

FIRST DRAFT

STRUCTURAL REPORT ON PREMISES OF

HARRISON FISHER LTD

EYE-WITNESS WORKS, MILTON STREET, SHEFFIELD S3 7WT

Eastwood & Partners are commissioned through WPA Chartered Surveyors on behalf of Harrison Fisher Ltd to advise upon the structural feasibility of retaining the complex of buildings known as Eye-Witness Works, and the adjacent Ceylon Works in Thomas Street, in beneficial use. Whilst this report is essentially based upon a structural evaluation, it will necessarily make assumptions, or give recommendations based upon experience of such matters, with regard to future potential use. At this stage no detailed architectural proposals have been formulated. The purpose of this report is that it be used as a basis for further discussion upon matters of general principle with Sheffield City Council's Planning and Conservation Officers.

General Background

Harrison Fisher who own and who operate from the premises are manufacturers and importers and distributors of cutlery, scissors and kitchen hardware. They operate under a variety of trade names, some such as Taylor's Eye-Witness being well known for quality of product. They also produce and package goods which are sold under the brand names of well known high-street stores, and also other goods not sold as directly branded. It is well known that the cutlery and associated light trades, once a major part of Sheffield's industrial heritage, can no longer compete on price with mass produced imports. Therefore Harrison Fisher's business is effectively of two kinds. They continue to produce on these sites, but in relatively small quantity, high grade goods which compete in terms of quality at the upper end of the market. They also import, package and wholesale a range of other goods, which in volume terms represent the majority of turnover. Thus there are on the site two distinct functions. One is manufacture which involves the use of significant space, with a range and quantity of

production machinery in-situ which is no doubt greater than is needed for current or predictable future purposes. They also warehouse, repackage and engage in wholesale distribution of a wide range of goods, requiring significant storage space from which 'picking' and consignment to customers takes place.

The number of people employed at the site is around 55. The gross floor area is, very approximately 8000m². It can readily be appreciated from internal inspection that space is not fully utilised. The complexities of internal arrangement mean that the ratio of gross to net usable floor area is low, yet there is a general effective under-utilisation of potentially usable space. Some areas are effectively unoccupied. The buildings as a whole are aged and at the stage where, if they are to have any significant future practical life expectancy, heavy maintenance costs will arise in the next 10-25 years, incompatible with sensible economic investment practice. The premises are a warren of small areas, making effective control of staff functions difficult and the most effective use of staff time impossible. A further factor, probably fully to be appreciated only from detailed internal inspection is that for historical reasons, arising from a large complex on slightly sloping ground, and from a pattern of historically piecemeal development there are numerous internal changes in level within Eye Witness Works, and a practical impossibility for staff to be employed without moving between one level or another. In terms of any attempt by Harrison Fisher to comply with the requirements of the Disabilities Discrimination Act, they might only, if entirely reasonably, point out that general improvement of access would place them under an unsustainable financial burden. Indeed it might reasonably be appreciated that such cost might well approach the costs of new-build of modern premises, of a much smaller size and on a single level.

So, Harrison Fisher now very sensibly appreciate that they cannot afford in the medium term to continue to operate from Eye-Witness and Ceylon Works. The costs of doing so outweigh the costs of relocation, but at the same time the traditional local trade, to which they are committed, is not so profitable as to enable them to relocate whilst maintaining the fabric of the current premises. They need to raise capital from the sale and reuse of the premises to be able to see that they have a future. We are advised that Harrison Fisher employ skilled labour, only readily available from present staff and that they believe that they have a reputation enabling continued production of cutlery to remain



profitable under favourable circumstances of an ability to re-trench such production elsewhere within Sheffield.

Harrison Fisher are not, however, able to take the simple step of demolition of buildings and sale of sites to raise capital. Both Eye-Witness and Ceylon Works are subject to Grade II listing. At Appendix A are the listings of the buildings. We have compared these with what can be seen. Probably the descriptions are fair, but, with respect, a little difficult to follow as they may seem to follow a description dictated whilst on site, but respecting a sequence of observations and train of thought though not fully edited into a clear narrative. At Appendix B is attached an extract from the Persner Architectural Guide to Sheffield (Ruth Harman and John Minnis, Yale University Press, 2004) which sets out, perhaps in clearer terms, the important features of the premises. We are unsure of precise dating, and as it may later appear, matters are simplified. However dates are no doubt correct with a reasonable degree of accuracy.

Appendix C is the Ordnance Survey Map of 1903 which is immediately to hand but useful in helping to set up a chronology.

Appendix D is survey plans, commissioned on behalf of Harrison Fisher. The first of these is marked up by us with reference to physical areas described hereafter. It is apparent upon inspection that these plans are to some degree limited – for example, blocked up openings are not clearly identified, and the number of sections is insufficient to show the true complexity of the premises in terms of levels. There is no distinction upon the survey plans between areas of differing age or the joints between them. However for current purposes the survey seems sufficient. Analysis hereafter is to be seen as ‘broad-brush’ but not we think thereby incorrect.

At this stage reference may be made to the marked up plan in Appendix D. Further explanation as to elevations will follow.

More Particular Analysis

By reference to the Plan in Appendix D, it must be noted that within this broad approach various things will become apparent. Firstly a cutlery or light-trades building in Sheffield may seem to emerge as either a single range, or ranges built around an open courtyard. In this case three separate

'courtyards' superficially emerge, but yet only broad in terms of growth of development and never, in all probability, so simple. Also 'courtyards' were developed so that major public street access was architecturally significant, but lesser elevations, and some internal communications were blocked off at ground floor level for reasons of security. The 19th century organisation of cutlery and light trades is sufficiently well appreciated as to need no detailed explanation here. However it is useful at this stage to say that an integrated company as now understood was not then present. There may have been a development to accommodate many 'little mesters' each pursuing a narrow specialisation integrated towards an end product, perhaps under the trademark of a capitalist whose only input into this was a name and degree of managerial organisation. So we might have, say in 1850 and continuing into the 20th century premises offering a degree of security with an internal courtyard secure through having little access at ground level on inner elevations. Major street elevations might be architecturally 'grand' and possibly funded in terms of capital by a single investor seeking to present a public face for sale of products which were in reality but the effects of a series of self employed 'mesters' each engaged in a narrow function. So we have physical evidence of investment in property leading to piece-meal expansion. However, because of this it becomes very difficult to engage upon physical analysis of the properties. Development may have taken place over a period of 100 years, but not later than 55 years ago, under very different practical circumstances than those of the 21st century. They will also have taken place through the activities of a local 'builder' not subject to current statutory control. So, it is not possible to engage in analysis presuming anything which is currently understood as 'proper practice' in construction.

We turn to description of what is present as indicated by marked-up survey plans within Appendix D. Marking up is to be seen as generalised in its conclusion, and neglecting minor alteration. With regard to earlier elements of construction these must surely have included hearth and chimney arrangements later removed so that we have now no, or very limited opportunity to determine anything with precision. Probably, however, there is extensive removal from the earlier elements of buttressing cross walls and associated flues and hearths. Such hearths would have been necessary both to provide warmth for skilled trades in winter and the opportunity to heat materials in the course of production.

Criteria for 'Listing'

It is necessary to note various matters. At the time of listing (1986) the Milton Street frontages, and to a lesser extent those to Thomas Street would probably have been seen as a historically important remaining element of the 'cutlery and light trades'. This will still be so, albeit that such buildings were erected surrounded by housing, now long lost, and replaced by car parks and late 20th century development. Such premises may always have seemed to be 'grand' amongst their lesser surroundings. To say this is but to create a context in which they were built, and very clearly there was never a reasonable expectation, that originally surrounding housing of poor quality (see Appendix C) had any hope of survival into the 21st century. Back-to-back and cellar dwellings were banned by Acts of Parliament dating back to the 1870's, and it is thought that in the wider public interest all were demolished around 50 years ago. The premises, albeit 'listed' now survive in isolation from their original context.

Between, say, 1850 and 1875, there were rapid developments in building technology. Production of glass became very rapidly developed, so that traditional 12 light window frames were overtaken by large sash windows, with accompanying change in joinery practice. There was a gradual replacement of load bearing masonry combined with traditional timber floors by the introduction of cast iron beams, and concrete and brick jack arch floor construction. After around 1890-1900 cast iron elements were replaced with steel and concrete. From the 1870's there was use of cast stone lintels instead of shallow brick arching. At the same time, say after 1860, and up to 1900 there was an introduction of ornamental features, and an abandonment of 'Georgian' classical style in favour of more eclectic design. These considerations, if very broad, do help in identifying age of elements of structure, particularly in that steel was only widely used in buildings after 1890. What may emerge, in general, is this. The buildings may be 'listed' upon the basis of their more public frontages. In practice these may date between, say 1850 and 1880.

Internal development of Eye Witness Works is more readily, in a wider sense, to be dated not earlier than 1890, and clearly extends into the second half of the 20th century.

In general it may be said that all roof coverings are close to the end of their serviceable life and this observation need not be repeated. But, to describe elements as numbered in Appendix D :-

Area A

This is no doubt an important element of streetscape on the Milton Street frontage. Indeed, it is probably the sole reason for listing. To a certain, if limited degree, areas of frontage are marked upon the elevational plan. It is difficult to say more than that these may seem to date from between about 1850 and about 1875. The history is clearly a little more complex than is described in Appendices A and B. Limited current partial defect is to be noted as being marked up. The lines of inner (North) walls will be noted. They must be much altered, and probably in their original form gave not more than 5m internal width at all floor levels, with timber floors and king post truss roofs. They were potentially effectively blank at inner ground floor level for reasons of physical security.

Roofs are slated, but no doubt not in an original form. (Removal of chimneys is not apparent). Nor are rainwater goods. Sensibly there has been widespread removal of internal cross walls and flues/chimneys, buttressing front and rear elevations. It is to be noted that due to potential removal of cross walls there is clear evidence of a series of introductions of tie rods and patress plates in various places. Where apparently original cross walls remain their provenance is uncertain as they appear unbonded in some instances to front and rear walls. Main front and rear walls are by no means in a dangerous condition, albeit displaying differential settlement as they are above deeper founded partial cellars. Such settlement does not clearly extend into upper extensions, and was probably long ago effectively complete.

The rear limits of Area A are difficult to define, due to complex history. Unlike the frontage they are much altered, and at ground floor level effectively largely lost due to alterations extending into the second half of the 20th century.

Area B

Area B is the Western wing of Eye-Witness works, continuing round into the rear (North) elevation. These elements appear to be of the same building, as an early (1850's?) extension of the Western element of Area A. They are of three storeys, built of load bearing brickwork with timber floors and

king post truss timber roof supporting a slate covering. The internal width is generally about 4.3m reducing to 3.9m between piers supporting roof trusses.

Both external elevations were probably originally blank at ground floor level, a common security precaution. However there are numerous later penetrations through the walls, not respecting the rhythm of the original fenestration. The rear elevation brickwork is exposed. It is of poor quality material, now deeply weathered and with a substantial proportion of individual bricks now spalling. Ongoing decay of exposed brickwork cannot be stopped, and the extent of occurrence of individual bricks now unsound is such as to make piecemeal repair impractical. If this wall were to be seen as having any long term future then this might only be through overcladding. The West side wall is covered in plain render, clearly of some age. No doubt this has been applied because of decay of brickwork on the elevation most exposed to the prevailing wind and driving rain. There are various areas internally where damp penetration can be seen.

The internal elevations of Area B are in better physical condition, but at ground floor level where they adjoin Area C subject to substantial alteration.

Area C

Area C is a single storey machine shop within what as once an open yard. It is steel framed with a flat roof over pyramidal patent glazing to give light. The material used suggests that the structure is of the order of 40-50 years old. It is thus to be seen as a 'modern' feature.

Area D

Area D is of complex form. On the West side it rises to four storeys, the uppermost floor having continuous glazing in its side walls giving a workshop for engraving or similar work requiring good light. The Eastern side is three storeys high. Potentially there were here two separate but adjoining ranges, each facing into a courtyard in separate occupation. Clearly, however, there has been substantial later remodelling so that they form a more integrated block, but without continuity of floor levels. Structures are complicated and history is difficult to determine although all elements clearly post-date Areas A and B. Substantial elements of side walls are removed at ground floor level. The Western part has elements of first floor which are of brick jack-arches on iron or steel

beams, whilst elements of upper floors are of timber. A tentative date of around 1880 might be given to this part. The Eastern elements contain extensive use of rolled steel beams, either as original components or (less likely) as a result of very substantial remodelling. In any event the materials used suggest a date of not earlier than 1895. Roofs are timber framed and slated. At the North West corner, adjoining Area B is a chimney obviously postdating Area B, but seeming to predate Area D. The chimney is long disused, apparently sound but in need of routine repointing.

Taken as a whole Area D is superficially physically sound, if in need of extensive maintenance in the short to medium term. However it is clearly much altered at lower levels and lacks internal spatial continuity due to differing floor levels.

Area E

Area E is infill within an original yard. It contains a number of small structures, varying between single storey and three storeys in height. Buildings are generally of masonry with timber floors and timber framed slated roofs, although some areas of asbestos cement sheeting are present. The age of buildings is predominantly late 19th or early 20th century but with some more modern elements. Extensive alteration has taken place at ground floor level to create larger spaces for machine tool operation.

General condition, as with Area D, remains serviceable but with obvious need for extensive expenditure on maintenance in the short to medium term. As also with Area D complex ground level alterations and differing levels of floors in separate building elements lead to lack of internal spatial continuity.

Area F

Area F lies between area E and Egerton Lane. At present it has an old brick wall on the North side, and a monopitch steel framed asbestos cement sheeted roof up to the side of Area E Buildings. The 1903 Ordnance Survey map suggests that at that time the site was occupied by a narrow workshop range, similar to Area B, and with an open passage separating it from Area E buildings. The present North side wall is a lowered remnant of an earlier building now lost, and Area F is essentially of modern construction.

Area G

This is a three storey brick built workshop of approximately 6m internal width and with timber floors and a timber framed slated roof. Old maps suggest that the building once extended as far as Thomas Street through part of Area I, but has been shortened. A panel of brickwork on the North face has been subject to modern reconstruction and in the section of roof above the original timber king post truss is replaced with a steel angle truss. The age of the building is unclear, it could date from the earliest time of industrial occupation. Its brickwork is basically sound, but there is a need for significant localised repair and complete repointing.

Area H

This is a two storey building of brick and beneath an asbestos cement sheeted pyramidal roof. It is apparent that the upper storey is a later addition, probably early 20th century as it incorporates rolled steel beams. The lower section with thicker walls, is earlier and the thickness of walls and lack of openings suggest that it may originally have been a secure store. The building requires some maintenance.

Area I

Area I is a three storey building with frontages to Thomas Street and Egerton Lane. It is understood to have been constructed following destruction of earlier buildings by fire. It has masonry walls and concrete floors supported on steel beams. It is unclear whether it is fully steel framed or whether beams merely sit on substantial masonry piers. The apparent strength of the flat roof construction suggests that it may have been designed to allow upward extension.

The external walls are of brickwork, with concrete feature banding and there is a plaque dated 1950. The building is of varying internal width, typically about 7m – 8m clear, and whilst showing signs of wear and tear effectively in serviceable condition. There is good internal stair and lift access.

Area J

This is Ceylon Works, separated from Eye Witness Works by Egerton Lane and thus effectively separate premises physically unconnected and only by historical accident now in common ownership. The Thomas Street elevation is brick, in a generally classical if eclectic style and with



twin doorways not clearly relevant to current, or perhaps any historical internal arrangement. It is of three storeys with timber floors and slated timber roof. Brickwork on side elevations is heavily weathered and in need of repointing and repair. A date of 1875 would seem reasonable. Old maps show that this, together with the side elevation of Eye Witness Works (now lost to become Area I) were the only buildings other than terrace housing in Thomas Street.

There is a West wing of three storeys running along Egerton Lane. The South (Egerton Lane) elevation is relatively plain but faced with white salt glazed bricks at upper levels to reflect light into the windows of Eye Witness Works. Construction is of load bearing masonry with timber floors and a timber trussed slated roof. Internal clear width is no more than 3.8m at first and second floor levels.

At ground floor level the North side wall is carried on cast iron columns and beams and extends into a windowless workshop about 8m wide with a timber trussed monopitch lean-to roof. It can be seen that this extension building was originally of two storeys, but was cut down to its present size, probably not later than 1900.

Despite statements to the contrary in appended descriptions we see no evidence that Area J is not essentially of a single period of building, around 1875 and with the unusual feature of reflective brickwork respecting existing rights of light to the earlier Area G.

At the North East corner of Area J, and within a lower small yard, is a 20th century toilet block.

General Discussion of Condition

It will be seen from the foregoing that the buildings are of varying age and condition. All are in need of substantial expenditure in the short to medium term if they are to remain with any degree of serviceability, with the possible exception of Area I of Eye-Witness Works. None have modern standards of amenity, and there is very little potential for compliance with the possible requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act. The complex took its present form over 100 years ago to meet the special needs of an industry now vanished in terms of organisation of work practice.



It is obviously not possible to predict future maintenance and costs with any accuracy. One may start by saying that it is fairly clear that over the course of the next 20 years all roof coverings would need replacement. The area of roof is about 4000m² and much of this is so laid out that scaffolds need to be erected to heights of three and four storeys to renew a roof slope no more than 3m across. Re-roofing costs, at current price would be likely to be in the region of £400,000 - £500,000. Over the next 20 years there is foreseeably much other maintenance and repair work needed in painting, repointing, addressing crumbling masonry in Area B and renewal of aging building services. The total predictable maintenance cost over the next 20 years is perhaps of the order of £1 million, and this is but to retain the premises in an occupiable condition. Such expenditure would not improve currently poor physical facilities. The medium term outlook for Harrison Fisher is clear. Expenditure on maintenance is likely to be of greater order than the cost of new purpose built facilities from which they would be able to operate with greater working efficiency.

Future Use

It is reasonably apparent to rapid inspection that the premises have only limited potential to be adapted for more efficient working by Harrison Fisher, and any such adaptation would probably lead to the complete disuse of areas for which no alternative purpose is readily to be imagined.

Should Harrison Fisher relocate then the question arises of future use of the premises. As structural engineers experienced in such matters we may have a measure of understanding, although we have not the ability to replace the more precise advice obtainable from specialist surveyors and architects. However to comment further at this stage it is useful for us to anticipate such advice.

The complexity of the premises, as they now stand, and the potential availability of similar premises not subject to 'listing' creates commercial difficulty. To try to let any part of the premises with Harrison Fisher still in occupation may seem impossible. Potential tenants are only parties of limited means and seeking out premises upon a least cost basis. There may be an over-supply of such premises on the market, and returns in respect of rental (repairing leases being non-obtainable commercially) will be very limited indeed. They could not protect the obligations of Harrison Fisher in respect of 'listing'.

The circumstances of listing are to be noted. It is readily to be understood that Eye-Witness Works, Ceylon Works and the adjacent Beehive Works, in which Harrison Fisher have no interest or influence, together form an island of mid 19th century street-scape. In practice, as historical maps and records may show, such an island fortunately escaped destruction in 1945-45. The surrounding sub-standard housing was either bombed, or being subject to actual or potential slum clearance in 1939. There are a number of immediately surrounding sites not redeveloped because their subsequent value lies in car parking serving 20th century industrial premises.

We may then look at potential commercially viable future use. The importance of the site is to be respected, but it is to be appreciated that elements at the heart of site listing may be restricted to main frontages, being to little significant extent spoiled by pre-dating intervention, and that there remain significant elements of varying age which are not of no clear value. With all respect to listing procedures they do not discriminate, and, indeed may rely upon old, and slightly garbled oral description. The listing does not extend to my internal features, and it is very strongly suggested that no such of value will be seen to be present, having either been lost by the time of listing, or more probably never to have existed. In terms of listing, what seems to matter is street-scape appearance on Milton Street/Thomas Street. Such may only be preservable if what goes on behind is commercially viable, albeit that 'facadism' is not currently encouraged. With respect, without such a concept listed street-scapes might have been much more widely lost. And, to retain a façade commonly costs more than total demolition and replacement. In terms of long term use there is, perhaps, no wider potential than façade retention even if this is not in accordance with current thought.

There is, of course, at the rear of Eye-Witness Works an ancient chimney, perhaps of 'land mark' status, and whose preservation may be desirable, even if without practical use.

It is believed that preservation of the premises may reasonably be narrowed down to three possible uses. The first, continuing occupation by Harrison Fisher has already been discussed at length, and no doubt this is a matter of ready appreciation and to be supported by expert advice from commercial surveyors. The second is wider reuse commercially. It is thought that without major intervention



this is a fruitless objective. It might be foolhardy to think that there would be commercially sustainable return upon the necessary major investment in upgrading.

Finally, there is use for residential purposes. We understand that WPA advise that the current market may support conversion to student letting accommodation – typically single study-bedrooms with en suite facilities, and limited areas of communal use. There may be more difficulty in thinking that in this location and at the present time there would be scope to consider conversion to larger privately owned flats. In any event similar structural/architectural considerations will apply. In the following discussion we need to make simple presumptions as to spatial planning, and whilst we are not architects we trust that our presumptions all appear as self-evidently a matter of common sense.

Student ‘flats’ are typically of around 15m² in area. In new build they will be arranged ‘hotel-style’ either side of a central spine corridor and there will be limited provision of communal kitchen/utility space. Larger communal/social areas – residents lounges, bars etc have been found to incur costs not recoverable in competitive rental. Incorporation of publicly accessible facilities – shops, bars or restaurants is not commercially attractive in this location. A generalised comment on housing provision of this kind is necessary. Conversion costs of buildings of this kind are typically of the order of 80% - 90% of new build. Reconstruction with retained facades is not expensive than total new build. In a competitive market high density use of land is necessary and the ratio of nett-lettable/occupiable space to gross area including circulation space needs to be above 80%. So, even if conversion of existing premises is possible, in a price-sensitive market a ratio of nett lettable area to gross of around 70% must be achieved for purposes of economic viability. Planning will meet in full the letter and spirit of Disability Access requirements and there will be appropriate provision of lifts.

Against these criteria, the premises are discussed on an area by area basis.

Area A

This is three storeys high, and approximately 90m long. Internal clear widths vary slightly but are typically about 4.9m. Conversion would involve internal lining of external walls to provide thermal

insulation, and provision of an access corridor. The internal width of 4.9m then gives a room about 3.4m deep, and to respect the rhythm of fenestration about 6m long. Rooms are thus significantly larger than is normal in student accommodation, so the ratio of nett lettable to gross floor area will fall below 60%. Even allowing for the 'value' of retained structure – normally, in practice very limited, unit costs of lettable area are high, and tenants have to bear the costs of maintenance and servicing of a high proportion of general and circulation areas within rents. In a competitive market, this may seem unsustainable, and, as will be seen is also likely to result in underdevelopment of the site with consequent economic effects.

If one considers Area A in isolation (and it is fair to do so, since it is a dominant consideration) the reasonable conclusion is that redevelopment would need to increase the depth of the block to allow flats either side of a corridor, but that the Milton Street façade may be retained.

Area B

It will be noted that this block is already much altered and that the rear elevation masonry is in such poor condition that major intervention is needed. The internal width, between piers, is but 3.9m. Given the rhythm of fenestration any conversion on a 'corridor' principle gives rooms which are unattractively long and narrow, and are either significantly smaller or significantly larger than is normal, whilst having a 'long' wall with windows which may be superficially attractive but in practice gives rise to difficulties of layout of a study bedroom with en-suite facilities. If access were to be rooms opening to either side off a series of stair towers, then rooms are more sensibly sized but Disability Access poor. In either alternative layout nett lettable/gross ratio is below 60%.

It is suggested that despite its age, Area B contributes little or nothing to the criteria normally involved in 'listing' and that its original appearance is neither present nor restorable in a way consistent with practical reuse. If there is to be future commercial viability of the site Area B might be considered as needing demolition to allow redevelopment.

Area C

Area C is a modern steel framed workshop occupying a courtyard approximately 24 x 18m in area. It is suggested that the present frame and roof are of no historic value and should be retained only if

there is commercial purpose. The size of the area is greater than is necessary for communal facilities be they enclosed or merely open space. Whilst commercial study could possibly show otherwise it is doubted that a use for the area other than residential use is either appropriate or achievable. Upon removal of the roof, what is then revealed is much altered inner elevation of blocks B and D and an open space which, if not redeveloped, results in economic disbenefit. As common space, it is larger than is necessary for amenity or reasonable in the commercial context of city centre development. Consideration of Area C leads to conclusions compatible with the idea of deepening Area behind a retained façade and redevelopment of Areas B and D.

Area D

Retention of conversion of Area D is difficult. Whilst spaces may appear from survey plans to be amenable to conversion in practice they are of different periods of build and 'up-and-down'. Nothing here seems to have historic value beyond the mere fact of being extensions of fronting buildings, clearly listable, but having taken place at a significantly later date and without architectural pretension. Of course, the fourth storey glazed size penthouse above the Western element may be thought to be of interest. However its conversion for reuse is beset by difficulty. Its location is incompatible with sensible positioning of any 'management suite'. It is difficult and expensive to create any space meeting thermal requirements, or to provide services capable of meeting the needs of occupiers. However attractive a 'glass box' may be to an external observer, those who live within it lack privacy. It is thus suggested that demolition and redevelopment of Area D is appropriate.

Area E

Similar considerations to Area D apply in general. Moreover certain elements are non-reusable 20th century agglomeration or prevent appropriate natural lighting in redevelopment. Again, and perhaps with greater force demolition and redevelopment is appropriate.

Area F

See previous description. What is present is a lean-to shed, albeit containing an early-stage much altered element of outer wall. Sensible reuse of the site indicates demolition and rebuilding.

Area G

Potentially this is of early-stage date, but subject to major alteration including unsympathetic partial reconstruction of externally facing wall. Consideration of its future must also involve the currently undeveloped space within Egerton Lane. Redevelopment of the site may need to envisage physical connection between Ceylon Works (Area J) and Eye Witness Works and if not already obtained a 'stopping up' notice on Egerton Lane is no doubt justifiable releasing the site for use.

Area H

Whilst the history of this area is obscure it is strongly suggested that it is so altered by intervention as to be of very limited interest. To allow economic redevelopment it would need to be demolished.

Area I

Here are matters upon which we take no clear view. It is not 'listable' in isolation dating from 1950. It may be thought to be an exemplar of good quality industrial development of its date, with clear if limited architectural pretension. Alone of buildings on the site it may appear upon detailed architectural and structural analysis to be retainable at economic value. At the same time, perhaps, it might be difficult to argue against demolition and redevelopment if this proved essential to ongoing retention of other elements.

Area J

This is Ceylon Works, and whilst it is at present 'stand alone', observations have already been made as to the potential for connection with Eye Witness Works by closure of Egerton Lane.

Prima facie the front facing facade together with the immediately adjoining rear elements are capable of restoration and reuse, but perhaps only within a much wider scheme of redevelopment.

The three storey rear wing is too narrow internally at higher level that even upon any presumption of structural adequacy retention is uneconomic.

The single storey workshop extension to the North is of uncertain historical importance. But what can clearly be said is that it contains at best elements of older structure now much altered, and incapable of retention without major alteration.



It may seem that there is considerable potential for retaining and converting the elements of structure facing directly onto Thomas Street, but to retain more may merely lead to economic lack of viability.

Summary

An initial appraisal leads to the simple view that the site is not retainable in its current form. It is not currently capable of economic use delivering value able to pay for long term up-keep. A radical approach may be necessary to ensure preservation of important features, and this is likely to lead to a solution in which only limited elements can be retained.