

COB & LIME SPECIALISTS

Heritage Assessment

Newman House, TR21 0LS



Leslie Cornell Building Restoration Ltd
Unit 13-14 St Austell Bay Business Park
Par Moor Road
St Austell
Cornwall, PL25 3RF
01726 337577
cornellcob@outlook.com
www.cornellcob.co.uk

Leslie Cornell

November 2016



CONTENTS:

Property Details

Historical Importance

Property Description

Justification

Proposals

Schedule of Works

Method Statements

Summary

Property Details:

Property Address	Newman House The Garrison St Mary's Isles of Scilly
Postcode	TR21 0LS
Listed Building Status	Grade II*
Date Listed	12 th February 1975
English Heritage ID Number	62520
OS Grid Reference	SV8990410788
Assessed By	Leslie Cornell
Assessment Date	October 2016

Historical Importance

The strategic significance of the Isles of Scilly has been recognized since before the time of the Spanish Armada. The islands were a vital anchorage for British ships controlling routes between mainland Europe, Ireland and the west coast of Britain, and if lost to enemy control they could have become a tactical base from which to disrupt British shipping.

St Mary's Garrison is located on the outer western part of St Mary's Island, the largest island in the Isles of Scilly group. This impressive site occupies a somewhat detached headland overlooking a sheltered anchorage. Formerly known as Hugh Fort, the headland is linked to the rest of St Mary's by a broad sandy isthmus occupied by Hugh Town, the principal settlement on the Isles of Scilly.

The Spanish became a particular threat to the Isles of Scilly after 1590 when they captured a foothold in Brittany at Blavet. The Armada had prompted no immediate, substantial action in Scilly, but the relative proximity of Spanish forces in western France started a new phase of fortification. In May 1591 the West Country's defences were made ready for an imminent invasion and Scilly was to be reinforced with additional ships and land forces.

In March 1592/3 the Spanish threat to Scilly was again being assessed, and the conclusion was that from May until September there should be a garrison of eighty men at least, one half to be strong labourers to further the fortifications on St Mary's. By May 1593 a plan for the defences had been finalized. The main fortification and Star Castle was built – the work of Francis Godolphin and the Surveyor of the Royal Works, Robert Adams. A major construction programme was undertaken to create defensive walls running north to south on the west side of Hugh Town. There were also stone fortifications at Newman's, Morning Point, Woolpack Battery, Bartholomew Battery, Steval Point and Charles Battery. These were linked to each other and to the stone walls along the east side of the Garrison by a comprehensive set of earthworks.

In 1598 Spain concluded a peace treaty with France, returning the key port of Blavet in Brittany and therefore reducing the immediate threat to Scilly. Later in the year Philip II of Spain died and after Elizabeth I's death in 1603, England and Spain were able to conclude a peace treaty the following year.

The Isles of Scilly remained in Royalist hands for much of the Civil War, and in 1649 under the governorship of Sir John Grenville the Garrison became the last Royalist stronghold. It was the base for up to 800 men, besides an immense number of officers, although they were finally forced to surrender to Admiral Robert Blake of the Parliamentarian fleet in June 1651.

During their time on Scilly the Royalists were responsible for improving St Mary's fortifications, and particularly for the construction of the earthen defensive lines around the Garrison. These consisted of low banks with inner ditches – the breastwork – that were linked to widely-spaced gun platforms. The breastwork originally enclosed much of the headland as part of the 17th century defensive ring set low down on the coastal slope, although the greater part of this defensive circuit has since been lost either to coastal

erosion or when the 18th century masonry curtain wall was constructed to supersede it. The best-preserved elements of the breastworks are to be found on the north-western side of the Garrison, although there are additional short and badly-eroded lengths to the south-west and in the south-eastern corner.

In 1715 Christian Lilly, a military engineer, was appointed to survey, repair and improve the fortification at St Mary's. Lilly also included designs for a Storehouse, now Newman House, which was located overlooking Newman's Rock. In style, it is very similar to the buildings flanking the slightly earlier gate of Pendennis Castle. In his survey Lilly identified that a vast quantity of earth and Sodwork was needed to renew and complete the Parapets of the Fortification. Lilly's survey also recorded that the fortifications were in stone from the ruinous Newman's Battery at the north of the Garrison. Lilly was responsible for identifying the work needed, but the day to day running of the project probably fell to Abraham Tovey, the Board of Ordnance's resident man in Scilly.

After 1717, Scilly returned to being a minor player in the Board of Ordnance papers. Lilly's work was complete by the end of the year and as Storekeeper, Abraham Tovey managed the everyday needs of the Garrison and carried out minor repairs to buildings.

The progress of the construction of the Garrison walls continued through the 1740's. The volume of stone, and the quality of the stone work, indicates that there must have been a substantial workforce from the mainland present on St Mary's. Some of the heavy labour could have been supplied by members of the garrison, and islanders, but this type of work would have also required considerable numbers of skilled craftsmen to quarry, cut and lay the stone, particularly the fine quality stone along the south side of the Garrison.

Construction on the Garrison continued through until 1746 when the defeat of the Jacobites at Culloden marked the end of French-sponsored threat. Huge sums of money had been spent on large defences that were now thought unlikely to be used and so the funding for the project simply stopped.

In 1793 Britain went to war with France (the Napoleonic War), a conflict that lasted until 1815 with only brief interludes of peace during the two decades. With the outbreak of this war the number of troops manning the Garrison was increased, but the Garrison was never required to fire a shot in anger; and with the defeat of Napoleon, the islands returned to their status as a quiet military backwater.

In 1834 Emporer Augustus Smith took a 99 year lease as Lord Proprietor of the Isles of Scilly. He found the islands neglected and the Garrison's gun emplacements were half ruinous, but during his tenure, from 1834 until his death in 1872, there were no immediate threats to the islands, certainly none that warranted major investment in the defences.

In 1882 the Morley Committee investigated the defences of mercantile ports as the Government had realized that the country and its navy was wholly dependent on coal. This prompted the creation of a series of defended ports, but the idea of creating a protected anchorage for shipping was extended to Scilly. To achieve this two large batteries with a barracks between were created above the 18th-century Woolpack Battery overlooking the St

Mary's Sound. While the large batteries were being constructed, the decision was taken to provide searchlights to illuminate any potential enemy shipping in St Mays Sound.

The signing of the Entente Cordiale in 1904 meant that centuries of hostility with France ended, and British concerns now turned to the growing might of Germany. During World War I Scilly remained of strategic significance, but for an entirely new form of warfare. The start of unrestricted submarine warfare by the Germans at the beginning of 1917 led to an expansion in the establishment of anti-submarine air bases around the coasts of Britain. A naval sub-base was established at St Mary's with a flotilla of Admiralty tugs, armed trawlers and drifters for anti-submarine patrols.

In military terms Scilly was under-prepared for World War II; in the summer of 1940 the islands were defended by just one Company of troops, with their headquarters at Star Castle, and there were no anti-aircraft defences and no significant naval presence.

Following an air raid on the 28th August 1940 Scilly was discussed by the War Cabinet. Winston Churchill declared that the islands must be held at all costs and the Chiefs of Staff were directed to make depositions accordingly. Meanwhile two destroyers were anchored in St Mary's Pool to give some anti-aircraft cover. On the 2nd September 1940, the Chiefs of Staff decided to double the garrison on the islands and provide two anti-aircraft guns.

In 1941 the beaches and military installations were wired and nearly 30 pillboxes were built around the cost of St Mary's. There are examples of these on the Garrison, some of which are cunningly worked into the pre-existing 18th-century structures.

After D-Day any serious threat to the islands receded and therefore in December 1944 Star Castle was de-commissioned.

Today the line of the Garrison Walls are the route for a hike around St Mary's coastline.

In the late 1920's Mrs Violet Wakefield, grandmother of the current tenants, obtained a lease for Newman House and the surrounding land from the Duchy of Cornwall. At the time, it was a burned out shell with no roof. Violet had it roofed and renovated.

Violet lived there until the mid 1960's after which it was used by the extended family as a holiday home and maintained by her son, Humfrey Wakefield.

When Violet Wakefield first took out the lease in the 1920's, there was a lot of rubble and fallen stone in the area where the pottery is now. Her son Humfrey, a trained archaeologist, built the pottery, and a 'bachelor flat' (Treskey) above it. Humfrey lived and worked there as a potter with his artist wife Helena, mother of the current tenants, after they married in 1957 until his death in 2010. There was one original wall standing amidst the rubble, which was the West wall of a former forge, and this forms the East wall of the kiln room in the pottery, the West wall of the lean-to studio in the courtyard and the East wall of the drawing room in the flat Treskey which is situated above the kiln room.

The Duchy of Cornwall remain the owners of Newman House and the surrounding land and it continues to be used by the Wakefield family, with its upkeep and repairs supported by holiday lets.

Property Description:

Newman House was originally built as the Garrison Storehouse. It is an important and mostly complete example of its type, one of the most architecturally elaborate buildings on the island and is part of an important fortification.

External:

The external structure is made of roughly coursed granite rubble with dressed granite, stone-coped gable slate roof and rendered end stacks.

Symmetrical 5-window range. Segmental arches with dressed voussoirs and keystones over horned 8/8-pane sashes. Porch with cambered roof has similar sash to front and granite lintel over 4-panelled door to left return. Dressed quoins rise from plinth to coved cornice. Hipped dormers with slate-hung cheeks and segmental-arched horned 6/6-pane sashes. Courtyard to rear enclosed by mid C19 extension to south, 1960's rear (east) range with keyed segmental arch over horned 8/8-pane sash above double entry with C20 panelled screen and C20 porch.

The internal accommodation consists of:

Ground Floor – Stately dining room with open hearth. Large Kitchen.

First Floor – Sitting Room with open hearth. Double bedroom with en-suite bathroom. Single bedroom.

Second Floor – Two twin bedrooms with dormer windows on both south and north sides. Bathroom and separate toilet.

Justification:

As detailed within the Historical Importance section of this document, our Clients have had stewardship of this property through generations of their family line. Newman House is situated on a prominent and desirable site [of St Marys] and remains a ‘place to go to’ for many visitors, offering accommodation within easy reach of local amenities and attractions. Newman House continues to generate much required funding for on-going maintenance to the property and surrounding grounds and gardens. Mindful of this, all Proposed Works have been scheduled to; minimize disruption and maximize (crucial) seasonal letting opportunities.

Our Clients have been respectful to the buildings’ needs for many years although on-going remedial works have, however, been undertaken within the restrictions and parameters of the above reasoning. All remedial works therefore have been approached with an urgency rather than a long-term understanding of sustainability, durability and effectiveness. It is now that our Clients offer a decisive, sympathetic and holistic approach to ensure Newman House has not only approved methods and materials introduced, but its future secured for local/national importance and to create an approved level of foundation for further, on-going and future works.

Whilst all Proposals should require approved materials and application methods, we highlight that particular attention be made to the external envelope/s. Reason: The presence of impermeable, cementitious pointing and render applications. Our investigations with regard to ‘localised’ areas of excessive moisture content [within the principal fabric/s] concludes that a permeable [breathable] natural lime-based replacement mortar/s be introduced. Mindful of this, we have given priority and mileage into these Proposed Works.

Other works within the Proposal/s would be considered and identified as on-going maintenance.

Proposed Variation (with reference to: Heritage Assessment – Proposals – Section 6 and Drawing No NH/10516/COURTYARD-ELEVS/01)

Whilst mindful, and supporting of, necessary Conditions and legal compliance of works to Listed Buildings, in this instance we would like to mitigate this Variation for the following reasons:

1. The introduction of a cast-iron replacement will require essential annual maintenance. Due to the location of the property, sea-salts are commonplace and we would expect accelerated corrosion if left unattended. Given the location [of the FWP] within the Courtyard, access is restricted at high-level. Safe-working (at height) could not be achieved with ladder/s and in addition, a glass-canopied roof, at 1st floor level, will impede full (required) access.
2. We do not propose and/or condone further usage of UPVC rainwater/FWP products within this, or any other phase of restoration. The existing, cast-iron, ogee profile guttering to additional elevations is in good condition, moreover, these elements can be accessed safely in accordance with Work at Height Regulations 2005.
3. Our proposed introduction of a UPVC replacement FWP would not, in our opinion, reflect

negatively to the historical importance of Newman House and/or impact upon the local environment. The location [of the FWP] is within a Courtyard accessed only by house-holder and maintenance personnel and is not visible from the public highway/footpath.

4. Our proposed introduction of a ‘cast-iron effect’ replacement would not require an extensive (perhaps, unrealistic – as detailed in Item 1) maintenance programme.

We bring to your attention Section 16 Part 3 of the Listed Buildings (and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 – ‘Any Listed Building Consent shall ensure for the benefit of the building and of all persons for the time being interested in it.’

We support this application with the photos below.



PROPOSAL/S

CONTENTS:

- 1.0 Newman House (External Walls)**
- 2.0 Newman House Annexe (External Walls)**
- 3.0 Newman House (Main Roof)**
- 4.0 Newman House Windows (External & Internal)**
- 5.0 Newman House Annexe Windows (External & Internal)**
- 6.0 Courtyard**
- 7.0 West Elevation (Pottery)**
- 8.0 Newman House Ground Floor (Internal)**
- 9.0 Newman House 1st Floor (Internal)**
- 10.0 Newman House 2nd Floor (Internal)**

1.0 Newman House (External Walls)

North Elevation (inc Porch) – Drawing Ref: NH/10516/ELEV-NTH/01

- 1.1 Remove, using non-power tools, existing cementitious pointing application/s (inc opening reveals).
- 1.2 Using an appropriate Natural Lime/sand mortar, repoint all exposed jointing/s



NEWMAN HOUSE NORTH ELEVATION

East Elevation – Drawing Ref: NH/10516/ELEV-EST/02

- 1.3 (as 1.1)
- 1.4 (as 1.2)



NEWMAN HOUSE EAST ELEVATION

South Elevation – Drawing Ref: NH/10516/COURTYARD-ELEVS/01 and ANNEXE-ELEVS/02

- 1.5 (as 1.1)
- 1.6 (as 1.2)



NEWMAN HOUSE SOUTH ELEVATION

West Elevation – Drawing Ref: NH/10516ELEV-WST/03 AND 04

- 1.7 Remove, using non-power tools, existing cementitious render application/s
- 1.8 Remove, using conservation approved methods and materials, existing paint surfacing/s to window arches and keystones
- 1.9a (as 1.2)
- 1.9b Using an appropriate Natural Lime/sand mortar, introduce a ‘bag-rub’ application*
- 1.9c Using an appropriate Natural Lime/sand mortar, introduce a 3-coat render*
- 1.10 Items 1.9a and 1.9b – Introduce a Mineral Paint System



NEWMAN HOUSE WEST ELEVATION

2.0 Newman House Annexe (External Walls)

North Elevation

2.1 (as 1.1)

2.2 (as 1.2)



NEWMAN HOUSE ANNEXE NORTH ELEVATION

East Elevation

2.3 (as 1.1)

2.4 (as 1.2)



NEWMAN HOUSE ANNEXE EAST ELEVATION

South Elevation

- 2.5 (as 1.1)
- 2.6 (as 1.2)



NEWMAN HOUSE ANNEXE SOUTH ELEVATION

3.0 Newman House Main Roof (External) Drawing Ref: NH/10516/PLAN/ROOF/05

- 3.1 Full inspection to be undertaken on completion of Scaffold Erection
- 3.2 Provisionally: Removal and reinstatement of existing ridge tiles (potentially to inc dormers)
- 3.3 Provisionally: Chimney repairs
- 3.4 Provisionally: Rectification/replacement of weather flashing components (all)
- 3.5 Provisionally: Remedial works to localized areas of slate roofing (inc dormers)
- 3.6 Provisionally: In-situ maintenance to rain water elements

4.0 Newman House Windows (External/Internal – All Elevations – inc Look-outs)

- 4.1 Provisionally: In-situ restoration and decoration

5.0 Newman House Annexe Windows (External/Internal – All Elevations)

- 5.1 (as 4.1)

6.0 Courtyard Drawing Ref: NH/10516/COURTYARD-ELEVS/01

- 6.1 Remove existing failed/failing cast-iron Foul Waste Pipe (FWP) from ground-level to eaves
- 6.2 Introduce UPVC, cast-iron FWP replacement



NEWMAN HOUSE COURTYARD FWP

- 6.3 West Elevation (Studio) – Replace and/or reinstate all missing, broken, failed natural slate to 1st floor covering/s.



NEWMAN HOUSE STUDIO WEST ELEVATION

- 6.4 West Elevation (Studio) – Introduce treated 150mmx25mm timber fascia board, rainwater gutter and downpipe
- 6.5 In-situ restoration to: W27, W28 and W29

7.0 West Elevation (Pottery) Drawing Ref: NH/10516/ELEV-WST/03 and 04

- 7.1 Remove existing natural slate (to be re-used for Item 6.3)
- 7.2 Introduce an appropriate render to exposed substrate/s (substrate unknown at present)
- 7.3 Introduce 4x natural slate window cills
- 7.4 Introduce a Mineral Paint System (as detailed for Item 1.10) to Ground and 1st Floors
- 7.5 In-situ restoration to: W15, W16, W17 and W18



NEWMAN HOUSE POTTERY WEST ELEVATION

8.0 Newman House Ground Floor (Internal) Drawing Ref: NH/10516/PLAN-GRD/02

- 8.1 Dining Room – Item 1 – Remove localized failed/failing surface plaster/s to ceiling
- 8.1a Introduce an appropriate Natural Lime/sand base-coat plaster
- 8.1b Introduce an appropriate Natural Lime/sand top-coat plaster
- 8.1c Introduce an appropriate Natural paint
- 8.2 Dining Room – Item 2 – Remove localized failed/failing surface plaster/s to R/H window reveal.
- 8.3 (as 8.1a, b and c)



NEWMAN HOUSE GROUND FLOOR DINING ROOM

9.0 Newman House – 1st Floor (Internal) Drawing Ref: NH/10516/PLAN-1st/03

- 9.1 Sitting Room – Item 1 – (as 8.1, 8.1a, b and c)
- 9.2 Sitting Room – Item 2 – (as 8.2, 8.2a, b and c)
- 9.3 Landing Wall – Item 3 – Remove existing failed wallpaper and replace
- 9.4 Master Bedroom – Item 4 – Remove existing wallpaper/s to ceiling and replace



NEWMAN HOUSE 1ST FLOOR MASTER BEDROOM

10.0 Newman House – 2nd Floor (Internal) Drawing Ref: NH/10516/PLAN-1st/04

- 10.1 WC – Remove and replace existing wallpaper/s
- 10.2 D1 – D10 – Dormer reveals (all). Remove localized existing failed/failing surface plaster/s
- 10.3 (as 8.1a, b and c)



**NEWMAN HOUSE 2ND FLOOR
DORMER REVEALS (TYP)**

SCHEDULE OF WORKS:

(Refer to: **PROPOSAL/S**)

METHOD STATEMENTS: (with ref to: PROPOSAL/S)

Item No:

1.1 Removal of existing cementitious pointing applications should be achieved using hand tools only ie hammer and plugging chisel. The use of power tools for removal is not recommended...principal reason being that [potentially] irreversible damage to surrounding fabric/s may result. As good practice the depth of jointing should be 1 and a half times that of the jointing gap (guideline).

1.2 **Repointing preparation-** All exposed jointing/s are to be cleaned free of dust and detritus. Prior to repointing, all jointing/s are to be thoroughly dampened using either hand-sprayers and/or light use of hose-pipe.

Materials – We would recommend that a Natural Hydraulic Lime (NHL) 5 be used. Reason: This has a stronger set strength that would be suited to a) the exposed location of the walls and b) better suited to granite fabric/s. Medium – coarse, washed yellow sand with a grit of 1mm – 6mm (sample panels to be available for approval)

Mixing – 2 and a half parts sand to 1 part NHL. This can be mixed using a conventional mixer. Water should be added to the mixer prior to dry goods. Thorough mixing [of raw materials] is to be achieved for effectiveness.

Application – Using the square edge of a feather trowel and an appropriate ‘scoop’, the lime mortar should be introduced into the jointing/s only and not on the surrounding stonework. Good practice is to start pointing at the highest level of the elevation and work down leaving all applications ‘raked-back’ across the wall.

Reason: To ensure that further dampening of the wall does not disturb new work.

After-care – All newly introduced pointing applications can be ‘tamped’ back using a stiff bristled hand-brush after an initial set has been achieved. Reason: To ensure mortar is fully imbedded within joint gap, to dislodge any mortar that has accrued to the stonework edges and provide a suitable, textured surfacing. All finished pointing can be moistened periodically to ensure crucial drying-time retarding. In addition, all newly introduced pointing applications are to be protected from drying winds and/or direct sunlight with hessian sheeting. Protection to remain for a minimum of 10 days.

1.7 Removal of existing cementitious render application/s should be achieved using hand-tools only ie hammer and (varying) chisels. Continue (as 1.1)

1.8 **Removal of existing painted surfacing/s to window arches and keystones.** Peelaway 7 is recommended as an approved paint removal process. Reason: Non-toxic, sympathetic to substrate/s and environmentally (in comparison) considerate. Test areas must be introduced prior to full application. As per manufacturers specifications

1.9a **Re-pointing** (as above)

- 1.9b Bag-rub** – A successful bag-rub application can be achieved using conventional plastering tools. This application should only be introduced if the stonework is of questionable appearance and/or friable. Reason: To ensure substrate stability without losing the [natural] aesthetic.

Materials – We would recommend using a NHL 3.5 (moderate strength) and a fine-medium sand. Reason: NHL 3.5 achieves a firm set without compromise to building movement and in addition, this application can be painted (ref to: Paint)

Mixing – (as 1.2 above)

Application – Using conventional plastering tools and starting from the highest point, the mortar is to be ‘layered-up’ onto the wall surface, with a secondary motion excess mortar is to be ‘scraped off’. Repeat this process until a sufficient area of the wall [or all] is covered. Using a dampened sponge, remove further excess [mortar] from the jointing/s and stonework. After initial curing and using clean, dampened sponges, all mortar is to be lightly sponged.

After-care – All finished surfacing to be periodically moistened (as detailed above) and protected (as detailed above)

- 1.9c Lime render** – To be introduced only if all other options have been dismissed. Reason: The aesthetic loss of Historic construction methods and materials.

Materials - Base coat: NHL 3.5 and a medium/coarse grit washed sand
 Scratch coat: NHL 3.5 and a medium grit washed sand
 Finish coat: NHL 3.5 and a fine or medium grit washed sand

Mixing – (as 1.2 above)

Application - Base coat: All surfacing to be thoroughly moistened (as per detailing above). Using a conventional gauging trowel, ensure all stonework and hollows are stabilized and/or filled.

Scratch coat: Base coat surfacing to be thoroughly moistened (as per detailing above). Mortar to be ‘layered-up’ on to the prepared wall surfacing to a maximum thickness of 15mm. Before initial curing, introduce 10mm, fibre mesh reinforcement and introduce a second pass render. After initial curing, key surfacing using a multi-pronged comb.

Finish coat: Scratch coat application is to be thoroughly moistened (as per detailing above). Mortar to ‘layered-up’ on to the base-coat at a maximum thickness of 10mm. Before initial curing, introduce 4mm, fibre mesh reinforcement and introduce a second pass render. After initial curing, float to achieve flat, finished surface. Lightly sponge to finish.

After-care – (as detailed above)

- 1.9 **Paint Application –** (for bag-rub and render only) Mineral Paint Systems are now widely recognized within the Conservation sector. Favorable characteristics of these paints have been well received and are now insisted upon (in some instances) over recommended. In brief, application is a 4-visit approach. 1st application is an etching fluid, 2nd application is a fixative, 3rd application is a thinned paint application and the final application is a neat (occasionally thinned by 5%) paint application. As per manufacturers instructions.
- 3.0 **Newman House (Main Roof)** – Method Statements to be forwarded on completion of 3.1 (Roof inspection)
- 4.1 **Window Restoration (typ)**

Joinery Items: Paint removal using Peelaway 7 and/or sanding. Heat-gun use if not within immediate vicinity of historic glazing components. If sash/es require removal for repair or access (to sash-box weights), this must be undertaken as follows.

Remove staff beads and then the bottom sash. Remove parting beads and then the top sash. Remove sash box pockets to access weights (if required).

Glazing/Putty: Due to the time of year that these works are to be undertaken, we recommend the use of Repair Care for all glazing (where necessary). Reason: Linseed oil putty applications operate within a limited temperature range.

Replacement Joinery items (if applicable): If localized replacement/s are required these must be of hardwood or treated timber. Removal of failed area/s only. Reason: To ensure original fabric/s are not lost.

Decoration: With repairs achieved and components sanded, apply knotting where necessary. When dry, sand back. Apply Cover Stain (thinned with 25 – 35% white spirit). When dry, sand back. Any filling required at this stage to be introduced. Epoxy resin filler/s should be considered. Reason: Durability and strength. All further paint applications to be a water-based system. Reason: They are successful at lower temperatures over oil-based products.

- 6.1 **Courtyard –** Foul Waste Pipe (FWP) to be removed from the existing, low-level branch tee only. Items to be removed are: 1 x section of pipe, 1 x 45 degree bend, 1 x section of pipe and 1 x 45 degree bend. Reason: Deterioration. These items are to be removed by hand, potentially a small angle grinder may be required to assist with corroded fixing/s. Items removed to be replaced with like for like components. All [newly introduced] fixings to be stainless steel.

8.0 Internal repairs to existing plaster work (all) –

Removal of existing failed areas of plaster to be undertaken with hand-tools. Note; where ‘patching-in’ is required and/or unavoidable, use of a multi-tool may be necessary. Reason: Multi-tool can effectively remove a recognized area without disruption to surrounding, stable plaster/s. Care must be taken not to ‘chase’ too deep. Reason: To ensure underlying fabric and/or lathes are unaffected.

Preparation to substrate/s must include a clean, stable background. Moisten (with hand-sprayer) area to be restored.

Lime Applications - Introduce an NHL 3.5+ medium coarse sand (with natural hair) base coat. After initial curing, comb-scratch. Scratch (or float coat) to be NHL 3.5 + fine/medium grit sand applied to moistened background. Finish coat to be NHL 2 + fine sand. Trowel to finish.

Decoration – All newly introduced plaster/s to receive ‘breathable’ lime-paint applications only. Note; all new plaster work cannot receive paint until a minimum of 30 days from completion.

- 9.3 Wallpaper (all)** – Removal of existing failed/failing wallpapers must NOT be undertaken using steam operated systems. Reason: High risk of separating underlying, natural plaster/s from fabric/s. We recommend that controlled ‘saturation’, using warm water, sponges and upvc (round-edged) scrapers.

Please note: Existing wallpaper/s (where described) are of non-historic importance.

SPECIALIST MATERIAL STOCKISTS (as detailed for above)

NHL 5, 3.5 and 2	Cornish Lime Co-Bodmin (or approved equivalent)
CLS28, 35 and 36 (sands)	Cornish Lime Co-Bodmin (or approved equivalent)
Beeckosil (ext wall paint)	Cornish Lime Co-Bodmin (or approved equivalent)
Beecks Insil (int wall paint)	Cornish Lime Co-Bodmin (or approved equivalent)

Zinnser (joinery paints)	Dulux Dec Centre-Truro (or approved equivalent)
Repair Care (for glazing)	Dulux Dec Centre-Truro (or approved equivalent)
Cast-iron FWP	Drainage-on-line (or approved equivalent)

Summary:

Newman House is by far, worthy of Grade 2* Listing:
'important buildings of more than special interest' Historic England.

Only 5.5% of the nations' Listed Buildings and Monuments fall under this category, marking Newman House as one of Cornwall's most outstanding, surviving examples of historic architecture and importance.

Our Clients are now ready for a new chapter in this buildings history. Its long-term security, not solely for their family connections but for local and national importance. A new and fresh approach to understanding the building's needs. Specialist advice and direction is now being drawn from and sought after.

Whilst Newman House continues to be used for much needed income, it also represents a family home with fond memories, and mindful of all of these factors, a fully sympathetic approach and application will continue.

With regard to the Proposed (and necessary) Works outlined within this document, there is NO demolition and/or alteration to historic fabric/s. There are NO additional buildings proposed (or required). And finally, there are NO proposals for any unsuited, unsympathetic and/or 'out of character' applications.

We would expect that all future works to Newman House (and its historic attachments) be carried out in accordance with:

Section 8 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

National Planning Policy Framework 12 - Environment

Construction, Design and Management Regulations 2015