

Heritage Works Buildings Preservation Trust Ltd

Winstanley Hall, Wigan

Options Appraisal Study

Contents

Chapter 1	Executive Summary	2
Chapter 2	Introduction	18
Chapter 3	Location, ownership, current use, description	20
Chapter 4	The history and significance of Winstanley Hall.....	24
Chapter 5	The planning context.....	29
Chapter 6	Why the buildings are at risk and barriers to development	31
Chapter 7	Philosophy and strategy	35
Chapter 8	Condition.....	39
Chapter 9	Market analysis	43
Chapter 10	Options	45
Chapter 11	Project costs	46
Chapter 12	Financial valuations and appraisals.....	49
Chapter 13	Grant funding and bridging the deficit.....	51
Chapter 14	Recommendations and delivery of the preferred option	56
Chapter 15	Risks and next steps	60
Appendices	66
Appendix A	Planning assessment by Sedgwick Associates	
Appendix B	Valuation report and development appraisals by Knight Frank.....	
Appendix C	Quantity surveyors costs by BWA	
Appendix D	Correspondence received from Tim Banks.....	
Appendix E	Option 7 scope of works for stabilisation as a ruin proposed by the design team	

Chapter 1: Executive Summary

- 1.1 This executive summary provides a précis of a report prepared at the end of a feasibility study to consider options for the retention, repair and economic reuse of the grade II* listed Winstanley Hall and its associated outbuildings, some of which are listed at grade II* and others grade II. This study has been undertaken by Heritage Works Buildings Preservation Trust, working with a design team comprising Calls Architecture, Bernard Williams Associates Quantity Surveyors, Martin Stockley Associates Structural Engineers, Knight Frank Valuation Agents and Sedgwick Associates Chartered Town Planners.
- 1.2 The headings and numbering of the paragraphs in this summary relate to the chapters in the options appraisal study report. It is intended that the summary may be read as a 'standalone' document, or as an introduction to 'signpost' readers to the report chapters that are of most relevance to them.

Chapter 2: Introduction

- 2.1 The purpose of this study was to explore the possible options and costs associated with the reuse of the Winstanley Hall site and to identify the financial deficit, sources of potential funding and delivery mechanisms.
- 2.2 The study was funded by Dorbcrest Homes, English Heritage and Wigan Council.
- 2.3 The introductory chapter of the report sets out the purpose of the study, the parties involved (client, consultants and stakeholder consultees) and the study limitations.
- 2.4 This chapter acknowledges the study team and contributions to the study made by Kierstan Boylan of Dorbcrest Homes, Darren Ratcliffe of English Heritage, Jason Kennedy, Jenny Tunney and Mike Worden of Wigan Council and Deborah Baker, a student at Manchester University and David Barton, a friend of the Bankes family.

Chapter 3 Location; ownership; current use and description

- 3.1 The Winstanley Hall site is located within Winstanley Park, approximately 3 miles south west of Wigan town centre.
- 3.2 The subject of this study is a 4.23 hectare site comprising of Winstanley Hall and its ten outbuildings. The site is located in the centre of the Park and is accessed by means of a private unmade road off the A571 Pemberton Road.
- 3.3 The site is currently in the ownership of Dorbcrest Homes, the freehold having been purchased by them from Tim Bankes in 2000. The Bankes family has owned the wider estate for over 400 years.
- 3.4 There are no public rights of way over the site and the owner has a right of access via the road which passes through the Winstanley estate and is owned by Tim Bankes. There are restrictive covenants in place on the site to ensure the use of the land does not present a nuisance to the occupiers of the adjacent land and limiting development adjacent to the wider estate to garaging and infrastructure.
- 3.5 The outbuildings have not been upgraded and have always been in agricultural use, though this ceased some time ago. Selected areas of the Hall were occupied in the 20th century, though on a limited basis. Following World War Two the Bankes family used very limited areas of the Hall. In the 1960s the occupant added an extension, but only a few

rooms continued to be inhabited. The Hall had already been vacant for several years when Dorbcrest purchased it.

- 3.6 Currently all buildings on the site are vacant with the exception of a 1950s bungalow currently used by a site security guard.
- 3.7 Detailed descriptions of all the buildings have previously been written by Kathryn Sather & Associates (KSA) in the Conservation Management Plan commissioned by Dorbcrest and the Summary of Relative Significance by the Architectural History Practice (AHP) commissioned by English Heritage. A brief descriptive overview is included in this chapter.
- 3.8 The main Hall was originally constructed from sandstone blocks in an H-plan form and dates from the 1590s. The building has been subject to many phases of alteration and extension. The L shaped north east extension dates from the 17th century and was partially rebuilt in the 19th century.
- 3.9 Extensions to the north pre date 1770 and the large extension to the west features a date stone of 1780.
- 3.10 In 1818-19 a further phase of work was undertaken to the designs of Lewis Wyatt including the four-storey entrance tower, the remodelling of earlier extensions, the removal of gables and replacement with a flat parapet obscuring the roof. Internal modifications by Wyatt resulted in the entrance being relocated to a south east position.
- 3.11 The two-storey extension housing a Gun Room and Chapel was added in the 19th century along with internal alterations and two single storey extensions to the west.
- 3.12 The hazardous condition of the Hall has limited access to many areas of the building. However, interiors are described and surviving elements photographed extensively in the KSA report including the Lewis Wyatt interior schemes with decorative plasterwork along with the wooden panelling to the Chapel and Gun Room and the stained glass windows.
- 3.13 The various associated outbuildings are also described in brief. Buildings 2-8 form an upper courtyard and buildings 9-11 create a secondary, lower courtyard. All outbuildings are identified below:
- Building 2: Malt House
 - Building 3: Estate Office
 - Building 4: Dairy House
 - Building 5: Coach House
 - Building 6: Tithe Barn
 - Building 7: Tithe Cottage
 - Building 8: Stable
 - Building 9: Forge
 - Building 10: Keeper's Cottage
 - Building 11: Farrier's Lodge
- 3.14 The William Spence sculpture of Neptune forms a fountain feature within the upper courtyard. It dates from the early 19th century and was commissioned by Meyrick Bankes II.

Chapter 4: The history and significance of Winstanley Hall

- 4.1 The Bankes family took possession of the estate in 1595. Academic opinion dates the Hall to around 1595. Winstanley Hall was originally an 'H' plan building with classical Elizabethan symmetry still evident in the south eastern elevation. Some roof beams and mullioned windows from that date remain. There were coal reserves on site and frequent and extensive mining was undertaken in Winstanley Park until 1979. This was close to the Hall and has contributed to the instability of the south east front. Alterations were carried out by Lawrence Robinson in 1778-80 including an octagonal extension to the north west and internal modifications. An extensive landscaping scheme was also implemented at around the same time.
- 4.2 Meyrick Bankes inherited in 1803 and employed architect Lewis Wyatt to make several alterations to the Hall including the relocation of the main entrance to the south west, internal reconfiguration including a new main staircase and significant decorative schemes featuring superb plaster work to ceilings and walls. The eastern extension was enlarged and the Elizabethan gables replaced with a flat parapet giving the Hall a more uniform appearance.
- 4.3 Meyrick Bankes II inherited in 1832 and shortly after he had the Tithe Barn, Coach House, Stable Block built, forming a courtyard. The Coach House is attributed to Lewis Wyatt. Additions to the Hall from the 1840s include a two-storey canted wing with balcony housing a Gun Room and Chapel. The Neptune statue in the upper courtyard, cottage to the north of the barn, and a group of buildings to form a lower courtyard were added at this time. The main or upper courtyard is notably more significant in architectural merit, historical and group value than that to the east.
- 4.4 Eleanor Bankes made minor alterations in the late 19th century including the installation of single-storey bays to the west of the Hall and a fountain with plunge pool in the courtyard. Her most striking contribution was the erection of the Estate Office in 1884 in an unusual 'Swiss chalet' style.
- 4.5 The early 20th century saw many great parties and gatherings at the Hall but after World War II the Bankes' did not occupy the Hall full time. There were some inappropriate additions during the mid-20th century; namely a 1950s bungalow (the Keeper's Cottage) and a 1960s extension to the north west elevation that are in stark contrast to the historic form of the Hall. Onerous financial burdens made the upkeep of the estate challenging and despite efforts to keep the site in repair, under use and insufficient maintenance resulted in decay which has continued to this day. Following nationalisation of the industry, the Coal Board carried out opencast mining to within 20 metres of the Hall from the late 1940s. A further Compulsory Purchase Order acquisitioned land for the building of the M6 in the 1960s which split the Park and had a negative effect on the Hall's access and its setting. Edward Bankes occupied a small part of the Hall until 1984 and his son James lived in the Moat House for a short period. A tenant lived in the 1950s cottage until the 1990s but all buildings have been vacant for some time.
- 4.6 Schemes for redevelopment by developers and not for profit organisations were explored in the 1990s but they failed to come to fruition and the property was marketed in July 2000. Dorbcrest Homes purchased the Winstanley site from Tim Bankes in November 2000 with the intention of converting the Hall and outbuildings to residential use. Development appraisals and costings revealed a large deficit and an enabling development scheme was proposed in order to bridge the gap. Dorbcrest, English Heritage and Wigan Council could not reach agreement on an enabling scheme. The housing market has since suffered a collapse and the Hall and outbuildings remain vacant and continue to deteriorate.

Significance and heritage merit

- 4.7 Winstanley Hall and the two attached gateways are listed at grade II*. The Coach House, Tithe Barn and Stable are grade II* (upgraded from grade II in 2001). The Neptune fountain is grade II along with the estate cottage and estate office. The moated site of Winstanley is a scheduled monument and a number of architectural features within the Park may be worthy of listing.
- 4.8 The Lewis Wyatt alterations and additions to Winstanley Hall (both internally and externally) contribute to its significance and are a good example of his work. The internal plaster work is of particular note. Wyatt was from a family of well-known architects and his other works include alterations to Lyme Park, Eaton Hall and Sherborne House. The Conservation Management Plan by KSA and the Statement of Significance by AHP conclude the majority of buildings are significant with the exception of 20th century additions, which are deemed to have a negative impact on the site. The Forge and the Farrier's lodge are considered to be of lesser significance and are not listed. The main upper courtyard buildings are considered to be the most significant of the outbuildings along with the Neptune fountain.
- 4.9 The Winstanley estate previously employed a number of local people both to service the estate and in the mines. During both world wars, the estate was utilised by training and as a camp and for a period after 1945 the estate housed several homeless local families. The demise of the Hall has seen its local importance decline with many local people unaware of its existence. Local interest groups have expressed concerns over the condition of the site. Whilst there is no right of way currently, there may be an expectation of public access to the site. Expectations will have to be managed in terms of the extent of the site that can be saved. It is often difficult to accept that historic assets may be beyond reuse, particularly in the context of a perceived lack of intervention by public bodies. Expectations of large grant contributions and investment can lead to unrealistic hopes of what is achievable.

Chapter 5: Planning Context

- 5.1 This chapter describes the planning framework within which proposals for the Winstanley Hall site will be considered.
- 5.2 These include the listed status of the buildings, the location of the site within green belt land, concerns relating to enabling development and its justification and the designation of the adjacent land as a site of biological importance with the known presence of bats (a protected species). There is also an acknowledgement that Wigan as a borough does not benefit from the economic advantages present in other areas of the North West. All these factors combine to create a complex and challenging set of constraints on the Winstanley Hall site.

Chapter 6: Why the buildings are at risk and barriers to development

- 6.1 There are many reasons why a building becomes 'at risk', be that a risk of loss of character through irreversible change (generally in times of economic buoyancy) or the risk of total loss through dereliction and demolition (again often through economic pressures). At Winstanley the contributing factors to the building being at risk are in some cases complex and historic. An outline of the issues is set out below:

Location and access

- 6.2 Winstanley is located in the south west of the Borough of Wigan close to the M6 which can be heard from the site but is accessible by a slightly convoluted route. The Hall lacks

a grand driveway as access is currently via an unmade track off the A571 which arrives at either the eastern edge of the lower courtyard or the west of the Hall. The road is in poor condition and ideally a more direct access route would be provided. This requires investment and the ability to acquire land from the wider Winstanley estate.

Planning constraints

6.3 The listed status of the buildings imposes planning restraints, which can deter prospective purchasers and developers. Location within the green belt also severely restricts potential for additional development. The poor condition of the buildings could result in the Council serving an Urgent Works Notice requiring the owner to carry out works or resulting in the Council undertaking the works and reclaiming costs from the owner. This threat is a powerful deterrent to potential owners.

Market failure

6.4 The local housing market continues to suffer as a result of the recession. The average four-bed house in Winstanley sold for £220,000 in March 2010 with a ceiling price for detached homes considered to be £500,000. There are concerns over the number of high end, high value properties that the local market could sustain at one time.

6.5 The cost of new build development is high compared to the level of return achievable in the Wigan area, which increases the level of enabling development required to bridge the deficit.

6.6 The potentially limited level of return is a further barrier when considered alongside the significant investment required to bring the Hall back into use due to its poor condition.

Lack of adaptability for new use

6.7 Single occupier use of the Hall is not realistic. The large buildings are not balanced with the advantage of large external space for private gardens and parking which severely restricts use as a hotel, educational institution, and residential care home. There are also issues for the siting of enabling development within the setting of the listed buildings.

6.8 Internal structural walls make vertical subdivision of the Hall to a number of houses preferable to conversion to apartments.

Condition

6.9 Vacancy, under use, lack of maintenance and decay all date from long before the 1970s. Dry rot is extensive and water ingress has resulted in significant structural weakening and the collapse of a number of internal floors, caused by a combination of blocked and failed rainwater goods, roofs that are in a bad state of repair and the ongoing theft of lead. A number of chimneys have collapsed into the Hall and others have been removed and stored. Vandalism and theft continue and the level of repair required to bring the buildings back into use is formidable for any owner.

Investment required

6.10 The site requires an informed conservation approach and intervention on a massive scale. The significantly high cost of materials, specialist contractors and surveys required to bring the buildings back into use is increased by the need to provide a new access route.

Conservation approach

6.11 The findings of previous significance reports are not disputed and it is difficult for parties to concede that saving all parts of the site is neither possible nor practical. Decisions to prioritise the built elements have proved contentious and difficult to resolve.

- 6.12 Surveys have indicated the presence of long eared bats on the site. Alternative accommodation would need to replace the roosts lost by repairing and subdividing the buildings and the necessary licences obtained.

Maintenance

- 6.13 Building owners are often reluctant to invest in time consuming and expensive programmes of maintenance when no end use and financial return is identified in the medium term. An absence of maintenance and preventative measures to stop decay has placed the Hall at serious risk and continues to do so.

Attitudes

- 6.14 Winstanley Hall has been a problematic site for several decades. Conflicting priorities and ideas of the developer, Council, English Heritage and previous owners have led to negative feelings and the failure to reach a compromise to secure the future of the site.
- 6.15 Interaction with local communities is currently low but public expectation in terms of funding and access will need careful management.
- 6.16 The level of recording and archaeological research required by English Heritage has not been clarified but these requirements have the potential to be costly and thus significantly alter the financial appraisals of any end use. It is considered vital that a comprehensive schedule of requirements is agreed in the near future. Opportunities for learning and wider interpretation can be considered subsequently.

Chapter 7: Philosophy and strategy

- 7.1 This chapter includes the approach to conservation and the reuse of the buildings adopted by Heritage Works and the design team.
- 7.2 The approach has been to identify the best course of action to protect the historic and heritage significance of the listed buildings, whilst ensuring they have a sustainable future use that can support the extensive ongoing maintenance of the site. The first priority is the stabilisation of the main structural elements, particularly within the Hall, in order to prevent further loss.

Long-term viability

- 7.3 It is considered that agreement by all parties on a way forward is critical after several years of the postponement of decisive action.
- 7.4 Decisions should be made for the long-term future of the site and not based on short or medium term outcomes. It is acknowledged that the current financial downturn has a negative impact on the financial appraisals for the site, but a solution was not achievable even at the peak of the property market and therefore deferring decisions until the 'market returns' is not recommended.

End uses

- 7.5 The team considers that the best uses for the buildings to be those for which they were originally built; that is the residential use of the Hall and the outbuildings repaired for agricultural purposes. A smaller number of larger house units are considered preferable than a larger number of high value apartments due to both the likelihood of attracting purchasers and the structure of the existing building. A mixed-use scheme has the potential to be eligible for a wider range of grant funding sources.

Enabling development

- 7.6 Enabling development is by definition against planning policy but can occasionally be justified if the overall benefits can be proved to outweigh the 'disbenefits'. Financial viability studies by a number of previous potential purchasers and the current owner conclude that the deficit resulting from the conversion of the Hall can only be bridged by either substantial grant funding or enabling development. Previous enabling proposals for new build development close to the listed buildings have not been considered appropriate and the local authority stance on green belt policy has resulted in a lack of resolution on this issue.
- 7.7 If an alternative site away from the Hall could be identified, the concerns over green belt development might be overcome but the costs of acquiring land will only increase the financial gap and consequently increase the scale of development required. Consideration should be given to a joint approach between Wigan Council, Dorbcrest and possibly the owner of the wider estate in order to identify any possible sites for cross subsidising development.

Prioritising built elements

- 7.8 The reality of conserving all buildings at Winstanley site is set against the availability of securing resources and funding, along with the viability of identifying a long-term end use. A rational approach must be adopted to prioritise those parts of the site that are most significant.
- 7.9 It is considered that the original 'H' block of the Hall is the historic core and should be retained if at all possible. The loss of later additions and extensions will result in a more manageable footprint and the study team is prepared to make a case for the demolition of some elements of the Hall and the less significant outbuildings that form the lower courtyard.

Access and ownership

- 7.10 Separate uses on the site will require separate accesses and a second route will need to be identified and its acquisition negotiated with Tim Bankes, the owner of the wider estate.
- 7.11 A change of ownership of the site should be considered if it is in the best interests of securing grant funding and consequently offers the opportunity to secure a viable future. The price at which Dorbcrest's land interests and intellectual property should be valued is not within the remit of this study.
- 7.12 Dorbcrest have received a number of enquiries from prospective purchasers, however upon closer inspection of the buildings and challenging planning issues, no offers have resulted in a sale. It must be accepted that given the complexities of the site and the substantial financial investment required, the buildings will not attract a purchaser on the open market who can legitimately secure the long term future of the site. A remarketing exercise is considered inappropriate, an opinion which is reinforced by Knight Frank.

Chapter 8: Condition

- 8.1 The buildings are in a very poor state of repair and a comprehensive schedule of conservation works is required in order to bring them back into a stable condition and secure their long-term future.

Principal areas of concern

- 8.2 The main Hall has suffered from subsidence for many years and the south east elevation has been propped since at least the 1970s. This shoring up requires additional measures as movement continues.
- 8.3 All areas are considered hazardous and several parts are inaccessible. A void in the masonry to the eastern parapet of the western tower has significantly increased in size since 2007 and the chimneystack is now under immediate threat of collapse.
- 8.4 The roofs are in poor condition and water ingress has resulted in extensive rot to internal timbers. Chimneys are in places tied with steel ties to rotten timber beams. Internal walls are under threat and chimneys have already collapsed bring down walls and floors for the full height of the building. The outbuildings are in various states of disrepair. The western end of the Coach House has collapsed and leaning parapets indicate vertical movement. The original barn has collapsed to the south and requires making safe. It is recommended access to the Stable be prevented until stability can be addressed. Buildings 9 and 10 (the Forge and Farrier's cottage) are in a very poor condition. External areas and features are also in a state of disrepair, though the Neptune fountain has undergone repair.

Immediate action required

- 8.5 The south westerly bay of the original 1590s elevation is at significant risk of collapse and it is recommended the masonry to the western tower be made safe as a matter of urgency and access be prevented until this work has been done. Chimneys would benefit from either tying back to strong points or being dismantled and safely stored.

Chapter 9: Market analysis

- 9.1 Market advice has been provided by Knight Frank alongside consultation and research by Heritage Works.
- 9.2 End uses that have been considered include residential, agricultural, commercial office space, hotel, educational institution and monument in the landscape. Options relating to level of finish have been considered including mothballing, shell repair, full repair, demolition and consolidation as a ruin.
- 9.3 The commercial office market in Wigan is not as high as other areas within Greater Manchester. Whilst there is appeal in a courtyard scheme, the local market indicates rental levels would be unlikely to exceed £12.50 per sq ft.
- 9.4 Other uses such as hotel, educational institutions, and residential homes have been discounted due to a combination of level of investment required, locally available alternatives and the limited curtilage of the site posing access and parking issues.
- 9.5 There are no direct comparables, but it has been assumed that any residential development would compete against higher end units in Winstanley, which tend to achieve higher values than Wigan in general.
- 9.6 There is evidence to suggest that a ceiling price for property in Winstanley is around £500,000, however large units will attract families who will demand a level of external space that is difficult to achieve at Winstanley Hall. Treatment of external areas including landscaping is a major consideration in the success of any development.

Chapter 10: Options

10.1 The design team's proposals have been informed by an understanding of the history and significance of the buildings and the recognition of the need to identify viable economic uses for the site. The philosophy described in Chapter 7 along with market advice from Knight Frank has led to 9 options being identified:

Option 1:

- Mothball main 'H block' of the Hall
- Demolish Victorian north end additions
- Mothball principal upper courtyard buildings
- Demolish buildings 2, 4, 7, 9, 10 and 11

Option 2:

- Repair main 'H block' of the Hall and convert into 5 houses
- Demolish Victorian north end additions
- Repair Coach House (building 5) and convert to provide 5 garages with storage over
- Shell repair buildings 3, 6 and 8 (possible agricultural use)
- Demolish buildings 2, 4, 7, 9, 10 and 11

Option 3:

- Repair main 'H block' of the Hall and convert into 5 houses
- Demolish Victorian north end additions
- Repair Coach House (building 5) and convert to provide 5 garages with storage over
- Repair and convert upper courtyard buildings 3, 6 & 8 into offices
- Demolish buildings 2, 4, 7, 9, 10 and 11
- Provision of car parking on site of demolished lower courtyard buildings, and associated driveway spur

Option 4:

- Repair entire Hall building ('H block' and Victorian north end additions, excluding the 20th century additions) and convert into 7 houses
- Repair Coach House (building 5) and convert to provide 5 garages with storage over
- Repair building 3 and add new build wings to each side, to create 2 further garages
- Repair and convert upper courtyard buildings 6 & 8 into offices
- Demolish buildings 2, 4, 7, 9, 10 and 11

Option 5:

- Dorbcrest's residential scheme, unamended (apartments in the entire Hall, with demolition of the 20th century NW appendages only, apartments in all outbuildings, with replacement new build elements in the lower courtyard)

Option 6a:

- Demolish the entire Hall
- Repair and convert principal upper courtyard outbuildings to residential
- Demolish buildings 2,4,7, 9, 10 and 11

Option 6b:

- Demolish the entire Hall
- Repair and convert principal upper courtyard outbuildings to offices
- Demolish buildings 2, 4, 7, 9, 10 and 11

Option 6c:

- Demolish the entire Hall
- Shell repairs to principal upper courtyard buildings for agricultural use
- Repair and convert building 3 for residential use
- Demolish buildings 2, 4, 7, 9, 10 and 11

Option 7:

- Consolidate Hall as a ruin
- Shell repairs to principal upper courtyard buildings for agricultural use
- Demolish buildings 2, 4, 7, 9, 10 and 11

Drawings of each option are provided at Chapter 10 in the main report.

Chapter 11: Project costs

11.1 Bernard Williams Associates have prepared indicative costings for each of the options described in Chapter 10. The figures in table 11a below reflect construction and non-construction costs including professional fees, statutory fees, surveys and intrusive investigations and contingencies.

Table 11a: Project costs including construction and non-construction costs

Option No.	Summary	Construction costs	Non-construction costs	Sub total
1	Mothball Hall core and principal outbuildings	1,125,000	425,000	1,550,000
2	Shell repair Hall core convert to 5 houses, shell repair principal outbuildings	5,530,000	1,620,000	7,150,000
3	Shell repair Hall core convert to 5 houses, courtyard to offices	7,820,000	2,205,000	10,025,000
4	Repair whole Hall core convert to 7 houses, convert courtyard to offices	9,445,000	2,680,000	12,125,000
5	Dorbcrest scheme to form 35 units apartments and houses	11,360,000	3,190,000	14,550,000
6a	Demolish Hall, convert courtyard buildings to residential	3,990,000	1,160,000	5,150,000
6b	Demolish Hall, convert courtyard buildings to offices	4,210,000	1,215,000	5,425,000
6c	Demolish Hall, fabric repairs only to courtyard, create managers house	1,660,000	530,000	2,190,000
7	Consolidate Hall as ruin, repair courtyard buildings for agricultural use	3,680,000	1,095,000	4,775,000

11.2 Chapter 11 also discusses non-construction costs. If the project were implemented by a commercial developer, a profit of the order of 20% on all costs would be expected. If the project is undertaken by a not-for-profit organisation such as a building preservation trust, no profit is required and instead a 5% project management fee is added to cover costs. Table 11b shows Knight Frank's appraisal figures which include the total project costs (construction and non-construction fees), a management fee, an allowance of 6.5% for debt interest on finance borrowed to fund the project, legal fees, promotion and agents fees.

Table 11b: Total project costs after appraisal

Option No.	Summary	Total costs
1	Mothball Hall core and principal outbuildings	1,668,375
2	Shell repair Hall core convert to 5 houses, shell repair principal outbuildings	7,823,500
3	Shell repair Hall core convert to 5 houses, courtyard to offices	10,987,346
4	Repair whole Hall core convert to 7 houses, convert courtyard to offices	13,258,424
5	Dorbcrest scheme to form 35 units apartments and houses	15,786,000
6a	Demolish Hall, convert courtyard buildings to residential	5,689,000
6b	Demolish Hall, convert courtyard buildings to offices	5,976,647
6c	Demolish hall, fabric repairs only to courtyard, create managers house	2,362,500
7	Consolidate Hall as ruin, repair courtyard buildings for agricultural use	5,140,500

Chapter 12: Financial valuations and appraisals

12.1 Knight Frank has provided valuations for the different options. Residential values have been calculated on the basis of achieving £130-140 per sq. ft, based on local market comparables and the valuation of office elements has been calculated using an estimated rental potential of £12.50 per sq. ft. On the basis of the very poor condition of the buildings at Winstanley Hall and the significant investment required to repair them, Knight Frank has put a current day value on the buildings of £1.00. The values in this study do not reflect the price paid by the purchaser, but have been independently assessed by Knight Frank. Estimated costs, end values and subsequent level of deficit are shown in table 12a.

Table 12a: Deficit calculations for all options

Option No.	Summary	Total project costs	Revenue Estimate	Deficit
1	Mothball Hall core and principal outbuildings	1,668,000	0	1,668,000
2	Shell repair Hall core convert to 5 houses, shell repair principal outbuildings	7,823,000	2,085,000	5,738,000
3	Shell repair Hall core convert to 5 houses, courtyard to offices	10,987,000	3,968,000	7,019,000
4	Repair whole Hall core convert to 7 houses, convert courtyard to offices	13,258,000	4,346,000	8,912,000
5	Dorbcrest scheme to form 35 units apartments and houses	15,786,000	7,620,000	8,166,000
6a	Demolish Hall, convert courtyard buildings to residential	5,689,000	2,375,000	3,314,000
6b	Demolish Hall, convert courtyard buildings to offices	5,976,000	2,590,000	3,386,000
6c	Demolish hall, fabric repairs only to courtyard, create managers house	2,362,000	400,000	1,962,000
7	Consolidate Hall as ruin, repair courtyard buildings for agricultural use	5,140,000	400,000	4,740,000

Chapter 13: Grant funding and bridging the deficit

13.1 This chapter introduces a number of relevant sources that may be considered to bridge the conservation deficit. There are few sources of funding that provide grant for the repair and reuse of historic buildings and the majority of funders will not provide grant to contribute to private sector profit. Many funding awards also come with specific requirements on public access.

Housing and Communities Agency

13.2 HCA's emphasis is on affordable housing and sustainable communities. Housing potential at Winstanley Hall is for large, high value, high end market homes and these do not fit the criteria of HCA.

Heritage Lottery Fund

13.3 The conversion of the Winstanley site to private housing is unlikely to attract HLF funding because of the strict requirement for public access, learning and participation. There is no public access to the site at the current time and it would prove extremely difficult to meet the relevant HLF requirements.

North West Development Agency

13.4 The NWDA has a limited role in funding housing and related activity. The large private house units proposed for Winstanley Hall do not meet the criteria of generating wider economic benefit and therefore would not be eligible for NWDA funding.

English Heritage

13.5 The Winstanley Hall site has not received any English Heritage funding previously. Discussions and meetings held as part of this study indicate that the level of grant that may be available to fund fabric repairs as part of a successful scheme would be limited and subject to a requirement for some degree of public access.

Charitable trust sources

13.6 Whilst a cocktail of different charities would need to be approached for small sums, it is unlikely that many charitable trusts would be interested in funding given the commercial element of the project.

Architectural Heritage Fund

13.7 The AHF is not able to make a capital contribution to a building project and a building preservation trust would need to secure ownership or a long lease on the property to qualify for any loan or grant.

Wigan Council

13.8 Discussions held as part of this study have indicated that any financial contribution made by Wigan Council would not be at a significant level in relation to the deficit figures and would be likely to be phased over a number of years. Assistance with identifying a site for the location of development to cross subsidize the Hall could be considered.

Natural England

13.9 Natural England can provide grant aid for historic buildings as part of its wider Higher Level Stewardship (HLS) scheme for agricultural land. Specific funding is available for historic and archaeological feature protection (HAP), including works to conserve or consolidate historic structures and features that are not considered to be 'historic buildings' and for the restoration of historic farm buildings (HTB). HLS grants cannot be used to convert historic buildings to an alternative uses such as residential or commercial. In principle, the outbuildings at Winstanley Hall would be eligible for 80% funding through the HTB scheme and the main Hall could qualify for 100% funding for consolidation. It should be recognised that the Winstanley Hall building far exceeds the scale of the average monument in the landscape that qualifies for Natural England grant.

Enabling development

13.10 It is accepted that the land currently in Dorbcrest's ownership is not of sufficient size and is in too close proximity to the existing listed buildings to be considered suitable for an enabling development proposal. Acquisition of an alternative site could be achieved by the donation of land from the surrounding estate (though this is not considered to be a likely solution) or alternatively, Dorbcrest could explore the use of other sites they have within (or outside of) the Borough, in conjunction with suitable land in the ownership of the Council. There is a need for considerable further appraisal work to clarify the level of development required.

Chapter 14: Recommendations and the preferred option

14.1 No option is viable without significant grant funding, private investment and/or unquantified but probably extensive enabling development. On these grounds options 3,4,5 and 6a and b have been discounted as being unviable.

14.2 The study team does not support the mothballing of the buildings. It is considered that investment in mothballing the buildings will only continue to delay a decision on the future of the site.

First option

- 14.3 This could be described as the 'architecturally preferred' option. The 'H' block of the Hall is converted to five houses and the upper courtyard buildings repaired for agricultural use. Effectively this is option 2, with the amendment that building 5 is shell repaired for agricultural use and building 3 is repaired for use as an estate manager's house. The courtyard buildings would be purchased by the estate owner, Tim Bankes, and the upper courtyard buildings shell repaired by 80% Natural England grant and 20% contribution of the owner. Dorbcrest would retain the Hall site and convert the Hall to five houses bridging the considerable deficit by either enabling development on land within the Park negotiated with the estate owner or on a separate site(s) located away from Winstanley, although it is acknowledged this brings its own issues and challenges.
- 14.4 Alternatively, the whole site could pass to Tim Bankes who could grant a long lease or even the freehold of the Hall to Heritage Works, together with an area of parkland for the siting of enabling development.
- 14.5 The 'architecturally preferred' option conserves the greatest part of the historic site and enables external views of the site to be reinstated and the siting of the listed buildings improved. It returns buildings to original uses and secures their long-term future.
- 14.6 There are, however, a number of potential difficulties with this option. Tim Bankes has indicated that he does not favour the combination of agricultural and residential use within such close proximity on the site, even if a separate access route could be provided and his co-operation is crucial in order to access the Natural England grant.

Second option

- 14.7 An alternative option that is potentially more fundable, and therefore more viable, has been proposed.
- 14.8 This is Option 7: the whole site is transferred to Tim Bankes' ownership, and, subject to meeting requirements to put the whole estate into a Higher Level Stewardship agreement, the buildings become eligible for Natural England funding. Natural England grant can be used to fund 80% of the costs of the repair of the agricultural outbuildings with the remaining 20% provided by the new owner. Additionally, through a creative interpretation of the HLS criteria, 100% of the costs of consolidating the H block of the Hall as a ruin can be met, under provisions for the consideration of ancient monuments.

Third option/fall back position

- 14.9 In the event that enabling development cannot be agreed and Natural England grant cannot be secured for the consolidation of the Hall, this study has identified no alternative sources of funding sufficient to bridge the conservation deficit and the option remaining is 6c: return of the site into Tim Bankes' ownership, demolition of the hall, fabric repairs only to the courtyard buildings for agricultural use, including retention of building 3 as an estate manager's house.
- 14.10 The study team acknowledges Option 6c to be the most achievable financially, but also considers it the least favourable for the buildings, resulting in the total loss of the Hall and having a radically negative impact on the site. Option 6a/6b still have considerable funding and enabling development issues, although potentially require no grant.
- 14.11 The 'preferred options' set out above all require a change of ownership to Tim Bankes, who can unlock the Natural England funding and has the ability to provide the matching private investment required. We believe that a workable agreement can be reached for the transfer of ownership from Dorbcrest to Tim Bankes, although it is not within the remit of this report to suggest at what price that transfer should be. The Natural England

funding and English Heritage consents for the scheduling of the Hall are critical to the 'fundable' option and must be secured before the transfer of ownership can take place.

Chapter 15: Risks and the next steps

- 15.1 The largest risk to the site is not to act at all and accept the likelihood of the dangerous collapse of the Hall. Not only would this be potentially unsafe; it would result in an historically and architecturally significant building being lost forever without the opportunity to protect or record any of its fabric or features.

First option

- 15.2 This relies on Wigan Council reviewing its previous stance on enabling in the green belt and being prepared to consider a case for a residential development within the green belt area. Alternatively, the developer and Council could agree a joint approach to identifying and acquiring suitable land away from the existing site. An agreement on a realistic level of profit achievable by the developer is vital. The statutory bodies will need to agree on what makes Winstanley Hall important as a historic asset and accept that in order to save any of the Hall, it is necessary to lose the later and, in the main, less significant elements, to demolition. Dorbcrest would have to agree to sell the courtyard buildings back to the original owner and an acceptable price to both parties negotiated. If agreement could be reached, it will be necessary to identify and secure land for enabling housing and a new access route. Careful and detailed cost analysis and appraisals would be essential in order to minimise the risk of not achieving the required surplus to fund the Hall. Legal agreements could offer some guarantees of the position in the event of the scheme's failure. A means of providing alternative accommodation for the bats would need to be identified and agreed.

Second option

- 15.3 Option 7 is almost wholly dependent on Natural England supporting the grant application, which in turn is reliant on the transfer of the whole site to Tim Bankes and his agreement to enter his wider estate into the scheme. The Natural England funding is competitive and success is not guaranteed, especially as the consolidation of the Hall represents a departure from the usual qualifying structures. Agreement would need to be secured to see the Hall scheduled by English Heritage. It would have to be accepted by all parties that once consolidation works were complete, their reversal would not be realistic and the option to convert back to a long-term alternative use would be lost.

Fall back option

- 15.4 It is not the preference to see the Hall demolished and lost because of a lack of financial resource to secure its future. The necessary permissions would have to be obtained, risking setting a precedent for other sites in a similar situation. It is possible that the developer may seek to develop on the footprint of the demolished Hall to subsidise the conversion of the remaining outbuildings to residential or commercial use. This is not considered appropriate in the context of the remaining listed buildings and Options 6a and 6b risk a return to the issues of enabling development and associated risks. If the site were in the ownership of Tim Bankes, it is possible that grant funding from Natural England could be secured for 80% of the costs to repair the remaining buildings for farm use.

Next steps

Immediate actions

- 15.5 It is recommended that some emergency works be carried out as soon as possible. In particular the masonry void to the west tower of the Hall should be addressed and works to prevent further chimneys from collapsing are advisable.

- 15.6 Consideration should be given to the provision of additional security on the site as continued theft risks the further loss of remaining features.

Short term actions

- 15.7 It is recommended that the steering group maintains the momentum and builds on progress achieved to date with further meetings and discussion on the findings of this report and that in light of this study, Tim Bankes should be part of these discussions.
- 15.8 English Heritage, Wigan Council and Dorbcrest are asked to consider the findings of this report, discuss with members and colleagues if appropriate and share their preferred options and position.
- 15.9 Negotiations must be continued and progressed with Natural England in order to clarify the detail of the HLS scheme and possible funding package.
- 15.10 It is considered urgent that clarity and agreement on the level of archaeological recording is reached and a schedule distributed.
- 15.11 If an enabling development scheme is to be seriously considered there is a need for further feasibility study work to be undertaken in order to clarify costs, scale of development and the location of a site.
- 15.12 Dorbcrest are asked to consider whether they wish to pursue a scheme at Winstanley or if they would prefer to conclude negotiations allowing them to withdraw.
- 15.13 It has been suggested that Heritage Works has a continued involvement with the Winstanley site. Trustees will consider the implications and associated risks of this and the Trust will consider developing proposals to take forward the findings of this report.

Chapter 2: Introduction

Purpose of the study

- 2.1 This report has been prepared by Heritage Works Buildings Preservation Trust as the culmination of an options appraisal study funded by the English Heritage, Wigan Council and Dorbcrest Homes.
- 2.2 This study assesses the current condition of Winstanley Hall and its outbuildings and explores the costs of conservation led repair of the buildings and their conversion to an economically viable use, identifying the 'conservation deficit' and the means of bridging this cost.
- 2.3 The aim has been to identify a means of turning the redundant site, which is becoming a liability, into an asset that brings greatest benefit to the buildings and enables a long term financial solution within the context of the planning strategy and the local area.
- 2.4 The purpose of the study has also been to identify the barriers that have previously prevented development and explore possible delivery mechanisms for recommended options.
- 2.5 The need for this options appraisal study was identified as a result of a review of Buildings at Risk Report in Greater Manchester, Merseyside and Cheshire undertaken by Heritage Works in 2008-09. That study, which was funded by English Heritage, resulted in a shortlist of buildings that could be regarded as potential future projects for a building preservation trust and recommended these be explored further by a series of options appraisal studies. Heritage Works' attention was also drawn to Winstanley by Dorbcrest's design team and by developers previously interested in the Hall, having reached the conclusion that only a Building Preservation Trust led solution is possible for the site.

Key parties involved

- 2.6 The study has involved site visits and meetings with Dorbcrest, Wigan Council and English Heritage, who have formed a steering group for the study.
- 2.7 Consultation has also involved the owner of the wider estate, Tim Bankes and representatives from Natural England.

Extent and limitations of the study

- 2.8 The study has been carried out in accordance with a brief and project methodology agreed between funders and Heritage Works Buildings Preservation Trust.
- 2.9 The study has been undertaken over a five month period during which the study team has been granted access to the properties owned by Dorbcrest. However, due to the hazardous condition of some areas of the site, it has not been possible to access all parts of the buildings.
- 2.10 Building condition surveys have been undertaken but surveys have been visual and non-invasive.
- 2.11 The history and significance of the Winstanley site has been subject to extensive study previously, namely through the Conservation Management Plan prepared by Kathryn Sather Associates in 2008 and the Summary of Relative Significance undertaken by Architectural History Practice in 2009. This study is not intended to repeat their findings, but to focus on the potential options for the future of the site.

- 2.12 The multidisciplinary project team has been brought together and managed by Heritage Works, a building preservation trust with considerable experience of the regeneration of complex historic buildings. Trust Director Kate Dickson has managed the project with Project Officer Laura Jessup. Lorna Tittle has provided administration and Trustee Paul Butler has contributed advice and monitored the study on behalf of the Trust Board.
- 2.13 Architects Rob Craggs and Nick Allen of Calls Architects have undertaken the condition surveys and design work.
- 2.14 Structural engineering input has been provided by Neil Logan from Martin Stockleys Associates.
- 2.15 Cost advice has been provided by Andrew Gaunt of Bernard Williams Associates.
- 2.16 This design team was selected on account of the members' prior knowledge of the site, having previously been employed by Dorbcrest Homes to develop a scheme to listed building consent stage.
- 2.17 Market and valuation advice has been provided by David Roper and Simon Mackay of Knight Frank. Knight Frank had not previously had any engagement with the project and were selected by all the funders of the study to provide a new and independent viewpoint.

Acknowledgements

- 2.18 We would like to acknowledge the support and participation of all organisations and individuals who have contributed to the study including Kierstan Boylan from Dorbcrest Homes, Jason Kennedy, Jenny Tunney and Mike Worden from Wigan Council, Deborah Baker, a student from Manchester University and David Barton a friend of the Bankes family and Gillian Laybourn and Darren Ratcliffe of English Heritage.
- 2.19 We are also grateful to Dorbcrest Homes for access to intellectual property and previously commissioned reports including the Conservation Management Plan by Kathryn Sather Associates, condition surveys by Martin Stockleys and architectural plans by Calls Architects.

Chapter 3: Location, ownership, current use, description

Location

- 3.1. Wigan is the most Westerly district of Greater Manchester, situated approximately half way between Manchester and Liverpool.
- 3.2. Winstanley Hall is situated in Winstanley Park, approximately three miles south west of Wigan town centre. The wider Park covers 370 acres of woodland and farmland and forms part of the Winstanley Estate which extends to 1500 acres. The site is accessed off Pemberton Road (A571) along an unadopted track road to the north east of the Hall.
- 3.3. The site is in close proximity to the M6 motorway, which borders the western edge of the Winstanley estate. However, the access to the motorway is somewhat convoluted being via Pemberton/Billinge Road (A571) which continues further east, then turning back on the A557 to travel west and then south to access the slip road.
- 3.4. The subject of this study is a specific area within the wider estate comprising of Winstanley Hall, its adjacent 10 outbuildings and land extending to 4.23 hectares. The site sits almost centrally within the wider Park, with Gorse Hill Wood to the north west and Mossey Croft and Spring Pool Wood to the south.
- 3.5. Within the group of buildings, Winstanley Hall is located to the west. It juxtaposes at an awkward angle to a courtyard grouping of outbuildings, located in close proximity to the north eastern façade of the Hall. The Coach House, Tithe Barn, Stables form three sides of the courtyard with the Estate Office and Dairy forming the north-western edge. Central within this courtyard is a fountain featuring a large statue of Neptune. To the north of this upper courtyard stands a second, smaller courtyard formed by the rear elevation of the stable block, the Forge, the Keeper's Cottage and the Farrier's Lodge.

Ownership and current use

- 3.6. Dorbcrest Homes purchased the freehold to the site in 2000. The built assets are as follows: The Hall, Malt House, Estates Office, Dairy House, Coach House, Tithe Barn, Tithe Cottage, Stable, The Forge, Keepers Cottage and Farrier's Lodge. The surrounding estate is in the ownership of Tim Bankes, with the exception of two houses within the grounds, which were sold to private owners in the 1980s. The Bankes family has owned the Winstanley estate for over 400 years.
- 3.7. There are currently no public rights of way within Winstanley Park and the surrounding land is used for farming.
- 3.8. The access route to the site is in the ownership of Tim Bankes with Dorbcrest having right of access. There are restrictive covenants in place, which ensure that the use of the land surrounding the Hall does not cause a nuisance to the owner/occupier of the adjacent land and against the placing of any building on this land except for infrastructure and garaging.
- 3.9. The outbuildings in the upper and lower courtyard have not been upgraded and have always been for agricultural and associated estate use, though this has long since ceased.
- 3.10. Selected parts of the Hall remained lived in for the early part of the 20th century, though this was not on a full time basis. Use of the house became even less frequent and limited to certain areas after the Second World War, though the Bankes family continued to own the site. At some point during the 1960s a small brick extension was added to west side

of the Hall, by which time only a small part of the Hall was inhabited. By the time the site was sold to Dorbcrest in 2000, it had already been vacant for several years.

- 3.11. Currently all the buildings are vacant and uninhabitable with the exception of a 1950s bungalow, which occupies a site on the approach to the Hall and is used by a security guard employed by Dorbcrest.

Description

- 3.12. Detailed descriptions of all the buildings have previously been written by Kathryn Sather & Associates (KSA) in the Conservation Management Plan commissioned by Dorbcrest and the Summary of Relative Significance by the Architectural History Practice (AHP) commissioned by English Heritage. This study does not intend to duplicate this information and provides a brief overview only.

Building 1: Winstanley Hall

- 3.13. The main Hall has been constructed over many phases with the original part dating from the 1590s and being of 'H' plan on a south-west/north-east axis. The front south-east elevation has two projecting bays to either end with a recessed central bay featuring the Bankes family crest.
- 3.14. The Hall is constructed in sandstone with ashlar blocks and quoins. Windows have stone surrounds and mullions and recede in size through the heights of the building. The roof is natural slate and features several pitches and tall chimney stacks. The original roof has been modified extensively.
- 3.15. The L-shaped north-east wing extension dates from the late 17th century, most likely to provide additional service accommodation and was partially rebuilt in the late 19th century. Mullioned windows survive to the north east.

18th Century

- 3.16. Plans show the Hall extensions to the north pre-date 1770. The large extension to the west of the Hall to create more reception rooms has a canted apsidal end and a date stone from 1780 to the west wall. These additions were to designs of Lawrence Robinson.
- 3.17. The 4 storey entrance tower to the south west side of the Hall dates from 1818-19 and is the work of Lewis Wyatt. The 18th century Robinson extension was remodelled by Wyatt and Elizabethan gables removed and a flat parapet to principal elevations inserted, obscuring the roof. The effect is one of a uniform roofline. This attempt at a cleaner treatment of forms is evident where the previous extension is incorporated into a symmetrical south elevation with stonework and window detail broadly matching the original. Internal modifications by Wyatt resulted in the entrance being moved to its current position in the south west, from its original location to the south east. The entrance porch has Doric pillars and an arched doorway.



South west façade with Wyatt tower



South east elevation showing original 'H'block and flat parapet

19th Century

3.18 The two-storey Gun Room wing with balcony overlooking the courtyard (possibly Meyrick Bankes II's own design) dates from the mid-19th century. Internal alterations and enlargement of service accommodation within the Hall date from the late 19th century.

3.19 The two single storey extensions to west side of Hall are from the 1880s.

3.20 It is difficult to describe accurately the interiors as damage and decay is extensive and access severely restricted. The Conservation Management Plan Gazetteer gives detailed information and photographs of internal features including interior decorative schemes by Lewis Wyatt in the drawing room, dining room, main stair hall, library, sitting room, landing, dressing rooms, corridors and bedrooms; high quality decorative plasterwork throughout particularly the cornices and ceilings; stained glass panels in the Gun Room and carved timber panelling to the Gun Room and Chapel.



Great Hall with fallen ceiling



First floor corridor towards Chapel

Building 2: Malt House

3.21 Dating from mid-late 19th century. This is a single storey building in rough faced coursed stone with stepped gable wall, abutting the Hall. The rear of the structure incorporates brick remains, probably from the late 17th century.

Building 3: Estate Office

3.22 Dated 1884, this is nominally a three storey building with altered pitched roof. It is built in rough faced coursed stone with dressings to windows and doors and features unusual decorative elements including two bands of diamond patterned stone. There are timber window frames with some leaded lights and concrete roof tiles.

Building 4: Dairy House

3.23 Dating from mid-19th century with possible remodelling in late 19th century, it is likely this building had a previous domestic use. Constructed in rough coursed stone with rusticated ashlar cills and lintels, it has a natural slate hipped roof. A single storey 20th century flat roofed block links to the Estate Office.

Building 5: Coach House

3.24 Dating from late 19th century with possible remodelling in late 19th century. The building is constructed from random coursed stone with dressed surrounds and arched openings with double doors. The Coach House is a long and narrow building of two storeys with central three-storey bay featuring a square clock tower. It is thought to be the work of Lewis Wyatt.

Building 6: Tithe Barn

3.25 The original part of barn to the rear (now substantially altered) dates from late 16th /early 17th century. The front extension of 1834 is of coursed sandstone with a central three storey semi-circular tower and two convex ends of two storeys with arched openings following the curve of the walls. The upper window openings are circular with hexagonal wooden frames within and pitching eyes. Windows on the ground floor are of Romanesque design.

Building 7: Tithe Cottage

3.26 Dating from mid-19th century with possible remodelling in late 19th century, this two-storey cottage was built as an extension to the barn and is constructed from random coursed stone with natural slate roof.

Building 8: Stable

3.27 There is evidence to indicate a building on this site as early as 1838 but the current building suggests rebuilding or major alteration in the late 19th century. It is of rough faced coursed sandstone with rusticated surrounds and octagonal windows to first floor. The canted central tower is three storeys with dovecote openings at roof level and the two storey wings feature Doric cupolas at each end. The roof is stone slated to the rear and asbestos to the front.

Building 9: Forge

3.28 Dating from late 19th century, the single storey building is of rough faced coursed sandstone with arched openings. The gable is surmounted by a carved horse to the north-east end. The roof covering is partly stone slate and partly corrugated iron.

Building 10: Keeper's Cottage

3.29 A 20th century brick bungalow sits adjacent to the site of the half-moon pool.

Building 11: Farrier's Lodge

3.30 Dating from late 19th century, this building is single storey with arched openings and echoes the Forge building opposite. It is built of rough faced coursed sandstone.

3.31 The William Spence sculpture of Neptune forms a fountain feature within the courtyard. It dates from the early 19th century and was commissioned by Meyrick Bankes II.

Chapter 4: The history and significance of Winstanley Hall

A brief history

- 4.1. The history of Winstanley estate and its buildings has been well documented, most notably in the Conservation Management Plan by Kathryn Sather Associates (KSA) and the Summary of Relative Significance completed by the Architectural History Practice (AHP). This study does not attempt to repeat the work done by others, but for completeness a brief history of the site is included below.
- 4.2. It is documented that the Bankes family took possession of the estate from the Winstanley family in 1595 and the site marks the location of a much older moated dwelling, which probably played host to a high status family. Although the writings of Joyce Bankes, who inherited the estate in 1951, proffer the opinion that the Hall was built by the Winstanley family at a date between 1555 and 1570, academic opinion places the build date of the current Hall around 1595.
- 4.3. The architectural form of the Hall is the result of a number of historical innovations and influences, which gradually converged over the lifetime of the building, forming a distinctive whole. Winstanley Hall initially took the form of a squat H-plan building on an east-west axis, classically medieval with a central hall crowned by a great chamber and separate service rooms located in the northern wing. The typical Elizabethan symmetry derived from the projecting wings can still be discerned in the south-eastern elevation, which would have functioned as the main frontage at this time. A number of the Hall's features from this date remain, including some roof beams and mullioned windows.
- 4.4. Winstanley Hall illustrates the development of a number of architectural approaches with its symmetrical frontage and the main versus subsidiary elevation. However, it is not the region's earliest example of these techniques and its plan form is conventional in comparison to contemporary progressive layouts such as Dorfold Hall, Cheshire.
- 4.5. Alterations were minimal until 1770, being restricted to a low extension on the north-eastern front. Charles I had instigated heavy taxes; the Civil Wars raged (1642-9); and the plague struck (1665) but as the Industrial Revolution gained momentum in the latter part of the 18th century, confidence rose, as did the potential of the coal reserves under the Winstanley estate.
- 4.6. The success of the Bankes family at Winstanley Hall was rooted in coal. With reserves on site, mining activity has been frequent and extensive, undertaken in the Park as recently as 1979. At times the mining came surprisingly close to the Hall itself: such was the proximity that it is documented that the pit heads were given special architectural attention. Whilst little built evidence of this activity remains close to the Hall, the excavations have undoubtedly contributed to the physical instability of the south-east frontage, which remains propped today. Open cast mining has destroyed many landscape features and no evidence remains of historic gardens close to the Hall.
- 4.7. William Bankes inherited the estate in 1775. He was a cultured traveller who garnered knowledge on his visits at home and abroad to bring improvement to Winstanley. His alterations were carried out by Lawrence Robinson between 1778 and 1780 and include the octagonal extension with canted apsidal end to the north-west as well as internal modifications to open up larger portions of the inside space. William's ambition was not restricted to the house: fields were replaced with a landscaped park in the style of Capability Brown; pineapples grew in new greenhouses; and a walled garden took shape.

- 4.8. The estate passed briefly to William's cousin Thomas Holme, thence to Thomas' son Meyrick Bankes in 1803. It was for Meyrick that Lewis Wyatt's extensive and significant alterations were carried out in 1818/19. The original 'H' plan had already been substantially built upon and modified, with the former great chamber having been split into separate bedrooms. Wyatt changed not only the look, but also the way the house functioned, by moving the main entrance to the south-west with the addition of a four-storey Doric-columned entrance tower. The reorientation exercise was carried through to the internal space of the house, resulting in a new main staircase and hall. Significant decorative schemes were introduced including wrought iron staircase balustrading and plaster mouldings on ceilings and walls. Servants' facilities were enhanced and the north-eastern extension of 1600-1770 was enlarged. The Elizabethan gables were dismantled and replaced with a flat parapet giving the house a more uniform external appearance.

The Outbuildings

- 4.9. Meyrick Bankes II inherited the estate in 1832. He left a wealth of information regarding the estate as well as a physical legacy concentrated on the outbuildings. Maps dating to 1770 show an arrangement of outbuildings in approximately the same layout as the current outbuildings. However, it appears that the Tithe Barn (building 6), Coach House (building 5) and Stable Block (building 8) were re-constructed for Meyrick in the 1830s, although the Barn includes an earlier 17th century element. It has been suggested that the Stables may have been constructed or remodelled in the 1880s, and that the Coach House may have been the work of Lewis Wyatt. Each of the three buildings is of an idiosyncratic style, with the group displaying a range of bays, mullioned windows, pointed lights, canted heads, towers, Tuscan cupolas and a clock tower.
- 4.10. The eccentric style favoured by Meyrick can be identified in his second round of additions to the house: in 1843 the eastern elevation was extended to accommodate a two-storey canted wing with balcony, accommodating the incongruous combination of Gun Room and Chapel. Further additions include the Neptune statue; the cottage on the north end of the barn (building 7) and a bay to the south; a set of gates; and later, the lower courtyard whose function related to the management of horses (buildings 9, 10, 11). This courtyard incorporates identical mirrored buildings, enclosed on a third side by a stone wall, and on the fourth by a half-moon pool. Both together and individually, the main or 'upper' courtyard buildings are notably more significant in architectural merit, historical and group value, than the smaller group to the east.

Later years: the Hall

- 4.11. Meyrick's daughter, Eleanor, inherited the estate in 1881. She made only minor alterations to the Hall and outbuildings, including the installation of single-storey bays to the west of the house, which are of lesser historic importance; a decorative wall to join the Tithe Barn to the Coach House; and a fountain with plunge pool in the west portion of the courtyard. The most striking contribution during this period was the Estate Office, dated 1884 and displaying a range of unusual detailing, in almost 'Swiss Chalet' style.
- 4.12. Eleanor's son George inherited in 1907 and the social life of the Hall appears to have battled on despite the impending decay of the 20th century. Having parted company with Balconie Castle, their Scottish estate near Edinburgh, Winstanley became the Bankes' family focus. Princess Louise visited for an overnight stay in 1921 and several first hand accounts recall various events and gatherings at the Hall including large parties of visitors taking advantage of the estate's proximity to Aintree Racecourse.
- 4.13. After the World War II the family did not return to the Hall full time and used the estate sporadically in the shooting season (September to January). Ownership was transferred to a trust at the bequest of George Hildyard Bankes to be passed to one or more of his grandchildren. Joyce Bankes, her husband Edward and their stockbroker acted as

trustees from 1954. During the 1950s the gardens were well tended and though efforts were made to keep on top of an extensive repair and maintenance schedule, the Hall's condition continued to deteriorate. Unfortunately the built alterations of this period had a negative impact: the 1950s keeper's cottage adjacent to the half-moon pool and the 1960s extension to the north-western elevation that was built to provide a bright, modern living space and garage but was devastatingly inconsistent with the Hall.

- 4.14. By the mid-20th century it seems that only part of the ground floor, principally the Butler's Pantry, was in use. The estate was undoubtedly a financial burden and onerous death duties had resulted in the auction of the Winstanley Estate's mines, brickworks, farms and numerous houses - assets which may otherwise have provided a financial crutch to support the failing Hall. The Coal Industry Nationalisation Act of 1946 resulted in areas of the Park being compulsorily taken over by the National Coal Board. Contemporary minutes from the House of Commons describe that coal production was completed at 'Winstanley Hall No. 3 site' in 1946 and a new contract for opencast mining at another site known as 'Winstanley Hall No. 3A' was let in 1948. Several further debates raise the problems and local concern at the intensity of the opencast mining, which came within twenty metres of the front door of the Hall and effectively destroyed much of the surrounding Park land in a way that the previous deep shaft mining undertaken by the Bankes family had at least limited. Winstanley Park was subject to a further Compulsory Purchase Order to provide land for the M6 motorway, which was opened in 1963. The motorway ran through the Park on the site of Gorse Hill Wood, isolating the water supply to the ornamental ponds and lake (at Island Dam) and limiting the main vehicular access to the Hall from Billenge Lodge, which sits on the corner of Winstanley Road/Pemberton Road. The busy motorway had a negative effect on the setting of the Hall, not least as it separated the three lodges that formerly stood at various entrances to the Park (Upholland Lodge, Park Lodge and Billenge Lodge) from the rest of the site.
- 4.15. Joyce and Edward's son, James Bankes, took the majority of the Winstanley Estate by way of settlement from the Trust in 1971 and the remainder (including the Hall) in a separate settlement in 1978. Following Joyce's death in the 1970s, her husband continued his tenancy of the Hall until 1984. For a short period after he inherited, Edward's son James occupied the Moat House. A caretaker also stayed on for a time in the 1950s bungalow and continued to carry out various repairs and maintenance to the by then semi-derelict Hall. Whilst James successfully managed the let land and farmed the remainder, he concluded that the Hall was not suitable as a family home and actively sought a developer who would be capable of restoring the buildings. Several interested developers came close to purchasing the site and two schemes by not-for-profit organisations were put forward. However, the scale of financial investment required, apparent requirement for enabling development and the difficulty in securing agreement between the owner, the interested purchasers, Wigan Council and English Heritage meant that none of these approaches were converted into a sale. After several failed negotiations, James' son, Tim, who had been passed the Estate by his father, officially marketed the property nationally in July 2000 and the site was sold to Dorbcrest Homes in November 2000.
- 4.16. Dorbcrest's intention was to convert the Hall and outbuildings to residential use, but unable to reach an agreement with English Heritage and Wigan Council, their plan has not been realised. In the ten years since the site was bought by Dorbcrest, construction costs have continued to rise, the property market has peaked and fallen and the extent of finance required to repair the buildings has become significant. Despite some emergency works undertaken by the owners, the site has continued to decay and is now in a fragile condition.

Significance and heritage merit

- 4.17. Winstanley Hall and the two attached gateways were listed at Grade II* in 1966. The Coach House, Tithe Barn and Stable are Grade II* listed (upgraded from Grade II in 2001). The Neptune fountain in the stable courtyard dates from 1830 and is Grade II listed. The Estate office and cottage to the north of Winstanley Hall are both Grade II listed, included for their group value. The moated site at Winstanley is a scheduled monument and a number of architectural features in the wider parkland may be worthy of statutory protection.
- 4.18. The Lewis Wyatt alterations and additions to Winstanley Hall contribute to its architectural significance. The Wyatt family was a well-known architectural 'dynasty' and included several notable architects of the 18th and 19th Centuries. Lewis' uncles were James Wyatt (a rival to Robert Adam) and Samuel Wyatt (clerk of works for Keddleston Hall and designer of Tatton Park and Trinity House). Benjamin Wyatt (Lewis' father) won the competition to rebuild Drury Lane theatre, remodelled Apsley House and was involved in the design of Lancaster House, London.
- 4.19. Lewis Wyatt was a keen protagonist of the revived Elizabethan and Jacobean styles at least twenty years before this approach became a popular practice. His other works are numerous and include Stockport Parish Church (1813-17), alterations at Lyme Park (1814-17), Eaton Hall (1829) and Sherborne House (1829-34). Winstanley Hall is an early example of his Jacobean-style work. His additions are of good architectural quality and the care with which new and existing elements are matched is evident. Cuerden Hall, Lancashire is a Wyatt building comparable in approach and age to Winstanley. Wyatt's later works including Cranage Hall in Cheshire (1828-29) indicate that Winstanley and Cuerden were significant steps towards the development of his style. The Architectural History Practice findings conclude that the Wyatt elements of the Hall are nationally important examples of his work.
- 4.20. Contemporary plans of interior rooms provide an informative social commentary of the age. They highlight how the building structure served and reflected the needs and status of its various occupiers. Of the internal structure, the more significant elements are the load-bearing walls, roof structure and the principal staircase. There are several significant examples of decorative plasterwork within the Hall, many to Lewis Wyatt designs, including ceiling and cornice details.
- 4.21. The KSA and AHP reports conclude that the majority of the buildings are significant, with the exception of the 20th century additions (including the Keeper's cottage, which is considered to detract from the wider historic site) and some later additions to outbuildings. The Forge (building 9) and the Farrier's Lodge (building 11) are not listed, of a later date and are partially collapsed. Their significance is deemed to be lower in comparison to other buildings on site.
- 4.22. Of the outbuildings, it is considered that those structures forming the main courtyard space are the most significant in terms of their architecture, contribution to spatial form and their wider group value. The AHP significance statement identifies the main part of the Hall, buildings 3, 5, 6, 8 and the Neptune fountain as being of 'high significance'; buildings 2, 4, 7 and 9 of 'medium significance'; and the small linking element between the Hall and building 2 along with building 11 as being of 'low significance'. The 20th century extension and more modern bungalow (building 10) have a 'negative impact' on the site.

Local importance and design considerations

- 4.23. The Hall, the estate and its coal reserves collectively employed a number of local people. The Winstanley estate sat on around 40 million tons of coal and five working pits operated in total, mined through leases. The first of the pits closed in 1939 and the last operations were abandoned in 1979 when the pits were capped and the area landscaped. The estate and Hall had a sizeable staff even into the 20th century employing maids, cooks, butlers, gardeners, chauffeurs and estate workers. There may be residents in the local area who were employed at Winstanley, or whose parents worked there.
- 4.24. Winstanley has previously played a role in the local community. During World War I the estate was used for training and as a transit camp and in 1919 there was a large gathering in Winstanley Park for peace celebrations. The Women's Auxiliary Air Force used the grounds in World War II: on their departure, local homeless families moved into the huts erected on the estate, staying for about a year.
- 4.25. With the demise of the buildings and the estate as an employer, Winstanley's local importance has dwindled and we have so far encountered few local people who still recall the Hall in active use in the first half of the 20th century. Present-day anecdotal evidence is varied, suggesting both local attachment to the Hall, and conversely, a complete lack of knowledge of its existence. Whilst the Hall is an important part of the history of Winstanley and Pemberton area, the site has long been closed off to visitors and there are no public rights of way across the site.
- 4.26. The Hall is a considerable distance from the nearest town and is hidden from the road, from which it is accessed by an unassuming dirt track. Integration with local communities in recent years is minimal. 'Save Wigan' and other local groups and individuals have expressed concern over the derelict state of the buildings and are clearly hoping for a solution that involves re-use. There is some expectation of a level of public access to the site and indeed the larger estate, which will no doubt increase in the event of any progress. Whilst it is recognised that the condition of the buildings is very poor, expectations will need to be managed in terms of how much of the site can be saved. It can be difficult to accept that historic assets are sometimes beyond re-use, particularly when, in the eyes of the public, there has been an apparent lack of action on the part of the owners and relevant authorities. The frustration at the level of intervention by public bodies and expectation of large grant contributions can lead to unrealistic expectations of what can be achieved.

Chapter 5: The planning context

Listed building policy

- 5.1 Policy for the preservation of buildings of special architectural or historic interest is set out at national level and is enshrined in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
- 5.2 National policy in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that in determining any application for Planning Permission for development affecting a listed building, special regard will be given to the desirability of preserving the building, its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest (section 66). This echoes the similar statutory duty for dealing with Listed Building Consent.
- 5.3 Specific advice on relevant planning consents are discussed further in the Sedgwick Associates report in Appendix A
- 5.4 **PPS 5** (Planning for the Historic Environment) sets out the Government's planning policies on the conservation of the historic environment. It replaces PPG 15 and 16 and is supported by 'Planning for the Historic Environment Practice Guide' endorsed by English Heritage and DCMS.
- 5.5 PPS 5 sets out a presumption in favour of the conservation of designated heritage assets. In certain circumstances consideration will be given to the loss of an asset, but only when clear and convincing justification is given.
- 5.6 Policy **HE11** in PPS5 relates to enabling development and states that the benefits of any such development should outweigh the disbenefits of departing from policy.

Regional Policy

- 5.7 The North West of England's Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) was adopted in September 2008. It sets out planning and transport policy in the region until 2021 and provides a framework for determining applications. A number of policies are relevant in consideration of development of Winstanley:
 - DP2** – refers to conserving the region's heritage
 - DP4** – refers to best use of existing resources (the sequential test)
 - DP7** – refers to protection of the historic environment
 - RDF4** – refers to green belts
 - EM1(C)** – refers to the protection of the historic environment
 - MCR5** – refers specifically to the northern part of the Manchester city region
- 5.8 Wigan is identified as a third priority town forming part of the north Manchester region in the RSS. It is recognised that 'significant investment will be needed to raise the northern parts of the City Region to the same levels of economic achievement as those in the south'.

Core Strategy

- 5.9 The Wigan Local Development Framework will, in time, replace the Unitary Development Plan. In the meantime the Unitary Development Plan is a 'saved' development plan under the terms of the 2004 Act.
- 5.10 Winstanley is considered to be part of 'Wigan town'. Guidance states that development will be focused in and around Wigan town centre and to the south and west of the centre (Policy SP3, also Wigan South Central Masterplan, adopted May 2008). Winstanley falls within the 'focus for development', on the very edge of the Wigan south central priority area although the Hall itself falls outside this area, within the Greenheart Regional Park.

The spatial vision for borough aims to conserve and enhance the best buildings of the past.

- 5.11 The local proposals plan identifies the following objectives as being relevant at the Winstanley site:
- BEL 3** – refers to the reuse and conversion of existing buildings
 - H1** – refers to the use of previously developed land for housing.
 - GB1** - states approval will not be given, except in special circumstances, for new buildings other than agricultural use and essential facilities that preserve openness.
 - GB1A** – refers to the re-use of buildings within the green belt
 - GB1B** – refers to extensions to existing buildings within the green belt
 - GB1C** – refers to replacement dwellings within the green belt
 - EV4D** – states that permission will not be given to any proposal which is likely to adversely affect the character or setting of an historic park, garden or cemetery
 - EV4B** – details the main considerations that the Council will apply when assessing development proposals to or affecting buildings included in the list of buildings of special architectural or historic interest in the Borough. It recognises it may be necessary to relax the strict interpretation of other policies of the Plan, for example green belt policy, in order to ensure the survival of particularly important buildings or to ensure that extensions are in scale or character with a Listed Building.
- 5.12 The area adjacent to the Hall is also classed as a Site of Biological Importance, which is a non-statutory designation but must be given consideration under the UDP.
- 5.13 It can be seen that the policy issues and considerations described in this chapter are numerous: the listed status of the buildings, the location of the site within green belt land, concerns relating to enabling development and its justification and the designation of the adjacent land as a site of biological importance with the known presence of bats (a protected species). There is also an acknowledgement that Wigan as a borough does not benefit from the economic advantages present in other areas of the North West. All these factors combine to create a complex and challenging set of constraints on the Winstanley Hall site.

Chapter 6: Why the buildings are at risk and barriers to development

The problems and why the buildings are a risk

6.1 There are many reasons why a building becomes 'at risk', be that a risk of loss of character through irreversible change (generally in times of economic buoyancy) or the risk of total loss through dereliction and demolition (again often through economic pressures). At Winstanley the contributing factors to the building being at risk are in some cases complex and historic. An outline of the issues is set out below:

Location and access

6.2 Wigan is a former major mill town and coal mining centre. The Borough is identified as a priority area in the Regional Spatial Strategy. Statistics for Wigan display marked inequalities; the area is ranked 53rd in England for concentration of deprivation which effectively means it has hotspots of some of the most deprived LSOAs in the country, but these sit alongside less deprived areas such as Winstanley which is designated as 'comfortably off' according to the NWDA research unit. Population has declined in the last twenty years.

6.3 Winstanley is in the south west of the Borough and has easy access to the M6. The motorway is laid out in a cutting, but from higher floors of the Hall it is visible and traffic can certainly be heard from the site.

6.4 Winstanley Park itself is to the east of Winstanley area in a semi-rural location. The Winstanley Hall site is not visible from the road is reached by a track off the A571, Pemberton Road. This track is owned by (and runs through) the wider estate, with rights granted for access to the Hall site. The road is unmade and runs to the north of the Hall where it splits to arrive either at the eastern edge of the lower courtyard or to the west of the Hall entrance. Consequently the Hall lacks a direct approach or grand driveway to its main front door and the route is instead awkward and convoluted. In addition, the physical condition of the access road is poor. Dorbcrest have the right to improve it within set limits, though it is not possible to construct a more direct route across the estate due to ownership issues. The above factors combine to create difficult access for both vehicles and pedestrians.

6.5 The Hall site was sold with ten acres of surrounding land. This presents a tight boundary to the existing buildings, limiting the opportunity for external private space, gardens and car parking in any conversion scheme and making enabling development impossible to achieve without impacting on the setting of the listed buildings.

6.6 The limitations of the existing access routes indicate the existing long driveway requires considerable upgrading and investment. Ideally a second more direct access route would be added but there is some potential difficulty in acquiring land from the estate owner in terms of his agreement and the cost to provide another road.

Planning constraints

6.7 The listed status of the Hall and a number of its outbuildings imposes planning constraints on how the building can be adapted and the process of securing consents can be a deterrent to developers or prospective purchasers.

6.8 The location of the site within the green belt severely restricts the potential for additional development on the site and also influences the extent of any demolitions, extensions and changes of use. These limitations, in conjunction with the real and perceived issues of dealing with listed buildings are a challenge for developers trying to identify a new use for the buildings.

- 6.9 Winstanley Hall and its outbuildings have been in a state of decay for many years and continue to deteriorate. It is within the power of the local authority to serve an Urgent Works Notice under Section 54 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, in relation to the urgent need for specific works in the preservation of a listed building. This notice requires owners to carry out works to arrest deterioration of the building or, if necessary, allows the Council to carry out the work required itself and reclaim costs from the owner. This is a powerful deterrent to a potential developer or purchaser, and a source of real concern for an owner, as it carries the risk of bankruptcy. It also necessitates a financial outlay in maintaining and securing the building, with no tangible financial return. The threat of such action has been an ongoing possibility for many years at Winstanley.

Market failure

- 6.10 The local housing market in Wigan continues to suffer as a result of the recession. In March 2010, the average house price in the Borough was £96,341 (Land Registry figures) and the average four-bed house in Winstanley sold for £220,000. The ceiling price in Winstanley is set at about £500,000 for a detached house and even then the market could not sustain a 'glut' of high end/high value properties being released for sale.
- 6.11 The cost of new build development is high when compared with the potential financial return in the Winstanley area. This serves to increase the scale of any enabling development required to bridge the conservation deficit for the Hall, in turn reinforcing problems in the context of the green belt, extent of land available and the setting of the listed building.
- 6.12 The deteriorating condition and necessary investment required to restore and convert the buildings act as a barrier to investors and developers, particularly when balanced against the potentially limited levels of return. Whilst several parties have expressed interest in purchasing Winstanley Hall from Dorbcrest, no offers have proceeded to sale.

Lack of adaptability for new use

- 6.13 The Hall was originally built as a large single dwelling with a variety of associated uses in the outbuildings, all of which were agriculture related. Modern living patterns are no longer compatible with such large floor areas.
- 6.14 The large buildings are in contrast to the limited external private space and car parking and the site does not offer the combination of internal and external areas required to attract a single residential occupier.
- 6.15 The cost of conversion to use as a hotel, educational institution, residential care home or other supported housing is great. The location and proximity of other similar establishments when combined with issues surrounding access, location and lack of external space make these reuses unsuitable.
- 6.16 Previous plans to retain all the buildings and convert them to residential use were not possible without prohibitively large scale enabling development and are even more unlikely to be achievable in the current market.
- 6.17 The listed Hall and its internal structural walls make any horizontal subdivision challenging. The space is more suited to vertical division. This limits its future use as apartments and indicates that subdivision as houses is more appropriate.
- 6.18 Any new use would demand a level of parking provision, which would need to be located either in one of the outbuildings or in a new structure. Both of these alternatives present some challenges in relation to green belt policy and financial values.

- 6.19 The limited curtilage of the land and green belt policy make the possibility of enabling development within the site to cross-fund the restoration of the Hall unlikely.

Condition

- 6.20 The Bankes family sold the property in 2000, although the Hall was last inhabited in 1984 by Edward Bankes. Prior to this the occupants steadily withdrew from the Hall, living in successively smaller portions of the house. Vacancy, under-use, lack of maintenance and decay date from long before the 1970s.
- 6.21 Extensive dry rot is present throughout the Hall. Water ingress, caused by blocked and failed rainwater goods and poorly maintained roofs, has resulted in significant structural weakening and the internal collapse of some floors. The ongoing theft of lead from the roof is exacerbating the problems caused by water ingress. A number of chimneys have collapsed down into the Hall: others have been removed. These problems can only be resolved by specialist intervention on a large scale.
- 6.22 Vandalism and theft has further contributed to the deterioration and loss of historic fabric including internal features. The sheer scale of repair work now required to repair and bring the buildings back into use is formidable to an owner and increases the longer the buildings are left vacant.

Investment required

- 6.23 The reuse of Winstanley Hall and its outbuildings requires an informed conservation approach. Specialist contractors, detailed surveys and traditional materials are expensive and the level of finance associated with the repair, restoration and reuse of the buildings should not be underestimated.
- 6.24 The additional costs of creating a second driveway and acquiring the necessary land to do so are also considerable.

Conservation approach

- 6.25 The Conservation Management Plan and the Significance Survey undertaken in recent years have identified almost all areas, with the exception of the Victorian extensions and 20th century additions, as being highly significant. Whilst this is not disputed, it is difficult for parties to concede that it may not be possible or practical to save all of the buildings. Decisions regarding the prioritisation of elements of the Hall and outbuildings are contentious and have proved difficult to resolve, meanwhile the buildings continue to deteriorate.
- 6.26 Previous surveys have indicated the presence of long eared brown bats in the roof space of the Hall. All species of bat and their breeding sites or resting places (roosts) are protected by law and it is a criminal offence to damage, destroy or obstruct access to any place used by bats for shelter, whether they are present or not. The replacement of internal partitions or the loss of the main Hall roof space would require licence applications. It is possible that alternative accommodation would need to be provided for the bats. Further surveys and professional advice are required.

Maintenance

- 6.27 Winstanley Hall is a large and complex building and the outbuildings are not insignificant in size. The ongoing maintenance of historic, listed structures is time consuming, costly and demands an informed, specialist approach. Building owners are often reluctant to commit to significant investment and implement maintenance schedules when no end use, and subsequent financial return, has been identified in the medium term. As a result of a prolonged period of lack of general maintenance and the absence of preventative measures to stop decay, the Hall has continued to deteriorate at an alarming rate; the

most detrimental factor being the failure of elements of the roof, subsequent severe water ingress and resultant damage. Lack of intervention continues to put the buildings at risk of further decay and the real threat of collapse.

Attitudes

- 6.28 The Winstanley Hall site has been a contentious and problematic site for several decades. Discussions between the previous owner, developer, English Heritage and Wigan Council have been ongoing without resolution for a number of years. There are conflicting ideas over the best approach to secure a future for the site and a resolution accepted by all has proved to be elusive. Each stakeholder has priorities and views that have, at times, been incompatible. This long history of disagreement has led to feelings of mistrust, a lack of optimism and a difficulty in all parties reaching a compromise to secure the future of the buildings.
- 6.29 Interaction with the local community is currently low. Winstanley Hall is however, a significant site for the Wigan area and wider North West region. There is a level of public interest in the Winstanley Hall site and a number of groups have expressed concern over the current state of the buildings. Any proposed scheme will attract considerable public interest and raise questions of public access. Whilst the primary concern of all parties is the safe guarded future of the site, expectations of the likely level of public sector intervention and investment will need careful management, particularly in light of the perceived lack of action in the past and the current restraint in public spending.
- 6.30 The level of recording and archaeological research required by English Heritage and Wigan Council has not yet been clarified. These requirements have the potential to significantly alter the financial appraisals of any end use. It is therefore considered vital that a comprehensible schedule of requirements is agreed in the near future. The opportunity for learning and wider interpretation should be considered subsequently.

Chapter 7: Philosophy and strategy

Conservation

- 7.1 Winstanley Hall is listed as Grade II* by English Heritage. Its outbuildings include structures listed at Grade II* and Grade II. Grade II* buildings make up 5.5% of all listed buildings in the country and are considered to be of 'more than special interest'.
- 7.2 The approach to the Winstanley site has been to identify the best course of action to protect the historic and heritage significance of the listed buildings, whilst ensuring they have a sustainable future use that can support the extensive ongoing maintenance of the site.
- 7.3 Basic structural and fabric surveys have demonstrated that many of the buildings are in a very poor state of repair with significant defects and extensive loss of, and damage to, existing elements. The team considers the first priority to be the stabilisation of the main structural elements, particularly within the Hall, in order to prevent further loss.

Long term viability

- 7.4 The long-term viability of the site and the reality of the current situation are fundamental to assessing the options. Winstanley has suffered from many decades of neglect and decay and the postponement of decisive action has contributed to the present position. It is considered that agreement by all parties on a way forward is now critical to avoid the loss of the whole site.
- 7.5 The strategy employed is to consider decisions in the context of the long term future and not based on the short or medium term outcomes. It is accepted that the current financial downturn has a great impact on costs, values and financial appraisals. However, it should be remembered that the Winstanley site has been in a derelict condition for many years, including those at the peak of the property market. Deferring decisions until 'the market returns' is not a recommended strategy.

End uses

- 7.6 The best use for an historic building is often the one for which it was originally built. Winstanley Hall was built as a house and whilst it is recognised that single occupier ownership is not a likely option, the design team considers the most favourable reuse for the Hall is as a number of residential dwellings. The outbuildings were built for a variety of purposes, all relating to the agricultural estate. Bringing the courtyard buildings back into this use would be preferred, providing it could be sustained in the long term.
- 7.7 The historic and structural fabric of the Hall is more suited to division to vertical houses than to a large number of apartments. Flooding the Wigan property market with a large number of apartments is a high-risk strategy in a locally restricted market. It is considered more probable that a smaller number of purchasers willing to pay a high price for an exclusive home in Winstanley Hall can be identified than a larger number of investors willing to purchase high value apartments within the scheme. Sales of high-end properties have not slowed to the same extent as the rest of the market and a smaller number of larger dwellings within the Hall is considered favourable.
- 7.8 The creation of larger residential units will require careful consideration of the external space, including the provision of external private gardens and parking facilities. Properties of the size and value of those proposed at Winstanley demand such provision and without it purchasers will be reluctant to invest.
- 7.9 If possible a mixed-use option with potential to attract a variety of grant funding sources is preferable. The sizable deficit is more likely to be met if a number of funding sources

can be levered into the project. The sources of relevant funding are limited and consequently end uses may be dictated to some extent by the grants available.

Enabling development

- 7.10 Enabling development is by definition against planning policy and it seeks to address the deficit that occurs when the cost of maintenance, major repair or conversion of a building is greater than the resulting value to its owner or the market. In certain circumstances, when the overall benefit outweighs the 'disbenefit' of going against policy, enabling development can be justified.
- 7.11 Financial appraisals undertaken by a number of developers over the last 15 years who have been close to purchasing Winstanley Hall, and indeed the current owners, have all concluded that returning the Hall and outbuildings to a viable use results in a large conservation deficit that can only be bridged by either substantial grant funding or enabling development.
- 7.12 In the case of Winstanley Hall the specific issues surrounding enabling development have centred on building new houses close to the listed buildings on land identified as green belt. Previous proposals stalled for a number of reasons, not least that the scale of development required was large at around 40 dwellings. The size of necessary development is accentuated by the relatively low property prices in the Wigan area (even before the recession) and the significant costs involved in building homes capable of achieving high values within such an area. A large development would require further considerable investment for infrastructure and access, assuming green belt and land ownership issues could be overcome.
- 7.13 It has been suggested that previous enabling proposals have had a negative effect on the setting of the listed buildings because of their close proximity to the Hall. The site boundary leaves only a limited amount of land and this is considered too small and too close to the Grade II* listed Hall to be appropriate for new build development. A combination of inappropriately large scale development, its position relative to the existing buildings and local authority interpretation of green belt policy has resulted in a failure to agree a suitable enabling scheme.
- 7.14 However, the identification of a site located further away from the Hall or land that was not located within green belt but that could sustain development at a level to cross subsidize the refurbishment of the historic buildings may be more achievable.
- 7.15 The cost of acquiring suitable additional land is a further consideration. The scale of development required to generate an adequate profit margin to cover infrastructure, build costs and professional fees and contribute to the conservation of the historic buildings is already significantly large. Additional land acquisition costs would only serve to widen this gap and consequently increase the scale of development required. Consideration could be given to a joint approach to identifying and acquiring a suitable site, which could involve Wigan Council, Dorbcrest and possibly the owner of the wider estate.

Prioritising built elements

- 7.16 The Conservation Management Plan and Statement of Significance identify that almost all parts of the site are significant and should therefore be saved through re-use. However, the reality of conserving all buildings at Winstanley is driven by the availability of resources to do so and the ability to secure long-term uses.
- 7.17 The site has a high concentration of buildings and the scale of the Hall and main outbuildings is considerable. As explained above previous attempts to identify a scheme to convert all buildings on the site for residential use required an unacceptable level of

enabling development. It is therefore necessary to accept that it is not possible to secure a future for all of the structures and that the floor area and scale of buildings retained must be restricted. A rational and pragmatic approach must be adopted to prioritise those parts of the site that are the most significant, and those elements whose loss may be considered in order to retain the most important 'core' parts.

- 7.18 It is considered, and accepted by previous reports, that the original 'H' block is the historic core and the most significant part of the Hall and that if possible, this should be retained. The loss of later additions and extensions will limit the size of the building to a more manageable footprint. The removal of the 20th century extensions to the north-west is considered beneficial. In order to achieve the retention of the most significant elements on the site the study team is therefore prepared to make a case for the demolition of some elements of the Hall.
- 7.19 The design team considers that the main courtyard buildings (buildings 5, 6, 7 and 8) are highly significant and should be retained if possible. The smaller courtyard buildings (9, 10 and 11) are considered to be of lower significance. The Keeper's Cottage detracts from the historic setting and the Forge and Farrier's Lodge are in poor repair. The study team is prepared to make the case for these buildings to be demolished. The Malt House (building 2) dates from the Victorian period and is in very poor condition, having no roof. Its size and awkward relationship to the Hall makes conversion to a new use difficult and it is suggested that this building could be demolished and priority given to the more significant buildings.
- 7.20 The team proposes the retention of the all of the main 'H' block of the Hall, the 1818-19 entrance and north-west extensions which house the Wyatt staircase and hall, the drawing room and dressing room and bedrooms above. Internally, the later, north west phases, of the building are considered in the main to be of medium significance and therefore it is suggested must be a lesser priority than the earlier phase of the building.
- 7.21 It is appreciated this approach will result in the loss of the Gun Room and the Chapel, both significant rooms added by Meyrick Bankes II. These are currently inaccessible and in a poor condition with extensive rot. If it is accepted that elements of the buildings will have to be lost in order to retain the historic core then it is considered that the earlier phase to the south-west of the building should be prioritised.

Access and ownership

- 7.22 Separate uses on the site would require separate accesses. The current access route is not adequate for a mixed-use option where residential use is combined with agricultural or commercial use. A second access route will need to be identified and its use negotiated with the estate.
- 7.23 A change of ownership may need to be considered if it is felt to be in the best interests of securing grant funding and consequently a viable future for the buildings. It is reasonable to assume the current owner would seek to achieve a sale price that reflects the market value of the land in their ownership. The intellectual material in their possession may also be considered to have a saleable value.
- 7.24 Between 1996 and 2000 several prospective purchasers, including a building preservation trust expressed interest in acquiring the site to redevelop it. None of these developers could reach an agreement with authorities on the subject of enabling development. Following a national marketing exercise by Savills, Dorbcrest purchased the site in 2000. Despite several efforts and some considerable investment on their part, they have been not secured an appropriate scheme for the re-use for the buildings and

have been unable to reach a satisfactory agreement with Wigan Council and English Heritage on any enabling development scheme.

- 7.25 Since taking ownership, Dorbcrest have received several enquiries from individuals and companies interested in purchasing the Winstanley site. However, upon closer inspection of the buildings and the issues surrounding redevelopment, no offers have translated to a sale and in the meantime the buildings have continued to deteriorate. It must be assumed that, given the level of anticipated deficit, the complex history of planning issues and the restrictive nature of the site, the buildings will not attract a purchaser on the open market who can legitimately secure the future of the site. In the context of the above, the study team does not consider a remarketing exercise to be appropriate or useful, an opinion that is reinforced by Knight Frank in their report at Appendix B

Chapter 8: Condition

- 8.1 Winstanley Hall and its outbuildings have suffered from deterioration over a period of many decades. The current owners have carried out limited emergency stabilisation works, but vandalism and theft have accelerated existing problems and the pace of deterioration continues at an alarming rate. It should be noted that serious issues have been present for a much longer period than the current ownership and that decades of under use, poor maintenance and neglect have contributed to the derelict condition of the site.
- 8.2 Martin Stockley Associates were commissioned by Dorbcrest to complete a structural appraisal in October 2007 and produced an addendum report in April 2008. The content of these reports have been made available for the purpose of this study and Calls Architecture has produced a recent overview of condition. It should be noted that the precarious state of the Winstanley site means that further deterioration could occur at any time and it is recommended an additional survey be undertaken before any work on site commences. A summary of the current condition is set out below.

Principal areas of concern

Hall

- 8.3 The main Hall has suffered from subsidence for a number of years. Photographic evidence shows external propping to the south-east elevation has been in place since at least the 1970s. This instability is most likely due to the prolonged period of mining in close proximity to the Hall in the past. The shoring now requires additional measures as movement continues.
- 8.4 All areas are considered hazardous with several parts inaccessible. The western tower over the entrance requires urgent attention. A void in the masonry to the eastern parapet has significantly increased in size since 2007 and the stack itself is now under immediate threat of collapse, with the certainty of causing widespread damage to the floors below.



*Void to masonry above tower
back*



*Roof from attic window: chimneys fixed
to rotten timbers with steel ties.*

Roofs

- 8.5 The Hall has many small pitched roofs with hidden valleys. Blockages have resulted in overflows and leaks and consequently dry and wet rot is extensive to internal timbers. Theft of lead from the lower roofs has resulted in further decay. There is a danger that chimneys are at risk of collapse as several are fixed back to rotten timbers with steel ties.

Internal Walls

8.6 Internal walls are threatened with several exposing a lack of bond to adjoining walls through movement or failure of internal timber floors. Chimneybreasts to the south east and south west have previously collapsed bringing down walls and floors for the full height of the building.

Timbers

8.7 Widespread decay has resulted in the collapse of several floors and ceilings. The main timber beams are providing a limited amount of remaining rigidity but these are now under threat from decay. Boarded floors and joists have already failed in several places.

8.8 It is considered that the early 1590s wing is under immediate threat from timber decay and its condition is deteriorating rapidly.

8.9 Some ground floor rooms are accessible with caution but rotten floor timbers prevent access to areas over cellars. Access to the Gun Room and Chapel is no longer possible and observation of these rooms in the past four years has indicated that rot is extensive. The first floor can be reached safely by a stone stair case which is in reasonable condition. Whilst the upper floors are accessible for the full length along the central corridor it is not safe to step beyond the threshold of any of the rooms. The vaulted cellars to the south west are covered by collapsed masonry and upper floors.

Building 2: Malt House

8.10 There is no roof present to the building, having collapsed and walls remain open to the elements



Malthouse



Estate office

Building 3: Estate Office

8.11 The structure is considered generally stable but with no access to upper floors. Walls are damp and the roof is not water tight resulting in timber decay.

Building 4: Dairy House

8.12 The building is considered generally sound though roof is leaking and timbers are decayed.

Building 5: Coach House

8.13 The western end has collapsed including roof and the masonry is down to first floor level. Parapets are leaning in places and there is evidence of vertical movement in bed joints.

Building 6: Tithe Barn

8.14 The original barn has collapsed to the south, behind a gable wall within the barn. The roof and upper floor have gone and some of the remaining stone requires dismantling to make it safe. Other external masonry appears to be in reasonable condition.

Building 7: Tithe Cottage

8.15 The building is considered generally stable and accessible with caution. Bulging and cracks are visible indicating movement. Some internal timber decay is present.



South east end of Tithe barn



Interior of Tithe Barn

Building 8: Stable

8.16 During 2009 the parapet stonework to the central tower has partially collapsed and is in danger of further loss. It is recommended that access be prohibited until stability can be assessed and addressed. The single storey element has a large portion of roof coverings missing.

Building 9: Forge

8.17 Access to the building is prohibited. The roof is in very poor condition and decay appears to be widespread.

Building 10: Keeper's Cottage

8.18 The building is considered to be in sound, if dilapidated, condition.

Building 11: Farrier's Cottage

8.19 This structure is in very poor condition. The roof is missing, though walls remain. Access is prohibited.

External areas

8.20 The general landscaping and external space is in poor condition. Steps and pathways are broken and the site is badly overgrown. The fountains require repair and maintenance, although Dorbcrest refurbished the Neptune fountain in 2001 and this is now protected within a metal fenced enclosure.

Immediate action required

- 8.21 The most pressing issue is the risk of imminent further collapse in all parts of the building. The south-westerly bay of the original 1590s elevation, currently propped, is at significant risk.
- 8.22 It is recommended that the masonry to the western tower is made safe as a matter of urgency and that access to the tower and west entrance is prohibited until this has been undertaken.
- 8.23 Several chimneys are at high risk of destabilisation and possible collapse. These would benefit from either tying back to strong points, or being dismantled and placed safe storage.



Propped elevation requiring attention



Dangerous loose masonry to tower

Chapter 9: Market analysis

9.1 The options in this chapter have been developed following site visits and steering group discussions between Dorbcrest, Wigan Council, English Heritage and Simon Mackay and David Roper of Knight Frank.

9.2 End use options that have been considered for the Winstanley Hall site are:

Residential	Commercial	Other
Hall as apartments, upper courtyard outbuildings as houses	Courtyard as offices	Educational institution
Hall as 5 houses, upper courtyard outbuildings as houses	Hall as hotel	Courtyard buildings as agricultural use
Hall as 7 houses, upper courtyard outbuildings as houses	Residential retirement accommodation	Consolidation of Hall as a ruin; agricultural use of upper courtyard

9.3 In addition, options relating to level of finish have been considered including mothballing, shell repair, full repair, demolition and consolidation as a ruin.

Commercial

9.4 Wigan has a relatively large manufacturing base and office demand is not as high as other areas within Greater Manchester. There are no direct comparables to Winstanley Hall but professional opinion suggests there would be appeal in an attractive courtyard development of offices in the rural setting Winstanley offers. However, the market in Wigan would indicate a limited demand and it is unlikely rental levels would exceed £12.50 per sq ft. Whilst the M6 motorway is close enough to be a noise disturbance, access to junctions is convoluted and not as straight forward as office tenants might expect and require.

Other uses

9.5 The hotel offer in Wigan is limited. Ashfield House is a small hotel in Standish housed in a late 18th century country house and hosts wedding receptions. There are a number of chain hotels in the local area- a MacDonald Hotel, Best Western and Premier Inn and a limited number of small family run establishments. The Wigan area is not considered a visitor destination and lacks the pull of other North West destinations in Cheshire, Manchester city centre, the Peak District or the Lake District.

9.6 Haigh Country Park is a publicly accessible area of park and woodland, within which stands Haigh Hall. The Hall dates from 1840 and is a popular venue for weddings, conferences and public events. The Park and Hall are run by Wigan Leisure and Culture Trust a charitable trust working on behalf of Wigan Council. It is unlikely a further 'country house' hotel and wedding venue could be sustained within the area, particularly given the high levels of investment required and complex issues relating to access and car parking.

Educational institution

9.7 Winstanley College, a state sixth form college is located within close proximity to the Hall site. The opportunity to attract an educational institution to the Hall is limited. Where private schools have been established in historic buildings for decades, there is little

incentive to relocate. New independent institutions are unlikely to choose such difficult buildings when competing against contemporary state Academies with state-of-the-art facilities and any extension and addition to the existing buildings is problematic given green belt policy.

Residential

- 9.8 Land Registry statistics demonstrate a significant reduction in average property values in the Wigan area. Average detached houses were achieving around £229,000 in the last quarter of 2007 which dropped to around £190,000 in the final quarter of 2009. The average detached price as at March 2010 is £184,817; the lowest level since September 2004. The average four bed house sold for £220,000 in March 2010. The number of transactions in the last quarter of 2009 is around 60% down from typical levels at the peak of the market.
- 9.9 The UK property market continues to suffer from the effects of the recession. However, even before the downturn, the values achieved in Wigan were below the average for the Greater Manchester region.
- 9.10 The local market within the vicinity of Winstanley Hall experiences higher values than Wigan overall. There are no direct comparables but it has been assumed proposed end units would compete against higher value detached houses in Winstanley.
- 9.11 Local estate agents have confirmed that in recent months standard modern detached homes in Winstanley have achieved around £190,000-£210,000. The highest values reached around £470,000 and whilst these are not typical, they tend to be in the areas very close to Winstanley Hall, overlooking the historic parkland.
- 9.12 There are a small number of larger character properties on the market. These tend to be located near to Parbold, Standish and Upholland. Very few sales exceed £500,000.
- 9.13 High value properties for over £1,000,000 are rare have been on the market for some time and there is little evidence for demand at these levels.
- 9.14 The evidence suggests there is a ceiling value for property in Winstanley of around £500,000 and there could be demand for a small exclusive development on the site with the benefit of larger than average units and the distinctive setting. However, large units will attract families who will expect private external space and garage parking, which cannot readily be provided appropriately within the setting of the grade 2* listed properties.
- 9.15 Professional opinion suggests the treatment of external areas is a major consideration for any successful scheme at Winstanley. Other developments at attractive listed buildings have failed as a result of poor overall design and treatment of the wider site. Driveways, landscaping and private gardens would need to be presented to the highest standard in order to ensure any scheme was successful.

Chapter 10: Options

The market assessment and stakeholder consultation has led to the identification of the options below. Related drawings can be found on the following pages.

Option 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mothball main 'H block' of the Hall • Demolish Victorian north end additions • Mothball principal upper courtyard outbuildings • Demolish buildings 2, 4, 7, 9, 10 and 11
Option 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Repair main 'H block' of the Hall and convert into 5 houses • Demolish Victorian north end additions • Repair Coach House (building 5) and convert to provide 5 garages with storage over • Shell repair buildings 3, 6 and 8 (possible agricultural use) • Demolish buildings 2, 4, 7, 9, 10 and 11
Option 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Repair main 'H block' of the Hall and convert into 5 houses • Demolish Victorian north end additions • Repair Coach House (building 5) and convert to provide 5 garages with storage over • Repair and convert upper courtyard buildings 3, 6 & 8 into offices • Demolish buildings 2, 4, 7, 9, 10 and 11 • Provision of car parking on site of demolished lower courtyard buildings, and associated driveway spur
Option 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Repair entire Hall building ('H block' and Victorian north end additions, excluding the 20th century additions) and convert into 7 houses • Repair Coach House (building 5) and convert to provide 5 garages with storage over • Repair building 3 and add new build wings to each side, to create 2 further garages • Repair and convert upper courtyard buildings 6 & 8 into offices • Demolish buildings 2, 4, 7, 9, 10 and 11
Option 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dorbcrest's residential scheme, unamended (apartments in the entire Hall, with demolition of the 20th century NW appendages only, apartments in all outbuildings, with replacement new build elements in the lower courtyard)
Option 6a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demolish the entire Hall • Repair and convert principal upper courtyard outbuildings to residential • Demolish buildings 2,4,7, 9, 10 and 11
Option 6b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demolish the entire Hall • Repair and convert principal upper courtyard outbuildings to offices • Demolish buildings 2, 4, 7, 9, 10 and 11
Option 6c	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demolish the entire Hall • Shell repairs to principal upper courtyard buildings for agricultural use • Repair and convert building 3 for residential use • Demolish buildings 2, 4, 7, 9, 10 and 11
Option 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consolidate Hall as a ruin • Shell repairs to principal upper courtyard buildings for agricultural use • Demolish buildings 2, 4, 7, 9, 10 and 11

Chapter 11: Project Costs

- 11.1 Bernard Williams Associates has prepared indicative costs for each of the options described in Chapter 10. These can be found at Appendix C.

Construction costs

- 11.2 Costs are based on preliminary scope of works formulated in conjunction with Calls Architecture and Martin Stockley Associates, structural engineers. The scope of works for consolidation of the Hall as a ruin can be found at Appendix E.

VAT

- 11.3 VAT is charged on works of repair to listed buildings, but not on works of alteration, except where those works are so significant as to be 'notifiable' under planning legislation. VAT is not charged on new build residential development. VAT paid on listed buildings works can be reclaimed in certain circumstances, where the developer has 'opted to tax' and anticipates charging VAT on disposal of the property (except residential). As there is considerable uncertainty on the delivery mechanism and the rate of VAT that may be charged at the time of any development, we are unable to assess the VAT implications for the project. We recommend further advice be taken in due course to determine the most tax-efficient method of delivering the project. The figures contained within this report do not include an allowance for VAT.

Non-construction costs

- 11.4 To the base must be added an extensive list of non-construction costs.
- 11.5 **Professional fees:** Design team fees for a conservation accredited architect, a structural engineer, a quantity surveyor, a services engineer, a construction (design and management) co-ordinator are estimated at around 15% of the contract sum.
- 11.6 **Statutory fees:** A provisional allowance has been included for planning application fees, building control fees and any change of use fees.
- 11.7 **Surveys:** It will be necessary to undertake a number of specialist investigations such as timber and ecological surveys, site investigation, flood risk assessments and an element of recording of historic fabric. It is difficult to estimate these costs, but a sum has been included. It should be noted that these costs are subject to significant increase, dependent on the recording requirements of English Heritage. For example, comprehensive scaffold to allow safe access and extensive recording could cost up to £200,000, whereas the allowance for recording in our figures is between £45,000- £80,000 dependent on the proposed scheme. The costs in the report are based on individual options and it is not necessarily to select and combine items from different options.
- 11.8 **Intrusive investigations:** A provisional allowance has been included for intrusive investigations and opening up of the buildings' fabric.
- 11.9 **Contingencies:** A sum has been included to address unknown costs that may occur.
- 11.10 Taking into account the above, development costs including construction and non-construction elements are likely to be in the order of the figures shown in table 11a.

Table 11a: Project costs including construction and non-construction costs

Option No.	Summary	Construction costs	Non-construction costs	Total costs
1	Mothball Hall core and principal outbuildings	1,125,000	425,000	1,550,000
2	Shell repair Hall core convert to 5 houses, shell repair principal outbuildings	5,530,000	1,620,000	7,150,000
3	Shell repair Hall core convert to 5 houses, courtyard to offices	7,820,000	2,205,000	10,025,000
4	Repair whole Hall core convert to 7 houses, convert courtyard to offices	9,445,000	2,680,000	12,125,000
5	Dorbcrest scheme to form 35 units apartments and houses	11,360,000	3,190,000	14,550,000
6a	Demolish Hall, convert courtyard buildings to residential	3,990,000	1,160,000	5,150,000
6b	Demolish Hall, convert courtyard buildings to offices	4,210,000	1,215,000	5,425,000
6c	Demolish Hall, fabric repairs only to courtyard, create managers house	1,660,000	530,000	2,190,000
7	Consolidate Hall as ruin, repair courtyard buildings for agricultural use	3,680,000	1,095,000	4,775,000

Developer's profit/management fees

11.10 A private sector developer undertaking a highly risky project such as Winstanley would expect to make a return on costs of 20% (The profit margin is calculated based on all costs including fees).

11.11 If Winstanley Hall was to be taken forward by a not-for-profit organisation such as a Building Preservation Trust (BPT) there is no requirement to make a surplus. The organisation must however cover its staff costs in managing the project and a mechanism to do this is the inclusion of a project or development management fee equivalent to approximately 5% of the project costs.

Other costs

11.12 Knight Frank has produced appraisals for each option using Pro Dev development appraisal software. A development appraisal enables the 'true' costs of a development to be taken into account, factoring in finance charges over the development period and profit targets. Knight Frank's appraisals include the total project costs (construction and non-construction fees), a management fee, an allowance of 6.5% for debt interest on finance borrowed to fund the project, legal fees, promotion and agents fees. Below is a summary of total costs for each option. Knight Frank's full appraisals can be found at Appendix B.

Table 11b: Total project costs

Option No.	Summary	Total costs
1	Mothball Hall core and principal outbuildings	1,668,375
2	Shell repair Hall core convert to 5 houses, shell repair principal outbuildings	7,823,500
3	Shell repair Hall core convert to 5 houses, courtyard to offices	10,987,346
4	Repair whole Hall core convert to 7 houses, convert courtyard to offices	13,258,424
5	Dorbcrest scheme to form 35 units apartments and houses	15,786,000
6a	Demolish Hall, convert courtyard buildings to residential	5,689,000
6b	Demolish Hall, convert courtyard buildings to offices	5,976,647
6c	Demolish hall, fabric repairs only to courtyard, create managers house	2,362,500
7	Consolidate Hall as ruin, repair courtyard buildings for agricultural use	5,140,500

Chapter 12: Financial valuations and appraisals

Valuations and analysis

- 12.1 Dorbcrest purchased the Winstanley Hall site from Tim Bankes in 2000. The values in this study do not reflect the price paid by the purchaser, but have been independently assessed by Knight Frank.
- 12.2 On the basis of the very poor condition of the buildings at Winstanley Hall and the significant investment required to repair them, Knight Frank has put a current day value on the buildings of £1.00.
- 12.3 There could arguably, however be a value attached to the land on the site (10 acres). In addition, Dorbcrest are the owners of a large body of intellectual property in relation to the site including commissioned architectural schemes, structural engineer surveys, a conservation management plan and quantity surveyor's figures. This information has a financial value to any future owner of the buildings. It is not within the remit of this study to suggest a value for the land and intellectual property and these figures are not included in the valuations presented.
- 12.4 The appraisals are based on an indicative programme and assume a start date of February 2010, with an onsite date of October 2010 and construction times of between 20 and 38 months depending on the option. In all cases, grant aid has been factored in at month 19. See Appendix B for full appraisals.
- 12.5 A pricing exercise has been undertaken to inform revenue estimates for residential properties in option 2, 4, 5 and 6a. These values have been calculated on the basis of achieving £130-140 per sq. ft, based on local market comparables and the advice of Knight Frank. The figures can be found at Appendix B
- 12.6 Options 3, 4 and 6b include the provision of office accommodation. The valuation of these elements have been calculated using an estimated rental potential of £12.50 per sq. ft, based on advice received from Knight Frank.
- 12.7 Options 6c and 7 propose that the courtyard outbuildings are converted to agricultural use. The valuation figures used for these options are estimates, informed by the opinion of Knight Frank's agricultural specialist.
- 12.8 The completed conversion of building 3 to estate manager's accommodation has been given an estimated value of £100,000
- 12.9 Table 12a shows the total project costs (rounded figures), estimated revenue figures and the subsequent deficit.

Table 12a: Deficit calculations for all options

Option No.	Summary	Total project costs	Revenue Estimate	Deficit
1	Mothball Hall core and principal outbuildings	1,668,000	0	1,668,000
2	Shell repair Hall core convert to 5 houses, shell repair principal outbuildings	7,823,000	2,085,000	5,738,000
3	Shell repair Hall core convert to 5 houses, courtyard to offices	10,987,000	3,968,000	7,019,000
4	Repair whole Hall core convert to 7 houses, convert courtyard to offices	13,258,000	4,346,000	8,912,000
5	Dorbcrest scheme to form 35 units apartments and houses	15,786,000	7,620,000	8,166,000
6a	Demolish Hall, convert courtyard buildings to residential	5,689,000	2,375,000	3,314,000
6b	Demolish Hall, convert courtyard buildings to offices	5,976,000	2,590,000	3,386,000
6c	Demolish hall, fabric repairs only to courtyard, create managers house	2,362,000	400,000	1,962,000
7	Consolidate Hall as ruin, repair courtyard buildings for agricultural use	5,140,000	400,000	4,740,000

12.10 The figures in table 12a show that all of the schemes have deficits, ranging from £1.66 million to almost £9 million, without the standard commercial developer's profit being considered. Option 5 is the Dorbcrest scheme which includes the demolition of the lower courtyard buildings, replacing them with new build elements. However, none of the above figures include any costs for enabling development and reflect the conservation deficit of each option.

Chapter 13: Grant funding and bridging the deficit

This section is written in May 2010 following a recent change of Government. There are considerable uncertainties in relation to public sector budget cuts and levels of bank finance in the present financial climate. Information contained within this chapter is particularly susceptible to change.

Grant Funding

- 13.1 Sources of funding for historic buildings are limited, even when the building is Grade 2* listed and priority 'A' on the At Risk Register. Possible grant funding sources and other ways of bridging the conservation deficit are identified and discussed below.

Homes and Communities Agency (HCA)

- 13.2 The Homes and Community agency is the national housing and regeneration delivery agency for England and has an annual investment budget of more than £5billion. HCA works locally through nine regions, with Winstanley falling under the North West area. HCA priorities in the North West are identified as follows:

- To link housing and regeneration resources to support growth, deliver housing renewal, tackle affordability issues and create sustainable communities where people want to live and work.
- To adopt innovative approaches to investment in order to increase housing supply and deliver new and improved infrastructure.

- 13.3 **Kickstart** is a HCA housing market stimulus programme targeting schemes stalled due to the recent financial downturn. It supports the construction of high quality mixed tenure development including social rented accommodation, shared ownership, discounted market sale/rented homes and shared equity schemes. The minimum unit number for Round One was 50 and scheme must already have been granted detailed planning permission. Winstanley Hall does not therefore meet the requirements of this scheme.

- 13.4 The HCA **National Affordable Housing Programme (NAHP)** targets development schemes with a proportion of dwellings identified for low cost home ownership and social rent. Before applying for funding, housing providers must first be awarded Investment Partner status through the pre-qualification process. Schemes incorporating historic buildings include Greylingwell, Chichester, a former hospital site which includes a Grade II listed Chapel and an 18th century farmhouse. These buildings are within much larger development schemes and it is proposed that they will house commercial and community facilities. Funding through NAHP is not for heritage sites per se and contributions to the conversion of historic buildings in successful schemes are integral elements in wider regeneration or community creation reflecting the HCA programme's emphasis on affordable housing and sustainable communities. Housing potential at Winstanley Hall is for large, high value, high end market homes and these do not fit the criteria of HCA.

Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF)

- 13.5 The **Heritage Lottery Fund's** resources are extremely stretched at present, as funds are redirected towards the 2012 London Olympics. Whilst conservation of historic buildings remains a key priority for the HLF, projects must also provide opportunities for people to learn about, enjoy and make decisions about their heritage. In practical terms this means that historic building projects must provide long term physical and intellectual access to the asset, and that the project must encompass a education / training and community engagement programme.
- 13.6 The HLF grant programme most suitable for Winstanley Hall would be the Heritage Grants scheme, which allocates awards of £50,000 and over. To be eligible for this funding stream a project must demonstrate that it helps people learn about their own and other people's heritage. The guidelines state that where a private owner is involved, the

public benefit must be greater than the private gain and that for grants over £1million, match funding of 25% must be found. The long term benefits and learning potential of any project are key to a successful HLF bid and projects asking for grants of over £1million should include an element of training and ongoing benefit for the public.

- 13.7 The conversion of the Winstanley site to private housing is unlikely to attract HLF funding because of the strict requirement for public access, learning and participation. There is no public access to the site at the current time and it would prove extremely difficult to meet the relevant HLF requirements.
- 13.8 It is acknowledged that other conversion schemes in the region have successfully secured HLF grants, such as Bank Hall in Chorley. In that case £1.59 million has been ring fenced as a contribution to a development scheme that proposes the conversion of a historic house into 12 dwellings with an enabling development of 23 houses. This grant was allocated under a previous HLF grant regime which had less stringent requirements than those currently in place. Bank Hall proposals include the use of the Prospect Tower and a meeting space on the upper floor of the building by Bank Hall Action Group (a volunteer friends organisation) with public access to both these spaces and the surrounding pleasure grounds on a monthly basis. The opportunity to offer a similar level of access at Winstanley is complicated by the fact that the wider grounds are farm land under separate ownership, an established friends group does not exist, a portion of the building that could be set aside as an exhibition/meeting space has not been identified and would only serve to widen the gap by decreasing the saleable area. Even if long term public access issues could be addressed, the HLF contribution would be towards shell repair of the historic buildings and there would still be a significant unfundable gap to bridge in order to bring the building back into use.
- 13.9 Option 1, the mothballing of the Hall and all outbuildings has the lowest grant requirement but still has a deficit of £1,668,000, of which £913,500 relates to the Hall. This scheme will only serve to support, waterproof and mothball the structure for 5-10 years and given that this is not a long-term solution to the site, it would not qualify for HLF funding. The particular circumstances and issues surrounding Winstanley Hall, including the limited opportunity for ongoing public access, lead to the conclusion that the site would not meet the HLF funding requirements under their current criteria.

North West Development Agency (NWDA)

- 13.10 NWDA programmes are led by the Regional Economic Strategy and funded through a Government single budget for regional development agencies. The agency's strategy focuses on business, skills and education, people and jobs, infrastructure and quality of life. The overriding objective for the NWDA is to achieve the sustainable economic development of the region. The NWDA has a limited role in funding housing and related activity. The North West Regional Housing Strategy aims to create a balanced housing market across the region that supports economic growth, strengthens economic and social inclusion and to ensure access for all to high quality, affordable housing in sustainable mixed communities. The large private house units proposed for Winstanley Hall do not meet the criteria of generating wider economic benefit and therefore would not be eligible for NWDA funding. In addition, the future of the agency is currently uncertain under the recent change of Government.

English Heritage

- 13.11 English Heritage offer grants for Grade I and II* listed buildings and scheduled monuments under their funding scheme for historic buildings, monuments and designed landscapes. Guidance states that grants are offered primarily for urgent repairs or other work required within two years to prevent loss or damage to important architectural features. Grants are not considered for works of alteration, conversion, improvement or

demolition (except where the latter is directly necessary for the preservation of the historic fabric).

- 13.12 Projects should prove there is no alternative source of funding available and wider benefits of proposals should include: economic regeneration, training and skills development, visitor access and interpretation, social and educational benefits for the wider public and increasing the value of the project through partnership with other funding bodies.
- 13.13 In addition to the general priorities, applications must meet one of the grant priorities for the region, in this case the North West. Winstanley Hall satisfies the criteria as being one of the region's 'buildings, monuments and landscapes on the heritage at risk register, where funding would provide a reasonable prospect of sustaining the place in the long term.' Grants for repair normally require a level of public access to be provided once repair work is complete and for awards of £200,000 or more, the grant conditions run for 15 years after completion.
- 13.14 The Winstanley Hall site has not received any English Heritage funding previously. Discussions and meetings held as part of this study indicate that the level of grant that may be available to fund fabric repairs as part of a successful scheme would be limited and subject to a requirement for some level of public benefits and access.
- 13.15 **Charitable trust** sources may be approached, such as the Pilgrim Trust, Esmee Fairbairn Foundation and Monument Trust. Other trusts such as the Wolfson Foundation demand that the property be open to the public for most of the year. Few charitable trusts will be interested in supporting a high end residential conversion scheme, unless this is managed non-commercially by a social enterprise organisation. In most cases, charitable trusts will only fund voluntary sector, charitable organisations, and the work required by applicants to secure, draw down and monitor relatively small amounts of funding cannot be underestimated. Whilst a cocktail of different charities would need to be approached for sums of between £1,000 and £25,000, it is unlikely that many charitable trusts would be interested in funding given the commercial element of the project.

Architectural Heritage Fund (AHF)

- 13.16 Mention should be made of the possible contribution of the AHF which exists to support the restoration and creative re-use of historic buildings by awarding small grants to building preservation trusts for project development (feasibility studies, project organiser costs etc) and providing very low interest working capital loans to charities undertaking restoration work where end values are insufficient to facilitate commercial bank lending. The AHF is however not able to make a capital contribution to a building project and the trust would need to secure ownership or a long lease on the property to qualify for any loan or grant.

Wigan Council

- 13.17 Discussions held as part of this study have indicated that any financial contribution made by Wigan Council would not be at a significant level in relation to the deficit figures and would be likely to be phased over a number of years. However, the Council could explore alternative contributions including the identification of suitable development land within their ownership and the potential for an element of partnership working.

Natural England

- 13.18 Natural England can provide grant aid for historic buildings as part of its wider Higher Level Stewardship scheme (HLS). HLS is a competitive scheme for landowners and its aim is to provide grant assistance to tackle countrywide environmental problems such as

pollution, loss of biodiversity and landscape character and damage to the historic environment.

- 13.19 In conjunction with wider targets, specific funding is available for historic and archaeological feature protection (HAP), including works to conserve or consolidate historic structures and features that are not considered to be 'historic buildings' and for the restoration of historic buildings (HTB). Awards are targeted at the highest priority environmental features and historic building restoration projects.
- 13.20 HLS grants cannot be used to convert historic buildings to an alternative uses such as residential or commercial as the high grant rates for building restoration work in HLS are based on the work having no direct impact on the economic value of a building. Therefore it is not possible for Winstanley Hall to receive grant funding to finance a conversion to residential or commercial use.
- 13.21 Priority will be given to buildings that demonstrate they meet the target statements for the Joint Character Area (JCA). The urgency of restoration is an important consideration and a building at risk from further decay will take priority. Historic restoration projects must be undertaken in the early years of a HLS agreement and a capital works plan for building after year 5 is not normally considered. Buildings are covered by the conditions of the HLS agreement for a period of 10 years.
- 13.22 In the North West Wigan is not a target area though conversely Natural England is actively seeking HLS applications from outside of target areas. Winstanley is able to address themes set out in the North West HLS Theme Statement. In relation to buildings these are specifically
- Theme 5: Reducing risk to nationally designated assets identified by the Heritage At Risk Survey
 - Theme 6: Securing positive management of prioritised historic buildings.
- 13.23 In principle, the outbuildings at Winstanley Hall would be eligible for 80% funding through the HTB scheme and the main Hall could qualify for 100% funding for consolidation. It should be recognised that the Winstanley Hall building far exceeds the scale of the average monument in the landscape that qualifies for Natural England grant. This stream of funding is dependent on the buildings being returned to the wider Winstanley estate, which would need to meet HLS requirements, and funding for the Hall would only be possible if it were to be given scheduled monument status and therefore had no long term end use.

Enabling Development

- 13.24 Enabling development is development that contravenes planning policy, but that can occasionally be justified because its benefits outweigh the 'disbenefits'. The heritage asset(s) must not be compromised by the new development and it is dependent on no other source of funding being available to secure the future of the asset.
- 13.25 It has been established that a number of enabling development schemes have previously been proposed at Winstanley Hall and failed, mainly due to green belt policy, proximity to the Hall, the scale of development proposed and the inability of various parties to agree a solution.
- 13.26 Most recently Dorbcrest have explored enabling development to fund the restoration and conversion of the Hall and the courtyard buildings to residential use and extensive development work and appraisals informed a planning application in 2003. The failure of all parties to agree various elements of this proposal resulted in its eventual withdrawal.

The presence of brown long eared bats and a great crested newt (both protected species) further complicates issues of developing on the land close to the Hall.

- 13.27 It is accepted that the land currently in Dorbcrest's ownership is not of sufficient size and is in too close proximity to the existing listed buildings to be considered suitable for an enabling development proposal and that to generate sufficient surplus income to bridge the conservation deficit to restore Hall and all the agricultural buildings to residential use, the level of development required would be of an unacceptable scale in planning terms. Furthermore, the legal agreement between Dorbcrest and Tim Bankes contains a covenant preventing residential development on land adjoining the wider estate.
- 13.28 If the Hall and the outbuildings are considered separately, the figures for an enabling scheme are more favourable. If the courtyard buildings were fundable under the Natural England scheme detailed above, and the Hall was reduced in scale by removing the later extensions, the scheme has a greatly reduced deficit.
- 13.29 Based on estimates, the restoration and conversion of the Hall to residential use could, in theory, be funded by enabling development at a smaller scale. The deficit for converting the Hall is estimated to be a little under £3million, which would be likely to rise to £3.5million when a new access route is added in. The developer has indicated that they could build homes at a construction cost of £150,000 per dwelling which they believe could sell at between £300,000 -£400,000. These figures cannot be read as accurate and would need considerable appraisal work but using them as a basis, the minimum number of houses required to bridge the gap would be 14. Assuming a density of 6 houses per acre for properties of high end value, this scheme could be achieved on a land area of 2.33 acres. If a more cautious view were taken that new build houses could generate £150,000, the level of new build would be around 24 houses and the site required would be 4 acres.
- 13.30 It has already been established that an alternative plot of land is necessary for any new build scheme and that additional costs of purchasing this land will only serve to widen the conservation deficit and thus increase the scale of development required. It is suggested that the required site would have to be acquired at no cost and in effect be gifted to the scheme. This could be achieved by the donation of more appropriately sited land from the surrounding estate (though this is not considered to be a likely solution) or alternatively, Dorbcrest could explore the use of alternative assets they have within (or outside of) the Borough, in conjunction with suitable land in the ownership of the Council.
- 13.31 The Council could consider a mechanism by which land is contributed to the scheme either at a favourable price (with potential to receive a super profit share on any sales after the Hall deficit has been bridged) or at a price that includes a grant contribution from the Council to the scheme. Any land identified would have to be in an area that could sustain high value housing. Whilst this arrangement would require a complex legal arrangement, agreed realistic profit levels for the developer and a willingness on both sides to engage in public/private sector partnership working, it presents the chance to cross subsidize the restoration of the Hall without the need for 'enabling development'. Dependent on the location of the site, it would also overcome the contentious issue of development within the green belt.
- 13.32 In order to establish more accurate costs involved in enabling development or a cross subsidizing scheme, there is a need for considerable further appraisal work. It is also considered essential that all parties adopt a realistic approach to the number of high value homes that could be released onto the market in Wigan.

Chapter 14: Recommendations and delivery of the preferred option

- 14.1 As we have demonstrated, no option is viable without significant grant funding, private investment and/or unquantified but probably extensive enabling development. On these grounds options 3,4,5 and 6a and b have been discounted as being unviable.
- 14.2 Of all the options, Option 1 has the cheapest cost. It proposes the demolition of extensions to the main Hall and buildings 2, 4, 7, 9, 10 and 11 and the mothballing of the Hall core and courtyard buildings (3, 5, 6 and 8). Mothballing involves some support to prevent further loss of fabric and the weatherproofing of buildings and is designed to last for five years, or ten at most. The study team neither supports nor recommends this option. The site has been in a state of continuing decay and uncertainty for decades. It is considered that investment in mothballing the buildings will only contribute to a history of indecision and a continuing failure to commit to a line of action on this site.
- 14.3 Remarketing Winstanley Hall is not considered beneficial at this stage and will only serve to delay any decisions on its future. A workable solution to the site has not been identified nor agreement reached on its future in the past 15 years; a period during which the property market has experienced previously unknown highs. Whilst it is accepted that the country is currently experiencing a period of recession, there is nothing to suggest that a return to more favourable market conditions would result in any change to Winstanley's situation.
- 14.4 The favoured course of action, as set out in Chapter 7, is to protect the historic and heritage significance of the listed buildings, whilst ensuring they have a sustainable future use that can support the extensive ongoing maintenance of the site. Having accepted that all the buildings cannot be retained, and that the deficit can best be tackled by separating the Hall from the agricultural outbuildings, it is necessary to consider the funding and delivery of the site as two packages. Three options have emerged, with variations that could be considered within the same broad principles.

First option

- 14.5 This could be described as the 'architecturally preferred' option. The 'H' block of the Hall is converted to five houses and the upper courtyard buildings repaired for agricultural use. Effectively this is option 2, with the amendment that building 5 is shell repaired for agricultural use and building 3 is repaired for use as an estate manager's house.
- 14.6 In this option the Hall would be reduced to a smaller footprint (with demolition of later extensions and additions) and converted to five houses. The courtyard buildings would be purchased by the estate owner (Tim Bankes) and shell-repaired to facilitate agricultural use, funded by 80% Natural England grant and the remaining 20% contributed by Tim Bankes.
- 14.7 A level of enabling development on a suitable identified site would be required in order to bridge the conservation deficit on the repair and conversion of the Hall. As mentioned earlier the amount of development is not insignificant and brings its own issues and challenges.
- 14.8 If the Hall remained in the ownership of Dorbcrest, a suitable area of land for enabling development would need to be found and realistic expectations over the level of developer's profit attainable established as the appraisals in this report have been calculated on the basis of a 5% management fee and not a 20% commercial developer's profit.

- 14.9 Alternatively, the whole site could pass to Tim Bankes who could grant a long lease or even the freehold of the Hall to Heritage Works, together with an area of parkland for the siting of enabling development. In this scenario, Heritage Works would need to identify a developer partner to take forward the new build element of the scheme required in order to maximise the cross subsidy of the Hall repair and conversion.
- 14.10 The 'architecturally preferred' option is identified as the only one that can give the Hall a sustainable and long-term future use. It does require a change of ownership for part of the site and the acceptance that the Hall will require a level of enabling development or cross subsidy. A secondary access road is also necessary to separate residential and agricultural traffic.
- 14.11 A residential use would secure the building and the establishment of a management company could ensure the long-term maintenance and management of the Hall.
- 14.12 Whilst limited demolition of the Hall and the smaller outbuildings would be necessary, the most significant elements of the site would be kept and the important group value of the site retained. This is the option that repairs and conserves the greatest part of the historic site and the largest number of buildings.
- 14.13 By maintaining the Hall in residential use and repairing the courtyard buildings for agricultural purposes, the original uses of the site would be re-established.
- 14.14 The mix of viable uses would remove the buildings from their 'at risk' status.
- 14.15 By repairing the exterior of the Hall and opening up a new access route to the Hall, historic external views of the site would be reinstated and the siting of the listed buildings improved.
- 14.16 By combining a mix of uses on the site, it is possible to achieve access to grant funding for the repair of the agricultural buildings and the potential to fund the conversion of the Hall on the basis that enabling (or development that can provide cross subsidy for the Hall) replaces a financial contribution to costs from public monies.
- 14.17 There are, however, a number of potential difficulties with this option. To date, discussions with Tim Bankes have indicated that he does not favour the combination of agricultural and residential use within such close proximity on the site, even if a separate access route could be provided. He has indicated that an alternative delivery mechanism would have to be employed, whereby he would grant a long lease of parkland outside the Dorbcrest ownership to a charitable trust (ie Heritage Works) which would then have landowner status and thus be able to apply for Natural England funding and enter into a HLS agreement. Heritage Works would then need to secure ownership of Dorbcrest's property and find matching funding for the Natural England grant. The Trust would also need to employ tenant farmers to meet the HLS obligations. This is a complex, unfundable and very high risk delivery strategy which Heritage Works Buildings Preservation Trust is not presently able to consider.

Second option

- 14.18 Although the preferred option described above is considered to be in the best interests of the site and the buildings, it is acknowledged that it relies heavily on both complex delivery mechanisms and the ability to generate a substantial amount of 'profit' to bridge the conservation deficit. It is not guaranteed that the very specific set of circumstances required to achieve this option can be engineered and subsequently an alternative option that is potentially more fundable, and therefore more viable, has been proposed.

- 14.19 The alternative 'fundable option' proposed is Option 7: the whole site is transferred to Tim Bankes' ownership, and, subject to meeting requirements to put the whole estate into a Higher Level Stewardship agreement, the buildings become eligible for Natural England funding. Natural England grant can be used to fund 80% of the costs of the repair of the agricultural outbuildings with the remaining 20% provided by the new owner. Additionally, through a creative interpretation of the HLS criteria, 100% of the costs of consolidating the H block of the Hall as a ruin can be met, under provisions for the consideration of ancient monuments.
- 14.20 This is the only option for which potential grant funding has been identified and is therefore seen as more achievable financially than the other options requiring a grant contribution.
- 14.21 Option 7 allows the courtyard buildings to be repaired for their original agricultural use and secures their future in the long term.
- 14.22 It also allows the estate to be reconstituted as a whole, putting it back into single ownership and control. Wider conservation benefits are secured across the estate under the HLS agreement (repairs of historic structures, boundaries and historic woodland etc).
- 14.23 By consolidating the Hall as a ruin, the historic asset is not lost and instead is retained as a feature within the landscape.
- 14.24 There is the opportunity to record the features of the Hall and document them in a publicly accessible format.
- 14.25 It may also be possible for researchers and special interest groups to access the site for study purposes.
- 14.26 Consideration should be given to the opportunities for the provision of local skills training in the restoration of the agricultural buildings.

Third option/fall back position

- 14.27 Given the reliance on outside parties in the above two options, consideration has to be given to 'what if' these third parties cannot or will not cooperate or contribute. We have therefore considered a fall back position.
- 14.28 Appraisals clearly show each option has a large conservation deficit and therefore a large grant requirement.
- 14.29 In the event that enabling development cannot be agreed and Natural England grant cannot be secured for the consolidation of the Hall, this study has identified no alternative sources of funding sufficient to bridge the conservation deficit.
- 14.30 In the absence of funding for any alternative, the option remaining is 6c: return of the site into Tim Bankes' ownership, demolition of the hall, fabric repairs only to the courtyard buildings for agricultural use, including retention of building 3 as an estate manager's house.
- 14.31 The financial end value of this option is minimal at £400,000 giving rise to a funding gap estimated to be £1,962,000. It is unlikely that Tim Bankes would be interested in selling the agricultural buildings to realise the value attributed to them, so the funding gap is actually closer to £2.3 million. Whilst the owner of the site could realistically be required to meet the costs of demolition, the remaining project costs would have to be funded by

means of some grant assistance from Natural England, English Heritage and Wigan Council, if the repair work is to be executed to the required standards.

- 14.32 Alternatively, a variation which we do not recommend but which should be identified, is that no change of ownership occurs, and having secured consent to demolish the Hall, Dorbcrest undertake conversion of the outbuildings to either residential or commercial use (6a/b) with the requirement for enabling development on the footprint of the Hall. This would detract from the remaining 2* listed buildings and is not considered appropriate.
- 14.33 The study team acknowledges option 6c to be the most achievable financially, but also consider it the least favourable for the buildings, resulting in the total loss of the Hall and having a radically negative impact on the site. Options 6a/6b still have considerable funding and enabling development issues, although potentially require no grant.
- 14.34 It should be noted that demolition costs could rise significantly depending on the level of archaeological and building recording stipulated by English Heritage.
- 14.35 It is possible that a project recording particular elements of the building and its interior to create a useable resource for the public could be eligible for funding from Heritage Lottery Fund or alternative sources, although this will take some negotiating.

Delivering the preferred option

- 14.36 The 'preferred options' set out above all require a change of ownership to Tim Bankes, who can unlock the Natural England funding and has the ability to provide the matching private investment required.
- 14.37 From our discussions with Dorbcrest and Tim Bankes, we believe that a workable agreement can be reached for the transfer of ownership, although it is not within the remit of this report to suggest at what price that transfer should be. Chapter 12 suggests a basis for valuing Dorbcrest's assets in terms of land value and the value of the intellectual property within their ownership. The difference in the value of the Winstanley Park with and without the 'hole' in the middle can also be considered.
- 14.38 Additionally, Tim Bankes has declared that he is prepared to enter into a Natural England HLS agreement for the wider estate and, subject to securing sufficient grant funding to cover the costs of consolidation, to maintain the remains of the Hall as a managed ruin. The Natural England funding and English Heritage consents for the scheduling of the Hall are critical to this option.
- 14.39 Finally, late on in the study process, Tim Bankes declared his intention to employ Heritage Works as his agent to manage the repair project for the outbuildings and the consolidation of the Hall. Although this has in no way influenced our development of the options and recommendations set out in this report, it goes some way to assuage the concerns of partners about Tim Bankes' ability to carry out an exemplary heritage scheme and to satisfy the conditions of the grant funders. Correspondence from Tim Bankes is provided at Appendix D.

Chapter 15: Risks and next steps

Risks

15.1 It is recognised that there are a number of risks associated with the options described in Chapter 14. The largest and real risk however, is not to act at all and accept the likelihood of the dangerous collapse of the Hall. Not only would this be potentially unsafe; it would result in an historically and architecturally significant building being lost forever without the opportunity to protect or record any of its fabric or features. The following assessment of risks should therefore be considered in the context of this very real alternative.

Preferred option

- 15.2 The report team consider that the 'architecturally' preferred option is the only one that can potentially offer a secure future use for Winstanley Hall.
- 15.3 The key to the preferred option is the ability to fund the conversion of the Hall into residential use. The deficit is such that this can only be done with enabling or cross-subsidising development. This relies on Wigan Council reviewing its previous stance on enabling in the green belt and being prepared to consider, through the proper channels, a case for a residential development within the green belt area. Alternatively, the developer and Council could agree a joint approach to identifying and acquiring suitable land away from the existing site. Given the complex history of Winstanley Hall, this would likely require an element of third party involvement to encourage and facilitate partnership working on both sides.
- 15.4 An enabling development proposal would require a clear justification to be made for contravening planning policy and to demonstrate successfully that the benefits of saving the Hall will outweigh the 'disbenefits' of building in the green belt. Any enabling development proposal would require a thorough and detailed planning application, which would rely on further investment by the developers with no guarantee of a favourable result. The developer would also have to be prepared to reach an agreement on a realistic level of profit achievable by such a scheme, which would undoubtedly be lower than that possible from a typical development project.
- 15.5 In order to reduce the Hall to a scale that is manageable and fundable as a residential conversion, it will need to be acknowledged that it is not possible to safeguard all of the building. The statutory bodies will need to agree on what it is that makes Winstanley Hall important as a historic asset and accept that in order to save any of the Hall, it is necessary to lose the later and, in the main, less significant elements, to demolition. There is a risk that this principle cannot be accepted and that by continuing to expect the whole site to be saved, the conservation deficit remains at an unsustainably high level.
- 15.6 Listed building consent will be required for the demolition of any buildings within the Hall's curtilage, whether specifically listed or not, including the buildings within the lower courtyard. This will only be given with clear and full justification. Planning permission and listed building consent would, of course, be required for the conversion of the Hall.
- 15.7 The preferred option requires a split ownership of the site. Enabling/cross subsidy development on a reduced scale is only achievable if the courtyard buildings are funded by other sources. The only alternative source of funding identified is the Natural England grant which is accessible by Tim Bankes. Dorbcrest would therefore have to agree to sell the courtyard buildings back to the original owner and an acceptable price to both parties negotiated, which may require third party involvement.

- 15.8 Assuming a financial offer could be agreed, which we believe is the case, the estate owner would have to agree to committing to entering his estate into the HLS scheme and, if successful, sign a funding agreement in order to secure 80% of the costs of restoring the courtyard buildings. There is a further reliance on Tim Bankes contributing the remaining 20% of the costs to fund the barns' restoration.
- 15.9 The estate owner has previously indicated that it is not his preference to see the Hall developed for residential use, and has particular concerns over the issues of access over his land and the combination of agricultural and residential uses next to each other. It must be recognised therefore that there is a high risk that he will not agree to buy back the agricultural part of the site or to enter into negotiations to secure a further access route over his land (see chapter 14 for Tim Bankes' alternative delivery mechanism involving the lease of the land to Heritage Works, which the Trust is currently unable to accept).
- 15.10 If agreement could be reached, it will be necessary to identify and secure an alternative site for enabling housing. The scheme is dependent on the land acquisition costs being zero, or minimal. It is not guaranteed that any agreement could be reached with either the Council or Tim Bankes on the location and transfer of any site within Winstanley Park.
- 15.11 The residential units within the converted Hall would be in very close proximity to the agricultural courtyard buildings. There is a risk that this could deter potential purchasers and careful agreement and management of space and activity would be required to overcome this issue.
- 15.12 The use of the Hall as five houses would require the designation of car parking spaces for residents. In addition, an alternative access route to the Hall would need to be considered in order that residential and pedestrian traffic could be separated from agricultural traffic. This would involve negotiation with the landowner and planners and there is a risk that an agreement could not be reached.
- 15.13 In financial terms, there are a number of risks in either an enabling development or a cross subsidy mechanism of delivery. If costs escalated over budget for either the new build element or the conversion, there is a risk that the funding gap could increase. Given the poor condition of the Hall, contingencies will need to be sufficient to deal with the unknowns. Careful and detailed cost analysis and appraisals would be essential in order to minimise this risk as far as possible.
- 15.14 The location and current market position further increase the risk that development may not achieve sales values anticipated or fail to sell, resulting in a lower contribution to the conservation deficit from profit. Price points would need to be carefully considered to avoid limiting the potential market. A number of financial risks could be transferred to the developer through the terms in the legal agreements, but this would require extensive negotiations with the developer who would likely expect a limited risk in return for a limited profit.
- 15.15 A Section 106 agreement and other covenants could be designed to give certain guarantees in terms of the restoration of the historic buildings in the event that anticipated profit fell short or if the developer failed to deliver, again these will require detailed legal discussion, negotiation and acceptance on both sides.
- 15.16 The demolition of some areas of the Hall along with the reuse of the remaining part and the agricultural buildings would mean that resident bats would need to be re-housed. If a means of providing alternative accommodation for the bats could be identified, the risk of

detrimental impact on the bat population could be greatly reduced, but a location will need to be agreed and approved by the relevant bodies. This has previously proved to be a difficult issue and will require compromise and willingness to consider alternative options if it to be resolved satisfactorily.

Second option

- 15.17 The study acknowledges that the 'architecturally' preferred option has several areas of risk and that Option 7 is the only one for which potential grant funding has been identified.
- 15.18 It must be recognised that Option 7 is almost wholly dependent on Natural England supporting the grant application, which in turn is reliant on the following:
- An agreement on price and terms being reached between Dorbcrest and Tim Bankes (owner of the wider estate) resulting in the site being sold back to original owner.
 - Tim Bankes funding the remaining 20% costs of repair of the agricultural buildings.
 - English Heritage agreeing that the Hall should be scheduled as a monument, in order that it can be considered for funding to consolidate it as a ruin in the landscape, which may involve a delisting application.
 - The wider estate being successfully entered into the Natural England Higher Level Stewardship scheme and the owner signing up and adhering to this agreement, including the public access requirements identified by Natural England
- 15.19 The Natural England funding is competitive and success, to some extent, is dependent on other applications on the table at the time. Conversations with Natural England have confirmed that the grant requirement of £4 million is 50% of the Agency's annual national budget. Any grant would need to be phased and drawn down over a period of three years. The highest grant award to date has been £1 million.
- 15.20 In addition to the risks associated with the securing of the Natural England grant, there are further considerations and risks associated with option 7:
- 15.21 Works required to stabilise and consolidate the Hall as a ruin would, because of their nature, make the future re-use of the building highly unlikely. It would therefore need to be accepted by all parties that once consolidation works were complete, their reversal would not be realistic and the option to revert back to a long-term alternative use would be lost.
- 15.22 An approach to the maintenance and long-term management of the ruin will need to be agreed and costs calculated. Tim Bankes has indicated he is willing to accept this responsibility, but consideration should be given to the role of official bodies such as English Heritage and Wigan Council.
- 15.23 Clarity is needed as to the level of recording required for the Hall and it must be recognised that this has the potential to increase significantly the costs associated with this option.
- 15.24 Consideration should also be given to making the resulting recorded information available to wider audiences and the mechanics and management of any project to make this possible.
- 15.25 The Natural England grant terms would be valid for a number of years (usually ten) but in order to reassure the vendor of the site and the relevant stakeholders, it may be considered appropriate to negotiate specific clauses in any legal agreements to ensure

that the repaired buildings would be for designated in perpetuity for associated agricultural use only.

Fall back option

- 15.26 It is not the preference to see the Hall demolished and lost because of a lack of financial resource to secure its future, but if the preferred option of reuse fails and the Natural England grant is not forthcoming then Option 6c remains the only one that is achievable financially. However there are significant risks associated with this approach.
- 15.27 The demolition of the Hall would result in the loss of a building that English Heritage has designated as Grade II* (in the top 5.5% of all listed buildings in the country) and as top priority status on its At Risk Register. This would undoubtedly open up a debate as to the protection afforded to listed buildings and the wider aims of the listing process and be seen to set a precedent for other listed buildings at risk, particularly the significant number of country houses in England in a similar predicament.
- 15.28 A case would need to be made for the justification of demolition due to the derelict state of the buildings, the size of the conservation deficit, the lack of funding offers and therefore the acceptance that other options are not achievable. It is not guaranteed that the demolition application would be accepted.
- 15.29 It is considered unlikely that English Heritage or Wigan Council would wish to be seen to be funding the demolition of a grade II* listed building. It is possible that the owners of the courtyard buildings could realistically be expected to contribute to the costs of demolition. It should be noted that demolition costs could rise significantly dependent on the level of archaeological and building recording stipulated by English Heritage.
- 15.30 It is possible that a project recording particular elements of the building and its interior to create a useable resource for the public could be eligible for funding from Heritage Lottery Fund or alternative sources. English Heritage and Wigan might consider meeting the costs of recording the building.
- 15.31 Costs have been given to demolish the Hall and convert the courtyard buildings to either residential or office use (Options 6a and 6b). Both of these schemes still result in a deficit of over £5million, with no sources of funding identified. In the event that the Hall is demolished, the setting of the courtyard buildings would be drastically changed. It is considered likely that any developer would pursue an application for an element of new build development on the footprint of the Hall, reasoning that a new build enabling development to cross fund the conversion of the courtyard buildings would no longer be in close proximity to the Hall and therefore less detrimental to the site. It should be recognised though that the courtyard buildings are listed in their own right. Both Options 6a and 6b risk a return to the issues of enabling development and associated risks.
- 15.32 Option 6c involves the shell repair of the courtyard buildings for agricultural use, for which 80% grant may be accessible through Natural England. The remaining 20% would need to be contributed by either the building owner or by Wigan and English Heritage. As this funding can only be accessed through the HLS scheme for the wider estate, the site would need to have been purchased from Dorbcrest for an agreed sum and on mutually agreeable terms.
- 15.33 Listed building consent will be required for the demolition of all the buildings that will not form part of the final scheme. Planning consent will be needed for the change of use of the courtyard buildings to offices or residential.

Next steps

15.34 To progress the findings and conclusions of this study, the following next steps are recommended:

Immediate actions

15.35 Irrespective of which of the options described in this report is agreed to be the preferred solution to Winstanley Hall, it is recommended that some emergency works are undertaken to prevent further loss and deterioration of the buildings. In particular, the masonry to the west tower of the Hall is considered dangerous. Steps should be taken to make this area safe and access to the tower and west entrance should be prohibited with immediate effect until such works are completed. It is further recommended that the most vulnerable chimneys be tied back to strong points or dismantled and placed in secure storage to prevent the potentially serious consequences of their collapse.

15.36 Serious consideration should be given to increasing the security provision on site. Evidence suggests that theft and vandalism remain an ongoing concern and in the interests of health and safety and to prevent the further loss of remaining features, an increased presence is recommended.

Short term actions

15.37 This study has facilitated an increased level of dialogue between the stakeholders and considerable progress has been made in the past five months. In order to identify and agree a solution for Winstanley Hall it is considered vital that this momentum is maintained. It is suggested that further meetings are attended by the steering group and in light of this study, it is considered appropriate that Tim Bankes should be part of these discussions. Heritage Works could facilitate such meetings with appropriate arrangements in place.

15.38 Further discussions are required between members of the steering group and Natural England to move beyond agreement in principle to their involvement with the project, to the finer detail of any proposals. Negotiations between Tim Bankes and Natural England are also necessary to ascertain the detailed requirements and terms of the HLS scheme.

15.39 Following consideration of this report, it is necessary for English Heritage as a body to agree and clarify its position on the future of the site and the preferred option. In this respect the forthcoming discussions at the advisory committee are welcomed.

15.40 Clarity is also required on the level of priority the Winstanley Hall site is to be afforded by English Heritage regionally, nationally, and most pressingly, alongside other heritage sites that may be competing for Natural England grants money.

15.41 Further information and confirmation on the required level of recording at the site is also considered essential in enabling discussions to progress, particularly given the potential impact on costs and timeframes for delivery of the proposed options. In light of this information, discussion and agreement on funding contributions are required.

15.42 If the option of enabling or cross subsidising development to bridge the Hall's conservation deficit is to be pursued, it will be necessary to undertake further detailed feasibility study work in order to identify a suitable site and to reach a more accurate understanding of the minimum level of development required. The cost of this work will need to be calculated and funding secured before it could progress.

15.43 After consideration of the findings of this study and internal discussion within the company, Dorbcrest are asked to consider whether they wish to continue to pursue an

option for the site which involves them as owners and developers or whether they are willing to conclude negotiations with other parties that would allow them to withdraw.

- 15.44 The cooperation of Wigan Council in any future option is essential and this study report should be considered, if necessary by the relevant policy makers and elected members, in order that the Council's position can be agreed and made clear to the steering group.
- 15.45 The steering group is asked to consider making a copy of this report available to Tim Bankes.
- 15.46 Local interest groups have shown considerable interest in this study and the steering group is asked to consider whether this report, or the executive summary contained within it, should be made available to the public.
- 15.47 Following discussion and agreement on the preferred option by all parties, the steering group is asked to consider whether an addendum setting out the conclusions reached would be a useful addition to the study.
- 15.48 It has been suggested that Heritage Works has a continued involvement with the Winstanley Hall site. Trustees need to consider the role that the Trust could play, the fundability of future involvement and assess the associated long-term risks to the organisation.
- 15.49 In the short term, Heritage Works will consider a proposal to put to funders to take forward the findings of this report.

Appendices

- Appendix A Planning assessment by Sedgwick Associates
- Appendix B Valuation report and development appraisals by Knight Frank
- Appendix C Quantity surveyor costs by Bernard Williams Associates (BWA)
- Appendix D Correspondence from Tim Banks
- Appendix E Option 7 scope of works for stabilisation as a ruin proposed by the design team