantial” or “less than substantial harm.”

PARAGRAPH 133

Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefit that outweighs that harm or loss.

PARAGRAPH 133

Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.
Planning

Appraisal

At the moment there is an urgent need to find suitable, long term alternative uses that will offer the building complex a sustainable future. In the current economic climate there is little or no public sector finance available for capital funding and even less available to provide a realistic income that would secure the upkeep and maintenance of the building.

This strongly points to the need for private sector funding for almost all of the buildings. While it may be possible to consider this in relation to the retention of many of the buildings it is difficult to see how this could be achieved without some form of significant redevelopment or intervention over part of it. In coming to a judgment on whether any part of the site could realistically be considered there has to be an assessment (within the terms set out in the NPPF) of the heritage significance of the site as a whole including the relative significance of its constituent elements.

All of these considerations implicitly raise the question of whether all of the elements of the "designated heritage asset" that comprises Holmes Mill contribute equally to its significance.

While listed and of face value of equal importance to the remainder of the structure, there must be serious doubts that the former Weaving Shed has the same value and therefore significance as the remainder. The extensive alterations of the 1980s to this part of the complex have severely undermined the integrity and value of this part of the structure and equally importantly to the collective value and significance of the whole site.

Of note is that the proposals put forward in this application are an viable economic use of the entire site. The impact on the Spinning Mill, New Mill and the Gatehouse are largely limited to alterations to provide vehicular access and serving or internal alterations required to adapt the building to comply with the various regulations (BRets, Health and Safety, Asbestos and The Workplace Regulations) that were not present at the time the building were built. More significant alterations are required to the Weaving Shed and its redevelopment.

Conclusion

In reaching this conclusion it is acknowledged that one of the reasons for listing Holmes Mill was that it was considered (see the English Heritage "Reasons for Designation") that

"the mill complex comprises a range of buildings relating to the textile manufacturing process. This includes spinning blocks and engine houses of differing dates that afford the opportunity to study the evolutionary development of these specific building types."

There must be a serious question about whether the retention of the Weaving Shed in its entirety and in its present form makes the same contribution to the heritage significance of the whole site as the remainder of the buildings.

Whatever their physical condition they nevertheless meet the basic criterion of being part of a representative group of buildings that illustrate the evolution of a Lancashire cotton mill through the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. While it could be argued that the Weaving Shed in its current form represents a late and ultimately unsuccessful attempt to adapt the building to late twentieth century manufacturing processes it is difficult to see any real aesthetic, heritage or technical merit in its retention as it is.
Holmes Mill

Holmes Mill is situated on Greenacre Street, on the southern fringe of Clitheroe. It comprises two spinning mills founded in 1823 and c. 1830 by John Taylor of Showbridge, and Edmund, John & James Mercer & David Murray.

The complex was extended in the mid-nineteenth century with the addition of a Weaving Shed and two-storey warehouse to the New Mill. A new steam power plant was also added to New Mill in 1910. The complex was designated a Grade II listed building in March 2013.

All of the principal component buildings survive intact, although the Weaving Shed and warehouse were refurbished to leave only the external walls in the late twentieth century. The complex comprises two three-storey spinning blocks, one with attached hoist tower and privy block, three engine houses, one boiler house with flue to a reduced-height chimney, the external walls of a Weaving Shed and reduced-height warehouse, a further single-storey warehouse and covered yard, and a gatehouse adjacent to the Greenacre Street entrance.

A building investigation, commensurate with an English Heritage Level 2/3-type survey, was carried out by Oxford Archaeology and forms part of this application. It identified four phases of construction within the complex.

The primary phase comprised the erection of a 14 bay, three-storey mill, in limestone rubble and of non-fireproof construction, with a projecting privy tower. An attached four-storey engine and boiler house, incorporating a fireproof stair tower and loading loop hole, may represent an early addition to the eastern gable. The timber ceiling beams were carried on fluted cast-iron columns, the majority of which survive in situ. The works to this building are covered within this conservation plan.

A second three-storey spinning block was erected under separate ownership c. 1830, and was of similar construction, but had an attached beam engine house and single-storey boiler house attached at the south-eastern corner. A chimney, placed between the two mills, was rebuilt in brick prior to 1848, but retains what appears to be an earlier sandstone base. The northern, later mill was extended in 1853, with the addition of a Weaving Shed and integral two-storey warehouse.

The New Mill power plant was replaced in 1910, with the addition of a cross-compound horizontal engine, supplied by Clayton, Goodfellow & Company, of Blackburn, and placed within a new engine house, with a boiler house erected on its southern side to accommodate Lancashire boilers. The engine survives intact, in its original condition, complete with a rope drum on a secondary motion shaft, and associated drive and line shafts within New Mill. Many original features of the engine house, including gas-light fittings and decoratively painted wall plaster are also well-preserved. The fluted columns within the two main structures are possibly unique, but form part of spinning blocks which are typical of the expansion of the factory system in the first part of the nineteenth century.

The extant power plant retains one of only five in situ steam engines in Lancashire, and the last surviving engine by the renowned firm of Clayton, Goodfellow & Company. Whereas other engines have all been fully or partially restored, the engine at Holmes Mill survives in its original condition.

The decoratively painted plasterwork of the engine house and many aspects of the associated power transmission system survive in situ, including sections of line shafting for two hoists and bevel gear and top end bearings for the primary and upright drive shafts.
Weaving Shed - History

A Weaving Shed was added to the northern side of New Mill in 1853. It was of irregular plan form, narrowing along its western face, where it followed the line of Woone Lane, and also dog-legged around a two-storey, eight bay warehouse block that was incorporated into its south-eastern corner. Both were built, in limestone rubble, similar to that of the earlier mill. The majority of the western external wall of the Weaving Shed was coarsely rendered, with triangular sandstone voussoirs, in the gable of each bay, below the parapet roof. A similar vent survives at the northern end of the east wall.

A privy, which were probably housed in a narrow structure against Mearley Brook, is shown on mapping up to 1912. This structure, and the two-storey warehouse are depicted in an 'as existing' elevation accompanying the deposited building plans for the proposed extension of 1915.

The Weaving Shed original roof, cast-iron columns and warehouse was also largely removed during the major late-twentieth century remodelling, leaving only a single storey of its southern and eastern walls extant with the scar of the saw-toothed, multi-span roof remaining visible in the eastern and western walls.

Weaving Shed - Condition

The warehouse currently houses the relocated brewery and provides a workshop and general storage, including vehicles, for the hotel chain.

The shed is weather-tight but the roof and walls are un-insulated, and the roof and wall cladding is starting to deteriorate and in need of replacement if not imminently, soon.

The structural engineer has flagged up some concerns regarding the structural stability of the masonry walls and the lack of dry restraint at their head, they appear to act as cantilevers. The stability of the walls would improve significantly if an intermediate floor was installed.
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Weaving Shed - Use

The Weaving Shed is currently single storey, floor to underside of trusses is 6m with the ground floor level 2m below Woone Lane. It is approximately 54m long and 47m at its widest point and the current apertures total less than 5% of the building envelope.

Finding a ‘dumb’ use of the space was considered initially this included self-storage and B1/B industrial. These however were discounted as they didn’t respect the historic character of the rest of the site or its location within Clitheroe town centre conservation area.

It was therefore agreed that a people place needed to be included to ensure that the site became a strong visitor attraction, underpinned by a core business, the brewery.

It is envisaged that the eastern half of the Weaving Shed, facing the main road into town be converted into two retail units of 345 and 429sqm with a double height entrance between to provide access to the below ground west half. The gym/leisure complex then continues over the top of the retail on a new first floor structure.

This creates a use that benefits from its location as well as creating a dialogue between the users inside and its surrounding context.
Weaving Shed - Amount + Scale

The area available for the development has been largely fixed as there is minimal scope for extension.

The amount of accommodation has been increased by the inclusion of a new floor to allow the space to be converted from general storage to retail and gym/leisure use.

The scale of the development will change for the residents on Woone Lane as the roof has been lifted slightly to allow the new roof structure to be created. That said the nearest resident is over 22m away and the Castle grounds are opposite half the width of the roof.

Weaving Shed - Layout

The internal layout has been changed significantly by the inclusion of a new floor to allow the space to be converted from general storage to retail and gym/leisure use.

Externally the layout is largely unchanged as the development is within the current footprint.
Weaving Shed - Appearance

The Weaving Shed has been altered significantly, most noticeably when the two storey warehouse and historic roof were removed to allow a new steel portal roof to be installed with two central columns.

If every existing door and window were glazed the % of glazing would be less than 4%, this is too low a figure for a building as deep as this and where the uses retail and leisure would benefit from a higher % of controlled glazing.

It therefore proposed that additional glazing be provided in addition to providing a more contemporary elevation.

Weaving Shed - Access

The access has been altered internally to allow visitors to access both floors and externally to allow better connections with its surroundings, provide fire exits and to ensure that refuse and deliveries routes are more discrete.

On the north elevation two fire exits and a new vehicular access have been proposed these will ensure that the building complies with Bregs requirements and allows access to a discrete refuse/delivery area.

On the Woone Lane elevation a new access has been provided to allow visitors to access the first floor directly making the site generally more accessible to pedestrians from the town.

The access to the front elevation has been improved considerably by the the creation of a whole new facade, which allow access to the retail units and the gym/leisure complex.

Weaving Shed typical planning application elevation
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To assist in the understanding of the changes proposed/required, items of the building have been described, assessed to establish works required if at all. Where works is required the benefit is explained and an assessment of the impact on the heritage character undertaken. Plans showing the Relative Significance Survey are included within the appendix.

A structural report accompanies the application and additional information is included within that on masonry failures, timber treatment and repairs, structural alterations and strengthening.

The asbestos survey did not identify any asbestos within the Weaving Shed

This plan needs to be read with the following plans and elevations:

Ex 9 - 10 Weaving Shed Existing Plans
Ex 24 Weaving Shed Existing Elevations
PL 30 - 32 Weaving Shed Proposed Plans
PL 35 - 36 Weaving Shed Demolition and Alteration Plans
PL 300 Weaving Shed Proposed Elevations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on historic character</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scale</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Roof

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element / Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Works Required</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Impact on historic character</th>
<th>LA consent required</th>
<th>Associated works</th>
<th>Photo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>Double pitch ppc metal roof.</td>
<td>The roof is uninsulated, is showing significant signs of age and corrosion.</td>
<td>The replacement roof will minimise heat loss from the building fabric whilst at the same time clearly demonstrating that the roof is a contemporary alteration to the development.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>External wall</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaving Shed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The roof is to be replaced with a curved roof that resuses the existing roof steelwork. It also allows additional glazing at first floor level allowing more light to enter the building.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage/Rainwater goods</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaving Shed</td>
<td>Volley gutter mid span with upvc box gutter and matching downpipes.</td>
<td>All pipework to be removed when roof replaced. New pipework to be concealed internally or aluminium when exposed externally. New foul drainage to be installed internally.</td>
<td>Improve aesthetics by concealing pipework where possible.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Image](image1.png)
## External Features

### External wall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element / Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Works Required</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Impact on historic character</th>
<th>LA consent required</th>
<th>Associated works</th>
<th>Photo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woone Lane elevation</td>
<td>External walls two storey high roughly-coursed limestone rubble construction with tooled sandstone quoins to the north west corner. The top of the wall is concealed by the metal cladding that dresses down in front of the stone. The juncture with New Mill is clearly defined. The face of the stonework has cement mortar bringing the pointing flush with the stone. Some have described the stonework as 'slabbered' masonry. See below. We believe the exterior finish might be cement brush pointing and that the stonework was covered by limewash, either directly onto the stone and mortar or over a render which may simply have been a thin coating of sand and lime thrown onto the wall.</td>
<td>The 'slabbered' face is to have the cement removed to allow inspection of the stone and pointing behind. The stonework is then to have localised lime based pointing repairs as required. A sample panel showing the stages in repair has been undertaken.</td>
<td>Aesthetic benefits, as the mill will lose its unloved, unkempt appearance.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From our research it appears that the term 'slabbered' started to come into more common use during the 1980's when surveyors undertaking listing re-survey started to use it to describe any rubble wall where the mortar is carried over the faces of the stones leaving them only partly exposed or with just their outlines visible. It tends to be used in list descriptions and has fallen out of use as historic building specialist tend regard as being too imprecise and doesn't seem to have been in use locally. The Newton Conservation guide suggests that it is a local tradition, but is not clear whether this applies to cement or a lime based finish. There is no mention of it as a traditional technique in the Clitheroe conservation guide (some authors). There is no mention of the technique in the OAN report for Holmes Mill.
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# External Features

## External wall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element / Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Works Required</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Impact on historic character</th>
<th>LA consent required</th>
<th>Associated works</th>
<th>Photo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East and South elevation</td>
<td>Two external walls two storey high limestone rubble construction. The southern half is part of an eight bay warehouse that was incorporated into the south eastern corner. The north half is limestone rubble with a number of vents. The top of the wall is concealed by the metal cladding that dresses down in front of the stone. The face of the stonework has cement mortar bringing the pointing flush with the stone.</td>
<td>The walls are to be demolished and replaced with new masonry and glazing.</td>
<td>This part of the site is unattractive, lacking any heritage assets of value and is the most prominent. The replacement elevation maintains a warehouse appearance whilst acknowledging that it is a contemporary addition.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North elevation</td>
<td>External wall single storey high limestone rubble construction with render in places. The top of the wall is concealed by the metal cladding that dresses down in front of the stone. The face of the stonework has cement mortar bringing the pointing flush with the stone.</td>
<td>The stonework is to be left as is with like for like repairs where necessary. A fire exit and a goods access is to be installed.</td>
<td>The wall is not visible and lacks any heritage assets of value and is the elevation most suitable for deliveries/refuse/fire exit etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vents</td>
<td>Triangular sandstone vents replicating gothic tracery.</td>
<td>Retained where possible.</td>
<td>Retention of traditional detail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## External Features

### External wall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element / Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Works Required</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Impact on historic character</th>
<th>LA consent required</th>
<th>Associated works</th>
<th>Associated works</th>
<th>Photo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cladding All elevations</td>
<td>Grey gpc metal cladding with matching cover flashing to roof and drip to stone wall below.</td>
<td>The cladding is uninsulated, is showing significant signs of age and corrosion.</td>
<td>The replacement cladding will minimise heat loss from the building fabric.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Roof</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The metal cladding is to be replaced with glazing and localised metal panels so allow light in and views out from the upper storey of the building.</td>
<td>Make the building more engaging with its context whilst at the same time clearly demonstrating that the cladding is a contemporary alteration to the development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Windows and Doors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element / Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Works Required</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Impact on historic character</th>
<th>LA consent required</th>
<th>Associated works</th>
<th>Photo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Windows and Doors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East elevation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South elevation</td>
<td>Each of the eight bays of the original warehouse has a two-light single glazed timber window, with top hung vent.</td>
<td>The windows, roller doors and pass doors are removed as part of the demolition of the masonry walls. New doors within the glazing are to be provided to allow for general access and to provide exit routes.</td>
<td>This part of the mill is unattractive. Much of the damage was done when the first floor to the warehouse was removed and the Weaving Shed was roofed. It lacks any heritage assets of value and is the most prominent. The replacement elevation maintains a warehouse appearance whilst acknowledging that it is a contemporary addition.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>External wall</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North elevation</td>
<td>There are no windows or doors to the elevation to Wayne Lane.</td>
<td>Glazing is being provided as part of the treatment of the elevation, in addition an access door is also to be provided.</td>
<td>This doorway allows access at first floor level and improves the connection with the rest of the town and is the nearest entrance.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>External wall</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Load Bearing Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element / Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Works Required</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Impact on historic character</th>
<th>LA consent required</th>
<th>Associated works</th>
<th>Photo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaving Shed</td>
<td>Steel columns supporting roof</td>
<td>Existing columns to provide support for new floor, columns to be rubbed down and redecorated with intumescent coating to provide 1 hr fire resistance.</td>
<td>As required to comply with BRegs Part B requirements.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Roof</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaving Shed</td>
<td>New steel columns supporting roof new floor.</td>
<td>Steel I columns to built of new pod foundation approx. 1.8m square to provide support to new floor structure Columns to be fire rated to provide 1 hr fire resistance.</td>
<td>As required to comply with BRegs Part A and B requirements.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Roof</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaving Shed</td>
<td>Masonry walls to create pool enclosure, to divide units and provide support to first floor structure.</td>
<td>The pool is to be built off the slab with load bearing dense concrete wall constructed on strip footings as required to support the pool surround.</td>
<td>The slab has no heritage value and hence should be adapted as required to ensure that the Weaving Shed can be adapted to create sustainable uses.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Floors and Beams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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## Internal Features

### Floors and beams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element / Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Works Required</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Impact on historic character</th>
<th>LA consent required</th>
<th>Associated works</th>
<th>Photo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Floor Slab</td>
<td>200mm thick slab cast on visqueen.</td>
<td>Slab to be removed as required to allow for drainage and foundation installation as required. Finish as to be agreed as required by tenants.</td>
<td>The slab has no heritage value and hence should be adapted as required to ensure that the Weaving Shed can be adapted to create sustainable uses.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Load Bearing Structure</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mezzanine</td>
<td>Mesh floor to electricity equipment</td>
<td>To be removed as equipment to be relocated to suit revised internal arrangement.</td>
<td>The mezzanine has no heritage value and hence should be adapted as required</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Walls and Partitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element / Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Works Required</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Impact on historic character</th>
<th>LA consent required</th>
<th>Associated works</th>
<th>Photo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plasterboard partition</td>
<td>Plasterboard partitions on metal/timber stud partitions</td>
<td>Internal partitions as required by tenants/operators.</td>
<td>To ensure that the accommodation can be divided as required.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non load bearing masonry walls</td>
<td>Concrete block walls</td>
<td>Internal partitions as required by tenants/operators.</td>
<td>To ensure that the accommodation can be divided as required.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaving Shed Moore Lane elevation</td>
<td>2 storey high masonry walls with painted plaster finish internally, shadow of original saw-tooth roof still visible. Wall retaining for 2m from ground floor level.</td>
<td>To be relined internally to provide surface suitable for swimming pool/ changing room environment. Details to be confirmed with operator.</td>
<td>Character of wall unchanged.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>External Wall</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaving Shed North elevation</td>
<td>Single storey high masonry walls with painted plaster finish internally. Wall retaining for 2m from ground floor level at west side.</td>
<td>To be relined internally to provide surface suitable for retail/changing room environment. Details to be confirmed with operator.</td>
<td>Character of wall unchanged.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>External Wall</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Circulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element / Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Works Required</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Impact on historic character</th>
<th>LA consent required</th>
<th>Associated works</th>
<th>Photo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire escape stairs</td>
<td>Steel stairs</td>
<td>Stairs required to provide safe exit routes from all floors as exit routes from three elevations are compromised by use or retaining walls</td>
<td>To comply with BRega Part B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Floors and beams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Internal Features

## Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element / Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Works Required</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Impact on historic character</th>
<th>LA consent required</th>
<th>Associated works</th>
<th>Photo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heating</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All floors</td>
<td>Heating</td>
<td>System and arrangement to be chosen by tenant/operator.</td>
<td>To retain flexibility.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All floors</td>
<td>Hot water</td>
<td>This may be dependent on system selected for space heating or demand.</td>
<td>To retain flexibility.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ventilation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pool</strong></td>
<td>Supply and Extract Ventilation</td>
<td>System and arrangement to be chosen by tenant/operator.</td>
<td>To retain flexibility.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ensuites wc's</strong></td>
<td>Extract Ventilation</td>
<td>Extract ventilation required to all wc's and ensuites</td>
<td>To comply with BRregs standards and CIBSE Guide B:2005 and to satisfy The Workplace (health, safety and welfare) Regulation 1992.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sprinkler</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All floors</td>
<td>Sprinkler system.</td>
<td>System and arrangement to be chosen by tenant/operator if required.</td>
<td>For BRregs compliance and to BS 9999:2008 / BS 5306-2:1990</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electrics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All floors</td>
<td>Fire detection and Alarm system</td>
<td>Extension of existing fire detection and alarm system to all floors / areas where necessary.</td>
<td>For BRregs compliance Part B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All floors</td>
<td>Small power and lighting.</td>
<td>Removal of existing wiring and rewiring throughout.</td>
<td>Existing wiring in poor condition poses health and safety hazard.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drainage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Floor</td>
<td>Foul Drainage</td>
<td>Extensive drainage is required as there is very little existing drainage, what there is limited to the East elevation.</td>
<td>As required to comply with BRregs requirements.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix

Relative Significance Survey