

# Brewery Building Conversion Design Guidance SPD



**BLANK**

## Table of Contents

.....	1
Brewery Buildings SPD .....	4
Introduction: .....	4
Policy Context: .....	5
Burton Today:.....	8
What are Brewery Buildings? .....	9
Buildings remaining in uses (related to the Brewing Industry).....	11
National Brewing Museum and Arts Uses.....	12
Functionally redundant buildings .....	13
Large Buildings and Residential Uses .....	15
Smaller Buildings and Sites .....	16
Redevelopment .....	16
Heritage Led Regeneration.....	18
Equipment and Fittings.....	19
Minor Features .....	20

# Brewery Buildings SPD

## 1.0 Introduction:

1.1 Brewing in Burton has a long and rich history dating back as far as the 12<sup>th</sup> Century and beer brewed at Burton Abbey, near the site of St Modwens Parish Church. However, it is the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century mass expansion of brewing, on industrial scales in the town, which not only shaped Burton's growth and character but continues to be a notable presence in the townscape today.

1.2 The peak of brewing in the 19<sup>th</sup> century saw half of Burton's then c.40,000 population employed in some role related to the brewery industry, highlighting what a substantial contribution the industry had to the growth and life of the town.

1.3 Local brewing magnates grew in wealth and influence and endowed many of the public and civic buildings in the town, including its town hall ensuring that the impact of brewing was not limited to the brewery owners themselves.

1.4 Across the centre of Burton are numerous examples of brewery complexes including related buildings such as offices, water towers and bonded warehouses for the storage of beer awaiting onward transport. The scale and number of these remaining buildings produces a distinctive character for the town but also presents challenges in the reuse of the buildings and their sites.

1.5 As a process brewing is an activity which creates a need for a variety of structures, as well as associated elements of infrastructure, such that the notion of 'brewery buildings' as a general statement covers a wider variety of different building types, many of which bring their own particular challenges in terms of reuse or adaptation.

1.6 Surviving buildings and the wider multifaceted sites, which they form, contribute not only to the strong architectural character of the town but also as reminders of a significant aspect of its history.

## 2.0 Policy Context:

2.1 The East Staffordshire Local Plan 2012-2031 includes high-level policies for the protection of the historic environment. However, there are often areas of specific interest for which more tailored interpretation and application of policy may be required. This is acknowledged in the plan at paragraph 4.11 within the preamble (Detailed Policy 5: Protecting the Historic Environment: All Heritage Assets, Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and Archaeology), which identifies a number of areas where future guidance is anticipated to be forthcoming:

**4.11 Further supplementary guidance will be provided to support the historic environment policies in the Local Plan, such as updating the Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and commissioning new SPDs to cover specific topic areas such as local heritage assets, vernacular rural buildings, historic shopfronts and Burton upon Trent's brewing heritage.**

Local Plan 2012-2031, Page 172

2.2 As such this SPD seeks to provide additional detail on how various heritage policies, both local and national, shall be applied in the interest of preserving the brewing heritage of Burton and in using the value, which that heritage holds to champion regeneration.

**2.3 Detailed Policy 5:** sets out how assets should continue in their original use where possible, and financially viable and that such buildings “contributes to viable places and should be seen as a positive opportunity”. Clearly brewing remains an active industry within the town today and whilst many of the modern brewing buildings and structures are distinct from their more traditional counterparts, brewing continues to shape the character of the town, provide employment for its inhabitants and provide the distinctive aroma that often forms a feature of the town.

2.4 As well as acknowledging the irreplaceable nature of heritage assets in paragraph 184 the NPPF states that when developing plans a local planning authority should set out a positive plan for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment with consideration of:

- a) **the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets, and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation**
- b) **the wider social, cultural, economic, and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring**
- c) **the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness and**
- d) **opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of a place.**

NPPF; Paragraph 185

2.5 Clearly with brewing heritage being such a substantial part of the character of Burton today there will be many opportunities to draw upon its contribution in terms of retaining and enhancing the special character of Burton.

2.6 Also established attractions, such as the National Brewing Museum, but more generally the public tours and shop/visitor centres associated with many brewery businesses makes a valid and ongoing contribution to local social, cultural, and economic benefits to the town and wider area.

2.7 Ensuring that similar positive uses can be found for buildings, which have yet to find a sustainable long-term use, will provide greater opportunities for investment as well as for enhancing the contribution, which the history of the town continues to make to its character today.

**2.8 Detailed Policy 6:** also considers the historic environment, covering “Other Heritage Assets”, particularly non-designated heritage assets as well as landscape and townscape of value. It should be acknowledged, when considering former brewery buildings and sites that these buildings rarely exist in isolation but rather form parts of inter-related complexes, which often contribute to wider townscape qualities adding value in their own rights.

2.9 As a result, proposals will be best where founded on a good understanding, not only of the individual building under consideration, but of the relationships that a building has with its neighbours and as a component of the wider townscape and public realm. This relationship of buildings is also relevant in the wider planning and design context and not only where a townscape has been designated as a conservation area.

2.10 For the above reasons, good design will involve consideration of a variety of buildings, many of which may be heritage assets, designated or otherwise, as well as examples which are not of significant heritage interest in their own rights but nonetheless contribute towards the character of a wider complex of buildings, including providing the context within which heritage assets can be understood and experienced. Achieving a good balance means that many threads of heritage policy will likely converge when considering brewery buildings and sites.

2.11 In terms of wider townscape value, many types of brewery buildings are tall and/or have distinctive roof-forms meaning they can often make a substantial contribution to the roofscape of the town.

**Detailed Policy 6 has the following specific references of interest:**

**The roofscape and skyline of the towns of Burton upon Trent and Uttoxeter reinforce the character of not only the respective towns but the approaches to them. These should be protected with the sensitive location of new development and appropriate massing in order to retain an appropriate skyline.**

**And...**

**Where Statements of Significance and Environmental Impact Assessments are required the applicant should also assess the impact of new development upon the wider historic landscape character, potential unseen archaeology and local townscape and seek to protect and enhance it where appropriate.**

Local Plan 2012-2031: Extracts from Detailed Policy 6, p 175

**2.12 Strategic Policy 25:** also discusses the subject of 'heritage led regeneration' with particular reference to central Burton. In this context, given the extent to which the brewing industry is inseparably intertwined with the heritage of the town such heritage led regeneration will often effectively be 'brewing led regeneration'.

**The towns of Burton-upon-Trent and Uttoxeter, including their historic retail centres should be a focus for heritage-led regeneration and the repair of key heritage assets will be supported**

Local Plan 2012-2031: Extract from Strategic Policy 25, p 141

2.13 The value that the creative adaptation, reuse and restoration of brewery buildings and sites can bring to both place-making and adding value to regeneration scheme should not be underestimated. Brewery buildings are so synonymous with the history of the town that they deserve to be afforded specific attention within the planning process.

### 3.0 Burton Today:

3.1 The townscape of Burton today features live brewery sites, continuing the tradition of brewing in the town, but largely operating out of modern buildings, which can accommodate modern equipment and health and safety practises. Some smaller operators, including those that trade upon their traditional image, have more flexibility to continue to operate within traditional brewery buildings and examples such as Burton Bridge Brewery and The Tower Brewery stand out.

3.2 In addition, there are traditional brewery buildings that have already been adapted to serve new uses to varying degrees of success, in terms of retaining their distinctive character. Whilst large buildings with open plan floorspaces are highly adaptable uses, the subdivision of those spaces can ultimately affect their character.

3.3 There are examples of sites where many brewery buildings have been cleared but where some buildings of particular merit, or which were particularly suitable for re-use, have been retained amongst a redeveloped wider site. Also, there are examples of areas where there has been widespread clearance for more comprehensive redevelopment with little retained from the former use of the site.

3.4 Finally, there remain examples of buildings which are now redundant and awaiting either re-use, redevelopment, or slow decay.

3.5 Much can be learned of the positive and less successful outcomes of past approaches at the sites, which have already been subject to reuse or redevelopment, and recently published heritage best practise (Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: 3 “The Setting of Heritage Assets” – Historic England, 2017) advocates monitoring and review of previous decisions in order to learn lessons and improve future outcomes.

3.6 Whilst many examples of brewery buildings within the town are protected via listing with English Heritage, others gain protection from demolition via their position within conservation areas. However, there are still plenty of buildings associated with the brewing heritage of the town which are not formally designated heritage assets. Only a proactive approach seeking to engage with site owners and prospective developers can ensure that the value, and potential, of such buildings can be embraced.



## 4.0 What are Brewery Buildings?

4.1 Whilst this SPD seeks to consider 'brewery buildings' it needs to be appreciated that breweries consist of a wide variety of buildings and structures associated with the brewing process, infrastructure, servicing and administration. Some of these different types of buildings are more likely to be redundant for their original use (such as former malthouses and chimneys), and some of which will be far more difficult to secure new uses for (such as water-towers) and which may need to be retained as non-functional structures owing to their substantial townscape and place-shaping value.

### **Examples of buildings include the following:**

- Malthouses
- Bonded Warehouses
- Grain Stores
- Breweries
- Offices
- Stables
- Rail infrastructure (rarely survives)
- Water Towers
- Pump Houses
- Chimneys
- Cooperages
- Joinery and Engineering Workshops

4.2 Unfortunately, interiors of buildings rarely survive in any historic form, and even the listed examples often retain little in terms of original internal features, particularly equipment. Where buildings have already passed through alternative uses much of their original character will have been lost and even where buildings have remained in brewery uses until recently, the changing nature of the process will have resulted in alterations and 'improvements' to interiors and equipment. For example, old copper brewing vessels have largely given way to stainless steel where buildings remain in ongoing brewery use. On the other hand, where brewing has ceased a large amount of equipment has largely been salvaged for its scrap value.

4.3 The scale of buildings relating to the brewery heritage of the town is such that no single end user or approach is likely to be possible for all buildings. Whilst several of the building types, including grain stores, bonded warehouses and malting's have interiors dominated by large expanses of open space, there are simply so many building types that it is unreasonable to expect that uses and users, which would avoid the need for subdividing these spaces at least to some degree, could be found for all of them.

4.4 In addition, much of the transport infrastructure associated with the brewing industry has already been lost. For example, once the town centre featured a network of railways and breweries fronted by expanses of sidings where incoming raw grain and material could be unloaded as well as beer dispatched out to markets, both domestic and international.

4.5 Notwithstanding, in places roads now follow former rail routes preserving their routes in the townscape and form of the town. Many breweries would have also kept horses for delivery of beer to more local pubs in the town. However, few brewery stables now survive, with the example at the National Brewery Museum site being an obvious one.

4.6 In addition, the breweries were also responsible for large quantities of housing development in the town for their employees. Although, these are typically domestic terraces of the type seen widely in industrial towns and without any specific brewing influences, meaning they are outside the scope of this document. Similarly, the breweries would have had pubs and tap-houses within the town and again these are outside of the scope of this SPD.

4.7 It is important to remember that every building will be different, it will have undergone different adaptations during its life and potentially previous works to facilitate new uses. In addition, most brewery buildings do not exist in isolation but have other buildings forming a wider site or complex with a variety of inter-relationships all warranting consideration in determining appropriate options for re-use, adaptation, or redevelopment.

## 5.0 Buildings remaining in uses (related to the Brewing Industry)

5.1 In East Staffordshire, as the main town owes so much of its character to its brewing heritage and as brewing remains a major source of local employment, maintaining buildings and sites in active use will always be a desirable planning and policy objective wherever possible. It is often stated that 'the use for which they were built' is the most appropriate use for historic buildings. Indeed, local plan policy states as much (Detail Policy 5) as do elements of national best practise guidance.

5.2 However, it should be noted that the industry has changed, not only in terms of scale but also in terms of the nature of equipment used, and the connection to transport networks. Also, in terms of activities carried out on site as well as health and hygiene requirements. Whilst the best use for a building is arguably that for which it was first built and designed, some aspects of brewing have changed so significantly that buildings built for that function over 100 years ago might no longer be capable of supporting such use without significant changes, if at all.

5.3 The growth of smaller scale microbreweries offers some hope that some of the redundant buildings (generally unsuitable for use by the large brewers) may be capable of remaining in use by smaller players in the brewing industry today. Notably, there are examples where smaller brewers have been able to adapt and reuse former brewery buildings with examples being the Tower and, the unfortunately defunct, Heritage Breweries.

5.4 The active brewery sites are often tightly controlled for security and safety purposes and it is not uncommon for buildings to stand empty within a brewery complex (as the brewery no longer has a way of making active use of them), however, find it operationally difficult to make these empty buildings available to other users. These brewery sites can sometimes include listed examples. In such cases the Borough Council will work closely with the larger breweries to ensure these buildings continue to be kept in weathertight conditions and to explore any possibilities of such buildings being redeveloped or made more accessible.

**The contribution of the brewing industry to the unique character of the town is not limited to the buildings which survive but also the activity, which the industry generates, including the associated smells that often linger over the town.**

**Where brewery uses can be retained the planning system will seek to make it possible for such uses to continue where possible.**

**Where new brewery uses are proposed for former brewery buildings, there is the potential to best preserve and utilise the character of these buildings as well as to retain a diverse variety in the local brewing industry. The Council will seek policy measures in ensuring that new uses remain part of the town heritage and its life into the future.**

**Whilst new microbreweries cannot represent the solution for all of the redundant brewery buildings in the town such uses certainly have a part to play and should be encouraged together with expansion into associated uses such as on site taps and café's/off-sales catering to visitors.**

## 6.0 National Brewing Museum and Arts Uses

6.1 The National Brewing Museum has been an opportunity to preserve a series of former brewery buildings, including a number of ancillary outbuildings and service structures, (including stables). This approach has enabled buildings to be retained in a small group. In addition, the internal spaces have also avoided intensive subdivision for a new use and displays of brewing equipment have been retained on site (although not always in original positions within the buildings).

Whilst this has proven an ideal solution for this site it is very much a 'one off', experience where the efforts of the Heritage Brewery have demonstrated that the market is effectively saturated for another brewery museum in Burton.

6.2 However, there appears to be some capacity for other breweries to offer tours, supporting shops and associated tap houses with and without food offers. For example, it is now reasonably common for breweries to operate as visitor attractions in their own right without the need for an added museum experience. Such ancillary functions may represent potential uses for historic and traditional brewery buildings. For the above reasons, the Council will continue to support applications for commercial, social, and cultural activities, which bring the public into retained buildings and brewery sites.

6.3 In this same vein, arts-uses can represent positive opportunities to secure new uses for unusual building types. Art and cultural uses are often able to secure grant funding. However, they also tend to be reliant on such funding to be viable in the long term. Ensuring that such projects do not fail, once initial funding runs out, often involves making the spaces multi-functional so that they can host other events on a commercial basis, further improving accessibility. Again the National Brewery Museum has in recent years diversified on the site, increasing its restraint offer but also accommodating new attractions such as the escape rooms venture.

Arts uses, such as museums, galleries and performance spaces can represent positive ways to reuse buildings with large and open floorplans, however such uses are rarely self-supporting and often reliant upon grants for their long-term operation. Uses in association with educational establishments for arts based courses can make interesting approaches to the reuse of large spaces within buildings, particularly taller single storey building types such as joinery shops and cooperages' or barrel washes.

The successful reuse of some traditional former New Brewery Buildings on Union Street such as the "Brewhouse Arts Centre" is a good example of this kind of approach. The site incorporates performance spaces as well as a cinema suitable for multimedia presentations, a bar and dance studio as well as a variety of other spaces most of which are available for commercial hire to help diversify sources of income.

## 7.0 Functionally redundant buildings

7.1 Utility buildings such as water towers and chimneys are unlikely to be a productive use through change of use of a site and even where sites remain in brewery use. For example, these components are likely to have been superseded as large coal furnaces and steam driven equipment has given way to gas fired and electrically driven equipment.

7.2 Still, these are prominent and significant structures, which are often highly visible within the roofscape of the town. Whilst the difficulty of adapting these types of building for reuse is acknowledged, there are successful examples to be found. Perhaps the most notable is the Tower Brewery on Glensyl Way, which operates from a converted water tower associated with the former Anderstaff Lane Maltings. The tower is unlisted and could easily have been lost should such a creative adaptation not been forthcoming. Also, whilst the tower is shorter than many examples this does demonstrate how such buildings can be found new uses and need not simply be retained as redundant architectural features within a wider site.

7.3 There are two examples of listed water towers in Burton including that at Marstons Brewery and at Bass Brewery off of High Street towards the riverside. Also, there are other examples which have protection as curtilage structures, such as that associated with the malting's at the Bass Maltings site on Wetmore Road or at Plough Maltings on Horninglow Street. Redundant buildings are not limited to associated infrastructure, but sometimes include examples of large building types. Maltings are a significant example of buildings that are widely redundant.

7.4 In the UK today there are only 28 active malting sites (Maltsters Association of Great Britain), almost half of which (13) are in the whisky producing regions of Scotland and almost exclusively cater to distilleries. However, in the 18th century most towns had their own malting's and many larger brewers malted their own barley so as to have greater control over the product.

7.5 By the end of the 19th century Bass was establishing malting's in Lincolnshire (such as at Sleaford in 1892) so that barley could be malted near to where it was harvested before being brought to breweries by rail. This pattern eventually led to smaller brewers halting malt production in favour of buying in malted grain from larger centralised malting's, including facilities established at port towns to malt grain being imported into the country. Burton itself has numerous malting's associated with its various breweries. However, no barley is malted in the town today leaving all of these buildings redundant for their original purpose.

7.6 The town has four sets of listed malting's: 5 large buildings at the former Bass malting's at Wetmore Road, the North Malthouse at the former Yeomans, Cherry and Curtin Brewery, on Clarence Street, and the Plough Maltings on Horninglow Street. The final example is far smaller, at 6A Horninglow Street where the Malthouse is described as the oldest in Burton and a rare survival of a small Malthouse in Staffordshire.

7.7 These substantial buildings with large open floor spaces would be best suited to large open plan office type uses. However, one of the buildings at the Bass Maltings had been converted to such use and sat largely vacant for several years, once the first occupant had vacated the site, suggesting that there is insufficient local demand for such uses and they would be highly dependent on a single user which could result in substantial vacancies. Given that one building struggled to find alternative tenants, this most suitable use would be unlikely to present the solution for upwards of eight (8) such buildings within the town. Not to mention there are also other building types with similar large open plan floorspaces such as the types of associated warehousing.

7.8 Some buildings have found new uses as warehousing. However, the suitability of a building or site for this will be highly dependent upon access and proximity to major transport uses, and it is unlikely that use as warehousing will be a viable solution for more than a small handful of former brewery buildings.

7.9 Some uses may be capable of retaining elements of more open floor plans. For example, there are examples of brewery buildings in other areas where hotel uses have allowed some more open areas of floorplan as part of on-site spa, gym or restaurant uses for guests.

**Building types, such as bonded and grain warehouses or maltings, which traditionally have large areas of open plan floorspace are best utilised in ways which retain large open plan areas. The greater the intensity of subdivision a use requires, the greater the impact upon the character of the building and the less capable that use will be of maintaining the significance of the building.**

**Uses that require intensive subdivision, but which have the capacity to retain some areas of open space may be more favourably considered. Particularly where the more open areas retain a degree of public access. This includes proposals that can achieve this by having a different use at ground floor (such as retail at ground floor with residential or office accommodation above). This type of mixed-use development will be considered more favourably than schemes which tightly subdivide all available floorspace.**

## 8.0 Large Buildings and Residential Uses

8.1 Residential uses tend to have ready demand, contribute towards housing land supply, generate receipts which can offset the costs of repair, renovation and upgrading of buildings and as such they often form a significant part of new uses found for redundant buildings. Historically industrial buildings have found new lives as residential developments, cotton mill conversions are obvious examples.

8.2 This can sometimes be an effective way of saving historic buildings. However, they do bring some additional challenges.

8.3 As mentioned previously subdivision is a concern within buildings with large and open floor areas, residential uses would also limit any potential public access.

8.4 A greater challenge is that some building types are spread over multiple stories and have very deep floorplans. The way in which the building regulations apply to residential uses require that habitable rooms have access to natural light and ventilation as well as means of escape.

8.5 In buildings with very deep floorplans there will be significant areas of floorspace in the central areas where it is not possible to accommodate any habitable rooms. In a single storey building rooflights or dormer windows may provide a limited solution, however where the building has more than one floor this would still leave difficulties for the floors below.

8.6 Another difficulty with residential conversion of large buildings is providing adequate car-parking provision. A large former malting's or warehouse could give rise to a need for substantial car parking provision, sometimes there will simply not be sufficient associated land to accommodate this.

**Some larger warehouses and malting's buildings have added complications which arise from very deep floorplans. These make some uses very difficult to accommodate within the buildings, most notably residential uses where not only does the issue of subdivision represent a challenge but also how central areas of buildings can be utilised when there are requirements within the building regulations to have access to natural light and ventilation in habitable rooms but no easy or straightforward way to achieve this without creating voids within the core of the building to establish central light-wells.**

**Where such schemes are advocated it will be expected that an applicant can demonstrate that no more compatible uses can be found for the building. In some cases this may include citing examples of nearby buildings in such potential uses which have been vacant for protracted periods.**

## 9.0 Smaller Buildings and Sites

9.1 Where proposals affect smaller buildings, conversion may have greater potential to avoid issues which occur in some larger buildings. Smaller buildings are also more likely to have more readily adaptable internal space, without the need for significant subdivision. It can also be an added benefit when such sites have suitable spaces to accommodate associated car parking and services.

9.2 Smaller buildings may also have some potential as 'start-up' spaces for new businesses needing small and affordable premises to base themselves. Single storey buildings would be particularly suited to uses of this type. Although again location, neighbouring established uses and access to transport network is likely to dictate where such uses would be appropriate.

9.3 A mixed-use approach, seeking a range of appropriate uses might be able to maximise retention of structures within a site whilst also creating a vibrant mixed development, catering for new businesses and potential future employers in the town.

## 10.0 Redevelopment

10.1 Where sites are vacant and in prime central locations the temptation to see the value for redevelopment of the land as the main asset of the site is understandable. However, examples of sites where this has occurred in the past illustrate the impact that such one-sided approaches can have on the character of the townscape. The former Bass Middle Yard site, now Middleway Retail Park, is perhaps the best example. Whilst the development itself is a commercial success the site is now largely open space forming retail car-parking. The commercial buildings are all large open plan structures and the open expanse of car parking is highly visible from surrounding roads with little street frontage or sense of enclosure, particularly along its north and west sides.

**Where sites largely composed of brewery buildings are proposed for redevelopment it is considered appropriate for developers to:**

- 1. Demonstrate that reasonable efforts have been made to find occupants for the most significant buildings prior to consideration of site clearances.**
- 2. Where suitable uses cannot be found for buildings in their current forms it should be demonstrated that the proposed use of the site could not make use of some, or all, of the existing buildings, or retain components of them within the site.**
- 3. If it is demonstrated that no viable uses exist and that some or all of a site needs to be cleared to facilitate redevelopment then the form of that redevelopment should accommodate characteristics of the site in its**

10.2 Only where a site becomes unviable, cannot attract end users for buildings (which are incapable of economic adaptation or conversion), and where redevelopment of the site could not facilitate retention of key features or facades will such schemes be considered. Whilst it would still be desirable at that stage to consider the availability of alternative sites, it should be acknowledged that even if an alternative site for the proposed development can be identified the buildings would then simply remain redundant and prone to deterioration.



10.3 It is highly likely that in most cases a site will retain buildings, which can be retained and adapted to a new use. Therefore, only rarely would there be no prospect of any such buildings or features being retained. In parking areas consideration could be given to the construction of open sided canopy structures typical of brewery ancillary structures such as cask-washing sheds, which did exist on the Middle Yard site. Such structures would both provide shade in summer and could accommodate solar panels within the roof structures, offsetting the carbon footprint of the stores within such a development and the journeys of customers to the site. This would allow features to be retained and to serve new and green functions whilst still allowing vehicle parking beneath.

10.4 Where clearance and redevelopment would involve the loss of listed buildings then such a proposal would be subject to the tests within paragraph 195 of the NPPF relating to 'substantial harm to, or total loss of, significance of a heritage asset' in that planning permission would not be granted ...

**Unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, all of the following will apply:**

- a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and**
- b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and**
- c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and**
- d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use**

**Extract from Paragraph 195; NPPF**

10.5 Where a site redevelopment proposal would retain listed buildings but would involve the clearance of all, or most other unlisted former brewery buildings (which are not directly protected via the curtilage provisions within sections 1(5) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, it is likely that the proposal would still be considered to result in substantial harm to listed buildings. This is as a result of the loss of context and the change to their settings, diminishing the contribution, which the wider brewery complex provides to significance and the ability to perceive and understand that significance.

## 11.0 Heritage Led Regeneration

11.1 Heritage Led Regeneration does not necessarily involve retaining every building of heritage value on every site. However, it does seek to acknowledge that often the best way of ensuring that new developments respect and fit with the established and defining character of a place is to retain existing features on a site, which already achieve this objective.

11.2 This type of regeneration may be by retaining perimeter buildings of a site, which were often the more lavishly designed buildings as they were publicly visible, and companies had regard to a sense of civic pride and identity. Also, retention of taller buildings, which can act as landmarks or assist with wayfinding within a site as well as contributing to the roofscape of the town. As an example, some of the larger brewery complexes had their offices situated along the main road frontage of the site. The offices of B Grant and Company on Station Street are an obvious example of highly decorative public fronting buildings (which have been retained with areas of redevelopment beyond).

11.3 It is also true that the decorative scheme and elements of some historic buildings, including those that had fairly mundane, functions purposes, would be prohibitively costly to replicate today. Meaning that only by retaining the original can such features continue to provide embellishment to the built environment.

**Care needs to be taken when pursuing the approach laid out above. A site will need to be considered holistically and each building considered on the basis of:**

- **its architectural value,**
- **its condition and extent of previous alterations**
- **its contribution to the public realm**
- **its potential as a landmark within a redeveloped site and**
- **its usefulness as a retained building,**

**All of these factors need to be carefully considered in order to ensure that the most significant buildings, which make the biggest impact to local character within the context of redevelopment, are identified as priorities for retention.**

## 12.0 Equipment and Fittings

12.1 It has already been mentioned that original equipment and fittings associated with brewing rarely survive, having either been sold on/relocated to other breweries (when brewing ceased), sold for scrap, or replaced by modern equivalent in materials like stainless steel.

12.2 It is expected that the survival of historic features of interest within buildings will be rare. However, where such features are encountered and where their size and position make retaining them as features in situ difficult, then consideration should be given to the potential for re-siting such equipment either within buildings or externally. Burton already has a tradition of public art with brewing themes. This includes items such as the barrel roll at the train station, the Burton Cooper at Coopers Square shopping centre and The Malt Shovel at the corner of High street and New Street.

12.3 Subject to appropriate protective lacquer coatings copper vessels could be re-sited externally as pieces of public art. This could add to local character, provide landmarks to assist with wayfinding within a site and allow for heritage features to be retained.

12.4 Other features such as the perforated tiles of malting floors could be utilised in building fabric where ventilation is required. For example, for plant rooms or as extract grills for mechanical ventilation, or as flooring in corridors or hallways. It is unlikely that such features could be utilised as exterior surfacing. Early ceramic examples would be unlikely to survive frost action for many years if utilised in this way whilst later metal variants would be slippery during winter months.

**Innovative ways to incorporate significant features into new buildings, structures, surface or as art installations can represent positive ways to retain historic fabric as well as adding to a lively and distinctive character of a new development.**

**The ability to redeploy material such as this should not be seen as justification to remove fabric or features, which could otherwise remain in situ, but rather as a positive solution where the alternative would be total loss.**

**Care needs to be taken to ensure that where fabric is redeployed its new use and position is appropriate, with necessary protection against the elements where required.**

## 13.0 Minor Features

13.1 Besides buildings, Burton also possesses a variety of more subtle features associated with its brewing heritage.

13.2 One such example, is of stone markers set in pavements around the town marking the extent of land ownership of a brewery. Several examples can be found along Station Street, and elsewhere. Such minor features should not be overlooked, either during redevelopment of sites or simply during renovation of public realm surfaces.

13.3 As highly unusual features, loss of items such as this make a quirky and distinctive attrition to the character of the town and brewing heritage.

13.4 Such minor features can be easily overlooked. More importantly, owing to their scale should often be capable of being retained even if they need to be relocated. Therefore, attention to detail and early consideration of such elements will be important in order to safeguard minor features of heritage value and maintain the contribution that they make to the historic character of the town.