

**An Impact Assessment Report of the Proposed  
Development of the former Atkins Brothers Works,  
Lower Bond Street, Hinckley, Leicestershire  
(NGR SP 4270 9415)**

**Dr. Roger Kipling**

**For: Hinckley & Bosworth District Council**

Checked by

**Signed:**  **Date:** 23/02/2009

**Name:** ...Vicki Score...

Approved by

**Signed:**  **Date:** 23/02/2009

**Name:** ...R.J. Buckley...

**University of Leicester**

Archaeological Services

University Rd., Leicester, LE1 7RH

Tel: (0116) 2522848 Fax: (0116) 2522614

**ULAS Report Number 2009-008**

©2009

## REPORT CONTROL SHEET

**REPORT TITLE: The Atkins Factory, Hinckley:  
Impact Assessment Report of  
Proposed Redevelopment Scheme**

<b>Version</b>	<b>Detail</b>	<b>Prepared By Date</b>	<b>Checked By Date</b>
Draft	1st draft	Roger Kipling (ULAS) 13/01/2009	Vicki Score (ULAS) 16-01/2009
Version 2	Edited draft	Roger Kipling (ULAS) 23/02/2009	Richard Buckley 23/02/2009

## **ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE**

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.2 This section of the Heritage Statement assesses the potential effects of the proposed development on the Historic Environment (Archaeology and Cultural Heritage). The assessment was undertaken for Willmott Dixon on behalf of Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council by the University of Leicester Archaeological Services.
- 1.3 The scope of the archaeological and cultural heritage investigations has included consultation and desk studies to identify existing records and sites.
- 1.4 The objectives of the assessment have been to:
- Determine the likely survival and significance of cultural heritage within the study area;
  - Identify the potential for significant effects on cultural heritage resulting from construction and operation for the proposed development;
  - Identify the need for any further archaeological work in advance of the planning application; and
  - Identify potential requirements for any *in situ* preservation of archaeological remains and built heritage, or for their recording in advance of, or during, development.
- 1.5 The assessment presents a description of the baseline conditions of the proposed site and surroundings, discusses the relationship of the proposed development to known archaeological and cultural heritage interests and assesses the potential impacts on the historic environment. Recommendations for avoidance, mitigation and compensation are provided and an assessment made of the significance of predicted residual impacts of the proposals.
- 1.6 The assessment presents available information on the extent, character, date, integrity and state of preservation of archaeological deposits possibly present within the development area. The assessment takes account of all previous land uses and establishes the impact future development will have on the archaeological remains as well as to nearby historic buildings. The assessment will subsequently assist in providing an informed planning decision or whether further stages of work are necessary.
- 1.7 The assessment summarises the significance of the built environment, and includes those buildings on the development site itself as well as those in the vicinity.

### **2. ASSUMPTIONS**

- 2.1 All work has been carried out based on drawings supplied by the client.

- 2.2 The assessment has been completed only for known archaeological remains and historic buildings. The archaeological resource is by its nature an incomplete record. Where there are significant alluvial/colluvial deposits, made ground or lack of archaeological fieldwork, archaeological remains can remain undetected. Local knowledge has been utilised to assess the resources within the study area and to identify and assess areas of potential archaeology.

### **3. LEGISLATION, POLICY AND GUIDANCE**

- 3.1 The chief elements of legislation affecting cultural heritage are the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 which provides statutory protection for Scheduled Monuments and the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Other relevant guidance includes:-

- Planning Policy Guidance Note 15 : Planning and Historic Environment (DoE 1994).
- Planning Policy Guidance Note 16 : Archaeology and Planning (DoE 1990).
- Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan Section 4: Conservation and the Built Environment.

- 3.2 Because the site was deemed potentially to contain archaeological remains that could be affected by the proposed development, an assessment of the archaeological implications was required in advance of consideration of the development proposals by the planning authority in accordance with government advice outlined in Planning Policy Guidance Note 16: Archaeology and Planning.

### **4. METHODOLOGIES**

- 4.1 The following data sources have been consulted in order to establish the baseline archaeological and historic conditions in the area and to enable an assessment of the proposed scheme:-

- Archaeological records (Historic Environment Record for Leicestershire and Rutland (HER), Leicestershire County Council);
- Previous Ordnance Survey and other maps of the area (Record Office for Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland);
- Historical background material (ULAS Reference Library and University of Leicester Library);
- Geological maps (ULAS Reference Library);
- Previous studies of the area: conservation area statement, Druid quarter master Plan.
- Informal consultation was also undertaken with Local Authority Planning Officers and Architects.

- 4.2 All work follows the Institute for Archaeologist’s Code of Conduct and adheres to their Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Desk-based Assessments.
- 4.3 An historic building analytical survey (Level 3) was undertaken on the Goddard and Paget designed building at the Atkins factory (Hyam 2008), which was also the subject of a desk-based assessment report (Richards 2008), both conducted by ULAS in late 2008. An initial Historic Building Assessment (Level 2) had also been undertaken on the same building (TR Project, forthcoming), and the 1926 factory (Factory 2) on the same site had also been the subject of a Level 3 survey (Richards & Hyam, forthcoming). In addition, in pursuance of the conservation and conversion of the Goddard and Paget designed building, a series of interim Heritage Statements have been prepared in respect of three specific building applications, concerning roof repairs and design and access (Appendices 3 & 4).
- 4.4 The full reports are attached as Appendices 1 & 2.

***Assessment Methodology***

- 4.5 Cultural heritage can be divided into three subtopics:-
- Archaeological Remains, these can include artefacts, field monuments, structures, landscape features and can be visible or buried.
  - Historic Buildings, these are architectural or designed structures with a Significant historic value and can be of any date.
  - Historic Landscapes, these can include countryside, townscapes, industrial landscapes and designed landscapes such as parks and gardens.
- 4.6 To evaluate the overall significance of effects on cultural heritage features, the criteria outlined in Tables 1 to 4 have been used.
- 4.7 The value of an archaeological or historic resource can be assessed using a scale of criteria from Low to High. As historic and archaeological remains can be difficult to determine and assess without intrusive fieldwork there is also the option for them to be categorised as Unknown (See Table 1 below).

**Table 1 Methodology for Determining Sensitivity**

<b>Sensitivity</b>	<b>Examples of Receptors</b>
<b>High</b>	Sites of International or National value, e.g. World Heritage Site, Scheduled Monument, National Trail, Grade I and Grade II* Listed Buildings, Important designated landscapes
<b>Medium</b>	Sites of Regional or County value, e.g. Sites and Monuments Record, Other listed buildings, conservation areas or other designated landscapes
<b>Low</b>	Locally important sites, or those with poor preservation, e.g. locally listed buildings, locally important landscapes
<b>Unknown</b>	The importance of the resource has not been ascertained or is hidden.

- 4.8 The impact is defined as a change resulting from the scheme that affects the cultural heritage. Impacts can be either adverse (e.g. removal of a resource) or beneficial (e.g. improvement of public access or setting). Impact can be physical as a direct consequence of the construction works. Impacts may also be indirect such as those caused by changes in drainage and from long term effects such as compaction of remains beneath embankments. Work may also have an impact on the context (the perception and understanding of the site in relation to its landscape) or setting (the surroundings in which a place is experienced. The magnitude of impact does not take into account the value of the resource (e.g. the destruction of a Low Value site is the same magnitude of impact as that of a High Value site), but does take into account any agreed mitigation and enhancement.

**Table 2 General Methodology for Assessing Magnitude of Adverse Impacts**

	<b>Factors in the Assessment of Magnitude of Impacts</b>
<b>Major</b>	Change to key historic building elements, such that the resource is totally altered. Comprehensive changes to the setting.
<b>Moderate</b>	Change to many key historic building elements, such that the resource is significantly modified. Changes to the setting of an historic building, such that it is significantly modified.
<b>Minor</b>	Change to key historic building elements, such that the asset is slightly different. Change to setting of an historic building, such that is noticeably changed.
<b>Negligible</b>	Slight changes to historic building elements or setting that hardly affect it.
<b>No change</b>	No change to fabric or setting.

- 4.9 Significance of effects is considered as the product of the sensitivity/value of the environmental resource likely to be affected and the magnitude of the impact, whether positive or negative upon it. Significance should always be qualified as in certain cases an impact of minor significance could be considered of great importance by local residents and deserve further consideration. The significance of effects is assessed using judgments regarding value, magnitude of impact and significance of effect. The matrix set out in Table 3 is used as a check to ensure that these judgments are reasonable and balanced. Significance descriptors are listed in Table 4.

**Table 3 Significance of Effects Matrix**

<b>Importance of Receptor</b>	<b>Magnitude of Impact</b>			
	<b>Negligible</b>	<b>Minor</b>	<b>Moderate</b>	<b>Major</b>
<b>High</b>	Slight	Slight - Moderate	Moderate - Large	Large
<b>Medium</b>	Neutral - Slight	Slight	Moderate	Moderate - Large
<b>Low</b>	Neutral - Slight	Neutral - Slight	Slight	Slight - Moderate

**Table 4 Descriptors of Significance of Effects**

<b>Significance category</b>	<b>Typical descriptors of effect</b>
<b>Large</b>	These beneficial or adverse effects are considered to be very important considerations and are likely to be material in the decision-making process.
<b>Moderate</b>	These beneficial or adverse effects may be important, but are not likely to be key decision-making factors. The cumulative effects of such issues may become a decision-making issue if leading to an increase in the overall adverse effect on a particular resource or receptor.
<b>Slight</b>	These beneficial or adverse effects may be raised as local issues. They are unlikely to be critical in the decision-making process, but are important in enhancing the subsequent design of the project
<b>Neutral</b>	No effects or those that are beneath levels of perception, within normal bounds of variation or within the margin of forecasting error.

***Level of Confidence***

- 4.10 Given that predications can only be as accurate as the data they are based on it is important to attribute a level of confidence to which the significance of environmental effects have been assessed. Table 4 below defines the confidence levels referred to in this report.

**Table 4 Impact Prediction Confidence**

<b>Confidence Level</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>High</b>	The significance of an environmental effect is an informed estimate likely to be based on reliable data or subjective judgement with reference to similar schemes. Further information would not result in any chance to assessment of significance.
<b>Low</b>	The significance of an environmental effect is a best estimate likely to be based on subjective judgement without reference to similar schemes. Further information would be needed to confirm assessment of significance.

***Mitigation Methodology***

- 4.11 Mitigation avoids or reduces the potential adverse effects of the scheme. Where uncertainties remain over the value of the resource or the impact, mitigation strategies may be used to establish objectives and measures. Mitigation should be identified on a case-by case basis and can include strategies such as avoidance or burial (Preservation in situ), excavation, strip, plan and sample, relocation, photographic/measured surveys, information panels or landscaping.
- 4.12 Current guidance is that cultural heritage assets are non-renewable resources and that the primary goal of cultural resource management should be their physical preservation. In addition there should be a presumption in favour of the preservation in situ of nationally important remains. Where physical

preservation *in situ* is not feasible, systematic investigations for the purposes of 'preservation by record', is often proposed as an acceptable alternative (PPG 16, paragraph. 13).

## **5. BASELINE CONDITIONS**

- 5.1 No archaeological remains have been discovered within the proposed site of development. In addition, the desk-based assessment report has indicated the general vicinity of the application area to be relatively lacking in terms of archaeology, with the exception of a small number of prehistoric, Roman and later sites. Extensive redevelopment of the site during the 18th century is likely to have severely impacted upon any archaeological remains.
- 5.2 Fieldwork in connection with this application has consisted of a desk-based research report (Richards 2008) Appendix 1) and an historic building analytical survey (Level 3) targeting the Goddard and Paget designed building (Hyam 2008, Appendix 2). An initial Historic Building Assessment (Level 2) had also been undertaken on the same building (TR Project, forthcoming), and the 1926 factory (Factory 2) on the same site had also been the subject of a Level 3 survey (Richards & Hyam, forthcoming).

### **Archaeological Remains**

#### ***Prehistoric***

- 5.3 An Iron Age boat shaped brooch was found at Hinckley Castle, *c.*350m to the south-east of the development site (MLE6500).

#### ***Romano-British***

- 5.4 Two Roman sites have been identified in the vicinity of the application area, with finds evidence for a possible Roman occupation site *c.* 900m to the north-east (MLE2895). In addition, two Roman coins were found *c.*550m to the south-west (MLE7941).

#### ***Post-Medieval***

- 5.5 Various post-medieval archaeological sites have been recorded in the vicinity of the proposed development area. Timber framed cottages possibly dating to the 17th century were located *c.* 250m to the south-east of the application area, however they were demolished in 1955 (MLE2876). Hall House is recorded at Hinckley Priory with a formal garden and moats, *c.* 300m to the south-east of the development site (MLE2879). There is also documentary evidence for a fishpond (MLE2880) and a post-medieval garden (MLE2881). There is documentary evidence for a post-medieval windmill at Mill Hill, *c.* 200m to the west (MLE2886), and to the west of the Grammar School *c.* 650m to the north-east (MLE2888). There is documentary evidence for a post-medieval tower windmill *c.* 400m to the south-west (MLE2889). A post-medieval barrel-vaulted cistern was located *c.* 600m to the north-east (MLE6006). Building recording prior to demolition, revealed fragments of a timber-framed building dated to 1625 (by dendrochronology), *c.* 130m to the south



(MLE9161). Buildings at St Albert's Nursing Home were surveyed prior to demolition, c. 450m to the east (MLE9162). Buildings at 1-3 Regent Street, surveyed prior to demolition, showed a late 16th century timber frame of good quality, c. 120m to the south (MLE9165). Atkin's cottages (Knitwork factories) are a row of timber framed cottages of probable 17th century date, c. 50m to the north (MLE9762).

### **Historic Buildings and Landscapes**

- 5.6 The proposed scheme lies within the Druid Quarter Conservation Area. Hence the development would affect a number of historic buildings and the built landscape of the proposed development..

#### ***The Goddard and Paget Designed Building***

- 5.7 Conversion of the Grade II listed Goddard and Paget designed building is central to the scheme. The former Atkins Brothers hosiery works was initially constructed between 1875 and 1888 as a warehouse, although powered machinery was in use at some stage. Around 1886 the building was raised in height by a further storey, and in 1910 the Lower Bond Street range was extended northwards. The building represents the most substantial and significant building in the Druid Quarter Conservation Area and the wider townscape. Whilst largely unremarkable regionally or nationally in terms of specific architectural features, it does represent a tangible manifestation of the contribution of the mechanised textile industry to the economic and physical development of Hinckley from the late 1880s and also in terms of the social history encapsulated in its connections with the Atkins family and their wider social connections.

#### ***The Great Meeting House***

- 5.8 Situated at the southern end of the development area on Baines Lane, the Unitarian Chapel constitutes the most significant nonconformist religious building in Hinckley; it is Grade II\* listed. Built in 1722, it was subject to a number of subsequent rebuilds and alterations.

#### ***The Holly Bush Inn***

- 5.9 This recently-listed Grade II 1930s public house is located to the north of the development area.

#### ***The Framework Knitters' Cottages***

- 5.10 The range of three or four timber-framed cottages on the west side of Lower Bond Street probably date to the seventeenth century but were restored in 1927/8 by the Atkins family. The buildings are Grade II listed.
- 5.11 Development would impact on the setting of these historic buildings. In addition, the late 19th century terraced artisan housing on Druid Street would be visually impacted by the proposed new college building.

## Summary and Sensitivity of the Cultural Heritage

- 5.12 The assessment has shown that the general area has a relative paucity of archaeology and that post-medieval and modern development on the development site is in any case likely to have severely impacted upon any archaeological remains.
- 5.13 Whilst the desk-based assessment report did identify the potential for the survival of archaeological deposits towards the north of the Lower Bond Street frontage, the planned development is unlikely to impact upon these. However, there is the possibility that landscaping works intended for this area of the site may prove detrimental. There is, therefore, low potential for archaeology from the prehistoric to post-medieval periods. The sensitivity of the archaeology is therefore considered to be *Low*.
- 5.14 The listed Goddard and Paget designed building would be directly affected by the proposed scheme, in terms of alterations to and restoration of the structure. It is understood that in the initial stages of the works certain ancillary structures were removed without record. In addition, construction of the proposed new college building would affect the setting of further listed buildings, namely the Holy Bush Inn, the Unitarian Chapel and the framework knitters' cottages in terms of their position within the historic townscape.
- 5.15 The Grade II listed buildings are of *Medium* sensitivity. The Grade II\* listed Unitarian chapel is considered to be of *High* sensitivity.
- 5.16 The Historic Landscape lies within a conservation area and is therefore of *Medium* sensitivity. There are several identified, locally-listed Historic Buildings that would be directly affected in terms of their physical setting.

## 6. POTENTIAL IMPACTS

- 6.1 The footprint of the proposed new building will occupy less than half the development area, the remainder consisting of communal open spaces and car parking facilities. However, the basements proposed for the east end of the building will necessitate particularly deep subsurface disturbance. Groundworks, including the construction of a car park, are likely to have a lesser impact.

### *Construction effects*

- 6.2 The desk-based assessment study has determined that archaeological deposits are unlikely to be present and hence not affected by the development proposals. However, construction has the potential to significantly impact upon the several historic buildings located on and in the vicinity of the site. Notably, the Goddard and Paget designed building and the Unitarian chapel will require adequate screening from construction dust and noise and visual impacts in order to minimise possible detrimental effects to their fabric.

### ***Operational Effects***

- 6.3 It is likely that the development will have adverse operational impacts upon the historic buildings as regards their setting within the urban townscape. Notably, construction of a substantial new multi-storey building in close proximity to the Goddard and Paget designed building and the nonconformist chapel will have a significant visual impact on the existing structures, as is security lighting. In addition, the likely increase in motor traffic along Druid Street accessing the college is likely to have a detrimental effect in terms of noise and pollution on a quiet terraced residential street.

### **Archaeological Remains**

- 6.4 The desk-based assessment report has determined that due to the high levels of modern disturbance on the development area, archaeological remains are unlikely to be present within the assessment area. The impact on any archaeological remains is therefore considered to be *Negligible*.

### **Historic Buildings and Landscapes**

- 6.5 The development lies within the historic Druid Quarter and hence has a number of significant historic buildings within and in close proximity to it. The most significant of these is the Goddard and Paget designed building, a structure until recently in a poor state of repair and at risk of demolition. The ongoing programme of alterations and repairs represents a sustainable new use for the building whilst retaining the integrity of its industrial character. Furthermore, although the setting of the Goddard and Paget designed building has changed as a result of the development, involving the recent demolition of ancillary structures, and will be further altered with construction of the adjacent new college building, this should be viewed positively as providing a more sympathetic setting for this historic industrial structure.

However, the ongoing sympathetic restoration of the historic building, involving restoration of roofing and windows and with minimal disruption to its internal fabric, should be viewed positively as factors serving to enhance the character of the building.

- 6.6 As regards the Unitarian chapel, the removal of nearby industrial structures and the planned planting of trees and shrubs as screening to the proposed car parking area is likely to impact favourably upon the setting of the Listed building.
- 6.7 The low-rise Holly Bush inn is, however, likely to be unfavourably impacted in terms of setting by construction of the three-storey college building. Indeed, the recent demolition of a three-storey building previously adjacent to the inn is viewed positively as an improvement to its landscape setting.
- 6.8 As the buildings already exist in a built up industrial landscape and that many of the buildings on site have already been demolished leaving a

derelict area, the overall impact on the Listed buildings is considered to be *Minor Adverse*.

- 6.9 Similarly the impact on the Historic Landscape, bearing in mind the fact that many associated structures have already been removed and the landscaping of the area, is considered to be *Minor Adverse*.

## 7. MITIGATION MEASURES

- 7.1 The potential impact of the development upon the historic buildings has been outlined, both as regards possible physical impact (dust, noise) during the construction stage and, subsequently, in terms of compromising their physical setting (traffic congestion, light and noise pollution).

Recording has followed the principles enshrined in English Heritage's *Informed Conservation: Understanding Historic Buildings and their Landscapes for Conservation*, namely Conservation-based Research and Analysis (COBRA), defined as:

the research, analysis, survey and investigation necessary to understand the significance of the building and its landscapes, and thus inform decisions about repair, alteration, use and management.

- 7.2 Consequently, mitigation has already been undertaken in the form of:

- A Historic Building Analytical Survey, and
- Supplementary Heritage Statement documents

Mitigation is proposed in the form of adequate screening from potential dust and noise during construction to the Goddard building and the Unitarian chapel in order to minimise possible detrimental effects to their fabric. Further suggested measures include soft landscaping in the form of trees and shrubs to the car parking area to screen the area from the adjacent chapel. In addition, due care will be required in order to balance the need for adequate, safe external lighting for drivers and pedestrians whilst not detracting from the character of the existing historic buildings. Indeed, carefully chosen lighting in keeping with the character of the building may serve to enhance and emphasise the mill building and chapel.

- 7.3 Whilst the survival of archaeology across the majority of the development area is unlikely due to the degree of disturbance to which the site was subjected during the 18th and 19th centuries, the desk-based assessment identified the northern end of the Lower Bond Street frontage as having potential for archaeological activity. Whilst proposed works in this area appear restricted to hard landscaping, the proximity of the site to the historic town core and its position within the Druid Quarter may deem it advisable that groundworking activity be monitored by an archaeological watching brief.

## **8. ASSESSMENT OF RESIDUAL EFFECTS**

- 8.1 Providing the evaluation and mitigation described above is implemented there is likely to be a *Negligible* effect on the Archaeological Remains and a *Slight Adverse* effect on the Historic Buildings and the Historic Landscape. Overall the significance of effect on the Cultural Heritage is likely to be *Slight Adverse*.

Indeed, the impact on the Goddard and Paget designed building is likely to be beneficial, as without the proposed works it would become derelict.

## **9. LIMITATIONS OR CONSTRAINTS TO THE ASSESSMENT**

- 9.1 There are no significant limitations or constraints to the assessment for effects on archaeology and cultural heritage. The assessment is based on a desk-based assessment and a Level 3 historic building analytical survey. Confidence in the conclusions of these studies is, therefore, *High* and further information is not considered necessary in order to verify the results.

## **10. SUMMARY**

- 10.1 The initial assessment has considered the impact on Cultural Heritage. No evidence for archaeological deposits within the proposed development area has been identified. However the limited potential for the presence of buried archaeology and the location of the site within a conservation area suggests that an archaeological watching brief may be beneficial during the undertaking of groundworks. Two significant historic buildings are also located on the site, one of which is central to the proposed scheme. It is evident that the worth of these structures has been recognised in the care with which they have been sympathetically integrated into the development. However, it is recommended that due care be taken in terms of protecting the Goddard and Paget designed building and the Nonconformist chapel from damage during the proposed works, and that careful consideration be made regarding design in terms of site lighting, landscaping and vehicular access in order to mitigate against compromising their historic urban core setting. Providing this is agreed following further consultation with the Planning Authority Archaeologist, the suggested mitigation measures appropriate to the findings would provide a sufficient basis for ensuring that all elements of the historical environment are fully assessed and that there will be no significant residual effects on the historic environment.
- 10.2 The effects on the Goddard and Paget designed building are viewed as beneficial. However, the overall significance of effect on the Cultural Heritage is considered to be *Slight Adverse*.
- 10.3 A table summarising the findings is outlined below (Table 5).

## 11. REFERENCES

Clark, K., English Heritage , 2001	<i>Informed Conservation: Understanding Historic Buildings and their Landscapes for Conservation</i>
Institute for Archaeologists, 2006,	<i>Codes of Conduct.</i>
Institute for Archaeologists, 2001	<i>Standards and Guidance for Archaeological Desk Based assessments.</i>
Dept. of the Environment/Dept. of National Heritage, 1990	Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 16: Planning and the Historic Environment. London HMSO.
Dept. of the Environment/Dept. of National Heritage, 1994	Planning Policy Guidance (PPG)15: Planning and the Historic Environment., London HMSO.
-	Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act, 1979
-	Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990 (England only)
Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council, 2002	The Druid Quarter Masterplan and Regeneration Strategy.
Hyam, A., University of Leicester Archaeological Services (ULAS), 2008	An Historic Building Analytical Survey (Level 3) of the Goddard and Paget Building, The Atkins Factory, Lower Bond Street, Hinckley, Leicestershire. ULAS Report No. 2008-164
Richards, G., University of Leicester Archaeological Services (ULAS), 2008	An Archaeological Desk Based Assessment Centred on The Former Atkins Brothers Works Lower Bond Street, Hinckley, Leicestershire. ULAS Report No. 2008-157
Richards G. & Finn, N., University of Leicester Archaeological Services (ULAS) (forthcoming)	An Historic Building Assessment (Level 3 Survey) of the 1926 Factory, (Factory 2), The Atkins Factory, Lower Bond Street, Hinckley, Leicestershire
Ryder, P.	Hinckley Town Centre Conservation Area Historic Buildings Appraisal May/June 2000
TR Projects (forthcoming)	An Historic Building Assessment (Level 2 Survey) of the Goddard and Paget Building, The Atkins Factory, Lower Bond Street, Hinckley, Leicestershire

**Table 5 Summary of the findings**

	<b>Description</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>	<b>Magnitude of Impact</b>	<b>Significance of Effects</b>
<b>Archaeological Remains</b>	No archaeological remains within the site. Redevelopment is likely to have impacted any remains	Low	Watching brief during groundworks	Negligible	Slight Adverse
<b>Historic buildings</b>	1 x Grade II* Listed building and 1 Grade II building within the site. 2 x Grade II Listed buildings in the vicinity.	Medium - High	Recording already undertaken. Sensitive design and landscaping.	Minor Adverse	Slight Adverse
<b>Historic Landscapes</b>	Lies within the Druid Quarter Conservation Area	Medium	Sensitive design and landscaping.	Minor Adverse	Slight Adverse