

Ms Liv Rickman Council of the Isles of Scilly Town Hall The Parade St. Mary's Isles of Scilly TR21 0LW

Direct Dial: 0117 975 0691

Our ref: L01575327

29 April 2024

Dear Ms Rickman

Arrangements for Handling Heritage Applications Direction 2021

PARKSIDE, 9 THE PARADE, HUGH TOWN, ST MARY'S, ISLES OF SCILLY, TR21 0LP

Application No. P/24/022/LBC

Thank you for your letter of 8 April 2024 regarding the above application for listed building consent. On the basis of the information available to date, we offer the following advice to assist your authority in determining the application.

Historic England Advice

The significance of Parkside

Parkside is a modestly sized dwelling with its origins in the late 19th century and is constructed of granite rubble with a pitched, scantle slate roof. The roofscape is pleasing and contributes to the character of the building, and the use of slate laid in this traditional manner as the roofing material adds to local distinctiveness.

The planform of the building is relatively simple; single depth and two room with a rear 19th century outshot. Internally, this arrangement is clearly legible within the building, whereby the two rooms are separated by a staircase and is illustrative of the historic layout of the building.

Parkside is listed at grade II, recognising its special interest, and warranting every effort to preserve it. The building is also located within the Hugh Town Conservation Area. The Conservation Area has been designated due to its special architectural and historic interest, the character of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance.

The impact of proposals on Parkside



Stonewall



The removal of the staircase and existing partition walls

The application proposes to extend the accommodation on both the ground and first floors. As part of these works the staircase would be removed and repositioned in the north western corner of the main house.

The removal of the staircase would eradicate the existing partitioning on both the ground and first floors. The age and significance of the portioning walls that are to be removed is not clear from the information available, but they could be part of the original layout of the building. As such their removal could cause harm due to loss of historic fabric.

The positioning of the staircase, alongside the partition walls, sustains the historic planform and spatial arrangement of the building. Its removal would change the layout of the building from a two-room to a one room planform, eroding this historic layout and would cause harm.

Historic England has concerns regarding this element of the proposals and recommends that alternative options be considered that retain the historic internal spatial arrangements.

The first floor extension

Whilst we consider that there is some scope for extending the building, we have concerns regarding the flat roofed element of the proposed first floor extension. The proposed flat roof would appear to add a conspicuous feature to the highest point of the new roof that would fail to respond to the form of the historic roofscape.

We query if the proposed solar water tank might be better positioned on the ground floor extension, if set at an appropriate height so that it cannot be seen. This could negate the need for the flat roof and consequently allow for the simplification of the proposals and in order to better respond to the historic character of the building.

Historic England has concerns regarding the impact of this element of the proposals. We encourage opportunities to be sought to simplify the proposed roof structure by removing the flat roofed element from the proposals.

Policy context

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 201 outlines that it is the duty of your authority to identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a







heritage asset), and take this into account when considering the potential impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

Paragraph 203 (a) outlines that local planning authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets.

Paragraph 203 (c) makes it the duty of your authority to take account of the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Paragraph 205 states that great weight should be given to the conservation of a heritage asset, when consider impacts upon its significance. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be.

Paragraph 206 stipulates that any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification.

Historic England's Position

We have concerns regarding the harm that could arise from the changes to the historic planform. We also have concerns regarding the impact of the proposed false dormer, which is not entirely clear, but could cause harm through the introduction of a conspicuous roof feature to the scantle slate roof, that would not respond to the historic roof form.

Consequently, Historic England recommend that your authority works with the applicant to identify alternative options for the scheme that avoid and/or minimise the harm that we have identified. (NPPF 201).

Overall the proposals should seek to sustain and enhance the significance of Parkside, and the proposed extensions should make a positive contribution to local distinctiveness. (NPPF 203 A & C).

The NPPF requires that great weight should be given to the conservation of a heritage asset when considering the impact of a proposal on its significance, and that any harm to this significance requires clear and convincing justification. (NPPF 205 & 206). We do not consider that the harm we have identified has been clear and convincingly justified, and therefore alternative options should be explored that place the conservation of Parkside at the forefront of decision making.

Recommendation

Historic England has concerns regarding the application on heritage grounds. Our concerns relate to the alterations to the planform which could eradicate the historic arrangement. We also have concerns regarding the proposed flat roof element of the extension proposals, that would introduce a conspicuous new feature to the roofscape, that would not respond to its historic form.



Stonewall DIVERSITY CHAMPION



We recommend that your authority work with the applicant to identify design amendments that would avoid and/or minimise the harm we have identified.

We consider that the issues and safeguards outlined in our advice need to be addressed in order for the application to meet the requirements of paragraphs 201, 203 (A & C), 205 & 206 of the NPPF.

In determining this application you should bear in mind the statutory duty of section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess & and section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.

Your authority should take these representations into account and seek amendments, safeguards or further information as set out in our advice. If there are any material changes to the proposals, or you would like further advice, please contact us.

Yours sincerely

Harish Sharma

Assistant Inspector of Historic Buildings and Areas E-mail: harish.sharma@historicengland.org.uk



