HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT
2 HARTER STREET, MANCHESTER

prepared for BROOKMOOR LTD.

20th May 2014





mel morris
conservation

Melanie Morris Dip Arch. Cons, IHBC, MRTPI
Mel Morris Conservation
67 Brookfields Road
Ipstones
Staffordshire ST10 2LY
tel: 01538 266516 email: mel@melmorris.co.uk
www.melmorrisconservation.co.uk

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Methodology	1
3.	Non-Technical Summary	2
4.	Statement of Significance	4
5.	Site and Building Constraints	5
6.	Development of Plans – Conservation Principles	5
7.	Impact Assessment	6
	7.1 Introduction	
	7.2 Proposed Alterations	6
	• Conversion Into Residential Use	6
	• Creation of Duplex Apartments	7
	• Upgrading the Floors	8
	• Adaptation and Use of the original Timber Staircase	10
	• Proposed new lift shaft	11
	• Roof Alterations	12
	• Adaptation of Windows	16
	• Removal of Fixtures and Fittings	17
	• Disabled Access	18
	7.3 Public Benefits	19
	• Repair	
	• Restoration	
	7.4 Cumulative Impact Assessment Table	20-21
8.	Planning Policy Framework and Guidance	21
	8.1 NPPF 2012 & Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide	
	8.2. 'Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment' (April 2008, English Heritage)	
9.	Conclusions & Justification	26

1. Introduction

Mel Morris Conservation has been appointed by Brookmoor Ltd, to undertake a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) for alterations and change of use at 2 Harter Street, Manchester, a grade II listed building. The site is located to the east of an old canal basin (now filled in) off the Rochdale Canal, and to the west of Princess Street, within Whitworth Street Conservation Area, at NGR 384153, 397790.

This HIA is underpinned by a detailed Building Appraisal and a Statement of Significance, dated 10th February 2014, produced by Mel Morris Conservation.

2. Methodology

All reports undertaken by the consultancy on any heritage asset since March 2012 have been carried out in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, informed by the supplementary Historic Environment Practice Guide (6th March 2014).

The assessment is also informed by the English Heritage document - 'Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance' (April 2008). Whilst this document is intended mainly to guide English Heritage staff on best practice, it sets out a method for thinking systematically and consistently about the heritage values that can be ascribed to a place and it provides advice on how to apply the principles and policies in practice and detailed interpretation of policies on repair, on intervention for research, on restoration, on new work and alteration and on enabling development.

There is no standard agreed assessment method for undertaking a heritage impact assessment on a single heritage asset. ICOMOS UK produced guidance on heritage impact assessments for Cultural World Heritage Properties (Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments for Cultural World Heritage Properties, ICOMOS, January 2011) and the terms adopted in this HIA and stated below are based on the ICOMOS (2011) terminology.

Assuming that some alterations are either benign or positive, there are nine possible degrees of impact. As part of the assessment, we have considered the cumulative impact of the alterations on the heritage asset.

NEGATIVE CHANGE	POSITIVE CHANGE
MAJOR NEGATIVE	MAJOR POSITIVE
MODERATE NEGATIVE	MODERATE POSITIVE
MINOR NEGATIVE	MINOR POSITIVE
NEGLIGIBLE NEGATIVE	NEGLIGIBLE POSITIVE
NO CHANGE / NEUTRAL	NO CHANGE / NEUTRAL

The following matrix demonstrates how we have arrived at the different impacts for each alteration proposed. This is based on the Department of Transport's DRMB Impact Assessment (adopted for EIAs), which has been subject to scrutiny within the planning system, including Public Inquiries.

Significance/ sensitivity						
	Outstanding	Neutral	Slight	Moderate / Large	Large or Very Large	Very large
	High	Neutral	Slight	Moderate / slight	Moderate / large	Large / very large
	Medium	Neutral	Neutral/ slight	Slight	Moderate	Moderate / large
	Low	Neutral	Neutral / slight	Neutral; slight	Slight	Slight / moderate
	None	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral/ slight	Neutral / slight	Slight
		No Change	Negligible	Minor	Moderate	Major
	Magnitude of Impact					

3. Non-Technical Summary

This Heritage Impact Assessment provides a balanced view of the proposed alteration of the grade II listed building, 2 Harter Street, a former paper warehouse, to change the use of the existing building to create 22 residential apartments.

The adaptation and re-use of 2 Harter Street and conversion into residential apartments will involve a number of alterations which will affect the character of the listed building. Internal alterations are an inevitable consequence of residential conversion of an industrial building.. Conversely, the full re-use of this listed building will remove a listed building at risk and will secure its immediate repair and restoration and future maintenance for the foreseeable future. This Heritage Impact Assessment is designed to provide the document which addresses the delicate balance of weighing up both positive and negative impacts of the change of use.

During a process of deliberation and negotiation with both the heritage consultant and the conservation officer, the alterations to the listed building have been minimised to those that are essential in order for the scheme to be viable. The scheme which is now the subject of the full application has been adapted to be conservation-led and has been reduce to those alterations that are essential, whilst adding areas of restoration to ensure that the listed building is appropriately conserved and restored. The minimum number of apartments that is required to make the scheme financially viable is 22. This is demonstrated by the Viability Study produced by Jones Lang LaSalle. This study demonstrates that 22 apartments is only just financially viable. The option of a reduced number of units (21) has been assessed both in the light of the physical alterations required (see alternative Roof Floor Plan attached to the Viability Study) and the market conditions and viability of this type of accommodation in this location. In both cases, there is no scheme that can work with a reduced number of apartments and yet still command the same level of developer profit, and effectively remain viable. This would remain the case, regardless of the circumstances of any owner, whether it be the current owner or a new owner, and regardless of the actual amount paid for the site (the authoritative viability study has determined the current site value).

The outcome of the assessment is summarised on pages 6-19 with a summary table on page 20.

This assessment shows that the proposals involve a number of alterations which involve some degree of harm and this varies in each instance. The alteration of the roof structure, whilst in itself is the largest single alteration and which will require referral to both English Heritage and the amenity bodies, has to be seen in the light of the fact that a large proportion of the concrete roof slab must be removed and replaced, because of its condition, that the existing purlins are currently inadequate and will require additional support or strengthening for either repair or alteration, and that approximately 40% of the rafters have already been replaced. We consider that whilst the proposal involves alterations to the roof structure, and a new alignment of the slate roofs, it makes no sense to judge the application on the basis that the proposals in their totality equate to substantial harm.

We consider that the problems do not individually or cumulatively amount to substantial ham. We ask that the application is judged and assessed in its totality, rather than on the basis of single elements, such as the roof alterations.

The change of use has been modified over the last 6 months, and following the preparation of a detailed Heritage Appraisal, to take into account the significance of the listed building and to preserve the special details, its massing and character, its original plan form and its setting. The scheme has been significantly altered during the process of design development and works with the existing openings and constraints to minimise physical changes to the external appearance of the building, and indeed to restore some elements which have been altered.

Primarily, the proposal will bring into use a redundant listed building which no longer has an economic use, and which has been largely vacant for many decades and completes the regeneration of this local area of Manchester.

Significantly, we consider that none of the proposals result in substantial harm.

In our opinion the proposals provide a scheme of conversion that secures the optimum viable use of the listed building, and which has thoughtfully addressed by mitigation the negative impacts. Ultimately, the positive impacts of the scheme outweigh the harm. On balance, we consider that the proposals are both POSITIVE in finding a sympathetic new use and BENIGN, according to the definition used by English Heritage.

4. Statement of Significance

Mel Morris Conservation prepared a Historic Building Appraisal and Statement of Significance dated 10th February 2014, which is included as supporting information with the planning application. Importantly, the Appraisal, which involved a detailed inspection of the historic fabric, has informed the layout of the scheme as amended by Urbane Forms (Architects). The scheme has therefore developed in tandem to ensure that the significance of the building is protected and the inclusion of additional areas of restoration.

The statement of significance identifies the following key points;

- The paper warehouse at 2 Harter Street is typical of commercial warehouse construction at the end of the 19th century and is of high historic value. It is a largely brick-built structure with terracotta and stone dressings, five storeys with a high basement. In combination with cast iron columns and wrought-iron beams, it contains a timber plank floor and a robust outer brick structure. A loading bay with a hydraulic wall crane is located at the side of the building, with an integral wrought-iron canopy.

- There is now very little sense of the segregation of the warehousing function and the office function, with the exception of the elaborate panelling in the entrance lobby. Its evidential value has been diminished with the loss of the internal partitions and floor plan subdivision. The ground and first floors incorporate subtle differences in the window embrasures between timber panelled linings and rounded moulded brickwork; the floors above this level were probably exclusively used for inspection / warehousing.

- The largest and most successful traders built their own warehouses. 2 Harter Street was in essence a transit warehouse, purpose-built for transporting specialist papers, in association with the establishment of Henry and Leigh Slater's successful paper mill at Bollington. The single entrance, crane and unloading area are also evidence of a single user rather than designed as flexible space for multiple users. The rather lavish attention to detail in the terracotta elevations and the relatively small footprint would indicate a bespoke single occupier.

- The grid structure of the building was built for a practical purpose and was functional, incorporating inconsistencies of structural detail and large functional spaces. The building had a principally utilitarian purpose and was not designed with "architectural" interiors; cast-iron columns of the simplest, standardised form were adopted.

- There is evidence of the specialist machinery used within the building, but with changes in use over the years, these have been significantly altered. The external crane and canopy survive in a fair condition and largely intact. Other features, such as the lift hoist, which once ran through the centre of the building, are of historic interest (although only a fragment). The later passenger lift is intact but the removal of partitions has removed its context. The lift machinery is of limited interest. Reinforced concrete flooring was introduced in a limited way in the 1880s and we see some evidence of its early use at 2 Harter Street in the flat roof structure, although it has now lost its structural integrity and cannot be retained.

- The two principal elevations of the building to the east and south have very high aesthetic value. There is a marked contrast between the exterior and the interior. The external elevations to Harter Street (east and south) incorporate lavish terracotta detailing and decorative moulded ornamentation. They also contain an unusual combination of window types – sash windows to ground, first and second floors, with large, semi-circular windows to the third floor with casements, and smaller arched sash windows to the fourth floor, above the cornice. The canal basin elevation was much plainer and the upper levels (floors 2 to 4) had glazed white bricks. As can be seen by the evidence within the interiors, this outward lavish display to Harter Street was largely unrelated to the internal functions, or the rear elevation to the canal. The interiors have relatively low aesthetic value. They are mainly large utilitarian spaces. Only a few rooms at ground and first floor level were used as offices. We, therefore, have a very clear picture that the owners of the building were using it to present a high quality and outwardly successful image of their company, perhaps surprising given its back-street location.

Contribution of Setting to Significance

2 Harter Street has high value when seen in conjunction with the neighbouring listed buildings in and around Harter Street, Princess Street and Waterloo Street. Together, they provide evidence of the diversity and complexity of the integrated commercial functions within a small geographical area of the city. This building, perhaps more than its neighbours, still exhibits more of its industrial heritage value. To Harter Street, the setting of the warehouse is largely unchanged since 1908 but to the former canal basin, to the immediate west, redevelopment has significantly affected its setting and the filling in of the canal basin has removed its industrial context.

5. Site and Building Constraints

There are a number of constraints within the historic fabric and setting which have determined the development of the plans.

The main constraints are as follows;

- The structure will require new floors at each level, in order to accommodate a change of use. This new floor sandwich must meet both acoustic and fire separation and involves alterations to the appearance of the finishes at ceiling level.

- The site has only a small private and part enclosed area of land to the south, creating an opportunity for storage of domestic waste and cycle storage.

- The building sits on the back of the pavement, with limited defensible space. The cast-iron windows lighting the Lower Ground Floor, facing Harter Street, can be retained but will need to be adapted to provide a secure-by-design and watertight finish.

- The concrete slab roof structure has failed and will require a new slab. In addition, modifications will be required to the pitched roof to make the building appropriate for a change of use to 22 apartments.

- The existing main staircase can be used in the refurbishment, but a new passenger lift will be required.

- The secondary timber staircase can be re-used within duplex apartments but will require some minor modifications and the removal of some section of flights to accommodate this adaptation.

- In order to meet building regulations, mechanical extraction will be required to the bathrooms.

- There are a number of changes in level between the pavement and the ground floor, which make the introduction of a fully compliant disabled access practically impossible without either the loss of an apartment or the destructive alteration of the entrance lobby and removal of the entrance doors. In both cases, our options appraisal and impact assessment has determined that the loss of an apartment would make the whole scheme unviable and the alternative, the alteration of the entrance lobby and doors, would be too damaging to the special architectural interest of the listed building, which is of very high significance at this point. The provision of removable ramps for disabled access is, therefore, an unavoidable constraint.

6. Development of Plans – Conservation Principles

The conservation consultant and the architect have jointly worked on a number of design principles which have been steered by the findings of the Historic Building Appraisal and the Statement of Significance. A fundamental design principle is that the building is robust and can accommodate some change by introducing contemporary design solutions. A second design and conservation principle is the need to avoid introducing too much domestic character within the industrial character of the building. Lastly, is the principle to preserve the historic fixtures and fittings wherever possible.

7. Impact Assessment

7.1 Introduction

A number of works are proposed to the listed building to make it suitable for the proposed change of use. The main alterations to the listed building are identified as a series of principles, and then assessed for their impact. The same principles apply to multiple floor levels. Further individual impacts are dealt with at the end of this section. The main impacts are summarised at the end of this section in a table, which considers the cumulative impact of the alterations.

7.2 Proposed Alterations

7.2.1 Conversion into residential use

The general principle of conversion into residential use will involve subdivision of internal spaces and the upgrading of floors and windows to comply with Building Regulations.

There is some difference of opinion between the conservation officer and the author of this report about the relative merits and significance of the interiors of the listed building. One of the main areas of special interest of the listed building, and key characteristics, is the marked difference in the quality of detail and architectural expression of the exterior elevations and the utilitarian interiors. We have noted this in the Statement of Significance. Whereas we find that the interiors are relatively unaltered, and therefore of high historic value, we disagree with the conservation officer that the interiors have high or even moderate aesthetic value, with the exception of the entrance lobby. Ultimately, the sense of space and volume of the current floorplates, a characteristic of industrial warehouse buildings, will inevitably be altered by residential conversion and so the application needs to be judged on whether its impact is substantial or less than substantial. We judge that this element of the proposal involves less than substantial harm as it does not involve large scale loss or destruction of key elements and whilst the volume of the spaces is of some interest, it is not the highest part of the significance of the listed building. Any losses have been kept to the minimum required to make the 22-apartment scheme viable and the scheme has been adapted to increase the open and spacious character of the apartments, to remove partitions and corridors, where they are not necessary, and to incorporate the existing staircases, wherever feasible.

There is no requirement for a second means of escape from the upper floors provided that the existing stairwell can be completely isolated from the apartments; a smoke vent will be incorporated into the roof of the stairwell, in the event of a fire. The existing concrete staircase can be used in-situ, and will not require upgrading other than sealing and for the treads to meet the regulations by inserting a non-slip strip. This will be achieved by inserting a pair of 5mm aluminium plates set into the going of the concrete treads. As the concrete staircase is of low significance, this is considered an acceptable and neat solution enabling them to be used in-situ.

The most significant and radical alteration to the plans since December 2013 has been the reduction of the number of flats from 25 to 22 and the removal of the additional floor above the existing attic level. Further alterations have been in the form of reducing areas of corridor space to provide more spacious flats; Apartments 2, 7, 11, 14 and 18 are now more open-plan.

The building appraisal reveals that there were once internal partitions within the building, which have been removed. There are some clues to the position of these partitions at ground and first floor level, where the masonry walls vary in internal treatment and finish, but no conclusive evidence for the layout of the internal partitions and some evidence that the partitions varied in location between the ground and first floor. Whether there were partitions at level 2-4 is not known, but seems unlikely. The internal appearance of the open spaces within the building is now typical of late 19th century warehousing; large volume floor plates, interrupted by only cast-iron columns, although we know that some of the spaces, and the second phase stair core, were subdivided. Internally, the special interest lies primarily in the constructional detail, and as this is largely exposed, it provides an unfettered view of the method of construction. This warehouse was a largely utilitarian building, although externally it has an architectural quality not matched inside, with the exception of the timber staircase and the entrance lobby. This distinction and separation is part of its special interest.

It is accepted that residential use will have an impact on the generally perceived "spatial quality" of the interiors but it is not accepted that by introducing partitions this will have a substantial, damaging impact on the special interest of the listed building. The harm caused will be "less than substantial".

The building has windows on three elevations and is well-lit for a building of this type, with an unusually high level of natural daylight from ground-level up to the attic floor level. Conversely, the basement is poorly lit, with the exception of the rear (west-facing) elevation, which has sash windows overlooking a private car park to Linley House. There is also little solid wall space for fixed furniture and fittings, such as kitchen units, which would need to be created from the insertion of partitions.

Because of these constraints, and the position of the main staircase, the adaptation of the building will require a central serviced area. A central serviced core is critical to any change of use of the space, whether it be for residential use or for any other change of use. This would be the case irrespective of the number of residential units. This has dictated to a large extent the layout of the floors and the distribution of the separate units. It also provides a continuous series of solid walls for hiding service ducts, soil pipes, electrical cabling, meters, etc. As a result of the service core, which is placed close to the main stairwell, and which can be reached from the corridor without disturbing residents, the layout of each floor is ranged around this, with each flat benefitting from copious natural daylight.

The viability of reducing the number of residential units is addressed in the Viability Study by Jones Lang LaSalle, dated May 2014. The subdivision of the floor plate into 3.5 flats, rather than the 4 originally shown, is considered to be an appropriate compromise. As part of the re-design of the layout, the original staircase has been incorporated into duplex apartments. This makes an unusual layout, but works with the listed building and respects the key features of the building. To enable this to work, a means of escape into the central service corridor is therefore made available at both levels of each duplex and each duplex flat will have its own sprinkler system. The incorporation of the timber (original) staircase into a large number of the flats, by creating duplex apartments, has reduced the number of units overall on levels 0 to 4 by three, so a further reduction in the number of flats would be critical to the economic viability of the scheme (see Jones Lang LaSalle).

Level of Significance of Interiors & spaces – medium
Magnitude of Impact – moderate

Level of Significance	Outstanding	Neutral	Slight	Moderate / Large	Large or Very Large	Very Large
	High	Neutral	Slight	Moderate / slight	Moderate / large	Large / very large
	Medium	Neutral	Neutral / slight	Slight	Moderate	Moderate / large
	Low	Neutral	Neutral / slight	Neutral / slight	Slight	Slight / moderate
	None	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral / slight	Neutral / slight	Slight
		No Change	Negligible	Minor	Moderate	Major
		Magnitude of Impact				

7.2.2 Creation of Duplex Apartments

The general principle of the layout has evolved to take into account the need to work within the constraints of the building and to preserve its fixtures and fittings. This has meant that the floor plans have now been altered, as follows;
1. the creation of four duplex apartments between basement and ground floor levels. The existing timber stair has been re-used and the number of new openings within the floor reduced, as a result, by one.
Apartment 2 has been altered at basement level to remove the second bedroom and the narrow confined character and to enlarge the single bedroom. The staircase within Apartment 4 has already been altered and this alteration will be reversed and the original balustrade and steps reinstated.
2. The creation of two further duplex apartments between levels 1 & 2, and 3 & 4.
3. the simplification of the attic floor plan to remove the additional floor and duplex apartments at this level, and to provide just two apartments on a single level.

The physical impact of the alterations is to create slots within the timber floorboards (none of the structural members are affected). This means in practice three new openings between lower ground and ground floor. Small new openings at all levels would be created for the lift shaft and service riser (see 7.2.5). These could be seen to be exchanged (a *quid pro quo*) for the original openings through the centre of the bulding for the hoist, which are now boarded over. Because this affects just the floorboards rather than the framed structure, it is considered that the level of significance is medium, whilst the physical impact of this overall is minor, taking into account the benefit of re-using the staircase.

Level of Significance	Outstanding	Neutral	Slight	Moderate / Large	Large or Very Large	Very Large
	High	Neutral	Slight	Moderate / slight	Moderate / large	Large / very large
	Medium	Neutral	Neutral / slight	Slight	Moderate	Moderate / large
	Low	Neutral	Neutral / slight	Neutral / slight	Slight	Slight / moderate
	None	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral / slight	Neutral / slight	Slight
		No Change	Negligible	Minor	Moderate	Major
		Magnitude of Impact				

7.2.3 Upgrading the floors to provide fire and acoustic separation

The existing floor structure comprises a structural grid of wrought-iron and timber beams, which support a boarded floor. There are no secondary joists. The existing wrought iron and timber beam structure will be retained in-situ and the metal-work painted with intumescent paint. The timber axial beams will be retained intact, relying upon the natural char-rate of the timber (to be assessed by engineering calculation) to provide adequate inherent fire resistance, and supplemented with an intumescent varnish, such as Envirograf HW01/F or HW02/E.

In the absence of secondary joists, the existing floorboards cannot provide structural integrity (one hour's fire resistance) in the event of a fire, although according to the engineer at Thomasons they are a satisfactory depth for residential loading (page 18 of the engineering report). Both the option of retaining the existing floor level in-situ and upgrading the building from below and the option of raising the floor level and upgrading the building from above have been considered and the current solution enables the majority of the construction to remain visible, which, as this is of high significance, we consider is the better solution. The floorboards will need to be removed, set aside and new secondary joists inserted (see section Drawing 13010, (0-) 35A), which have adequate strength to support the new floor and to provide the framework needed for the acoustic and fire separation. The new secondary timber joists will be seated upon the top flange of the I-section wrought-iron beams. This detail is illustrated in the architect's sectional drawing no.13010, (0-) 35A, as is the sandwich of acoustic and fire separation. This detail applies to the majority of the building, with the exception of the communal corridors and some lobbies within the flats, which require a suspended ceiling to hide services, and two further areas which remain unaltered - the lean-to structure at Level 1, where the existing riveted beams and structure remain exposed (see Section 13010, (0-) 33B), and the panelled lobby, where upgrading will take place from above, avoiding the need to disturb the existing timber panelled ceiling.

This means that all of the cast-iron and most of the wrought iron frame will be visible, and almost half of the axial timber beams. The sandwich of the floor construction involves creating a plasterboard soffit to the panels of the ceiling between the wrought-iron spine beams and the axial timber beams. Where a new plaster ceiling is introduced, a shadow gap will be created around the perimeter of the plastered panel, where it joins the beams. At the junction with the timber moulded trimmers adjoining the masonry, the cast-iron shoes would still be visible, although the moulded trimmers would be retained in-situ, but masked by the inserted floor structure.





Left - the new plastered ceiling will finish just below the visible rivets of the top flange of the wrought-iron transverse beams.
Right - the current riveted wrought-iron compound beam and the top of the cast-iron columns which jointly carry the load-bearing brick-work of levels 2 to 4 (pictured right) of the rear elevation would remain visible in the proposed scheme (see sectional drawing 13010, (0-) 35A)

The section through the floor (Drawing 13010, (0-) 35A) shows this "robust" sandwich located above the top flange of the wrought iron beams. The consequences of upgrading the floor structure to provide fire separation, acoustic separation and structural integrity are that the new floor will sit approximately 150mm above the existing timber floorboard level. As there is a service corridor adjoining the main stairwell, the difference in height in the floor can be accommodated by a step and short ramp at the junction of the staircase landing and the new inserted floor. This avoids the need to modify the existing concrete slab on the staircase landing, and will enable the terrazzo floor to be retained in-situ at ground floor level. The existing timber plank floorboards at each level of the building would be lifted and re-used, laid onto the new floor structure wherever possible. Where there are insufficient planks, new engineered timber boards would be used. This impact is "less than substantial".

Corridors and the lobbies within each flat will need to have slightly lowered ceilings to accommodate the services and mechanical ventilation ducts for the bathrooms. It may be feasible to use the windows in the south-east corner (Apartments 8, 12, 15 & 19) and avoid mechanical extraction of these spaces, with a relaxation in the Building Regulations.

Level of Significance of floors – medium
Magnitude of Impact – moderate

Level of Significance	Outstanding	Neutral	Slight	Moderate / Large	Large or Very Large	Very Large
	High	Neutral	Slight	Moderate / slight	Moderate / large	Large / very large
	Medium	Neutral	Neutral / slight	Slight	Moderate	Moderate / large
	Low	Neutral	Neutral / slight	Neutral / slight	Slight	Slight / moderate
	None	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral / slight	Neutral / slight	Slight
		No Change	Negligible	Minor	Moderate	Major
		Magnitude of Impact				

7.2.4 Adaptation and Use of the Original Timber Staircase

The position of the timber staircase in the south-west corner of the building does not lend itself to any comprehensive circulation pattern as part of a change of use. In any event, there are two major problems with using this staircase as part of a means of escape;

i) this would involve the provision of a continuous enclosed partition wrapping around the timber staircase, which would be a significant alteration and spoil the current open character of the staircase. There is no physical evidence that the timber staircase was enclosed, as all internal partitions have been removed.

ii) the attic floor level has a very low raked ceiling at this point and there is a large "bulkhead" in the form of the original wrought-iron structural beam supporting the back wall of levels 2-4, which runs across the half-landing of the staircase at Second Floor Level. It is unlikely that this staircase would comply as a protected means of escape, without remodelling at these levels.

In view of both these constraints, and the position of the staircase, away from the main serviced core, we considered that there were only two viable options for the staircase; either to mothball it and leave it unaltered, in-situ and sealed up, or to adapt it to incorporate it into the flats. For the long-term management and conservation, it is considered that to adapt the staircase is the better solution, as it enables the relationship of the staircase and floor to remain evident, it makes best use of the natural daylight, and it creates more viable and larger flats, freeing up some of the spatial quality at each level.

Alterations; by incorporating the timber staircase into duplex apartments, there is no requirement for additional partitions or a protected means of escape within the flats and the alterations required to each staircase are reduced to taking out two short flights between ground and first floor level, between level 2 to 3 and at attic level. The floor would be boarded over at level 1, 3 and the attic, to match the adjoining boarded floors, with a new timber or steel trimmer along the line of the former balustrade and a new timber floor structure to unify the treatment and acoustic and fire separation measures.

The alterations proposed involve removing the staircase and reinserting the staircase 150mm higher than its existing position at all levels. This is to accommodate the heightened floor level which starts at lower ground level and continues at each level (see 7.2.3). The staircase at Lower Ground Level needs to be removed for two reasons; to allow the new raised floor structure to be inserted (see Drawing section 13010, (0-) 35A) and to provide the continuous basement waterproofing system needed for the external walls. The waterproofing system cannot reasonably exclude the staircase walls as the system relies on a complete seal for its integrity. At the higher levels, the staircase will need to be removed temporarily in order to provide fire separation between the levels which are not duplex apartments, to upgrade the floors and introduce new structural beams. The staircase cannot simply be cut off with sections left suspended. There are a number of consequences which make it impractical to put the staircase back at its current height; the risers vary in height between 170mm and 210mm and together these discrepancies and the differences in the floor to ceiling heights between the floors and the new inserted floor level (which will be 150mm higher than the existing floor), make it practically impossible to get the levels to work. If the staircase was put back in precisely the same position, it would create uneven treads with either short ramps between the new floor and the first nosing of the first step, or potential trip hazards, the landing between the duplex apartments would also need to be altered to create another continuous step into the upper level of the duplex, which would then require a different form of fire separation from the floor below with a lowered ceiling for this area. Lastly, the handrail height at the landings would be 150mm lower than the new floor level, too low to meet building regulations requirements. Uneven steps and lowered handrails do not comply with the Building Regulations. By removing the staircase, and reintroducing it at a slightly raised level, complete sections of the closed string, treads, newel posts, handrail and balustrade would remain intact.

The full detailed repair and restoration of missing elements of the the timber staircase will be addressed by a Method Statement to be produced by a specialist joiner and submitted as part of the application. This will set out how the staircase will be protected during removal and storage, how it will be adapted for re-use and how balustrades will be restored.

Mitigation; the short section of missing balustrade at each principal landing on levels ground, 2 and 4 will be reinstated and restored to the same square section and the balusters set into the new raised floor level, re-using the surviving handrails and newel posts. A new partition wall would be inserted to the rear of this. Where the handrail is removed, it will be finished

off and new sections spliced in to create a new section of handrail and balustrade, to the same detail, to meet the masonry on the southern wall and form a short section of balustrade.

Level of Significance of timber stair – medium
Magnitude of Impact – moderate

Level of Significance	Outstanding	Neutral	Slight	Moderate / Large	Large or Very Large	Very Large
	High	Neutral	Slight	Moderate / slight	Moderate / large	Large / very large
	Medium	Neutral	Neutral / slight	Slight	Moderate	Moderate / large
	Low	Neutral	Neutral / slight	Neutral / slight	Slight	Slight / moderate
	None	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral / slight	Neutral / slight	Slight
		No Change	Negligible	Minor	Moderate	Major
		Magnitude of Impact				

7.2.5 Proposed new lift shaft

The proposal involves the insertion of a new lift shaft within the building, close to the existing concrete staircase. The existing passenger and good lift, with its scissor-action sliding doors, is small and does not comply with current legislation. It cannot be re-used in the scheme and will need to be sealed shut.

The cast concrete slab roof over this stairwell is beyond repair and will be replaced with a sympathetic low-profile, glazed lantern, incorporating a patent glazed system, which allows light to flood down through the staircase, in a space which would otherwise have no natural daylight. The existing raised, pitched roof to the lift shaft is currently visible from Princess Street (see photo below). The lift workings will be retained in-situ, protected from falling down the shaft by a wire cage, or mesh net. A smoke vent, in the form of a section of the glazed rooflight, will be required to provide a protected common stair. This would be operated by smoke detection or a Manual call Point by the exit door.

The principle of inserting vertical lift shafts and hoists within warehouses is well-established in the city centre warehouses. This building is no exception and the original, corrugated iron-clad, vertical hoist is still in-situ at basement level, as well as the second phase lift at all levels. The lightweight nature of the cast-iron, fireproof structure, which was easily reversible, is clearly demonstrated by the ephemeral nature of the alterations to the structure undertaken when it was removed. The principle of vertical lift shafts or hoists is one which has a precedent in this building and is in the spirit of the building. It occupies a small footprint and, with the exception of the removal of floorboards, will have no impact on the lower levels of the structure or its special interest, and can be independent of the structure, just as the hoist was. The lift shaft will require a small over-run at roof level. Where it protrudes through the concrete roof slab, it projects about 900mm above the finished level but will be hidden from public view by the new slate roof. This cannot be seen from any vantage point. The surface finish of the shaft will be a continuation of the grey single-ply membrane proposed for the surface finish of the new concrete roof slab. This is a seam-less system and is not suitable for use with a lead capping. We consider that this is appropriate as the new concrete roof slab



will require a modern system of waterproofing.

Level of Significance of interior affected – low
Level of Significance of exterior affected - low
Magnitude of Impact – minor

Level of Significance	Outstanding	Neutral	Slight	Moderate / Large	Large or Very Large	Very Large
	High	Neutral	Slight	Moderate / slight	Moderate / large	Large / very large
	Medium	Neutral	Neutral / slight	Slight	Moderate	Moderate / large
	Low	Neutral	Neutral / slight	Neutral / slight	Slight	Slight / moderate
	None	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral / slight	Neutral / slight	Slight
		No Change	Negligible	Minor	Moderate	Major
		Magnitude of Impact				

7.2.6 Roof Alterations

There are a number of modifications proposed to the existing roof structure. These arise as a result of;
1. the need to create two apartments at this level,
2. the need to carry out extensive repairs to the roof, and
3. the need to adapt the roof for the services extraction flue, lift shaft over-run and glazed roof lantern to the main stairwell.
Alterations to the roof structure are critical to the viability of the residential conversion.

Existing structure; the existing roof comprises a flat, concrete slab, supported on wrought-iron I-section beams, which in turn sit on cast-iron columns, with mono-pitch slate roofs to two sides, hips at the corners of the east, west and south elevations and a missing section of mono-pitch roof to the third side. The fourth side of the roof is a straight brick abutment, with the adjoining building, which rises above the level of the 2 Harter Street roof. The roof pitch of the existing mono-pitch slate roof is approximately 35 degrees. The rafters have been largely replaced on the southern slope; only the original short





Attic roof space - the rear glazed roof to the west is missing (left) and has been replaced with a modern stud frame. The cast concrete panels have deteriorated and the reinforcement is heavily corroded. A large proportion of the rafters on the southern roof slope have been replaced, as can be seen in the photograph (right), where there are no marks from timber laths.

strut- trusses and purlins survive. The western mono-pitch has been largely removed, there is no roof covering and a vertical studwork structure has been temporarily sheeted over - there is only a small fragment of the original roof evident within the stairwell. This western roof slope originally had a much steeper pitch (perhaps as much as 70 degrees) and was largely glazed. It appears to have had very little slate covering. None of the original concrete and wrought-iron roof slab can reasonably be re-used, as there has been considerable corrosion of the reinforcement. This is accepted by the engineer's report (Thomasons - 10.12.13) which states "The high-level concrete roof has particularly suffered from water ingress and the severity of the corrosion to the bottom flange requires that this roof is replaced." The lower purlins have been propped throughout the roof space, as a result of significant deflection of the timbers. This may be a result from the additional weight from slate roofs (the original mono-pitches were largely glazed) or from insect damage, or a combination of these. The roof trusses are short strut-trusses which support the lower purlins. Works to remove purlins and rafters on the western roof, and their replacement with a timber screen, were undertaken at some point in the past prior to the current owner purchasing the building, but it is not possible to say with certainty when this was undertaken. It is possible that it was undertaken before the building was listed in 1994. The Thomasons report states "The lower purlin appears too shallow for the load/span and this is demonstrated by obvious deflection between supports and introduction of ad hoc support posts in the past. The cantilever configuration at the hip location will result in sagging of the roof if additional support is not introduced." They also state...."The existing purlin section sizes are unlikely to comply with current standards, particularly with regard to deflection limits. Strengthening would not necessarily be a requirement of building regulations but an evaluation of potential deflection would be advisable."

The repair of the roof is a priority and in order to make progress on this, the provision of a temporary roof covering with a large independent, wind and watertight, roof scaffold will be included as a Method Statement as part of the current application for listed building consent. This will ensure that the structure is safe, has no harmful impact on the listed building, and provides the unfettered means to undertake the more complicated structural repairs to the flat roof without further modifications.

Modifications to the roof; the proposed conversion involves modifications to the roof pitch, in order to create sufficient headroom within the eastern apartment, and a slight increase in the height of the ridge at the apex of the slate roof, as a result of this change in pitch. The pitch will be increased from 35 to 45 degrees, enough to provide sufficient headroom to make the front apartment viable. The existing rafters cannot be re-used in this proposed adaptation, although the short strut-trusses will be re-used in-situ and the purlins will be re-used (if the engineer considers them to be adequate) in the new alignment and strengthened. The gutter, parapet and hopper heads remain in the same position but the angle of the slate roof and the rafters will alter and the effect of this alteration is to raise the springing point of the new rafters by 20mm. The precise details of the junction of the parapet and gutter cannot be safely inspected until the building is fully scaffolded but, from the survey information that is available and aerial photographs, it does not appear to be constructed in the usual traditional way with a deep parapet gutter.

The proposed modifications to the west elevation and south elevation to create a balcony at attic level reflect the fact that this location is not as prominent as the Harter Street elevation and has already been significantly damaged. Following a meeting with the conservation officer, the design has been modified to separate the proposed cantilevered balcony from the existing brick chimney stack on the south elevation by a significant margin. This preserves the detached character of the chimney, as seen from street level, and reduces the amount of balcony and cantilevered roof. It now relates directly to the central brick pier on the main southern elevation.

Justification;
There is insufficient headroom within the Harter Street apartment (No. 21 - east side) currently to create a viable flat, without changing the pitch of the roof and inserting some dormer windows. The scheme has been altered, since our last meeting with the conservation officer on 26th March 2014, to reduce the pitch of the roof to one of 45 degrees and to replace dormers where possible with rooflights. This is as close to the original appearance of the roof that can be achieved. Unfortunately, the scheme still requires some dormers in order to provide the headroom space needed in critical areas of the eastern flat. As has been demonstrated by the Viability Study, the scheme cannot support a reduction in either the number or quality of apartments. To the street elevations, there will be very little visible difference in appearance, as the roof can only just be seen from Princess Street and not at all from immediate ground level (see photos on page 14). The proposed works involve creating a new roof to the entire building, retaining in-situ, wherever possible, the structural details that help to define its internal character; cast-iron columns, refurbished steel beams, timber trusses. Where structural elements cannot be

retained in-situ, some of these will be re-used on new alignments, although the rafters cannot be re-used. Indeed, the rafters will not be visible as part of the new scheme, which has to comply with Building Regulations to provide sufficient thermal upgrade. The fundamental design relationship of concrete flat roof slab construction and mono-pitched, Welsh slate outer slopes will be retained in the scheme.

The alterations proposed to the pitch of the lean-to roof will be an alteration to the original fabric, albeit some of the timbers will be re-used. We consider that the overall harm to the listed building will be less than substantial, taking into account the fact that all of the flat roof has to be replaced, as an unavoidable repair, which covers approximately 30% of the roof as seen on plan, that there is very little left of the western roof structure, and lastly that most of the rafters on the southern roof slope have been replaced. The eaves and parapet details, as seen from the Harter Street east and south elevations, will be unaltered. If these alterations to the roof pitches are not carried out, the number of flats would be reduced overall but the cost of repair and refurbishment will remain the same. We consider that the proposed alterations do not amount to "substantial harm", and therefore the scheme should be assessed based on weighing up the cumulative impact of alterations against securing its optimum viable use.

On balance, and on the basis that the roof needs both comprehensive structural repair immediately and modifications, the roof alterations can be justified on the grounds that it is critical to the viability of the scheme that two units are provided at attic level. The justification for this is addressed in the Viability Study by Jones Lang LaSalle.

As there are no details remaining of the original roof structure on the western roof slope, and any restoration would be largely conjectural, the design team considered that there was an opportunity here to design a contemporary elevation / roof finish. The zinc-clad, standing seam roof accommodates the very steep pitch and is an honest alteration which also, in terms of colour and detail, fits snugly with the slate roof covering on the other roof slopes. In conjunction with this cladding, the scheme proposes a glazed, full-height, inset balcony window to both the western elevation and the southern elevation. The glazed curtain wall is set back from the parapet by a metre, and has an overhanging cantilevered concrete roof, a continuation of the reinforced roof slab. This enables the creation of a more attractive apartment, which assists with the viability of the whole scheme. Although a modern detail, it is considered that the building can accommodate these alterations without a significant impact on its special interest, because the glazing is set back from the parapet and is not prominent in the street scene (see left photo). Whilst it manifests the change of use in a contemporary way, it respects the historic roof structure, plan form and original materials.





The alterations required to adapt the attic floor for residential use affects an area that has been altered and which is in very poor condition. The level of significance of this floor is only medium, because of the alterations it has undergone. A small section of the slate roof is visible from Princess Street (see photo right), but not from immediate views at street level or from the south. Long-range views from Princess Street will not be significantly affected by the proposed alterations, as these views are dominated by a number of protruding features on the skyline (see photo on page 11). Views from the car park to the rear of the site (western elevation) will be affected, but these are not generally in the public domain and the area has a panoply of very different roof types and finishes, with a range of roofs; flat, mansard, coped gables, and a range of elevational treatment; 20th century glazed curtain wall, plain brickwork with sash windows, and cast-iron glazing systems. The addition of a contemporary glazed structure at roof level is not out of place within this dynamic setting of 19th to 21st century adaptations to the building stock.

Mitigation; In order to address the extent of alteration proposed at roof level, there will be a number of measures undertaken to reduce the visual impact of the changes; the short strut-trusses of the existing structure will be retained in-situ, with the new rafters oversailing them. Both the cast-iron columns and the wrought-iron beams will be re-used and painted in





The range of different roof types, materials, and finishes to the west of Harter Street, overlooking the former canal basin (now a car park), is dynamic and interesting, as illustrated in these photographs. The addition of a contemporary glazed and zinc-clad roof to 2 Harter Street will not be out-of-place in this setting and in replacing the plastic-sheeted timber studwork, will positively enhance the listed building. The relatively small scale of the alteration can be seen in the photograph (below left) where the massing of the rear elevation is evident.





intumescent paint. Although a new concrete slab will be constructed, with new reinforcement, this will be to the same level as the original concrete flat roof, with an extended section to the south and west, forming a cantilever over the glazed curtain walling. These adaptations follow the spirit of the original construction. A further adaptation needed to provide increased headroom near the eaves to make a living room, bathroom and kitchen viable, involves creating flat-roofed dormers along the line of the roof to the eastern (Harter Street) elevation. They are simple windows, with traditional joinery details. These will be kept simple, to avoid an overly domestic character, painted a deep grey to match the slate, not white. We have considered possible alternatives to the dormer windows and increased pitch, in consultation with the architect, but there is insufficient headroom to make the rooms viable if rooflights were retained throughout. Conservation-type flush rooflights have been used where the headroom is not critical.

Level of Significance of interior and exterior affected – medium (original structure but modified and in poor condition)
Magnitude of Impact – major

Level of Significance	Outstanding	Neutral	Slight	Moderate / Large	Large or Very Large	Very Large
	High	Neutral	Slight	Moderate / slight	Moderate / large	Large / very large
	Medium	Neutral	Neutral / slight	Slight	Moderate	Moderate / large
	Low	Neutral	Neutral / slight	Neutral / slight	Slight	Slight / moderate
	None	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral / slight	Neutral / slight	Slight
		No Change	Negligible	Minor	Moderate	Major
		Magnitude of Impact				

7.2.7 Adaptation of Windows

Basement level windows

The surviving existing windows at basement level facing Harter Street and the south elevation are cast-iron, glazed with thin glass within the frames. At least two of the original cast-iron windows have been blocked up in brick during modifications on the south elevation. The cast-iron windows also have small, hinged, hopper lights for ventilation, some now fixed. Whilst it is feasible to retain the original cast-iron glazed windows in-situ in the stairwell (Apartment 4), which is not a habitable room, the cast-iron windows on the Harter Street elevation cannot be re-used in a residential conversion without some modifications. It is proposed that the cast-iron frames be retained, the glass removed, the cast-iron cleaned and re-painted, and that new, independent, louvred openable windows are set in front of the existing cast-iron frames. The cast-iron windows will therefore be visible from inside each flat. Protective security grilles are required to the pavement side. The new "sandwich" of windows at this level, and the need to provide a protective splashguard upstand, at pavement level, will require the original cast-iron windows to be set in a slightly modified position. Restoration of the original window apertures to the two altered lower ground level windows will require new terracotta window heads to be manufactured. These will need to be carried out by a specialist terracotta manufacturer, such as Shaws of Darwen or Hathern. Where cast-iron windows are missing, new windows will be louvred, which is an honest alteration enabling windows to be openable from the lower ground floor by remote control.



Cast-iron windows at lower ground level. Those to Harter Street (left) will need to be modified to enable this change of use to take place. Those to the timber stairwell (right) can be retained and repaired in-situ.



The windows overlooking the car park at basement level are sash windows, and these do not require any alteration. To achieve sufficient upgrade for thermal efficiency, secondary glazing will be required. Trickle vents will be provided to the secondary glazing only.

Windows to Ground, First, Second and Fourth Floors

The majority of the existing sash windows have been upgraded and adapted by inserting double-glazing. These windows will be refurbished and repaired like-with-like. As a principle, the use of epoxy resin fillers can be very successful where it leads to the retention of large elements, such as cills. This conservative approach to repair is an accepted methodology but will be used selectively. The Ventrolla report provides a window-by-window schedule of how each window will be repaired. Secondary glazing will be installed with profiles to reflect the dimensions of the sash windows. Trickle vents will be provided to the secondary glazing only. Where the windows are lower than the minimum acceptable height for Building Regulations, horizontal rails will be inserted into the brick window reveal, between the two sets of windows (see section Drawing no. 13010, (0-) 35A).

There are no existing sash window fasteners, no evidence that they have been removed, and very little remaining ironmongery throughout the building. The lack of sash window fasteners was probably the result of the need to open windows quickly, useful for an industrial building. The proposed alterations to the sash windows involve introducing traditional sash fasteners, in a chrome or brushed-satin finish, to be in keeping with the industrial character of the building. These are essential for security and to ensure draught-proof seals along the meeting rails.

The large doors for the loading bay have been modified and at some time in the past these were replaced with a "drawbridge" at ground floor level. This has been modified in the past and is of low interest (the original appearance is unknown but the sliding door mechanism is still in-situ). It is not feasible to retain the "drawbridge" within the new design, as the glazing is an important element of the conversion. Drawing 13010, (0-) 31F shows the simple treatment This is set in reveal, on the same alignment as the drawbridge, and retains the metal fixings and sliding door paraphernalia associated with the original doors.

Windows to Third Floor

The existing casements at third floor level have been altered but there are a few original details intact, which will be replicated. Secondary glazing will be made to follow the lines of the transoms and stiles of the casements. Trickle vents will be provided to the secondary glazing only.

Level of Significance of windows – high
Magnitude of Impact – negligible

Level of Significance	Outstanding	Neutral	Slight	Moderate / Large	Large or Very Large	Very Large
	High	Neutral	Slight	Moderate / slight	Moderate / large	Large / very large
	Medium	Neutral	Neutral / slight	Slight	Moderate	Moderate / large
	Low	Neutral	Neutral / slight	Neutral / slight	Slight	Slight / moderate
	None	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral / slight	Neutral / slight	Slight
		No Change	Negligible	Minor	Moderate	Major
		Magnitude of Impact				

7.2.8 Removal of Fixtures and Fittings

Hoist and Cast-iron shuttering

The adaptation of the building at lower ground level does not allow for the retention of the hoist as it falls within a critical area of the floor layout. This is redundant and although of industrial and archaeological interest as part of the building history, it is only a fragment of the original full-height structure.

Mitigation; in view of the alterations required to add a new raised floor in the lower ground to allow for services zone, it is feasible to preserve the pit for the hoist in-situ, under the new floor slab, so that some archaeological evidence is retained. The hoist will be photographed in good artificial light conditions prior to its removal and "preservation by record" will be undertaken to English Heritage standards of recording. The fittings and cast iron plaque will be offered to MOSI as part of their collection.

Bulkhead to Passage

The scheme has been modified, following representations from the conservation officer, to reduce the width of the access for cycles and to retain the original metal "bulkhead" below the loading bay, which is further evidence of the industrial use of the building. The original riveted sheet metal structure cannot provide a watertight detail and so the existing system of basement waterpoofing will take up any residual water that seeps into the building at this point.

Drawbridge

The large taking-in doors for the loading bay have been modified and at some time in the past the original doors were replaced with a small "drawbridge" , opening on a chain pulley, and fixed timber panel at ground floor level. This opening has been modified in the past and is of low interest (the original appearance is unknown but the sliding door opening cast-iron fittings are still in-situ). The cast-iron and wrought-iron fittings for the original sliding door will be retained in Apartment 4. It is not feasible to retain the "drawbridge" within the new design, as the glazing is an important element of the conversion and is the principal light source for the main living room in this apartment. The "drawbridge" is of low or no interest.

Hearth / fireplace

In view of the need to provide acoustic separation of the flats from the adjoining building, it will not be feasible to retain the open hearth within an apartment. However, the evidence for the fireplace opening will be retained in-situ behind a stud partition / dry-lining.

Electrical fittings and sprinkler system pipework

The Mather & Platt electrical fittings at ground floor level cannot be retained as a feature within an apartment, as they occupy a large area of wall space and fall on the alignment of a new partition wall. The old sprinkler system dates from the mid 20th century or thereabouts and is of no special interest. It does not have comprehensive coverage and cannot be re-used as part of the new sprinkler system. Its retention would create visual confusion with further services, rather than contribute to any appreciation of significance. It will therefore be removed.

Level of Significance of fixtures and fittings affected – low
Magnitude of Impact – moderate

Level of Significance	Outstanding	Neutral	Slight	Moderate / Large	Large or Very Large	Very Large
	High	Neutral	Slight	Moderate / slight	Moderate / large	Large / very large
	Medium	Neutral	Neutral / slight	Slight	Moderate	Moderate / large
	Low	Neutral	Neutral / slight	Neutral / slight	Slight	Slight / moderate
	None	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral / slight	Neutral / slight	Slight
		No Change	Negligible	Minor	Moderate	Major
		Magnitude of Impact				

7.2.9 Disabled Access

The relevant legislation includes The Equality Act 2010 and The Building Regulations Approved Document M (2013). The Equality Act does not override other legislation such as listed building legislation, and the need to conserve the special characteristics of historic buildings is recognised in Approved Document M. The guidance states that the aim should be to improve accessibility where practically possible, provided that the work does not prejudice the character of the building or increase the risk of long-term deterioration to the building fabric or fittings.

The Equality Act does not prescribe which option should be considered first, but the Code of Practice recommends that service providers should start by considering whether the physical feature which creates a barrier can be removed or altered. The main entrance should be adapted in preference to a side or rear entrance, unless this is specifically chosen as the principal entrance. This represents an inclusive approach to access because it makes services available to everyone in the same way. The Act requires that any means of avoiding the physical feature must be a 'reasonable' one. In determining reasonableness consideration should be given to the dignity of disabled people and the extent to which they are caused inconvenience or anxiety. It should always be remembered that the aim is to achieve a standard of access for disabled people that is equal to that enjoyed by the rest of the public.

Following a meeting with the conservation officer, a review of disabled access to the front elevation was undertaken. There are a number of constraints which prevent structural alterations to the front elevation of the building;

- the lobby is panelled and approached via a short flight of three stone steps.
- behind the entrance doors is an internal draught-lobby, with an encaustic-tiled surface and a matwell, with pivoting doors

(currently missing).
- further within the lobby are two additional steps leading to the staircase landing, in terrazzo finish.

Overall, the difference in level between the pavement and the main stairwell is approximately 1-metre, a significant change in level, which is currently accommodated by two separate flights of steps.

Unfortunately, because of the position of the adjacent doorway to "Charlie's Karaoke Bar", and the adjoining roller-shuttered doors, the pavement cannot be altered to create a ramped access. In any event, the change in floor level within the building would still require a second ramp to be provided within the entrance lobby and there is insufficient distance within the lobby to create this ramp to current approved standards without removing the inward-opening entrance doors and significant remodelling of the panelled lobby.

As the front entrance doorway and lobby is the area identified of the highest aesthetic significance within the building, this option has been discounted and an alternative location was considered, within the adjoining window bay. As the ground floor level is raised 1 metre above the exterior ground level, the provision of disabled access through the window aperture adjoining the main doorway on Harter Street would render a large area of both the ground floor and the lower ground floor out of use. This would effectively remove the duplex Apartment 1 from the scheme, and affect the whole viability of the scheme.

Although it is desirable to create full disabled access, there is no practical solution in this instance and the provision of removal ramps is included within the scheme, with the building being fully accessible from the entrance stairwell onwards. Apartment 21 is fully DDA compliant.

7.3 Public Benefits

The principal, positive beneficial impact of the scheme will be to secure the long-term future of this deteriorating listed property, which affects the settings of several other listed buildings as well as the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Repair

The building is built from robust materials, such as terracotta and moulded red brick and the walls are very thick. These have suffered from excessive water penetration as a result of the failure of the roof covering and gutters and a large number of the joints at the upper levels will require re-pointing. The massing of the walls may also mean that the building will probably take some time to dry out, once the sources of water penetration have been removed, and efflorescence is a strong possibility.

The building will be gently cleaned by using steam, such as the "DOFF" system by Stonehealth. This removes biocidal matter and is appropriate for terracotta and glazed bricks, as it does not damage or pit the surface. Re-pointing will be carried out using hand-held tools for raking out joints (not machine tools) and compatible lime mortars and sample panels will be prepared for the approval of the conservation officer prior to re-pointing. Lime putty, with fine sand may be required, where the joints are particularly tight, within the terracotta. Following re-pointing, the building will be monitored for efflorescence and any patches of effloresence will be removed on dry days by soft brushing and dry vacuuming to remove soluble salts.

All existing lead-lined gutters will be replaced with Code 5 lead, in conjunction with the re-roofing works. All leadwork will be carried out in accordance with the Lead Sheet Association guidelines. Where gutters do not comply with the guidelines and have inadequate steps, "T-pren" will be used to joint lengths of lead together.

Internally, the existing wrought iron and cast-iron will be cleaned down, rust removed and the surfaces prepared for a new min. 1 hour intumescent fire protection coating. All surviving metal coverings to the ventilation ducts will also be re-painted, (although the actual ducts will need to be blocked up from inside to remove the risk of fire spread).

Restoration

The proposed scheme involves the following works of restoration;

1. the reinstatement of the original window apertures to the ground and lower ground floor and the removal of the existing

cellar-drop openings to Harter Street. This element of restoration requires purpose-made terracotta cills / heads to be manufactured with moulded brick jambs. Terracotta will be manufactured by either Hathern or Shaws of Darwen and as this is a specialist skill, all works of drawing preparation and manufacture will be carried out by them. Patterns will be taken from the existing terracotta "keyed" window heads which survive on several windows at the same level. The steel framework / lintels for the original windows will be investigated to ensure that the new system of fixing is compatible.

2. The existing rainwater pipes and hopper heads are all grey plastic and there are no photographic records of the previous appearance of the rainwater pipes. We have identified a simple pattern of plain rectangular cast-iron hopper and round-section cast-iron pipe for restoration purposes, in a large section that would be appropriate for this building (pattern A484 – J & W Longbottom or similar - with 4" outlet and 4" round-section rainwater pipe). All cast-iron, and the insides of the hopper-heads, will be painted in a three-coat system with a black painted finish.

3. The missing sections of bull-nosed, blue brick coping will be reinstated, to the same profile, to the boundary wall overlooking the adjoining Linley House car park.

4. Both the external crane and the original metal canopy will be retained in-situ, cleaned and re-painted and the canopy will be re-glazed with safety glass.

Although there is some debate about the impact of the roof works, the restoration of the roof and the reinstatement of a permanent weathertight covering must be seen in a moderately positive light.

The restoration of the elevations and the removal of later unsightly additions, including the cellar-drop bulkheads, make a significant positive contribution to the high aesthetic value of the external elevations.

7.4 Cumulative Impact Assessment Table

The principal alterations and negative impacts are as follows;
- Insertion of partitions and corridors and service core to create apartments – MODERATE NEGATIVE
- Creation of duplex apartments and insertion of new staircases – SLIGHT NEGATIVE
- Upgrading floors to provide fire and acoustic separation – MODERATE NEGATIVE
- Adaptation and alterations to timber staircase – MODERATE NEGATIVE
- New lift shaft – SLIGHT NEGATIVE
- Roof alterations – MODERATE / LARGE NEGATIVE
- Adaptation of windows – SLIGHT NEGATIVE
- Removal of fixtures and fittings – MODERATE NEGATIVE

The principal alterations and positive impacts are identified here and in the Design and Access Statement and are as follows;
- Retention of external elevations, complete, with restored brickwork, terracotta and joinery, unaltered from ground level to fourth floor, with restoration of windows and reversal of modifications to openings to lower ground floor - LARGE POSITIVE
- Provision of sympathetic roof structure to replace current deteriorated concrete roof (off-set with alteration to pitch of slate roofs and new rafters) - MODERATE POSITIVE
- Re-use of the entire building, with no further areas of potential risk - LARGE POSITIVE & PUBLIC BENEFIT
- Sensitive adaptation of floors retaining main features of high significance - staircases, windows, panelled entrance lobby, wrought-iron and cast-iron and structural details - LARGE POSITIVE
- Removal of redundant building from the conservation area - LARGE POSITIVE & PUBLIC BENEFIT
- Restoration of original window apertures, cast-iron rainwater goods and terracotta details to damaged windows - LARGE POSITIVE

The following table sets out a summary of the cumulative impacts identified in this report, as listed above.

Negligible Negative/ neutral	Slight Negative	Moderate Negative	Moderate /Large Negative
0	3	4	1
Negligible Positive	Slight Positive	Moderate Positive	Large Positive
0	0	1	5

It seems reasonable that the alterations which have only negligible or slight impact should be acceptable in principle, as they do not harm the values of the listed building or its setting. Where there is a large or moderate negative impact, or a large number of cumulative negative impacts, this will need more careful consideration and weighing up of the public benefits.

Overall, the cumulative impact of the alterations to the listed building is in my view "less than substantial". Even if the roof alterations were seen to be large negative (as the conservation officer seems to consider them), when seen in the context of the fact that the roof requires major structural repairs and in the context of the whole application, this does not amount to substantial harm to the listed building. Paragraph 134 of NPPF requires the "less than substantial harm" to be weighed against the public benefits, including securing its optimum viable use. Viability and use of the building is addressed by the Jones Lang LaSalle Viability Study. We consider that residential use for 22 apartments is the optimum viable use, given the location of the building.

In all impact assessments concerning listed buildings it is important to weigh up the positive benefits of an application. In this instance, the most positive public benefit is the full economic use of a listed building which has become completely redundant. The National Planning Policy Framework recognises and advocates the need to find the optimum viable use. This is the use which involves least damage to historic and architectural interest and at the same time achieves a use which is viable, i.e. economic in that there is sufficient income or capital to both fund the repair of the building, and restoration if appropriate, to undertake a conversion scheme and to enable the continued maintenance of the building for the foreseeable future.

8. Planning Policy Framework and Guidance

Compliance with the local planning policy and generic policies contianed within the National Planning Policy Framework is addressed by Emery Planning Partnership.

8.1 National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and the Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide (March 2014)

NPPF has at its core the principle of sustainable development. This has three elements, socio, economic and environmental, all of which need to be evaluated for their public benefit, when weighing up proposals.

Sustainable development is divided into a number of principles. Principle 12 Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment is addressed within this HIA.

NPPF requires an assessment of significance of heritage assets (para. 128). A detailed assessment has been carried out by Mel Morris Conservation (dated 31.1.14), a consultant accredited with the IHBC, and this assessment of significance has informed the development of the scheme.

8.1.1 The condition of the Listed Building

Paragraph 130 of NPPF states;

> "Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of or damage to a heritage asset the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision."

The Planning Practice Guide states the following;

> "Should the deteriorated state of a heritage asset be taken into account in reaching a decision on an application? Disrepair and damage and their impact on viability can be a material consideration in deciding an application. However, where there is evidence of deliberate damage to or neglect of a heritage asset in the hope of making consent

or permission easier to gain the local planning authority should disregard the deteriorated state of the asset (National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph 130"

We believe that the condition of the listed building should be taken into account by the planning authority in making their decision. That would be only fair as the building has been largely vacant for over a decade and "at risk" for many years. The building was only acquired by the current owner in 2013, during which time they have undertaken works of decontamination and the preparation of plans for conversion and entered into detailed discussion with the LPA about the future use and adaptation of the building. There has been no deliberate neglect by the present owner - the opposite is the case and to suggest otherwise would be misleading.

The existing building was acquired by the current owner in 2013. It was acquired with the roof structure in a very poor condition, with western elevation partially exposed to the elements, concrete roof slab reaching a critical point and considerable water penetration. The building had been in a low-key use as a nightclub but this affected only the lower ground floor and the remainder of the building had been left unused for more than a decade. During that time, the upper floors were largely abandoned. Since acquiring the building, the new owners have cleared out debris and carried out decontamination of the lower ground floor level. They have attempted to make the roof watertight, although we understand that the use of sheeted covering was unsuccessful. We understand that the conservation officer suggested to the current owners two options; either sheet the building with tarpaulins fixed with ropes, or carry out comprehensive repairs and replace like-with-like. These options are, in my vew, problematic. In my opinion, the first option was rather impractical as there are no fixing points for the rope across the flat roof structure or along the gutters and there is no safe way of gaining access to carry out this temporary arrangement, without fully scaffolding the building. I also believe that the second option was not practically possible whilst there was some on-going discussion about the need for alterations to the roof structure to make the building viable for residential conversion. The repair of the roof is included, along with alterations, with this listed building consent application. To address the immediate roof condition, the provision of a temporary, high scaffold, which will make the roof wind and watertight for the duration of the refurbishment, is included with this application. This will be sheeted and have a rigid roof covering to prevent water damage. This is addressed in a Method Statement being submitted separately, as part of the application for listed building consent, by the applicant.

There is no evidence of deliberate damage or neglect and to the contrary, a scheme has been designed, with modifications, to meet the urgent need to find a resolution to the repair of the roof structure.

The condition of the building and the cost of repair and restoration are significant and material factors on the viability of the proposed scheme. The building is constructed with high quality materials and finishes, which will need careful and specialist repair, conservation and in some cases restoration. This all affects the cost of the scheme. The viability of the scheme is addressed in the Viability Study by Jones Lang LaSalle dated May 2014. Costs of repair are addressed in this study.

8.1.2 Optimum Viable Use

Paragraph 131 of NPPF states;

"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 Planning Practice Guide states the following;

"What is a viable use for a heritage asset and how is it taken into account in planning decisions?
The vast majority of heritage assets are in private hands. Thus, sustaining heritage assets in the long term often requires an incentive for their active conservation. Putting heritage assets to a viable use is likely to lead to the investment in their maintenance necessary for their long-term conservation. By their nature, some heritage assets have limited or even no economic end use. A scheduled monument in a rural area may preclude any use of the land other than as a pasture, whereas a listed building may potentially have a variety of alternative uses such as residential,

commercial and leisure In a small number of cases a heritage asset may be capable of active use in theory but be so important and sensitive to change that alterations to accommodate a viable use would lead to an unacceptable loss of significance.

It is important that any use is viable, not just for the owner, but also the future conservation of the asset. It is obviously desirable to avoid successive harmful changes carried out in the interests of repeated speculative and failed uses. If there is only one viable use, that use is the optimum viable use. If there is a range of alternative viable uses, the optimum use is the one likely to cause the least harm to the significance of the asset, not just through necessary initial changes, but also as a result of subsequent wear and tear and likely future changes.

The optimum viable use may not necessarily be the most profitable one. It might be the original use, but that may no longer be economically viable or even the most compatible with the long-term conservation of the asset. However, if from a conservation point of view there is no real difference between viable uses, then the choice of use is a decision for the owner. Harmful development may sometimes be justified in the interests of realizing the optimum viable use of an asset, notwithstanding the loss of significance caused provided the harm is minimised. The policy in addressing substantial and less than substantial harm is set out in paragraphs 132 – 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework."

The proposed change of use will remove a redundant and deteriorating building from an area of the City centre that is otherwise well-maintained, with a local resident population. Residential use, more than any other, provides a high degree of certainty over the future maintenance and repair of the building and investment in long-term conservation. The Viability Study demonstrates that other uses are not economically viable. Residential use is the only viable use and 22 units is the minimum needed to make the scheme viable. The Financial Appraisal in Appendix 4 of the Viability Study shows that the scheme is marginal, based on total operating profit for 22 units being less than is reasonably expected by developers, and not taking into account the actual costs paid for the site.

Whilst there is physical scope to reduce the number of apartments and to enlarge the apartments, any reduction in the number of apartments is critical to the viability of the scheme, as stated in the Jones Lang LaSalle report.

8.1.3 Assessment of level of harm

Paragraph 134 of NPPF states;

"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."

The Planning Practice Guide states the following;

"How to assess if there is substantial harm?
What matters in assessing if a proposal causes substantial harm is the impact on the significance of the heritage asset. As the National Planning Policy Framework makes clear, significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting. Whether a proposal causes substantial harm will be a judgment for the decision taker, having regard to the circumstances of the case and the policy in the National Planning Policy Framework. In general terms, substantial harm is a high test, so it may not arise in many cases. For example, in determining whether works to a listed building constitute substantial harm, an important consideration would be whether the adverse impact seriously affects a key element of its special architectural or historic interest. It is the degree of harm to the asset's significance rather than the scale of the development that is to be assessed. The harm may arise from works to the asset or from development within its setting.

While the impact of total destruction is obvious, partial destruction is likely to have a considerable impact but, depending on the circumstances, it may still be less than substantial harm or conceivably not harmful at all, for example, when removing later inappropriate additions to historic buildings which harm their significance. Similarly, works that are moderate or minor in scale are likely to cause less than substantial harm or no harm at all. However, even minor works have the potential to cause substantial harm.

> Policy on substantial harm to designated heritage assets is set out in paragraphs 132 and 133 to the National Planning Policy Framework."

The scope of the alterations is addressed within the table on page 21. The extent of harm is inevitably a matter of interpretation and our conclusions may not be the same as the planning authority. In our view, none of the works individually have substantial harm. In the impact assessment tables that we have adopted this would equate to either the highest level of impact on the highest level of significance (at the worst) to, in a sliding scale, the highest level of impact on something of high significance or moderate impact on something of outstanding significance. The single, largest alteration is the repair and alteration of the roof, but even the works to the roof must be seen in the light of its moderate interest, the alterations that have already taken place to the roof and the condition of the concrete roof slab. Substantial harm is a strong test and whilst it might apply in many circumstances to the removal of a complete element, the circumstances with the existing roof are different.

There are a number of works of moderate and minor negative alteration that are required to achieve the change of use. These have to be balanced against the need to find an economic use for the building.

The Planning Practice Guide states;

> "How can proposals avoid or minimise harm to the significance of a heritage asset?
> A clear understanding of the significance of a heritage asset and its setting is necessary to develop proposals which avoid or minimise harm. Early appraisals, a conservation plan or targeted specialist investigation can help to identify constraints and opportunities arising from the asset at an early stage. Such studies can reveal alternative development options, for example more sensitive designs or different orientations, that will deliver public benefits in a more sustainable and appropriate way."

The preparation of the appraisal and statement of significance has resulted in alterations to the plans and a large reduction in the scope of alterations.

8.1.4 Public benefit

The Planning Practice Guide states;

> "What is meant by the term public benefits?
> Public benefits may follow from many developments and could be anything that delivers economic, social or environmental progress as described in the National Planning Policy Framework. Public benefits should flow from the proposed development. They should be of a nature or scale to be of benefit to the public at large and should not just be a private benefit. However, benefits do not always have to be visible or accessible to the public in order to be genuine public benefits. Public benefits may include heritage benefits, such as: sustaining or enhancing the significance of a heritage asset and the contribution of its setting reducing or removing risks to a heritage asset securing the optimum viable use of a heritage asset in support of its long term conservation."

The re-use of the building and removal of the risks to the listed building will bring about significant public benefit. In particular, in this location, the building has been a local target for "urban explorers", and is vulnerable to theft and arson. Its condition and on-going vacancy has a detrimental impact on local businesses and the economic viability and security of nearby residential properties.

8.1.5 Setting

The Planning Practice Guide explains setting as;

> "Setting is the surroundings in which an asset is experienced, and may therefore be more extensive than its curtilage. All heritage assets have a setting, irrespective of the form in which they survive and whether they are designated or not.

The extent and importance of setting is often expressed by reference to visual considerations. Although views of or from an asset will play an important part, the way in which we experience an asset in its setting is also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise, dust and vibration from other land uses in the vicinity, and by our understanding of the historic relationship between places. For example, buildings that are in close proximity but are not visible from each other may have a historic or aesthetic connection that amplifies the experience of the significance of each.

The contribution that setting makes to the significance of the heritage asset does not depend on there being public rights or an ability to access or experience that setting. This will vary over time and according to circumstance.

When assessing any application for development which may affect the setting of a heritage asset, local planning authorities may need to consider the implications of cumulative change. They may also need to consider the fact that developments which materially detract from the asset's significance may also damage its economic viability now, or in the future, thereby threatening its ongoing conservation."

The setting of 2 Harter Street includes buildings lining Harter Street, views from Princess Street, and views from the private car park at the back of the building. The proposal respects the differences between the surrounding buildings, which date from the first half of the 19th century, right through to the 20th century, and there is considerable evidence of cumulative change from the west side and the former canal basin. On Harter Street itself, the buildings were largely constructed within a short time frame of 30 years, but even here there are a large number of differences in building types, roof pitch, methods of glazing and roof treatment, set within a largely rhythmical sequence of blocks of similar massing and height and materials. It is important to preserve these historic differences and the proposed alterations do this, by retaining the mansard proportions and relationship of lean-to roof and flat concrete slab, and do not introduce any massing that is out of place within the immediate setting.

8.2. 'Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment' (English Heritage, April 2008)

There are several elements within this guidance that are relevant when considering the impact of proposed alterations to a listed building. Although these are extracts from the document, each statement stands alone.

Section 4. Significant places should be managed to sustain their values
Paragraph 4.5 states that; "Intervention may be justified if it increases understanding of the past, reveals or reinforces particular heritage values of a place, or is necessary to sustain those values for present and future generations, so long as any resulting harm is decisively outweighed by the benefits."

The scheme accords with this guidance in that it seeks to sustain the heritage values of the site, with any harm being outweighed by public benefits.

"New work and alteration
Paragraph 138 states that; "New work or alteration to a significant place should normally be acceptable if:
a. there is sufficient information comprehensively to understand the impacts of the proposal on the significance of the place;
b. the proposal would not materially harm the values of the place, which, where appropriate, would be reinforced or further revealed;
c. the proposals aspire to a quality of design and execution which may be valued now and in the future;
d. the long-term consequences of the proposals can, from experience, be demonstrated to be benign, or the proposals are designed not to prejudice alternative solutions in the future.

The scheme accords with this guidance in that it is informed by a full and thorough Historic Building Appraisal and Statement of Significance, which provides the background needed to understand the impacts, and the impact assessment demonstrates that the proposed scheme will not materially harm the values of the place.

"Integrating conservation with other public interests
Paragraph 149 states that; "Changes which would harm the heritage values of a significant place should be unacceptable

unless:
a. the changes are demonstrably necessary either to make the place sustainable, or to meet an overriding public policy objective or need;
b. there is no reasonably practicable alternative means of doing so without harm;
c. that harm has been reduced to the minimum consistent with achieving the objective;
d. it has been demonstrated that the predicted public benefit decisively outweighs the harm to the values of the place, considering

- its comparative significance,
- the impact on that significance, and

the benefits to the place itself and/or the wider community or society as a whole.

The scheme accords with this guidance in that the predicted public benefit of change of use to residential use decisively outweighs any negative impact. Any harm has been minimised through careful design and is an inevitable consequence of bringing the building back into the optimum viable use.

9. Conclusions and Justification

English Heritage guidance accepts that change is often necessary to the future viability of listed buildings. In the case of redundant buildings, securing the optimum viable use is a significant consideration.

We consider that the proposed development involves no material harm to the values of the listed building, its intrinsic architectural or historic interest, and its setting. Where there are alterations, these are the minimum necessary to achieve the change of use, sympathetic and are part of the continuation of the life of the building in a viable use.

In weighing up the cumulative impact of the alterations, our conclusion is that the cumulative negative impacts resulting from the alterations are outweighed by the positive benefits of bringing the listed building back into an economic use.

The proposal fulfils all of the following;

- It reduces risk to a heritage asset (by making full use of the building).
- It makes a positive contribution to economic vitality and sustainable communities.
- It is an appropriate design for its context and makes a positive contribution to the appearance, character, quality and local distinctiveness of the historic environment.

The proposal will ensure the long-term viability of the buildings. The proposal is, therefore, sustainable and fulfils the sustainable development principles of NPPF.

Melanie Lloyd Morris B.A. Hons, Dip. Arch. Cons, IHBC, MRTPI