

# IMPACT ASSESSMENT

HIA.02 – RETROSPECTIVE CONSENT & 'PHASE 2' ALTERATIONS



**CONTENTS**

- 1. INTRODUCTION .....3
- 2. METHODOLOGY .....3
- 3. IMPACT ASSESSMENT - ITEMISED .....6
- 4. IMPACT ASSESSMENT - OVERVIEW .....10
- 5. CONCLUSION.....10

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1. SCOPE

1.1.1. This impact assessment considers the development proposal summarised below **and should be read in conjunction with the accompanying CAD Heritage REPORT NO: 3258.HIA.01 (Heritage Appraisal).**

1.1.2. Full details of the development proposal, principally involving refurbishment of the whole premises, and layout reconfiguration to provide an enhanced staff accommodation provision, can be found within the documents accompanying the submitted planning permission & listed building consent applications P/23/027 and P/23/027.

1.1.3. In summary the proposed works include:

- Ground floor trade area layout alterations, including incorporation of replacement commercial kitchen
- Conversion (part retrospective) of first and second floor levels to Manager's flat and staff accommodation for St Austell Brewery
- Enhancement of external trade spaces
- Full internal and external refurbishment
- Replacement signage and external lighting

### 1.2. DEVELOPMENT RATIONALE & JUSTIFICATION

1.2.1. Rationale & justification for the proposed development is principally found in the Design & Access Statement accompanying planning permission & listed building consent applications P/23/027 and P/23/027.

### 1.3. DESIGN REVIEW

1.3.1. The submitted proposal takes into consideration points raised by the Case Officer prior to receipt of a Heritage Impact Assessment and the subsequent findings of our desktop research and site walkover.

## 2. METHODOLOGY

### 2.1. ASSIGNING VALUE AND IMPACTS

2.1.1. Development can cause both negative and positive impacts on the historic environment – including changes to the character of a local environment or building, or the setting in which it is experienced.

2.1.2. Our assessment of impacts, covering both positive and negative, is based on the systematic approach outlined in Guidance on ICOMOS Heritage Impact Assessments for Cultural World Heritage Properties (2011) and the Department for Transport's DMRB LA 104 'Environmental Assessment and Monitoring' (2020). This approach establishes a hierarchical system whereby levels of importance are ascribed, based on the level of statutory protection the asset enjoys, or could potentially enjoy once it is fully understood, set against a magnitude of impact (change).

### 2.2. IMPORTANCE & VALUE

2.2.1. The 2020 DMRB guidance is based on 'Environmental Value' generally, to allow it to be applied to environmental factors not related to heritage. It establishes a hierarchy of 'Value (sensitivity) of receptors/resources and sets out qualifying characteristics for a resource to be attributed to that group.

2.2.2. The environmental value categories of DMRB LA 104 can be cross referenced with recognised heritage protection and evaluation criteria to help place heritage assets in the value hierarchy – as seen in the tables below. Such an approach was adopted by DMRB in heritage-focussed forerunners to the 2020 guidance.

Value (sensitivity) of receptor / resource	Typical description
Very High	Very high importance and rarity, international scale and very limited potential for substitution.
High	High importance and rarity, national scale, and limited potential for substitution.
Medium	Medium or high importance and rarity, regional scale, limited potential for substitution.
Low	Low or medium importance and rarity, local scale.
Negligible	Very low importance and rarity, local scale.

TABLE 1: 'Environmental value (sensitivity) and descriptions [DMRB LA104 2020 TABLE 3.2N]

**VALUES OF HISTORIC BUILDINGS & STRUCTURES [INCLUDING CONSERVATION AREAS]**

Asset Value	Typical Criteria
Very High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Structures described as of universal importance as World Heritage Sites</li> <li>Other buildings of recognised international importance including potential to contribute significantly to acknowledged international research objectives</li> </ul>
High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scheduled Monuments (including standing remains)</li> <li>Undesignated assets of schedulable quality and importance</li> <li>Assets that can contribute significantly to national research objectives</li> <li>Grade I and II* Listed Buildings</li> <li>Other Listed Buildings that can be shown to have exceptional qualities in their fabric or historical associations</li> <li>Conservation Areas containing very important buildings</li> <li>Undesignated structures of clear national importance</li> </ul>

Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Designated or undesignated assets that contribute to regional research objectives</li> <li>Grade II Listed Buildings</li> <li>Conservation Areas containing buildings that contribute significantly to its historic character</li> <li>Historic Townscape or built-up areas with important historic integrity in their buildings, settings or built settings</li> </ul>
Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Designated and undesignated assets of local importance</li> <li>Assets compromised by poor preservation and/or poor survival of contextual associations</li> <li>Assets of limited value, but with potential to contribute to local research objectives</li> <li>'Locally Listed' buildings</li> <li>Historic (unlisted) buildings of modest quality in their fabric or historical association</li> <li>Historic Townscape or built-up areas of limited historic integrity in their buildings, or built settings</li> </ul>
Negligible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Buildings of no architectural or historic note; buildings of an intrusive character.</li> </ul>

TABLE 2: Hierarchy of value/importance of Historic Buildings & Structures based on DMRB LA104 2020 Table 3.2N

2.2.3. To ensure detail not included in statutory designations is accounted for in our impact assessments, we carry out site visits and inspections to produce bespoke appraisals of heritage value, based on the experience and professional judgement of its authors.

2.2.4. We identify **relative importance of fabric or characteristics to be affected by development proposals**, acknowledging, in line with Historic England guidance that not all elements of a listed building will contribute equally to its significance. Our assessments in this respect are consistent with the asset value categories used to assess the hierarchy of value/importance of the buildings overall.

2.3. SCALE OF IMPACT

2.3.1. The same DMRB guidance is then used as a baseline for assessing the ‘magnitude’ of impact (change) a development proposal would have on relevant heritage assets. An assessment of impact magnitude often relies on the experience and professional judgement of the assessor.

Magnitude of impact (change)		Typical description
<b>Major</b>	Adverse	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of resource and/or quality and integrity of resource; severe damage to key characteristics, features or elements.</li> </ul>
	Beneficial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Large scale or major improvement of resource quality; extensive restoration; major improvement of attribute quality.</li> </ul>
<b>Moderate</b>	Adverse	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of resource, but not adversely affecting the integrity; partial loss of/damage to key characteristics, features or elements.</li> </ul>
	Beneficial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Benefit to, or addition of, key characteristics, features or elements; improvement of attribute quality.</li> </ul>
<b>Minor</b>	Adverse	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some measurable change in attributes, quality or vulnerability; minor loss of, or alteration to, one (maybe more) key characteristics, features or elements.</li> </ul>
	Beneficial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minor benefit to, or addition of, one (maybe more) key characteristics, features or elements; some beneficial impact on attribute or a reduced risk of negative impact occurring.</li> </ul>
<b>Negligible</b>	Adverse	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very minor loss or detrimental alteration to one or more characteristics, features or elements.</li> </ul>
	Beneficial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very minor benefit to or positive addition of one or more characteristics, features or elements.</li> </ul>
<b>No change</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No loss or alteration of characteristics, features or elements; no observable impact in either direction.</li> </ul>

Table 3: Magnitude of Impact (based on DRMB LA 104).

2.3.2. Continuing to follow the DMRB guidance (consistent with ICOMOS 2011, 9-10), a matrix is then used to determine the significance of the identified impacts on the relative heritage assets.

		Magnitude of Impact (degree of change)				
		No Change	Negligible	Minor	Moderate	Major
Environmental Value (Sensitivity)	Very High	Neutral	Slight	Moderate or Large	Large or Very Large	Very Large
	High	Neutral	Slight	Moderate or Slight	Moderate or Large	Large or Very Large
	Medium	Neutral	Neutral or Slight	Slight	Moderate	Moderate or Large
	Low	Neutral	Neutral or Slight	Neutral or Slight	Slight	Slight or Moderate
	Negligible	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral or Slight	Neutral or Slight	Slight

Table 4: Significance of effects matrix (based on DRMB LA 104; ICOMOS 2011, 9-10).

2.4. ASSESSMENT PROCESS

- 2.4.1. The above methodology is applied to a list of proposed alterations in a tabulated format, providing an itemised assessment of impacts.
- 2.4.2. Our tabulated assessment also takes into account our independent assessment of relative values of affected characteristics or fabric.
- 2.4.3. Summarised judgements are then made on the impacts of the proposals as a whole on the heritage values categories contributing to the relevant heritage asset’s specific significance.

### 3. IMPACT ASSESSMENT - ITEMISED

WORKS	HERITAGE VALUE OF AFFECTED FABRIC/ CHARACTERISTICS (CONTRIBUTION TO SIGNIFICANCE)	MAGNITUDE OF IMPACT (ON RELEVANT FABRIC)	SIGNIFICANCE OF EFFECTS (A = ADVERSE) (B = BENEFICIAL)	DISCUSSION	MITIGATION (APPLIED OR RECOMMENDED)
<b>Direct Impacts (Main Range)</b>					
Removal of GF- FF Stair	Negligible/Low	Major	Slight - A	Lowermost leg of stair installed 1958-1989. Uppermost leg assumed c.1958. Uppermost leg of stair appears to contain a salvaged newel post consistent with first-second floor stair.	<b>Condition:</b> Recording of uppermost leg of stair once modern materials removed to improve understanding of staircase evolution prior to pub-use.
Infill GF door to Rear Range	Medium	Negligible	Slight - A	Likely an original window opening, later converted to a door. Has been in place as a door/full height opening since pub use began	Opening expressed for plan evolution legibility
Upgrading existing ceilings for fire resistance	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral [Potential Minor/Moderate - B]	Existing ceilings wholly modern. It is possible historic ceilings could be found behind, but invasive investigation required to confirm.	Investigate presence and condition of any earlier ceilings found behind those currently visible.
Replacement of Bar	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral	A modern installation but may contain recycled historic fabric from other sites	Reuse any recovered historic elements elsewhere in the building or send to architectural salvage for potential reuse on other sites
Replacement of internal finishes	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral [Potential Minor – B]	All finishes late C20 early C21 and of no specific interest.	<b>Condition:</b> Replacement finishes to safeguard fabric and encourage character enhancement
Upgrading existing doors for fire resistance	Negligible	Low	Neutral [Potential Minor – B]	Assumed replacement doors. All doors late C20/early C21 and of no specific interest or architectural salvage.	Reuse any recovered historic elements elsewhere in the building or send to architectural salvage for potential reuse on other sites
Repair & substantial overhaul of external joinery	Low	Negligible	Slight - B	All joinery C20 facsimile copies or late C20 installations.	
Replacement of external signage	Low	Major	Neutral [Potential Minor – B]	Late C20 & early C21 installations	<b>Condition:</b> Replacement signage
Replacement of external lighting	Low	Major	Neutral [Potential Minor – B]	Late C20 & early C21 installations	<b>Condition:</b> Replacement lighting

\* denotes works already carried out    \*\* denotes works already partially carried out

Removal of FF partition walls separating front and rear rooms (east side of main range)	Low	Major	Moderate - A	Northernmost wall installed in early C21. Southernmost wall stands on a historic wall line but was removed in C20 before being reinstated early C21. Southernmost partition likely to form part of the pre-pub residential phase and therefore of interest to plan form interpretation. However, the value of the affected partition has been diminished by the layout and physical changes which have gone before.	Retention of downstand beam already present (up to which the reinstated east-west partition was built) for plan evolution interpretation
*Removal of FF modern bar/ servery	Negligible	Major	Slight - A	Low architectural quality fixture related but not original to c.1962 pub expansion	
Infill of FF door to rear range	Medium	Negligible	Slight - A	Window opening converted to a door c.1962.	Opening expressed for plan evolution legibility
Alterations to former window to form door connection to rear range	Medium	Minor	Slight - A	Window blocked up c.1958 and now an internal wall. Former opening to be reopened with minor modification to accommodate door.	Stone recovered during works to be used for repairs/patching-in elsewhere.
**Provision of new partition walls/ layout & associated M&E	Low	Moderate	Slight - A	Additional partitions adversely impact legibility of earlier plan forms, however the plan form of the greatest interest to this particular building (residential phase) HAS already been substantially adversely impacted by pub conversion and subsequent alterations. Conversion and refurb were also at the expense of residential phase fabric.	Retention of downstand beam already present (up to which the reinstated east-west partition was built) for plan evolution interpretation
Infill of FF door to rear range (former kitchen link)	Medium	Negligible	Slight - A	Window opening converted to a door c.1989.	Opening expressed for plan evolution legibility
Installation of domestic extract fans	Medium	Negligible/minor	Slight - A		<b>Condition:</b> Details of product and installation method
First Floor- Lining of historic timber-panelled stair wall for increased fire resistance	High	No Change	Neutral	Lining applied in place of existing modern linings, on side of former commercial Kitchen	<b>Condition:</b> Details and final method of attachment of any upgrading of stairs
Second Floor - Installation of roof window to rear elevation	Low	Minor	Slight - A	Modern roof finish and modified roof structure	<b>Condition:</b> Details of product and installation method
Second Floor - Installation of smoke vent window to rear elevation	Low	Negligible/minor	Slight - A	Modern roof finish and modified roof structure	<b>Condition:</b> Details of product and installation method
Second Floor - Removal of wall between central two rooms – front of rear range	Negligible/Low	Moderate	Slight – A [Potential Neutral or Slight – B]	Modern wall fabric – rooms either side of wall may have originally been one.	Truss structure within partition, and any evidence it carries of historic partitioning/platering e.g. lath nail scars to be retained
Second Floor - Installation of fire doors in new/ altered openings	Negligible/Low	Negligible	Neutral [Potential Slight – B]		<b>Condition:</b> Details of product

\* denotes works already carried out    \*\* denotes works already partially carried out

Reroofing of building with natural slate	Medium	Minor	Slight or Moderate - A	Roof coverings form an important part of the overall architectural character. Existing roof covering in fibre cement – replacing with natural slate is in keeping with the traditional local vernacular.	<b>Condition:</b> Details of product and installation method
Replacement of modern rainwater goods	Negligible/Low	Minor	Slight - B	Existing rainwater goods in UPVC	<b>Condition:</b> Details of product and installation method
Replacement of cement-based pointing to external stone walls	Medium	Minor	Slight or Moderate - A	Ashlar granite walls form an important part of the overall architectural character of the building. Existing pointing in silver cement, applied in an unsightly strap fashion. Replacing with flush lime pointing is in keeping with the traditional local vernacular and has physical benefits to the building.	<b>Condition:</b> Details of product and installation method
<b>Indirect Impacts (Rear Range External Alterations)</b>					
Removal of modern kitchen extract ductwork & relocation in more discreet position to better reveal main range.	Negligible	Moderate	Moderate - B	Current kitchen extract equipment does not benefit from Listed Building Consent but has been in situ since c.2014. Impact assessment considers the fact that the existing equipment contributes negatively to the setting of the Main Range, as the focus of the Grade II designation. The proposal substantially improves the aesthetics of the current situation by removing the 'bridging' section of ductwork spanning over the ground floor Pool Room extension which masks views toward the only section of the rear of the Main Range walls still visible externally.	<b>Condition:</b> Details of equipment and installation positions

\* denotes works already carried out    \*\* denotes works already partially carried out



Replacement of doors/ windows to rear ranges	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral		<b>Condition:</b> Details of products and installation positions
Replacement of modern plant to minimum requirement	Negligible	Minor	Slight - B		<b>Condition:</b> Details of products/equipment and installation positions
Replacement of concrete slab patio with natural stone paving	Negligible	Minor	Slight - B		<b>Condition:</b> Details of products and installation methods/extents
<b>Other Impacts (Modern Rear Ranges Alterations)</b>					
Alterations to rear range partitions for back of house	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral	Late C20/Early C21 approved extensions	
Upgrading & alterations to existing drainage	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral	Late C20/Early C21 approved extensions	
Removal of kitchen fixtures/ installations and replacement in new Gf position	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral	Late C20/Early C21 approved extensions	
Alterations to partitions in modern rear ranges.	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral	Late C20/Early C21 approved extensions	
Forming new duct openings in modern floors/roof.	Negligible	Negligible	Neutral	Late C20/Early C21 approved extensions	

*\* denotes works already carried out    \*\* denotes works already partially carried out*

## 4. IMPACT ASSESSMENT - OVERVIEW

### 4.1. SUMMARY

- 4.1.1. The proposals have a negligible impact on the moderate communal values of the heritage asset and safeguard the use of the building from which that communal value derives, providing the opportunity for it to strengthen.
- 4.1.2. The proposals have no impacts on the high historic values of the heritage asset, but offer the continuation of a phase of use which contributes to the narrative of St Mary’s economic evolution following the sale of Duchy property in the 1950’s.
- 4.1.3. The evidential heritage value of the site is largely unaffected due to the retention of historic fabric of note. Furthermore, the proposed works offer the opportunity to uncover concealed evidence to improve understanding of the building’s evolution - potentially enhancing the site’s evidential value.
- 4.1.4. The proposals have a positive impact on the aesthetic values of the heritage asset, by enhancing its current appearance. This is principally achieved by the reversal or improvement of past alterations and additions.
- 4.1.5. The proposed works to the external trade areas of the site enhance the setting of the listed building. These and the external works to the building itself, also have a positive impact on the character of the conservation area in which it sits.

HERITAGE VALUES	IMPACT
HISTORIC	NEUTRAL
EVIDENTIAL	NEUTRAL/SLIGHT ADVERSE
AESTHETIC (EXTERNAL)	SLIGHT BENEFICAL
AESTHETIC (INTERNAL)	NEUTRAL
COMMUNAL	NO CHANGE/POTENTIAL STRENGTHENING
SETTING	SLIGHT BENEFICAL
<b>OVERALL - BALANCED</b>	<b>NEUTRAL/SLIGHT BENEFICAL</b>

## 5. CONCLUSION

The Bishop and Wolf, originally the residence of the Land Agent (or Steward) of the Lord Proprietors of the Isles of Scilly, and in its current architectural form from circa 1750, has been in public house use since the late 1950’s.

The 1950’s conversion and a series of substantial alterations and extensions have eroded the special architectural interest which would once have arisen from the building’s residential phase, but from which its primary significance is derived – namely the historic interest relating to its direct connection to an important aspect the history of the administration of the islands and its impact on the built environment.

The proposed development retains public house use for the current generation and strengthens the potential for it to continue to the next – thus protecting and potentially growing communal heritage value.

Physically, the proposal results in minimal losses of historic fabric of note whilst generating the potential to discover more, concealed behind modern wall and ceiling linings. There are gaps in the building’s historic timeline due to an absence of records and the fabric needed to interpret it unequivocally, which may reveal itself as the proposals are implemented.

Crucially, the proposal returns and secures the full use of the building, after a period of semi redundancy. This use is underpinned by a carefully considered commercial strategy devised by a highly successful hospitality operator with extensive knowledge of the islands’ economy – unlocking a substantial investment in the repair and improvement of the listed building, helping to safeguard it, and the physical and aesthetic benefits of the scheme for the long term.

On balance, with adverse and beneficial impacts accounted for, the proposed scheme is considered to have a neutral impact on the significance of the listed building and a minor positive impact on the surrounding conservation area.

Should the LPA Historic Environment Team take a less pragmatic view to the building's conservation, and consider the "less than substantial harm" threshold is met at the lower end of the undefined scale, this adverse impact should, in accordance with NPPF Paragraph 196, be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme, which in this case include the delivery of efficient and higher quality staff accommodation, helping support the Islands' economic prosperity whilst reducing existing pressure on severely limited housing stock.

**End.**

