

Barker-Mills Conservation

Heritage Statement and Impact Assessment

Proposals for replacement windows erection of a lean to canopy following removal of addition and internal alteration in the kitchen (application 3)

37 Melville Street Ryde, Isle of Wight



37 Melville Street Photograph taken by the author December 2023

Author: Dr N P Barker-Mills BA(Hons) PhD Dip Cons (AA) IHBC FSA

Version: NPBM 23/31-3 Final

Date: 4 March 2024

Contents

1.0	Introduction and purpose of report.....	page 3
2.0	Significance.....	page 4
3.0	Proposals, including background.....	page 8
4.0	Impact of Proposals upon significance.....	page 9
5.0	Historic Environment Legislation and Policy.....	page 13
6.0	Summary and Conclusions.....	page 14

Appendices

Appendix NPBM 1: NHLE Entry

Appendix NPBM 2: Sources

Appendix NPBM 3: Photographs of the Site

1.0 Introduction and purpose of report

- 1.1 Barker-Mills Conservation is an independent, expert consultancy advising on the historic environment. Nigel Barker-Mills, the author of this report, trained as an architectural historian and has an honours degree and doctorate awarded by the University of Reading. Following appointment as a Fieldworker for the Accelerated Resurvey of the Lists of Buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest for the county of Surrey, he was employed by Surrey County Council as a specialist historic environment officer advising on all aspects of the management of historic buildings and areas. He founded and subsequently chaired the Surrey Conservation Officers' Group and commissioned the first Buildings at Risk survey for the county. During his time in Surrey, he obtained a Post Graduate Diploma in Building Conservation from the Architectural Association of London, which included preparing a thesis on the issues around education of construction professionals working on historic buildings.
- 1.2 In 2000 he joined the south-east region of English Heritage in the role of Historic Areas Adviser during which time he advised on new development and regeneration issues across Kent, Surrey, Sussex and Oxfordshire. He provided expert monitoring for the Heritage Lottery Fund on area grant schemes and was the national lead for English Heritage in Developing the "Building in Context Toolkit". This training programme, delivered by the national network of Architecture Centres in collaboration with the Commission on Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE), won a national planning award in 2008.
- 1.3 In 2009 Nigel joined the London Region of English Heritage (later Historic England) as Head of Partnerships and subsequently Head of Development Management, with responsibility for strategic relationships with the Greater London Authority and managing the London Historic Environment Record. In 2011-2 he was appointed Planning Director for the London Region, leading a team of 40 specialist Inspectors and advisers, including architects, planners and surveyors providing the statutory advice and grant assistance across the capital. He retired from Historic England in 2016.
- 1.4 Nigel is a full, founder, member of the Institute of Historic Building Conservation (IHBC) and has served on both the south-east branch, as Chairman and Secretary, and also the national committee. He was Chairman of the Editorial Board of "Context" the Journal of the IHBC for 6 years and to which he has contributed several articles. In 2014 he was elected as a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries of London. In 2017 he was appointed Chair of the Heritage Advisory Group of the Canals and Rivers Trust. He was re-appointed as Chair of the Cultural Heritage Advisory Group in 2021.

- I.5 Nigel has been a member of several expert design panels, including those in Oxford and the London Borough of Haringey and has also published on architectural history and conservation. In 2015 he presented a paper at the 43rd Oxford Joint Planning Law Conference, an annual event organised by the Law Society, the Bar Council, the RTPI and the Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors (RICS). The paper on “Heritage Assets and their Setting” has been published in the Journal of Planning and Environment Law: Occasional Papers No 43 (*pub Sweet & Maxwell*)
- I.6 Barker-Mills Conservation has worked with clients across both public and private sectors including the Greater London Authority; the London Borough of Southwark; The Corporation of the City of London; Guildford Borough Council; Hart District Council and Historic England in both the south-east and the north-west regions. Private sector clients include the Gascoyne Cecil Estate; The SS *Great Britain* Trust and JCB. Recently Nigel prepared the draft Historic England Guidance on the Conservation of Georgian and Victorian Terraced Housing issued in July 2020 and he is currently working with Historic England the Dean and Chapter of St Paul’s Cathedral.
- I.7 This report has been commissioned by Caroline and Allan Bebbington and its purpose is to set out the heritage significance of 37 Melville Street in Ryde on the Isle of Wight. This enables the applicants to demonstrate the potential impact of their proposals upon heritage significance in accordance with paragraph 194 of the National Planning Policy Framework, as amended 2023 (NPPF).
- I.8 This statement has been informed by the Historic England Advice Note on statements of heritage significance published 2019.¹ The statement is based upon primarily secondary sources but also includes primary information relating to the history and ownership of the building as well as information gained from a site visit undertaken on 1 December, 2023.
- I.9 The views expressed in this report are the true and professional judgement of the author and provided in accordance with the Code of Practice of his professional Institute; the Institute of Historic Building Conservation (*IHBC*) of which he is a founder member.

2.0 Significance

- 2.1 Significance is one of the guiding principles running through the historic environment section of the National Planning Policy Framework (as amended 2023). The NPPF defines significance as ‘the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations

¹ Historic England 2019 *Statement of Heritage Significance: Analysing Significance in Heritage Assets Historic England Advice Note 12*. Swindon. Historic England.

because of its heritage interest'. Such interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic' and it may derive 'not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting'.² Significance is what conservation sustains, and where appropriate enhances, in managing change to heritage assets.

- 2.2 Any building, monument, site, place, area or landscape has the potential to be a heritage asset and as sites and society evolves over time, their interest will also evolve. All heritage assets have significance but this is on a sliding scale. It is the degree and nature of the significance that will determine the level and type of protection which will be appropriate under law and policy, including national or local designation, and which should inform future management. Where the identified heritage or cultural interest of a site meets defined criteria, it will then be eligible for designation, which at a national level includes Scheduling and Listing.³
- 2.3 37 Melville Street, Ryde has heritage interest that has justified its designation as a listed building in Grade II. The list entry is provided in *NPBM Appendix 1*. The building is also located within the Ryde conservation Area which is a further Designated Heritage Asset.
- 2.4 *Ownership history*
Deeds of the property at Melville Street provided by the current owners commence with an Indenture and copy of a lease dated 1848, which conveys the land (then undeveloped) owned by James Player Lind to Mary Baker under a 999-year lease. This relates well to the suggest date of the building in the list description of c1840. The building (now numbers 36 and 37) is therefore probably c1850 if a construction period of a couple of years is factored in.
- 2.5 In 1873 the site was owned by Francis Harding Newman who assigned to Anna Jubb and Charles Greaves (described as being of the "Second Part" in Assignment) and Sarah Million (of the "third part"), a part of the premises in the lease described as Miriam Cottage formerly known as Vale Lodge, but then as Eastnor as the same premises.⁴ The reference to "a part" of the premises may be an indication that at this time the original building was subdivided, and there is evidence in the fabric that might support this interpretation. (See *paragraphs 2.09 - 2.10 below*)

² A variety of terms are used in designation criteria (for example, outstanding universal value for World Heritage Sites, national importance for scheduled monuments and special interest for listed buildings and conservation areas) but all of these refer to a heritage asset's significance.

³ Designated Heritage Asset comprise World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Protected Wreck Sites, Registered Parks and Gardens, Registered Battlefields and Conservation Areas designated under the relevant legislation. NPPF Annex 2 Glossary p66.

⁴ This is contained in a later Assignment of 1937 which contains a history of the legal transfers relating to the property from its origins in 1848- See Appendix 2 Sources.

- 2.6 The lease was again assigned in July 1911 when Thomas Blackmore granted William Spencer all that land formerly called Miriam cottage, but then known as “Bishearne” 37 Melville Street. William Spencer died in 1931 so in the Assignment of the lease in 1937 he is described as “The Testator” in the history of property transfer section. When the lease was transferred in June of that year, 1937, William Arthur Spencer (of 2 Marlbro Villas, Western Road, Shanklin) acted as executor for William Spencer in carrying out the sale of the property to Bertram Henry Gatward of 20 and 21 Union Street Ryde, Jewellers Manager. Examination of the fabric of the building suggests that Gatward undertook significant renovations and extensions following his acquisition of the property and he lived in it with his small family until he died.
- 2.7 Before he died Gatward, then described as Retired Jeweller Manager, changed the ownership of the property from his sole possession to joint ownership with his “spinster daughter” Miss OC Gatward in 1968. This not only ensured her possession of the house on his death but presumably had financial advantages in terms of death duties and tax. The current owners purchased the property from the Gatward estate.

The Plan and Evolution of the house

- 2.8 The current plan form and fabric of the house offers clues as to its origins and subsequent evolution. It is pretty clear that numbers 36 and 37 were originally one property as suggested by the list description. The evidence supporting this is the consistent pitch and form of the roof, including eaves and ridgelines which includes the fragment of the original eaves now contained within the western side addition to number 37, which was once external. The consistency of the pilaster piers to the ends of the building and the small pane sash windows where they survive also indicate they were built at the same time. These sashes do not have horns for example. The irregular spacing of the piers and the vertical joint up the stack could be indications of number 37 being a later addition, but internal features, combined with the documentary evidence suggest that this is highly unlikely.
- 2.9 Internally there is clear evidence of former connections between what are now separate properties in the party wall between the two. There is a blocked opening behind the now exposed meters on the ground floor and similar evidence for an opening on the former first floor landing. The ground floor opening in the side wall of number 37 floor is inserted through red brick walling that matches the wall above, where the current owners have inserted an opening to serve a new stair (this is the subject of a separate application- Application 2).
- 2.10 The entrance wing itself contains yellow stock brick at ground floor level floor which includes an entrance arch and it was clearly originally single storey. The original roof appears to have been mono-pitch with a parapet to the front and was almost certainly covered in slate. This fabric is later 19th Century and therefore the evidence suggests that the entrance into the ground floor of number 37 was formed at that

time, if not later. There does not appear to be any evidence for an alternative earlier entrance into 37 which would suggest that it was constructed at the same time as 36, or shortly afterwards, as an independent or separate house.

- 2.11 The roof of the single storey entrance wing appears to have then been removed and a first floor placed above, presumably to provide a bathroom, based on the proportions of the space. It was probably constructed between the late 1930's/1940's and the 1950's under the new ownership of Bertram Gatward as it appears in a photograph of the property dating from the 1960's-70's. Number 37 is clearly distinguished from number 36 by what appears to be relatively newer cement render or pebble dash which has been applied to provide a consistent appearance and masking the junction between the ground and first floors of the entrance addition. The former flat roof of the entrance addition has been enclosed by the current owners as part of their works to provide the new stair which will be the subject of a separate application.
- 2.12 The existence of blocked openings in the party wall with adjacent property are also evidence that when built, 37 was part of the adjacent property and probably provided accommodation that was ancillary to the main reception rooms in the house. One of these main rooms was signalled by the curved bay to the west of the entrance; but the other was enlarged by the addition of a canted bay window in the later 19th century, probably in the 1870's when Charles Greaves, Anna Jubb and Sarah Million acquired the lease of the property. Taking the documentary evidence and combining it with an assessment of the different brick in the entrance wing which is a later yellow stock, it is possible that it was at this time that number 37 was separated from the remainder of the building; in which case it was at that time that the former openings in the party wall would have been blocked and it would have required a separate stair to access the first floor. This was placed between the front and rear rooms along the side of an existing partition.
- 2.13 The internal fabric also provides evidence of a further phase of work to number 37 which is clearly of 20th date. The rear wing at first and ground floor levels appears to show that it was extended and it was probably originally single storey, like the added entrance wing, and was then raised to provide first floor accommodation which is now the rear bedroom of narrow proportions and with coved internal eaves which has a very different character to the first-floor rooms of the main range.
- 2.14 The plan form of the building was also significantly altered when the first-floor bathroom was provided above the side entrance. This required a new opening in the west wall and the reconfiguration of the old partition to provide the access from the landing. (*Drawing 539/VW/24/1 original layout*) This partition was moved north so it is attached to the south side of the chimney breast and the architrave of the door

in this room is clearly 20th Century. This repositioning of the partition had the effect of reducing the depth of the front bedroom significantly.

2.14 In summary, the evolution of Number 37 appears to be as follows:

- *c1850* when built: Two rooms at ground and first floor levels connected to what is now number 36 providing ancillary accommodation;
- *Late C19 c1870(?)*: single storey side entrance bay added, new entrance through the side wall and construction of stair between the two rooms, cutting through the first floor with a flimsy partition provided at that level. Blocking of party wall openings and a single storey continuation of the entrance “wing” to the rear to provide kitchen/service room with possibly a bathroom above;
- *Early 20th Century between late 1930’s/1940-1960*: first floor added above the entrance range to provide a bathroom, reducing the size of the existing front bedroom; first floor rear wing converted to additional bedroom. New fireplaces replacing older ones in the ground floor rooms and new stair. Internal finishes of the ground floor rooms extensively renewed, external render replaced at the front and side to disguise the additions and new roof slates;
- *21st century*: stair removed, partition removed on ground floor, flimsy first floor partition removed, side entrance roof raised to enclose former flat roof and extended to the south.

3.0 Proposals

Background

3.1 The owners of the property have carried out some alterations which they have been advised by the Local Planning Authority (IOW Council) require Listed Building Consent. This consent cannot be granted retrospectively. The Council has also expressed concern about the impact of some of the work upon the heritage significance of the building. The owners have therefore commissioned this report to establish a good understanding of the significance of the building which has been used to inform their current proposals for the property. These will be submitted in three applications, of which this is the third. This is to both rectify the earlier failure to seek consent and also to address the Council’s concerns regarding their impact. Each application is organised into a logical package of work which can be implemented in phases. This approach also enables the Council to be satisfied that any permitted works have been carried out appropriately.

3.2 The proposals in this third application relate to the later kitchen addition to the rear of the property. In summary the proposals are for:

- Replacement of the Upvc windows on both floors in the east elevation with bespoke two-light timber casement windows incorporating slimline double glazing with true glazing bars;
- Replacement of Upvc window on the first-floor south elevation (to the bedroom);
- Demolition of small section of internal partition wall and door in east half of the south end of the kitchen and making good;
- Replacement of failing glazed lean-to with a lean-to canopy roof on timber posts;
- Replacement of C20 bathroom window on the front elevation with a small pane, slimline double glazed timber sash window with true glazing bars.

4.0 Impact of proposals upon significance

- 4.1 The proposals have been informed by an assessment of the significance of the existing building which has identified the probable historic plan form of the building and the phases of later adaptation. Using that understanding, the proposals involve alteration to later fabric of limited significance and the replacement of failing modern fabric.
- 4.2 *Replacement of the kitchen and bedroom windows and bathroom window to the front*
The existing windows on the east and south elevations of the kitchen wing are Upvc. These were inserted before the current owners acquired the property. One unit has failed, as can be seen from the condensation between the panes of glass. (*Appendix NPBM 3 Photograph 3*). the proposal is to replace these units with bespoke timber, two-light, flush casements, with each casement comprising 1 over 1 light with a central horizontal glazing bar. The windows are to be double glazed using a slim line unit that enables true glazing bars to be used. Casements are a familiar and historic form of fenestration for service areas and more modest houses as they were simple, and effective and cheaper than sashes. The kitchen is in a later addition that was built as “service” accommodation so the use of a casement is historically appropriate.
- 4.3 The first-floor bedroom window above the lean-to in the more historic part of the property has also been replaced by a double glazed Upvc unit. Here it is proposed to replace the window with a small-paned traditional sash design to match the appearance of the surviving historic sashes on the front and rear of the property. The new window will contain true glazing bars with appropriate matching mouldings and contain slimline double-glazed units. The sash will operate with weights and cords.
- 4.4 The first-floor bathroom window to the front of the property is a C20 timber casement window with obscure glazing and a top hung upper casement light. The

window is not traditional in design and detracts from the appearance of the property. The proposal is to replace this window with a slimline, double glazed, small pane sash window of traditional appearance.

4.5 The use of double-glazed windows in listed buildings has been a subject of contention over past decades. The issues have typically been whether such windows can accurately replicate the refinement of traditional timber profiles and mouldings found in historic fenestration. The general resistance to such windows has led to improvements in both the quality and appearance of double glazing. However, the issue is not solely about aesthetics but is also about integrity and authenticity with regard to the potential loss of historic fabric including glass.

4.6 After considerable research into double glazing technology Historic England has issued revised guidance on the use of double-glazed windows in historic buildings that provides criteria for assessing whether they may be appropriate. They are not suggesting an outright ban on their use. In their advice on the repair, care and upgrading of traditional windows (published in 2017) they state (page 62):

3. *“Where historic windows or replacement windows of historic pattern survive without historic glass it may be possible to introduce slim-profile double-glazing without harming the significance of the listed building. There are compatibility issues to consider as the introduction of double-glazing can require the renewal of the window frame to accommodate thicker glazing, thereby harming significance.”*

4.7 They also state:

4 *“Where historic windows have been replaced with ones whose design does not follow historic patterns, these are unlikely to contribute to the significance of listed buildings. Replacing such windows with new windows of a sympathetic historic pattern, whether single-glazed or incorporating slim-profile double-glazing, may cause no additional harm. It also provides an opportunity to enhance the significance of the building, which is the desired outcome under national policy.*

5. *Where a new window or re-glazing is agreed, the reflective properties of secondary and double-glazing as compared to modern, polished single-glazing, do not usually harm the significance of the building. But when new multi-paned windows are proposed, the desirability of reproducing broken reflections by individually glazing each pane should be considered. Where the aesthetic value of the building is high, then the impact on the whole of the relevant elevation should be considered, including the desirability of accurately matching other windows.⁵*

4.8 It is also relevant that on their website⁶ Historic England state:

⁵ HEAG 039 Historic England Traditional Windows: Their Care, Repair and Upgrading published 2017

⁶ <https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/your-home/making-changes-your-property/types-of-work/alter-my-windows/>

Can I replace non-historic windows?

Some windows, if they are later replacements which do not follow the historic pattern, may not contribute to the historic interest of your house and even spoil its appearance. You could consider replacing them with ones that match the historic pattern of your property to enhance it. Old photographs, or similar houses nearby, may have examples of the historic pattern. An exception to this may be where the replacement windows related to an important later phase of construction which did not follow the historic pattern.

We will support the removal of non-historic windows provided it is clear that they are not of interest and that the new windows are of an appropriate style which enhances the building. It is usually possible to fit new windows with integral slim-profile double glazing, subject to their detailed design. Multi-pane windows can be a problem as often the fine glazing bars are not able to accommodate the increased thickness of the glass.

New windows need to comply with minimum energy efficiency requirements as part of the Building Regulations (Part L). This can be achieved either with double glazing or secondary glazing. For listed buildings and buildings in conservation areas a case can be made for exemption where complying with required standards would unacceptably alter the character and appearance of the window. (underlining added)

- 4.9 The current windows in the kitchen wing are not historically significant and are not of a type that contribute to the architectural character of the building. In fact, the windows spoil the appearance and historic character of the building. The proposed new windows are to be of an appropriate style and are in appropriate materials. The proposal should therefore be supported. The precise details of the proposed windows can be approved through condition, although in general terms they will be a two-light casement with one over one lights. An indicative illustration of a slimline double glazed timber casement window but with small panes is provided (*Appendix NPBM 3 Photographs 5 and 6*) to enable the Council to be satisfied with the principle of the proposal.
- 4.10 The existing first floor window above the current lean-to in the older part of the property is also Upvc. It is proposed to remove this window and replace it with a small pane sash window to match the pattern and appearance of the historic sashes elsewhere in the property. The window will however be a slimline, double-glazed, timber sash with traditional sash weights and boxes. This conforms to the approach set out above by historic England and will be a heritage benefit by improving the appearance and character of the old part of the property.
- 4.11 The replacement of the first-floor bathroom window to the front involves the removal of a modern timber window of non-traditional design that spoils the appearance of the property. This window will be replaced with a sash window of

more traditional design that will enhance the appearance of the property and therefore represents a heritage benefit.

4.12 *Demolition of a small section of internal wall*

The current kitchen is in a later addition to the house that dates, at its earliest to the late 19th century. The floor is modern and most of the internal wall surfaces are modern. At the south end are two small rooms, originally ancillary spaces. It is proposed to remove the partition wall and door to the left hand (east) room in order to incorporate the space into the kitchen to increase its flexibility. (*Appendix NPBM 3 photograph 4*) The other space will be retained and can be used as ancillary, for example as a pantry or utility type space. The alteration is a small one but by incorporating the space into the kitchen it increases the flexibility of the space and provides more wall surfaces for cupboards etc.

4.13 *Replacement of the lean-to conservatory*

The existing lean-to conservatory is an ad hoc addition constructed from poor quality materials. It is in a poor condition and currently spoils the appearance of the rear elevation of the building. (*Appendix NPBM 3 Photograph 1*) removal of the structure would, in isolation be a benefit to the building. It is proposed to replace it with a simple canopy constructed of wood and glass affixed to the wall and supported on timber posts of simple square section. This will provide a sheltered but open area immediately outside the rear door of the property. No historic fabric is harmed by the proposal and the appearance of the listed building is improved.

Assessment of the impact of the proposals against Historic England Selection Guidance

4.14 The relevant selection guide for 37 Melville Road is “Domestic 2: Town Houses” 2nd edition (published 2017). The term ‘town house’ is an imprecise one. It traditionally implied a one-off design of considerable grandeur, but is now often used to encompass town dwellings at the ‘polite’ end of the spectrum, whether individual houses or terraces. The architecture of 36-37 places it within this end of the spectrum. There is a significant growth in the number of houses both built and surviving after 1850. The increased availability of building materials delivered by train, and greater mechanisation in the building trades, combined to create even greater standardisation across the country; allied to these developments was the professionalisation of the building trade and the emergence of the local architect.

4.15 Numbers 36-7 are in many ways examples of the greater standardisation of house plans and finishes that occurred in the middle of the 19th century. The selection guidance notes that when considering interiors, the plan can be important but also the survival of features including staircases; fireplaces; decorative plasterwork;

joinery: doors, architraves, panelling, shutters and so forth; built-in cupboards or shelved niches can all add to significance. As a result of previous alteration and refurbishment very few of these types of features survived in number 37. Where they do survive, for example the internal window architraves they are of relatively simple and standard form.

- 4.16 Even though modest and standard, these features remain of significance. Historic England advise that internally, the loss of major elements such as the staircase, or the room plan of the principal floors, or the stripping out of internal features, will undermine the case for listing. Alterations to the less prominent parts of a house, such as bedrooms and service areas, may have less of an impact than alterations to the principal spaces. The alterations proposed in this application do not involve the loss of any elements of significance.

5.0 Historic Environment Legislation and Policy

- 5.1 Where any development has the potential to affect the historic environment and its heritage assets the legislative framework includes the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. In particular Section 16 which requires a local planning authority to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses when considering applications for listed building consent. Section 66 of the 1990 Act also states that in the exercise of their planning functions a local planning authority shall have the same special regard.
- 5.2 An application for listed building consent is required, in general terms, for all works of demolition, alteration or extension to a listed building that affect its character as a building of special architectural or historic interest. The requirement applies to all types of works and to all parts of those buildings covered by the listing protection (including objects or structures fixed to the listed building, and to objects or structures within the curtilage, such as outbuildings), provided the works affect the character of the building as a building of special interest. (*Emphasis added*) The special interest of the building provides the justification for the listing and therefore works which do not affect that character do not require consent.
- 5.3 The application of this statutory duty informs the approach to the Historic Environment set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and supported by the National Planning Policy Guidance. In the NPPF (December 2023) it is recognised that protection and enhancement of our built and historic environment is an essential element of the environmental role of sustainable development and the Government's objective is the conservation of heritage assets

in a manner appropriate to their significance so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations.⁷

- 5.4 The principles and policies set out in Section 16 of the NPPF (December 2023) are explicitly linked to the responsibilities of Local Planning Authorities under the heritage related consent regimes of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990⁸. It is made clear that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and therefore their significance should be sustained and enhanced. The starting point is a good understanding of the significance of an asset and that understanding should be used to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage assets' conservation and any aspect of the proposal.⁹ If harm cannot be avoided it has to be clearly and convincingly justified. The greater the extent of harm the greater the justification required and the more significant the heritage asset the greater the weight to be given to its conservation.¹⁰
- 5.5 The proposals do not affect significant historic fabric and in three cases will result in enhancement to the architectural appearance of the building, which is a heritage benefit.

6.0 Summary and Conclusions

- 6.1 The property has been altered without consent and the owners are now seeking to rectify that situation as far as possible. This is the third of what will be three applications that will seek to address the concerns raised by the Council regarding the impact of work that has been carried out. The owners understand that listed building consent cannot be granted retrospectively, but they are seeking to actively engage with the Council and resolve the issues raised as far as possible.
- 6.2 This application concerns alterations that have not been implemented and do not include any elements of work carried out without permission. The proposals involve the removal of a small section of later fabric and the replacement of modern (20th Century) alterations that spoil the appearance of the house.
- 6.3 There is no harm being caused by these proposals and therefore in heritage terms they do not have to be justified. However, they will deliver heritage benefits both to the later extension and the original part of the building, and will improve the

⁷ NPPF paragraph 195 page 57,

⁸ NPPF paragraph 195 page 57, footnote 71

⁹ NPPF paragraph 201, page 58

¹⁰ NPPF paragraph 205, page 59

accommodation in the kitchen. This will increase the resilience of the building and therefore assist in supporting its longer-term conservation.

APPENDICES

Appendix NPBM I: NHLE Entry

Official list entry

Heritage Category: **Listed Building**

Grade: **II**

List Entry Number: **1221623**

Date first listed: **18-May-1972**

List Entry Name: **36 AND 37, MELVILLE STREET**

Statutory Address 1: **36 AND 37, MELVILLE STREET**

Location

Statutory Address: **36 AND 37, MELVILLE STREET**

The building or site itself may lie within the boundary of more than one authority.

District: **Isle of Wight (Unitary Authority)**

Parish: **Ryde**

National Grid Reference: **SZ 59692 92503**

Details

MELVILLE STREET 1. 1577 (South Side) Nos 36 & 37 SZ 5992 3/265

II GV

2. Circa 1840. Semi detached, originally probably one house. Two storeys cement rendered painted. Band between storeys on No 37 which has a narrower

frontage flanked by pilaster strips. No 36 has superimposed bay windows of three lights each to East, added later, sash, later glazing bars, block sills, moulded cornice to ground floor. One recessed sash window, glazing bars intact: centre of first floor and to West: two windows in shallow bow through both storeys with band between, recessed, sash, glazing bars intact, block sills. Central recessed panelled and glazed door with semi circular fanlight. No 37 is of one window, glazing bars intact with a small two storeyed entrance wing added to West.

Nos 35 to 39 (consec) form a group.

Listing NGR: SZ5969292503

Legacy

The contents of this record have been generated from a legacy data system.

Legacy System number: **413452**

Legacy System: **LBS**

Legal

This building is listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for its special architectural or historic interest.

Appendix NPBM 2: Sources

Historic England Guidance:

Making Changes to Heritage Assets Historic England Advice Note 2. February 2016

Listing Selection Guide: Domestic 2: Town Houses December 2017

Indenture and Copy of a Lease

26th September 1848

Between James Player Lind of Ryde and Mary Baker, spinster (lessee) granting 999 years lease of land between that owned by William Harris to the east and Miss Fenton to the west. The plot 50t wide and 100ft deep, the land to the south owned by James Player Lind.

Witnessed by Thos Hearn Solicitor and copy by Fardells

Assignment

25 June 1937 between William Arthur Spencer of No 2 Marlbro Villas, Western Road Shanklin (The Vendor) and Bertram Henry Gatward of 20 and 21 Union Street Ryde, Jewellers Manager (The Purchaser)

This contains details of the Lease of 26th September (above) but also details of an Assignment:

17 January 1873 made between Francis Harding Newman (of the first part) and Anna Jubb and Charles Greaves of the Second Part and Sarah Million of the third part, a part of the premises in the lease described as Miriam Cottage formerly known as Vale Lodge, but then as Eastnor as the same premises (this an indication of when it was first divided?)

Also describes a second assignment 18 July 1911 between Thomas Blackmore and William Spencer (The Testator) all that land formerly called Miriam Cottage but then known as "Bishearne" 37 Melville Street

The Testator (William Spencer) died 23 April 1931 by his will of 1926 appointed the vendor (Wm Arthur Spencer) and George Henry Harvey to be executors.

George Henry Harvey died 13 January 1935

Deed of Gift

18 June 1968 from B H Gatward (retired Jeweller Manager) to BH Gatward and Miss OC Gatward (going from single to joint ownership) of number 37 Melville Street His spinster daughter.

Appendix NPBM 3: Photographs of the Site



Photograph 1: Rear elevation of main house and later wing from the garden showing the ad-hoc lean to conservatory with a plastic roof and door and the Upvc first floor windows in the south elevation of the main house and the wing .Photograph by the author 2023



Photograph 2: Rear elevation of 36 and 37 showing the detail of the painted and incised render cladding on the main building contrasting with the later render finish on the rear elevation above the roof of the lean-to of 37 indicating the refurbishment that was undertaken when it was extended. The Upvc window is to be replaced by a timber sash



Photograph 3: Rear wing (kitchen) of 37 Upvc window in the east elevation from the inside. It is proposed to replace this window with a two light timber casement.



Photograph 4: Interior rear wing (kitchen) number 37 looking south toward the two ancillary spaces. It is proposed to remove the wall and doorcase to the left to incorporate the area containing the washing machine into the kitchen. The partition with the squinch moulding will be retained. Note the door architraves are modern as is the floor and the wall surfaces.



Photograph 5: A three light, timber slim-line, double-glazed casement window with true glazing bars and traditional flush finish recently installed (January 2024) with LBC into a Grade II listed building in Gloucestershire



Photograph 6: Detail of internal finish with traditional glazing bar mouldings and the traditional monkey tail fittings