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Summary of special character

Derivas berr a nas Arbennek

The special character of the Porthleven Conservation Area can be summarised as follows:

• A port which developed around a planned harbour during the nineteenth century in response to the needs of the Cornish mining industry as well as fishing and boat-building.

• Distinctive, dramatic topography, with the harbour sitting in a ‘bowl’ formed by the steep hills to either side, on which the town has developed. The harbour forms a focal point for local views while the hills around the town function as a backdrop.

• Three distinct character areas:
  – the harbour, which retains the character of a working port with its associated fishing and industrial buildings as well as facilities for tourists and residents, some limited housing, and the landmark Institute building;
  – the nineteenth-century settlement slightly inland from the harbour, with shops (Fore Street) and a mixture of styles of cottages (The Gue) and terraces (Thomas Street, Peverell Terrace);
  – the cliff top ‘seaside’ settlement (Cliff Road and Loe Bar Road), with an attractive mixture of small cottages, netlofts and houses.

• Good surviving historic buildings – especially around the harbour – relating to Porthleven’s industrial prosperity, including rugged ‘dock’ buildings and the Institute.

• Buildings predominantly two storeys in height, of stone with granite details and with slate roofs. Some houses feature attractive glazed porches.
Porthleven has medieval origins but developed particularly in the nineteenth century following the construction of a walled harbour in 1811–1825 and the construction of a more sheltered Inner Harbour in 1855. The harbour played an important role in the export of Cornish copper and tin; boat-building and fishing were also important local industries. In the twenty-first century, there remains some fishing, but Porthleven is principally now an attractive dormitory settlement for Helston and RNAS Culdrose as well as a popular seaside holiday destination.

The Porthleven Conservation Area was designated in March 1978, with its boundary encompassing much of the harbour and the nineteenth-century town. The aim of conservation area designation is to ‘preserve and enhance’ the features which contribute to an area’s special architectural and historic interest. Such features of course include historic buildings, but also other aspects of the townscape including trees and planting, paving, walls and boundaries, and open spaces. The aim is to protect the historic environment as a whole, not only individual buildings. Conservation area designation brings into force planning controls to help manage the impact of change on the historic environment. It is not that change cannot take place, but that it is carefully managed so that changes are appropriate and balance the needs of the historic built environment with those of residents and businesses.

The Management Strategy which forms the second part of this document is essentially a plan of action, based on the findings in the Appraisal. It includes general recommendations for the use of planning controls across the area as a whole, as well as specific recommendations for particular locations.

During the preparation of this document a number of people have been generous with their help and advice, particularly members of the Kerrier District Council Conservation Team.

This document has been produced in conjunction with the local community. A public consultation meeting about this study was held in December 2008. A careful record was kept of the points raised at that meeting, which were taken into account in producing the final version of this document.
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National planning policies

The power to designate Conservation Areas originates in the 1967 Civic Amenities Act; the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 updated and consolidated previous legislation.

A full statement of policies for the identification and protection of the historic built environment is set out in Planning Policy Guidance 15 (PPG15, 1994). Conservation areas are defined as ‘areas of special or architectural interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance’ (para 4.1). PPG15 and PPG16 are due to be replaced by a single document PPS5 in the near future.

A direction under Article 4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 may be required to preserve the character or appearance of the conservation area, or part of it. When applied to certain specified properties, it removes what are known as ‘permitted development rights’, that is, the automatic right of property owners to make certain minor changes to unlisted buildings (such as the installation of new windows or solar panels) without applying for planning permission. It is not that these changes cannot ever be made to properties covered by an Article 4 direction, but that planning permission will have to be sought and an appropriate design found before the works can proceed.

Local planning policy

Local planning policy is shaped by the Cornwall Structure Plan, elaborated by the Kerrier District Local Plan. The Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan was prepared in 2002 with Pre-Inquiry changes in 2004. It was not formally adopted, but it is currently used for reference in decision making. A new Cornwall Local Development Framework is being produced which will replace the Structure Plan and Local Plans. The Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy will be of use informing the Local Development Framework.

Chapter Four of the Kerrier District Local Plan comprises a comprehensive set of policies covering the built environment, including discussion of archaeology, conservation areas, and listed buildings.

Porthleven is given special mention in the Kerrier District Local Plan in the category ‘mining and industrial heritage towns, villages and harbours’. The plan discusses historic settlements in policy B.EN6, which relates especially to Helston but arguably has resonances for other historic settlements discussed in its preamble. This policy notes the need for new development to respect the form and layout of the historic street, block and building patterns, and seeks to protect possible archaeological remains by imposing conditions where such remains are thought to exist.

Policies B.EN9 and B.EN10 seek to protect listed buildings such that their special interest is not compromised by inappropriate work to the building or its setting. Policies B.EN11 and B.EN12 adopt a similar approach for Conservation Areas: development in such places will be permitted where: it respects the scale, height, massing, alignment and design character of the area; where it preserves existing heritage or architectural features; where it incorporates local building styles or materials; and where it preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the Conservation Area (other than in exceptional cases). The setting of the Conservation Area is also recognised as being important.

The coastline east and west of Porthleven lies within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty while the area to the north is defined as an Open Area of Local Significance by the Kerrier District Local Plan. Policy ENV.5 states that development on within or on the edge of towns and villages will not be permitted where this would be significantly harmful to either an open area which makes an important contribution to the visual appearance or quality of the landscape setting of a particular settlement, or a locally-distinctive land form, or a clearly-definable settlement boundary. The Local Plan furthermore states in policy ENV.6 that development within Open Areas of Local Significance will not be allowed where the setting of a town or village forms a green open foreground or background setting essential to the local character of the town or village; where it is essential to public views; or where green space penetrates the built-up area.
Porthleven is situated within the Coastal Zone as defined by the Kerrier Local Plan, which places restrictions on development. Policy ENV.11 states that development which would damage the natural environment will not be permitted; furthermore, development which does not need to be located on the coast will also not be permissible. Within coastal villages, such as Porthleven, development should be limited in scale to protect the special character of the natural and built environment. Development proposals close to the coastline itself will not normally be allowed, unless they have a functional requirement for coastal access. The cliffs east and west of Porthleven are notified Sites of Special Scientific Interest; development which does not conserve and enhance the SSSI will not be allowed (Policy ENV.20).

Porthleven is defined as a ‘larger village’ for development purposes by the Local Plan. The Local Plan also notes a need for eighteen new affordable houses per annum in the Porthleven/Breage/Sithney/Germoe area. Where there are to be developments, the Kerrier Plan makes reference to the Cornwall Structure Plan as the means by which proposals are to be assessed; Policy H12 of the Kerrier Plan also discusses the criteria in terms of significant developments, noting (amongst other factors) that developments should not harm the character and appearance of the landscape and that the scale and location of development should be closely integrated with the prevailing settlement form. Policy H13 sets out criteria for smaller developments of one or two houses.


A study was undertaken by De Facto for Porthleven Town Council in 2002. Although not a statutory planning document as such, it is mentioned here as a study which attracted considerable community involvement and to which frequent mention was made by stakeholders during the consultation process which accompanied the production of this Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy.

The De Facto study was commissioned as a way to move forward the delivery of the community development aspects of the Cornwall and Scilly Objective One funding between 2002 and 2012. By means of extensive consultation, it identifies the values and strengths which local people ascribe to Porthleven, as well as projects for enhancement which range from public realm works to the improvement of healthcare facilities. Its vision is that, by 2012, Porthleven is known as a ‘traditional working port celebrated for its unique historic harbour, its rugged beauty, outstanding natural environment, and exceptional quality of life.’

In that some of the projects proposed by the De Facto report involve Porthleven’s built heritage and streetscape, there is a degree of overlap between that study and the present document. That many of these projects still require action stresses the need for this Appraisal and Management Strategy, as this document should, once adopted by the local authority, function as an instrument of policy that can be used to identify and progress projects for enhancement, and can function as a baseline against which to test projects that will affect the character and appearance of the Conservation, for good and ill.
The name ‘Porthleven’ is first recorded in 1529. The word derives from the old Cornish words ‘porth’ (harbour) and ‘leven’ (level, smooth).

The history of Porthleven has been discussed at length elsewhere, in such illustrated publications as Tony Treglown’s useful Porthleven and in recent survey documents such as the Cornwall Industrial Settlements Initiative, 1999. The following section of this Appraisal does not intend to replicate such studies, but rather elucidates two key themes which are important in understanding the way in which Porthleven’s urban fabric has developed. As befits the fact that Porthleven’s name recognises its harbour, these themes are both related to its coastal position:

• Porthleven’s geology and topography, which explains its location and basic form.

• The development of the harbour and the Cornish mining industry.

Geology and topography

Porthleven is located on the South Cornwall coast, south-west of Helston and east of Penzance. It faces south, to sea, and is positioned on the alluvial plains at the mouth of a marshy valley. To the east and west, the valley’s sides comprise rocky cliffs of mylor slate which overlook the present-day harbour, while beyond are wind-swept fields with sparse vegetation. The watercourse which forms the valley in which Porthleven is located exists, like many others, to drain the upland granite area; the propensity of slate to shear into thin planes means that it is easily eroded, creating the dramatic hilly topography of this area. There are some seams of lead to the north-west of Porthleven, and numerous greenstone bands where the land meets the sea. The mouth of the valley may indeed have originally been more extensive: the geology map of Porthleven records a submerged forest below sea level, perhaps overwhelmed as sea levels rose at the end of the last Ice Age.

Perhaps the most obvious factor in explaining Porthleven’s existence is its coastal location. The existence of a silted-up beach in medieval times provided a sheltered location into which to pull up boats, though its sloping nature made use difficult. The marshy valley bottom precluded the construction of housing, but settlements grew up at Torleven and Methleigh Mill, and on the clifftops overlooking the mouth of the valley on the eastern and western headlands (now Cliff Road and Beacon Road/West End respectively). There was no Anglican church at Porthleven until 1839; instead, it was located at the boundary of Breage and Sithney parishes – hence the name ‘Breageside’ for the western settlement and ‘Sithneyside’ for the eastern. The residents of these small settlements were predominantly fishermen and agricultural workers. Landscape characterisation carried out by Cornwall County Council (www.cornwalllandscapes.org.uk) places Porthleven within the Mount’s Bay East character area, emphasising the impact of the sea on the landscape character of this area, both in terms of topography and planting.
3.0 Situation and historic development

Geological and topographical situation
The development of the harbour and the Cornish mining industry

Mining was already taking place in the Porthleven area in the 1600s: within a six-mile radius were numerous mines, including Wheal Vor at Carleen (north of Breage), which was one of the most productive mines in Cornwall by the nineteenth century. Copper and tin were especially important materials; silver lead was also mined in the immediate vicinity of Porthleven. Wheal Unity mine lay within the bounds of the current Conservation Area, at Unity Road. China clay was a further mining export.

The development of Porthleven in its present form began in the nineteenth century, with the construction of a harbour from where mined products could be exported. In 1810, there were 63 houses, including the Ship Inn on Breageside, which survives. On 26 June 1811 an Act of Parliament was passed for the construction of a harbour at Porthleven, and the Porthleven Harbour Company was set up. The Company were given the right to compulsorily purchase any land within 130 feet of the harbour wall that they felt they required for the construction of it and its associated buildings. The area which became the harbour included fields, orchards, meadows, willow fields, a pig moor and a quarry, plus several buildings. Construction was, however, slow and expensive, and further Acts of Parliament were required to extend the allotted construction period, and work was not finished until August 1825. Furthermore, even when completed, the harbour did not do as well as had been hoped, and it was put up for sale in 1831. It was not until 1858 that trade picked up, when the sheltered inner harbour was built. Few changes have since been made to it, which like many Cornish harbours and quays is now listed. It is especially distinctive for its coherence (having been built in a limited number of different phases) and its solid granite blockwork.

The harbour was not simply a means of exporting metals and china clay, but became the focus of a range of employments which gradually assumed a greater significance with the decline of Cornish mining from the late nineteenth century onwards. New warehouse and customs buildings followed in the wake of the harbour. Fishing was a key local employer: tasks such as pilchard-curing involved large numbers of local people in the last decades of the nineteenth century. The harbour also stimulated boat-building, which by 1850 was taking place on waste ground at the head of the harbour. Another key local industry which developed at this time and which has left physical traces in the town was netmaking, with nets and sails being made in small ‘netlofts’, a number of which survive on roads including Loe Bar Road and The Gue.
The massive scale and strength of the harbour walls and cliffs imbue them with a sense of sublime beauty.
Reflecting this economic growth, the majority of Porthleven’s surviving historic buildings date from the second half of the nineteenth century, especially around the harbour and leading off Fore Street: these developments linked together the formerly disparate settlements at Breageside, Sithneyside and Torleven. Porthleven gained its own Anglican church in 1839. It already had Methodist chapels by this date, all reflecting the growth of the local population. Church-building culminated in the construction of the Fore Street chapel, designed by the architect James Hicks of Redruth in 1883 and which is in many ways more prominent than the Anglican church. Many other buildings in Porthleven survive to reflect this late-nineteenth century prosperity. A good number are concentrated to the north of the harbour, around the road leading towards Helston, including Thomas Street (1879). Others were located on the harbourside, such as the impressive Bay View Terrace (1905), which replaced the earlier houses of Buenos Aires Row, and James Hicks’ Bickford-Smith Institute (1884), an iconic building whose seventy-foot clock tower forms the focus of local views and frequently features in tourist postcards. It now houses the offices of the Town Council.

China clay exports from Porthleven reached a peak in 1908/1909, with 7000 tons shipped out of the harbour, bound for Runcorn in Cheshire from where it was taken to the Staffordshire Potteries. Exports ceased in the 1930s, when St Austell became the major china-clay producing area in Cornwall. Fishing has remained important, though not on its previous scale: in 1961, there were only a dozen working boats at Porthleven. While this change has had economic implications, the decline in harbour traffic is perhaps one of the key reasons for the survival of its many historic buildings.

In the latter half of the twentieth century, Porthleven became a popular holiday destination as well as permanent settlement for people working in Helston (especially at RNAS Culdrose), and a large number of houses have been constructed to meet demand on the Sithneyside (eastern) headland, by private developers and the local authority.

Although the most obvious physical evidence of Porthleven’s past is its built environment, there may be archaeological remains of recent or ancient date discovered during construction works.

China clay

Tregonning Hill, near Porthleven in the vicinity of Breage, was the place where William Cookworthy, a pharmacist, discovered Cornish china clay in 1746. China clay, known as ‘kaolin’, had long been used in China to make porcelain; competition from elsewhere in Europe and America in the eighteenth century stimulated a search for the material in Britain.

China clay results when molten granite is changed by thermal and mineral factors during its formation. One of the constituents of granite is feldspar: in certain cases, when feldspar is rich in potash, china clay can form. As the molten rock cooled, it was attacked by steam, boron, fluorine and tin vapour, which all acted on the feldspar’s alkali content and transformed it into china clay.

Cornish china clay turned out to be of exceptional quality. By 1910, over a million tons were mined each year, being used in a variety of settings including not only porcelain manufacture but also paper-making, paints, and the pharmaceutical industry.
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4.0 Deskrifans

This section summarises the main characteristics of the Porthleven Conservation Area: what it is that makes the place distinctive. This special character can be summarised as follows:

- A working port which is the visual and functional focus of the settlement

- Distinctive, dramatic topography. The harbour forms a focal point for local views with the hills around the town as a backdrop. There are views of rooftops: the sloping nature of the land surrounding the harbour means that properties at lower levels can be clearly seen, as can those across the harbour.

- Three distinct character areas:
  - the working harbour, with its associated fishing and industrial buildings as well as facilities for tourists and residents, some limited housing, and the landmark Institute building;
  - the more sheltered nineteenth-century settlement slightly inland from the harbour, with shops (Fore Street) and a mixture of styles of cottages (The Gue) and terraces (Thomas Street, Peverell Terrace);
  - the clifftop settlement (Cliff Road and Loe Bar Road), the location of the earliest settlement in Porthleven which retains an attractive mixture of small cottages.

- Buildings predominantly classical in essence, two storeys in height, of stone with granite details and with slate roofs. Some houses feature attractive glazed porches. Historic buildings largely of the nineteenth century and related to Porthleven’s industrial heritage.

In what follows, this summary is developed.
Settlement form and movement

Porthleven is west of Helston, with its housing spreading out in roughly chronological bands north and east from the harbour at the historic core of the town. This form takes advantage of sheltered locations, and also responds to the local road network. The main road enters from the east as Wellington Road, drops south as Fore Street to arrive at the corner of the harbour, turns and continues due west along the north side of the harbour, and then turns north towards Breage and the A394. It functions in effect as the ‘spine’ for the town.
Within the Conservation Area, several streets of densely-packed terraced houses and cottages lead off eastwards from Fore Street and Wellington Road, connecting them to Peverell Road. These range from the lane-like Chapel Terrace and The Gue (where there are properties of various scales strung along a narrow roadway) to more conventionally ‘urban’ streets such as Thomas Street, arranged in more formal terraces. There are a number of useful pedestrian links between the various streets.

There is a road running around three sides of the harbour. That on the western side is paralleled higher up the valley side by Beacon Road, a street of informal row cottages and semi-detached houses facing across the harbour; the hilly topography means that there are only properties along one side of the road.
The road along the eastern side of the harbour leads around the Institute to the cliff-top cottages of Cliff Road and Loe Bar Road. Here again is an informal street pattern, with the road direction and position of properties being shaped to a significant degree by topography. The eastern side of the harbour is much-used by pedestrians, as many shops and cafes are here; the many cars attempting to park here on the dockside in summer causes pedestrian/motor vehicle conflicts.

Twentieth-century housing on the eastern headland above Peverell Road forms a looming and visible presence in the backdrop to views of the harbour from Breaigeside and the western quay. Its layout (outside the Conservation Area) again follows the topography of the land and thus consists of a series of streets largely parallel with Peverell Road.

There is limited dedicated parking in Porthleven: the principal car park is adjacent to the supermarket and the Boat Yard site at the northern end of the harbour (Kilto’s Field). A car park for visitors exists to the east at Shrubberies Hill.

**Building types and ages**

Though it is predominantly a residential street, Fore Street is the retail heart of Porthleven, with several shops including a pharmacy, takeaway, salon and florist, located predominantly in two-storey buildings of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In some cases, such as the Fish and Chip shop, retail units seem to have been inserted at ground level in the front gardens of what would originally have been houses. It is notable that Porthleven has retained a good number of shops despite its proximity to Helston, and this is an important feature of its character (the shop fronts themselves are generally of less interest, however). The Methodist Chapel is a prominent landmark; its location here reflects the fact that this was the part of Porthleven developed in the nineteenth century and where most of the population by then lived. Behind the street to the west are the supermarket (a utilitarian structure) and the nineteenth-century Anglican church.

Retail use continues along the eastern side of the harbour, though with a more tourist-oriented slant – there are galleries, craft shops, and cafes, some of which are located in historic dockside public buildings, such as the former Custom House. The principal public house is also located here, as is the Institute, a prominent building now housing the Town Council. To the northern side of the harbour is the historic boat yard site, which retains a vestige of its origins in now being a location for workshops and a garage. Along the western side of the port, early nineteenth-century harbour buildings are still predominantly in working use, though some have now been converted to entertainment and other functions. Buildings around the harbour are typically of 2–3 storeys.

![Cliff-top housing, Loe Bar Road](image1)

![Shops in Fore Street](image2)

![Nos. 1–6 Fore Street, a good-quality terrace with many surviving original features](image3)
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Much of the rest of Porthleven now comprises residential properties, mostly of two storeys and ranging in date from the eighteenth to the twenty-first centuries, though there are chapels and other buildings (e.g. a garage on The Gue) mixed in with the housing. Some residential properties (e.g. along The Gue and Loe Bar Road) have been converted from other uses such as netlofts, and there is a former shop still evident on Peverell Road. Housing ranges in style from modest cottages and terraces of the period 1807–1840 (e.g. The Gue, Chapel Terrace, Loe Bar Road), to more formal terraces of slightly later date (Thomas Street, Thomas Terrace, Peverell Road) to larger, grander semi-detached and detached properties arranged in a less dense fashion (e.g. Torleven, Beacon Road). Bay View Terrace forms a particularly coherent and impressive ensemble, comprising semi-detached late-Victorian villas fronting a raised path above the harbour entrance.

Although historic properties comprise a mixture of types and scales, they are noteworthy for their general contiguity. Within the centre, there is little sense of detached properties attempting to make a statement, and buildings are generally closely related in scale and form to their neighbours.

The settlement is surrounded to the north and east by twentieth-century development; there have also been some twentieth-century infills within the historic core.

Bickford Smith Institute: an iconic symbol of Porthleven

Former Custom House, now a harbourside gallery

View north across the harbour, from Bay View Terrace

Historic shop detailing, Peverell Road
Materials and architectural details

The majority of historic buildings in Porthleven are residually classical in style, with plain, regular elevations arranged to a basic proportional grid which controls all aspects of the design. St Bartholomew’s Church, the Methodist chapels and some of the harbour buildings (e.g. the Custom House and Institute) are more obviously ‘high’ architecture; the Institute is an especially impressive composition that combines ideas drawn from a varied range of sources including church architecture (the pointed windows of the tower) and castles (the battlements at the top of the tower). The Fore Street Methodist Chapel is Gothic in style, with pointed-arch windows divided into ornamental panels, whilst St Bartholomew’s Church draws upon Romanesque precedent in its simpler round-arched forms.

Virtually all historic buildings are constructed of stone, not surprisingly as this was a readily available material. Granite in various forms has been used to build the harbour, and for some buildings. Elvan is frequently used as a walling material, often laid as rubble; where this is the case, granite is typically used for quoins (at the corners of buildings), lintels (above doors and windows) and keystones – good examples include Anchor Cottage (Cliff Road), and 4-5 Institute Hill. This kind of detailing is important: the large granite blocks contrast attractively with the elvan in scale and colour. When used around windows on rendered buildings, the windows seem to take up a greater area of an elevation than is actually the case (e.g. 1–3 Chapel Terrace). Some modern properties in the Torleven area and behind Salt Cellar Hill feature good reinterpretations of this idiom.

Many older buildings are rendered and painted or limewashed in pastel shades, with rendering and painting provide additional protection from bad weather. In some cases, the painted colour forming a pleasant contrast with granite blocks around windows. Brick is not an historic material.

Delabole slate was traditionally used for roofs, though many buildings now feature artificial or non-local slate. Historic buildings do not feature dormer windows, and only rarely have hung slates on their elevations. ‘Strawtop’ (Cliff Road) features long straw thatching; other historic buildings may perhaps also have been thatched. Chimneys are an important feature of many buildings and contribute both to their character and that of the village as a whole in producing (together with the varied roof profiles of adjacent and adjoining houses) a distinctive ‘spiky’ roofline. Some houses have lost parts of their roofs in recent years to create outdoor sitting areas, though this is not an element of historic character.

Windows and doors were traditionally painted timber. Openings on eighteenth- and nineteenth-century residential and public buildings would typically have been vertical sliding sashes, many of which survive. Most that remain are four-light versions (two panes to each sash).
Character areas

From the preceding discussion, we can distil three distinct character areas on the basis of settlement form, building type, and architectural detailing:

- Harbour: a mixture of ‘rugged’ light industrial, warehouse, and retail properties, united by their common focus on (and views of) the harbour. A few residential properties, at the headland ends of the harbour, including the high-grade architecture of Bay View Terrace. This character area can be exposed to extremes of weather: wind, spray, and the smell of the sea. Within it, there is a distinct difference between the eastern side of the harbour (where the bulk of the tourist/visitor facilities and attractions are located) and the northern/western side (a primarily ‘working’ area, with historic warehouse buildings, workshops on the Boat Yard site, a utilitarian public realm, and ‘parking for fishermen’ signs). Breageside (e.g. Beacon Road) is especially tranquil; some houses have attractive chimneys, ironwork and timber porches. The physical disconnection between the two sides of the harbour, and their different functions, is an important part of their character.

- Village: more sheltered, this part of Porthleven developed away from the harbour (though still connected with it) in the nineteenth century. Its street layout and buildings give it a dense, more ‘urban’ feel. There are two distinct sub-areas, both of which reflect the conscious development of this area in response to that of the harbour: pre-1840 rows (e.g. Chapel Terrace) and villas on the one hand, and more formal, ‘urban’ terraces of slightly later date (Thomas Street, Peverell Road) on the other. Building types comprise a mixture of houses at various but related scales, plus retail and institutional uses. Properties typically are closely-packed, either fronting the street or with small gardens (e.g. Unity Road, where there are walled front gardens). Many are rendered and painted.

- Seaside: the historic Sithneyside area, predominantly residential and comprising a mixture of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century cottages arranged in an informal but close pattern along the coastal path/road which contrasts with the slightly more ‘urban’ planned rows and terraces of the ‘village’ area. Away from the harbour, this area is also characterised by the sight, smell and sound of the sea breaking on the sands beneath. Properties are often painted/rendered, and some have attractive wooden porches with stained glass. Historically, fishing-related functions such as netmaking also took place here.

These areas are illustrated overleaf.
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‘Harbour’ ‘Seaside’ ‘Village’
Listed buildings

The quality of many of the historic buildings in Porthleven has been recognised and a good number – including the harbour walls – are statutorily listed. Listing is not a preservation order but an identification stage where buildings are marked as having exceptional architectural or historic interest. Listed building consent is required in addition to planning permission for changes. The definitions of the various ‘grades’ used are as follows:

Grade I: buildings of outstanding architectural or historic interest.

Grade II*: particularly significant buildings of more than local interest.

Grade II: buildings of special architectural or historic interest.

The vast majority of buildings are listed at this grade.

Listed buildings are shown on the map, and include the following (drawn from the CSI survey of Porthleven and cross-checked with English Heritage’s online lists):
4.0 Characterisation

Grade II*:
Fore Street: Methodist Chapel

Grade II:
Bay View Terrace: Nos. 1–18
Beacon Road: Boundary stone
‘Breage Cliff’ and Victorian postbox in adjoining wall
Chapel Terrace: Wesley Chapel No. 12
Commercial Road: Nos. 1&2
Fore Street: Chapel-keeper’s house
Harbour: Harbour walls and piers (incl. Wharfs, jetties, bollards)

(listed anti-clockwise) Bickford Smith Institute
Old Custom House
The Harbour Inn
Memorial lamp
K6 type telephone kiosk
China clay store (three round-arched entrances)
Warehouse on west side of harbour
Lime kiln
Ship Inn and adjacent former smithy

Holman’s Place: ‘Mount Cottage’
Loe Bar Road: ‘Ring’o’Bright Water’ (aka ‘Tamarisk’) ‘Strawtop’
Fisherman’s cabin opposite no.1.

Peverell Terrace: Methodist chapel (now converted to residential use)
Nos. 7&8

Salt Cellar Hill: Salt warehouse (north side)
Preachers Hill: Torleven Farmhouse (aka Torleven Road)
Wellington Road: ‘Torleven’

Lime kiln (and fishing paraphernalia), contributing to the ‘working’ character of the western side of the harbour.
### Buildings of local interest

Although the majority of the unlisted historic buildings in the Porthleven Conservation Area have value and make a positive contribution to the conservation area, the following buildings have been identified as making a particularly important contribution and (as the Management Plan discusses further) would therefore be candidates for addition to a local list.

These examples have been chosen either as important local public buildings, or as being especially fine/intact examples which would merit careful handling. They are shown on the map and summarised below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beacon Road</td>
<td>Nos. 26 and 28&lt;br&gt;Row of three cottages between ‘Breage Cliff’ and Nos. 26/28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel Terrace</td>
<td>Nos. 3,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Row</td>
<td>St Bartholomew’s Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliff Road</td>
<td>‘Anchor Cottage’&lt;br&gt;‘Bay Cottage’&lt;br&gt;‘Mounts Bay Cottage’&lt;br&gt;‘Cliff House’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute Hill</td>
<td>Nos. 4,5,6,7&lt;br&gt;‘Sailaway’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loe Bar Road</td>
<td>‘Homeside’&lt;br&gt;‘Sandpiper’&lt;br&gt;‘Trellissick’&lt;br&gt;‘Trebeddow’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Pleasant</td>
<td>Lifeboat slip&lt;br&gt;WW2 pillbox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peverell Terrace</td>
<td>Former Coastguard station&lt;br&gt;War memorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Thomas Terrace</td>
<td>‘Torre Vean’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End</td>
<td>No. 46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scheduled Ancient Monuments/Archaeology

There are no Scheduled Ancient Monuments in Porthleven, according to the CISI report and information from Cornwall Council.
Public realm

‘Public realm’ refers to the appearance of streets and other public spaces. As Conservation Area designation is as much concerned with the character of historic areas in addition to the buildings they contain, it is worth discussing the subject here. In general, streets within Porthleven are working spaces which have developed organically over time, and their appearance is eminently functional. However, there is in some places a somewhat confused and at times cluttered collection of materials and items as a result of piecemeal accretion and repair, notably at the foot of Fore Street, an area which should be celebrated as the gateway to the harbour.
Street surfaces

Many roads in Porthleven are shared by pedestrians and cars, as befits the size of the settlement and the limited amount of traffic which passes through it. Main roads such as Fore Street have separate pavements.

Street surfaces are generally tarmac. Fore Street features attractive historic paving outside Nos. 1–6 with granite kerbs and small cream-coloured bricks each divided into square sections. The kerbs are laid so that they present a wide top surface. Elsewhere, however, Fore Street features a mix of paving: opposite Nos. 1–6, the surface is monoblock brick arranged in a herringbone pattern; elsewhere, conventional slabs have been used. Wellington Road has a mixture of granite kerbs and modern concrete items.
The harbourfront roadway features a mix of materials. To the western side (Breageside), the surface is largely tarmac as befits the working nature of this area. There is an unsurfaced strip adjacent to the dock wall and some areas with historic granite setts. The eastern side (location of the shops and public house) is again largely laid as tarmac, though there is an attractively-cobbled area opposite the public house. By the modern properties of ‘Harbourside’, a concrete surface has been used. Below Bay View Terrace, rubble stone has been used, laid in a ‘crazy paving’ style, perhaps for its ability to withstand rough weather. The elevated path along the front of Bay View Terrace is laid in badly-worn concrete. Shute Hill and The Gue retain historic rainwater drains in small pieces of stone.

Although the over-riding impression is appropriately one of an organic, working area, the results can seem somewhat scruffy in a few places: the foot of Fore Street (adjacent to the harbour), for example.

The low-level seating area on the northern side of the harbour, adjacent to the water, is also degraded.

Railings and street furniture

Utilitarian modern railings were introduced around the dock in recent years to mitigate health and safety concerns. Historic railings survive at the edge of the elevated path along the front of Bay View Terrace, though in extremely poor (even dangerous) condition.

Some historic items of ‘street furniture’ survive and are listed, including a Victorian post box on Beacon Road, and a K6 telephone box by the harbour. Other items, such as the bus shelter by the historic Boat Yard, are more modern.
4.0 Characterisation

Street lighting

Street lighting is provided by a variety of items, including lamp units mounted on telegraph poles and modern standalone street lighting units. These units are of various different designs, something that is all too apparent on the harbourfront where a modern ‘historic’ lamp is located adjacent to one mounted on a telegraph pole.

Coloured lighting is strung around the dock edge, providing a useful function in areas where street lighting is more patchy and giving a festive atmosphere, which is much appreciated by local people and visitors.

Signage

Street signage typically comprises modern plastic units. These are usually mounted on poles, e.g. at the end of Torleven Road. Traffic management (parking) signs are again typically mounted on poles. At the entrance to the dock area by the foot of Fore Street, signs advertise local businesses. This is undoubtedly important, but the results add to the street clutter when considered with the patchwork of surfaces, the string of coloured lights, and the railings.

There is a historic direction sign on Loe Bar Road. Other cast iron signs survive but are generally in poor condition.

Landscape, open space and gardens

There is relatively little public ‘green’ space within the Conservation Area. The principal areas are:

- the grassy area to the immediate north of the harbour, between the dock wall and the main road. It is somewhat cluttered and lacks a clear purpose
- immediately in the vicinity of St Bartholomew’s Church, which has a large graveyard

The harbour is in effect a large public open space, albeit not in the conventional sense of a park. The beach is a further important open space, and is located within the Conservation Area, though it is also separate by virtue of the recent necessary coastal defences which have been built. Green ‘wedges’ on the hillsides, e.g. steeply-sloping land between the back of Bay View Terrace and Peverell Terrace, are also very prominent – although they are private, the contribution that they make is important.

There is open space immediately outside the Conservation Area: the recreation ground on the eastern side of Methleigh Bottoms, for example. Furthermore, Porthleven is situated adjacent to Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and within an Open Area of Local Significance (the latter defined by the Kerrier Local Plan). The agricultural landscape within which the town can be seen on approach from the A394 is an important component of its character. In addition, fields form the backdrop to many views within the town. Breageside, for example, can be seen from beyond the Fore Street Methodist chapel. These views – the product of the way that Porthleven has physically developed and thus its underlying topography – make an important contribution to Porthleven’s character, with agricultural land situated within only minutes of the harbour. To the west, in particular, Porthleven’s boundary has not much changed in over a hundred years.

There is less pressure to lose gardens to parking than is often the case, not least as relatively few properties have front gardens, but in some areas – e.g. Bay View Terrace – they have been altered to create sitting terraces.
Views and landmarks

The harbour is such a strong visual feature that it naturally forms the focus of views, being visible from the higher land around it on which Porthleven has grown up. As was noted in the previous section, views of fields in the valley to the north and on the headlands are also significant as a backdrop to the town.

The hilly topography also means that there are significant views across the harbour from Breageside to Sithneyside (and back). Properties which may not be especially visible at close range are often prominent when viewed from the other side of the harbour. Views of roofs are a particular feature, e.g. from Peverell Terrace and Beacon Road, where it is possible to see the properties at the lower dockside level on the same side of the town as well as those across the harbour.

The principal landmark is the Institute at the end of the pier, a building which has assumed iconic status as a symbol of Porthleven through depictions in the press and on postcards against a backdrop of the stormy sea. The Methodist chapel on Fore Street and St Bartholomew’s church are also visible in many views (especially from the headlands) by virtue of their scale and massing. The Boat Yard and related buildings across the northern end of the dock is prominent in views from the pier and headlands as well as the dockside. Perched high on the headland, the Coastguard building is a further landmark.

The views are shown on the map on the next page. Images on the following page illustrate some of them; photos of key views elsewhere in the document are also numbered as per the map.

In addition, there are significant distant views of Porthleven from the approach roads, e.g. those which come from Helston and Breage.
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This drawing incorporates information from the Ordnance Survey which is © Crown Copyright. ABA Licence: AL1000 17547

Views, landmarks and open spaces

Key:
- Conservation Area Boundary
- Public open space
- Other key open space

A - Institute
B - Coastguard
C - Methodist Chapel
D - St. Bartholomew's Church

1. Church from Methleigh Bottoms
2. Harbour from Methleigh Bottoms
3. Town and fields beyond from Torleven Farm
4. Town and fields beyond from 'Torrevean'
5. Methodist church from Peverell Road
6. Methodist chapel from 'The Square'
7. St. Bartholomew's Church from 'The Square'
8. Harbour from 'The Square'
9. Harbour from Boat Yard
10. Methodist Chapel from the 'Smoke House Next Door'
11. Harbour and Institute from 'Smoke House Next Door'
12. Town and Coastguard from Ship Inn
13. Institute from Ship Inn
14. Institute from Mount Pleasant Road
15. Headland from Ocean View
16. Harbour and Boatyard from pier end
17. Institute and Coastguard Station from pier end
18. Headland from Pier end
19. Institute from Loe Bar Road
20. Pier from Peverell Terrace
21. Methodist Chapel from Peverell Terrace
22. Town and Breageside from Salt Hill
23. Methodist Chapel from Salt Hill
24. Harbour from St Bartholomew's Church
25. 'Ship Inn' and Beacon Road from the Institute
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Town and fields beyond from Torleven Farm

Town and fields beyond from ‘Torrevean’

Methodist chapel from ‘The Square’

Harbour from Boat Yard

Methodist chapel from the ‘Smoke House Next Door’

Institute from Ship Inn

Institute from Mount Pleasant Road

Pier from Peverell Terrace

Town and Breageside from Salt Cellar Hill
5.0 Issues and opportunities

Porthleven enjoys a rich heritage, as the number of listed buildings in the Conservation Area demonstrates. Historic buildings are largely well-maintained, if sometimes spoiled by the uncritical replacement of windows with non-matching uPVC items or the application of incongruous render/cement pointing. Relatively few buildings are deemed to detract unduly from the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, though the presence of rather prominent modern housing within and adjacent to the area can detract from its setting.
5.0 Issues and opportunities

Boundary of the Conservation Area

The Porthleven Conservation Area comprises the vast majority of the historic settlement. No extension or change is proposed as a result of the assessment on which this Appraisal is based.

Buildings which detract from the Conservation Area, buildings at risk, and opportunity sites

Several buildings at risk were noted during the field visit on which this Appraisal is based:

- Loe Bar Road: Holiday cottage office adjacent to Loe Bar Flats
- Methleigh Bottoms: Accountant’s office and adjacent building, former warehouse converted to flats at junction with Harbour View/Beacon Road
- Mount Pleasant Road: Former lifeboat station
- Peverell Terrace: Nos. 7&8 (listed)
- Thomas Terrace: Building at the head of the street, near the junction with Wellington Road

In addition, the harbour wall is failing at points: part has collapsed in the Inner Harbour, and towards the pier, blocks are linked with rusting iron ties. The retaining wall below Bay View Terrace is also failing.

Several buildings which detract from the character and appearance of the Conservation Area were noted. Although in good condition and productive use, where works in the longer term present opportunities to make the buildings more in keeping with their neighbours, these are encouraged. Demolition would be appropriate if replacement would make a more positive contribution to the appearance of the Conservation Area or its setting. These buildings are shown on the map and are listed below:

- Cliff Road: ‘Hendy House’ and adjacent properties
- Elliston Gardens: All properties
- Forth Scol: Modern properties leading towards ‘Torre Vean’
- Harbour: Garages behind the lime kiln
- Holman’s Place: Modern properties behind no.2, backing onto Elliston Gardens
- Loe Bar Rd: Loe Bar Flats
- Peverell Terrace: New property opposite ‘Tremorlan’
- St Peter’s Way: The properties on the north-western side of the street above Peverell Terrace loom somewhat in views of the Conservation Area, though they are outside it.

In addition to the buildings listed above, where remodelling or replacement would present an opportunity to enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, there are various vacant or underused sites which offer opportunities to achieve the same objective provided that they are tackled in a sensitive fashion which respects the historic character, grain and appearance of the Conservation Area as defined in this Appraisal:

- Cliff Road: Beachfield car park
- Harbour: Sites on the western dockside, around the historic lime kiln and the warehouse buildings, and including the former lifeboat station.
- Boat Yard site. This is currently in productive use by various bodies, including a garage, and ideally such use should remain. However, there are some open areas which could be reworked – perhaps as public recreation space. As the Management Strategy discusses, any development here will need to be very sensitively handled, given the prominence of this site
- Mount’s Yard: former quarry, currently used as parking.
Public realm issues

As has been noted, Porthleven’s public realm is largely functional and reflects the village status of this settlement. However, the area at the foot of Fore Street could productively be improved, as might the eastern dock which is currently much used for parking, with conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles. In particular, pedestrians are forced onto a narrow chained-off pavement for part of the dockside. This subject is discussed further in the Management Strategy, which notes that a balance needs to be struck as the kind of major public realm works which would be appropriate in a larger town would not necessarily be appropriate here; they would spoil Porthleven’s organic, rural qualities if not carefully implemented.

Sustainability

Climate change is probably the greatest long-term challenge facing the human race, and the UK Government has made a number of commitments to reduce carbon emissions, which are believed to contribute to climate change. Current targets are to reduce carbon dioxide emissions by 20% (of 1990 levels) by 2010, and by 60% by 2050.

Operational energy in buildings (to heat, ventilate and light them, etc) accounts for 46% of the UK’s carbon dioxide emissions, and so in order to meet these targets it is critical that every household and business take measures to reduce energy use in their buildings. Part L of the Building Regulations came into force in 2002 and seeks to improve the energy efficiency of buildings. There are also progressive targets for carbon emissions from the construction and operation of new buildings (Ecohomes and Code for Sustainable Homes).

However, there is a risk that measures to improve the energy efficiency of historic buildings could damage or destroy their historic and architectural significance, and so it is an issue as well as an opportunity. For example, the installation of renewable energy equipment on buildings, such as wind turbines, solar water heating and photovoltaic cells, could have an adverse effect on the Conservation Area. There is also the perception that uPVC windows are more energy efficient (the sustainability of uPVC windows is a complex issue and is discussed further elsewhere in this document) but the installation of these is usually detrimental to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Therefore, the application of Part L is at the discretion of building control and Conservation Officers where it would otherwise threaten special character, as described in the inset. That said, a balance needs to be struck, and it is important that the local authorities, residents and businesses make serious efforts to reduce carbon emissions. Recommendations of how this might be achieved are set out in the management strategy section.
Part Two – Management Strategy
Rann Dew – Framweyth Dyghtya
Character areas

From the preceding discussion, we can distil three distinct character areas on the basis of settlement form, building type, and architectural detailing:

- **Harbour:** a mixture of ‘rugged’ light industrial, warehouse, and retail properties, united by their common focus on (and views of) the harbour. A few residential properties, at the headland ends of the harbour, including the high-grade architecture of Bay View Terrace. This character area can be exposed to extremes of weather: wind, spray, and the smell of the sea. Within it, there is a distinct difference between the eastern side of the harbour (where the bulk of the tourist/visitor facilities and attractions are located) and the northern/western side (a primarily ‘working’ area, with historic warehouse buildings, workshops on the Boat Yard site, a utilitarian public realm, and ‘parking for fishermen’ signs). Breageside (e.g. Beacon Road) is especially tranquil; some houses have attractive chimneys, ironwork and timber porches. The physical disconnection between the two sides of the harbour, and their different functions, is an important part of their character.

- **Village:** more sheltered, this part of Porthleven developed away from the harbour (though still connected with it) in the nineteenth century. Its street layout and buildings give it a dense, more ‘urban’ feel. There are two distinct sub-areas, both of which reflect the conscious development of this area in response to that of the harbour: pre-1840 rows (e.g. Chapel Terrace) and villas on the one hand, and more formal, ‘urban’ terraces of slightly later date (Thomas Street, Peverell Road) on the other. Building types comprise a mixture of houses at various but related scales, plus retail and institutional uses. Properties typically are closely-packed, either fronting the street or with small gardens (e.g. Unity Road, where there are walled front gardens). Many are rendered and painted.

- **Seaside:** the historic Sithneyside area, predominantly residential and comprising a mixture of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century cottages arranged in an informal but close pattern along the coastal path/road which contrasts with the slightly more ‘urban’ planned rows and terraces of the ‘village’ area. Away from the harbour, this area is also characterised by the sight, smell and sound of the sea breaking on the sands beneath. Properties are often painted/rendered, and some have attractive wooden porches with stained glass. Historically, fishing-related functions such as netmaking also took place here.

These areas are illustrated overleaf.
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The drawing incorporates information from Ordnance Survey which is © Crown Copyright. ABA Licence: AL1000 17547

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Area Boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Harbour’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Seaside’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Village’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Listed buildings**

The quality of many of the historic buildings in Porthleven has been recognised and a good number – including the harbour walls – are statutorily listed. Listing is not a preservation order but an identification stage where buildings are marked as having exceptional architectural or historic interest. Listed building consent is required in addition to planning permission for changes. The definitions of the various ‘grades’ used are as follows:

Grade I: buildings of outstanding architectural or historic interest.

Grade II*: particularly significant buildings of more than local interest.

Grade II: buildings of special architectural or historic interest. The vast majority of buildings are listed at this grade.

Listed buildings are shown on the map, and include the following (drawn from the CISI survey of Porthleven and cross-checked with English Heritage’s online lists):

**KEY:**

- Conservation Area Boundary
- Grade II* listed building
- Grade II listed building
- Building of local importance (potentially locally listed)
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Grade II*

Fore Street: Methodist Chapel

Bay View Terrace: Nos. 1–18

Beacon Road: Boundary stone

‘Breage Cliff’ and Victorian postbox in adjoining wall

Chapel Terrace: Wesley Chapel

No. 12

Commercial Road: Nos. 1&2

Fore Street: Chapel-keeper’s house

Harbour: Harbour walls and piers (incl. Wharfs, jetties, bollards)

(listed anti-clockwise)

Bickford Smith Institute

Old Custom House

The Harbour Inn

Memorial lamp

K6 type telephone kiosk

China clay store (three round-arched entrances)

Warehouse on west side of harbour

Lime kiln

Ship Inn and adjacent former smithy

Holman’s Place: ‘Mount Cottage’

Loe Bar Road: ‘Ring’o’Bright Water’ (aka ‘Tamarisk’)

‘Strawtop’

Fisherman’s cabin opposite no.1.

Peverell Terrace: Methodist chapel (now converted to residential use)

Nos. 7&8

Salt Cellar Hill: Salt warehouse (north side)

Preachers Hill:

(aka Torleven Road): Torleven Farmhouse

Wellington Road: ‘Torleven’

Lime kiln (and fishing paraphernalia), contributing to the ‘working’ character of the western side of the harbour.
Buildings of local interest

Although the majority of the unlisted historic buildings in the Porthleven Conservation Area have value and make a positive contribution to the conservation area, the following buildings have been identified as making a particularly important contribution and (as the Management Plan discusses further) would therefore be candidates for addition to a local list.

These examples have been chosen either as important local public buildings, or as being especially fine/intact examples which would merit careful handling. They are shown on the map and summarised below.

Beacon Road: Nos. 26 and 28
Row of three cottages between ‘Breage Cliff’ and Nos. 26/28

Chapel Terrace: Nos. 3, 5, 6

Church Row: St Bartholomew’s Church

Cliff Road: ‘Anchor Cottage’
‘Bay Cottage’
‘Mounts Bay Cottage’
‘Cliff House

Institute Hill: Nos. 4,5,6,7
‘Sailaway’

Loe Bar Road: ‘Homeside’
‘Sandpiper’
‘Trellissick’
‘Trebeddow’

Mount Pleasant Road: Lifeboat slip
WW2 pillbox

Peverell Terrace: Former Coastguard station
War memorial

Off Thomas Terrace: ‘Torre Vean’

West End: No. 46

Scheduled Ancient Monuments/Archaeology

There are no Scheduled Ancient Monuments in Porthleven, according to the CISI report and information from Cornwall Council.
Public realm

‘Public realm’ refers to the appearance of streets and other public spaces. As Conservation Area designation is as much concerned with the character of historic areas in addition to the buildings they contain, it is worth discussing the subject here. In general, streets within Porthleven are working spaces which have developed organically over time, and their appearance is eminently functional. However, there is in some places a somewhat confused and at times cluttered collection of materials and items as a result of piecemeal accretion and repair, notably at the foot of Fore Street, an area which should be celebrated as the gateway to the harbour.

Former Coastguard station, a landmark building looking out to sea

No. 46 West End, with attractive ironwork, chimneys and stone detailing

World War Two pillbox, facing out to sea at the entrance to the harbour

‘Sailaway Cottage’, Institute Hill

‘Trelissick’, Loe Bar Road

Former lifeboat station

Former lifeboat station
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Street surfaces

Many roads in Porthleven are shared by pedestrians and cars, as befits the size of the settlement and the limited amount of traffic which passes through it. Main roads such as Fore Street have separate pavements.

Street surfaces are generally tarmac. Fore Street features attractive historic paving outside Nos. 1–6 with granite kerbs and small cream-coloured bricks each divided into square sections. The kerbs are laid so that they present a wide top surface. Elsewhere, however, Fore Street features a mix of paving: opposite Nos. 1–6, the surface is monoblock brick arranged in a herringbone pattern; elsewhere, conventional slabs have been used. Wellington Road has a mixture of granite kerbs and modern concrete items.
The harbourfront roadway features a mix of materials. To the western side (Breageside), the surface is largely tarmac as befits the working nature of this area. There is an unsurfaced strip adjacent to the dock wall and some areas with historic granite setts. The eastern side (location of the shops and public house) is again largely laid as tarmac, though there is an attractively-cobbled area opposite the public house. By the modern properties of ‘Harbourside’, a concrete surface has been used. Below Bay View Terrace, rubble stone has been used, laid in a ‘crazy paving’ style, perhaps for its ability to withstand rough weather. The elevated path along the front of Bay View Terrace is laid in badly-worn concrete. Shute Hill and The Gue retain historic rainwater drains in small pieces of stone.

Although the over-riding impression is appropriately one of an organic, working area, the results can seem somewhat scruffy in a few places: the foot of Fore Street (adjacent to the harbour), for example. The low-level seating area on the northern side of the harbour, adjacent to the water, is also degraded.

Railings and street furniture

Utilitarian modern railings were introduced around the dock in recent years to mitigate health and safety concerns. Historic railings survive at the edge of the elevated path along the front of Bay View Terrace, though in extremely poor (even dangerous) condition.

Some historic items of ‘street furniture’ survive and are listed, including a Victorian post box on Beacon Road, and a K6 telephone box by the harbour. Other items, such as the bus shelter by the historic Boat Yard, are more modern.
Street lighting

Street lighting is provided by a variety of items, including lamp units mounted on telegraph poles and modern standalone street lighting units. These units are of various different designs, something that is all too apparent on the harbourfront where a modern ‘historic’ lamp is located adjacent to one mounted on a telegraph pole.

Coloured lighting is strung around the dock edge, providing a useful function in areas where street lighting is more patchy and giving a festive atmosphere, which is much appreciated by local people and visitors.

Signage

Street signage typically comprises modern plastic units. These are usually mounted on poles, e.g. at the end of Torleven Road. Traffic management (parking) signs are again typically mounted on poles. At the entrance to the dock area by the foot of Fore Street, signs advertise local businesses. This is undoubtedly important, but the results add to the street clutter when considered with the patchwork of surfaces, the string of coloured lights, and the railings.

There is a historic direction sign on Loe Bar Road. Other cast iron signs survive but are generally in poor condition.

Landscape, open space and gardens

There is relatively little public ‘green’ space within the Conservation Area. The principal areas are:

- the grassy area to the immediate north of the harbour, between the dock wall and the main road. It is somewhat cluttered and lacks a clear purpose
- immediately in the vicinity of St Bartholomew’s Church, which has a large graveyard

The harbour is in effect a large public open space, albeit not in the conventional sense of a park. The beach is a further important open space, and is located within the Conservation Area, though it is also separate by virtue of the recent necessary coastal defences which have been built. Green ‘wedges’ on the hillsides, e.g. steeply-sloping land between the back of Bay View Terrace and Peverell Terrace, are also very prominent – although they are private, the contribution that they make is important.

There is open space immediately outside the Conservation Area: the recreation ground on the eastern side of Methleigh Bottoms, for example. Furthermore, Porthleven is situated adjacent to Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and within an Open Area of Local Significance (the latter defined by the Kerrier Local Plan). The agricultural landscape within which the town can be seen on approach from the A394 is an important component of its character. In addition, fields form the backdrop to many views within the town. Breageside, for example, can be seen from beyond the Fore Street Methodist chapel. These views – the product of the way that Porthleven has physically developed and thus its underlying topography – make an important contribution to Porthleven’s character, with agricultural land situated within only minutes of the harbour. To the west, in particular, Porthleven’s boundary has not much changed in over a hundred years.

There is less pressure to lose gardens to parking than is often the case, not least as relatively few properties have front gardens, but in some areas – e.g. Bay View Terrace – they have been altered to create sitting terraces.
Views and landmarks

The harbour is such a strong visual feature that it naturally forms the focus of views, being visible from the higher land around it on which Porthleven has grown up. As was noted in the previous section, views of fields in the valley to the north and on the headlands are also significant as a backdrop to the town.

The hilly topography also means that there are significant views across the harbour from Breageside to Sithneyside (and back). Properties which may not be especially visible at close range are often prominent when viewed from the other side of the harbour. Views of roofs are a particular feature, e.g. from Peverell Terrace and Beacon Road, where it is possible to see the properties at the lower dockside level on the same side of the town as well as those across the harbour.

The principal landmark is the Institute at the end of the pier, a building which has assumed iconic status as a symbol of Porthleven through depictions in the press and on postcards against a backdrop of the stormy sea. The Methodist chapel on Fore Street and St Bartholomew’s church are also visible in many views (especially from the headlands) by virtue of their scale and massing. The Boat Yard and related buildings across the northern end of the dock is prominent in views from the pier and headlands as well as the dockside. Perched high on the headland, the Coastguard building is a further landmark.

The views are shown on the map on the next page. Images on the following page illustrate some of them; photos of key views elsewhere in the document are also numbered as per the map.

In addition, there are significant distant views of Porthleven from the approach roads, e.g. those which come from Helston and Breage.
4.0 Characterisation

This drawing incorporates information from the Ordnance Survey which is © Crown Copyright. ABA Licence: AL1000 17547

Views, landmarks and open spaces

KEY:
- Conservation Area Boundary
- Public open space
- Other key open space
- Institute
- Coastguard
- Methodist Chapel
- St. Bartholomew's Church

1. Church from Methleigh Bottoms
2. Harbour from Methleigh Bottoms
3. Town and fields beyond from Torleven Farm
4. Town and fields beyond from 'Torrevean'
5. Methodist church from Peverell Road
6. Methodist chapel from 'The Square'
7. St. Bartholomew's Church from 'The Square'
8. Harbour from 'The Square'
9. Harbour from Boat Yard
10. Methodist Chapel from the 'Smoke House Next Door'
11. Harbour and Institute from 'Smoke House Next Door'
12. Town and Coastguard from Ship Inn
13. Institute from Ship Inn
14. Institute from Mount Pleasant Road
15. Headland from Ocean View
16. Harbour and Boatyard from pier end
17. Institute and Coastguard Station from pier end
18. Headland from Pier end
19. Institute from Loe Bar Road
20. Pier from Peverell Terrace
21. Methodist Chapel from Peverell Terrace
22. Town and Breageside from Salt Hill
23. Methodist Chapel from Salt Hill
24. Harbour from St Bartholomew's Church
25. 'Ship Inn' and Beacon Road from the Institute
Town and fields beyond from Torleven Farm

Town and fields beyond from ’Torrevean’

Methodist chapel from ’The Square’

Harbour from Boat Yard

Methodist chapel from the ’Smoke House Next Door’

Institute from Ship Inn

Institute from Mount Pleasant Road

Pier from Peverell Terrace

Town and Breageside from Salt Cellar Hill
Porthleven enjoys a rich heritage, as the number of listed buildings in the Conservation Area demonstrates. Historic buildings are largely well-maintained, if sometimes spoiled by the uncritical replacement of windows with non-matching uPVC items or the application of incongruous render/cement pointing. Relatively few buildings are deemed to detract unduly from the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, though the presence of rather prominent modern housing within and adjacent to the area can detract from its setting.
Boundary of the Conservation Area

The Porthleven Conservation Area comprises the vast majority of the historic settlement. No extension or change is proposed as a result of the assessment on which this Appraisal is based.

Buildings which detract from the Conservation Area, buildings at risk, and opportunity sites

Several buildings at risk were noted during the field visit on which this Appraisal is based:

- Loe Bar Road: Holiday cottage office adjacent to Loe Bar Flats
- Methleigh Bottoms: Accountant’s office and adjacent building, Former warehouse converted to flats at junction with Harbour View/Beacon Road
- Mount Pleasant Road: Former lifeboat station
- Peverell Terrace: Nos. 7&8 (listed)
- Thomas Terrace: Building at the head of the street, near the junction with Wellington Road

In addition, the harbour wall is failing at points: part has collapsed in the Inner Harbour, and towards the pier, blocks are linked with rusting iron ties. The retaining wall below Bay View Terrace is also failing.

Several buildings which detract from the character and appearance of the Conservation Area were noted. Although in good condition and productive use, where works in the longer term present opportunities to make the buildings more in keeping with their neighbours, these are encouraged. Demolition would be appropriate if replacement would make a more positive contribution to the appearance of the Conservation Area or its setting. These buildings are shown on the map and are listed below:

- Cliff Road: ‘Hendy House’ and adjacent properties
- Elliston Gardens: All properties
- Forth Scol: Modern properties leading towards ‘Torre Vean’
- Harbour: Garages behind the lime kiln
- Holman’s Place: Modern properties behind no.2, backing onto Elliston Gardens
- Loe Bar Rd: Loe Bar Flats
- Peverell Terrace: New property opposite ‘Tremorlan’
- St Peter’s Way: The properties on the north-western side of the street above Peverell Terrace loom somewhat in views of the Conservation Area, though they are outside it.

In addition, the buildings listed above, where remodelling or replacement would present an opportunity to enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, there are various vacant or underused sites which offer opportunities to achieve the same objective provided that they are tackled in a sensitive fashion which respects the historic character, grain and appearance of the Conservation Area as defined in this Appraisal:

- Cliff Road: Beachfield car park
- Torleven Rd/Wellington Road: Modern houses behind ‘Torleven’ – outside the C.A. but impacting on its setting
- Harbour: Sites on the western dockside, around the historic lime kiln and the warehouse buildings, and including the former lifeboat station. Boat Yard site. This is currently in productive use by various bodies, including a garage, and ideally such use should remain. However, there are some open areas which could be reworked – perhaps as public recreation space. As the Management Strategy discusses, any development here will need to be very sensitively handled, given the prominence of this site
- Mount’s Yard: former quarry, currently used as parking.

Kerrier District Local Plan

B EN12 Demolition will be permitted where the structure to be demolished makes no significant contribution to the character or appearance of the area and detailed proposals for the re-use or redevelopment of the site have been approved

Planning Policy Guidance 15, para. 4.17:
Many Conservation Areas include gap sites, or buildings that make no positive contribution, or indeed detract from the character and appearance of the area: their replacement should be a stimulus to imaginative, high quality design, and should be seen as an opportunity to enhance the area. What is important is not that new buildings should imitate earlier styles, but that they should be designed with respect for their context, as part of a larger whole which has a well-established character of its own.
Public realm issues

As has been noted, Porthleven’s public realm is largely functional and reflects the village status of this settlement. However, the area at the foot of Fore Street could productively be improved, as might the eastern dock which is currently much used for parking, with conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles. In particular, pedestrians are forced onto a narrow chained-off pavement for part of the dockside. This subject is discussed further in the Management Strategy, which notes that a balance needs to be struck as the kind of major public realm works which would be appropriate in a larger town would not necessarily be appropriate here: they would spoil Porthleven’s organic, rural qualities if not carefully implemented.

Sustainability

Climate change is probably the greatest long-term challenge facing the human race, and the UK Government has made a number of commitments to reduce carbon emissions, which are believed to contribute to climate change. Current targets are to reduce carbon dioxide emissions by 20% (of 1990 levels) by 2010, and by 60% by 2050.

Operational energy in buildings (to heat, ventilate and light them, etc) accounts for 46% of the UK’s carbon dioxide emissions, and so in order to meet these targets it is critical that every household and business take measures to reduce energy use in their buildings. Part L of the Building Regulations came into force in 2002 and seeks to improve the energy efficiency of buildings. There are also progressive targets for carbon emissions from the construction and operation of new buildings (Ecohomes and Code for Sustainable Homes).

However, there is a risk that measures to improve the energy efficiency of historic buildings could damage or destroy their historic and architectural significance, and so it is an issue as well as an opportunity. For example, the installation of renewable energy equipment on buildings, such as wind turbines, solar water heating and photovoltaic cells, could have an adverse effect on the Conservation Area. There is also the perception that uPVC windows are more energy efficient (the sustainability of uPVC windows is a complex issue and is discussed further elsewhere in this document) but the installation of these is usually detrimental to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Therefore, the application of Part L is at the discretion of building control and Conservation Officers where it would otherwise threaten special character, as described in the inset. That said, a balance needs to be struck, and it is important that the local authorities, residents and businesses make serious efforts to reduce carbon emissions. Recommendations of how this might be achieved are set out in the management strategy section.

Building Regulations Part L1. Sections 2.9–2.11:

2.9 Historic buildings include -

a) listed buildings;

b) buildings situated in conservation areas,

c) buildings which are of architectural and historical interest and which are referred to as a material consideration in a local authority’s development plan,

d) buildings of architectural and historical interest within national parks, areas of outstanding natural beauty, and world heritage sites.

2.10 The need to conserve the special characteristics of such historic buildings needs to be recognised. In such work, the aim should be to improve energy efficiency where and to the extent that it is practically possible, always provided that the work does not prejudice the character of the historic building, or increase the risk to the long-term deterioration to the building fabric or fittings. In arriving at an appropriate balance between historic building conservation and energy consumption, it would be appropriate to take into account the advice of the local planning authority’s conservation officer.
Part Two – Management Strategy
Rann Dew – Framweyth Dyghtya
6.0 Introduction

This Management Strategy develops the findings of the Appraisal to consider how best the special character and appearance of the Porthleven Conservation Area can be protected and enhanced. It begins with an outline of the strengths and weaknesses of the conservation area, and the opportunities and threats facing it. The second section then considers how the character and appearance of the conservation area could be maintained and enhanced, referring to general and specific issues. The third section sets out the ways in which the Conservation Area is and can be protected by statutory and local means. The final section considers how this plan can be implemented.

Although some of the action points are particularly relevant to the local authority, working with local organisations and groups, the strategy is intended for everyone who lives or works in Porthleven, as well as those who visit it. Like the Appraisal, it is the product of local consultation and discussion. It is intended as a practical, achievable document, not a set of empty aspirations.
7.0 Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats

Strengths and weaknesses

The significant qualities of the Porthleven Conservation Area can be traced to its good-quality eighteenth and nineteenth-century buildings, especially around the harbour. Other important strengths are:

- its attractive topographical setting, in terms not only of the adjacent coastline and sea but also the inland agricultural areas, many of which are visible in views from Porthleven;
- good retail sector, despite Porthleven’s proximity to Helston, with a mixture of valuable local facilities (e.g. the supermarket) and shops for tourists;
- strong heritage;
- good transport links (e.g. hourly bus to Helston and Penzance);
- strong sense of community;
- varied range of housing, from small cottages to larger houses.

Weaknesses can be linked with Porthleven’s economic profile as well as its location:

- absence of many local employment opportunities, with many people commuting to Helston or further afield;
- dependence on motor vehicles to travel to work/shopping – a weakness experienced by many rural settlements compounded here by poor traffic management;
- the Porthleven valley has been identified as a flood risk zone by the Environment Agency. This zone includes the recreation ground;
- Porthleven ward falls within the 20% most deprived wards in England (2001);
- Significant number of second homes (resulting in a seasonal population);
- lack of affordable home.
Opportunities and threats

Porthleven already is a significant tourist centre, but the town’s attractive coastal setting, its mining heritage, and its pleasant townscape could further drive growth in this sector throughout the year. Tourism could be promoted in tandem with the regular Penzance-Helston-Falmouth bus route which runs through the town and which would be of use to walkers. There is scope for a local trail, perhaps based on the mining heritage of the area (as has been done elsewhere in Cornwall), or providing an enhanced walking/cycling route to Helston. Such routes would develop the good interpretative material available in the church and take advantage of public footpaths. New buildings (residential/retail/entertainment) offer an opportunity to enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area, for example by reusing dockside buildings, and will also provide local employment opportunities.

There is an opportunity to open the pier, in good weather and subject to appropriately-designed railings, so that visitors and residents can enjoy views of the harbour.

Equally, however, demand for new building could be characterised as a threat to Porthleven, if inappropriate designs or conversion detract from its special qualities as a historic port. Many netlofts have been unsympathetically converted. Similarly, the growing number of second homes in Porthleven could skew the local economy in a particularly seasonal direction, whilst also pricing local people out of the market. There is some pressure to add new cottages at the rear of historic properties. Extra tourism may also strain the limited parking provision which currently exists.

The fact that the harbour and dockside roads are privately-owned (though with public access) is both an opportunity (the landowner may be able to invest to a greater degree than the local authority) but also could be a threat. Ambiguities about land ownership elsewhere (e.g. Bay View Terrace) mean that the path and wall have become dangerous. Aerials and satellite dishes blight some streets. Poor traffic management poses threats: congestion, parking, speeding.
In general, the Porthleven Conservation Area is attractive and well-maintained, but even the best places can always be improved. This section looks at how the character and appearance of the Conservation Area could be thus enhanced. English Heritage’s Guidance on the Management of Conservation Areas states that enhancement can take two principal forms:

- the sympathetic redevelopment of sites defined in the detailed Appraisal of the area as detracting from its character or appearance
- pro-active proposals, such as the management and repair of a designed historic landscape, a scheme for the restoration of distinctive architectural features or traditional shop fronts, the reinstatement of historic surfaces, or the reduction of traffic intrusion and the rationalisation of street signage.

The action points set out within this section have been developed with the English Heritage guidance in mind. ‘Public realm’ points are directed particularly at the local authority, but the second half of what follows is also for local residents and businesses.

### Public realm

The Conservation Area Appraisal noted that the public realm in Porthleven has an informal, functional quality which reflects the size of the settlement and its origins as a working port. Major works of the kind which would be appropriate in a town or city centre, such as the wholesale replacement of paving materials, are unlikely to find favour or indeed funding in the immediate term: it would be easy to spoil the character of the area.

The character of the streetscape can be used to enhance and celebrate its distinctive features and buildings. Equally, it could become fragmented due to incremental changes and a lack of strategic thinking about the streetscape as a whole, and how individual parts relate to that whole. It is essential that a holistic approach to the public realm informs proposals for its improvement, as well as any essential maintenance/repair works, so that it does not become degraded. This will involve the various local authority departments who may be responsible for the town, as well as the utility companies, private contractors, and property owners, not least the Harbour & Dock Company. The ‘De Facto’ study recommended the public realm enhancements as a way to stimulate civic pride.

### Principles:

1.1 A considered, holistic approach to the public realm should be adopted, even where works are relatively minor in scale, such that its character and appearance, as defined in this document, is not compromised. Works to the public realm should enhance the special character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

1.2 Any proposals affecting the public realm should be developed with reference to key guidance documents, such as:

- Streets for All: South West (English Heritage, 2005)
- Paving the Way (CABE, 2002)
In a rural setting, elaborate repaving schemes covering the entire Conservation Area are unlikely to be practical, financially feasible, or aesthetically desirable: there are undoubtedly greater priorities elsewhere. Major works could indeed be seen to ‘sanitise’ the neighbourhood by removing its informal qualities. However, targeted interventions at key strategic points could be beneficial to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and may also assist in traffic management. Even if the public realm is not altered significantly in the immediate future, it is important to make sure that it is not allowed to degrade. In particular, the Local Authority and its partners should ensure that roadworks and installations by the utility companies do not damage the setting of historic buildings.

**Principles:**

1.3 There should be a presumption in favour of the retention or reinstatement of historic, local paving materials (such as granite kerbstones and cobbles) where appropriate within the Conservation Area.

1.4 Modern materials, such as monoblock brick paving, should be avoided.

1.5 Essential roadworks and utility company installations should not compromise or degrade the public realm, whether historic or not, and that surfaces should be correctly reinstated upon completion. The Local Authority should make maximum use of its powers under the New Roads and Streetworks Act to inspect works by utility companies and to apply financial penalties in cases where reinstatement is inadequate.

**Action:**

Particular points where work should be prioritised are as follows. These works will involve the local authority and local partners, such as the Town Council and Harbour Company.

- **Fore Street**, where the present mixture of materials could be rationalised to complement the attractive historic paving slabs outside Nos. 1-6. Enhancement would also present an opportunity to implement traffic calming by giving priority to pedestrians, though such measures should not involve the loss of historic kerbs/paving.

- **‘The Square’,** at the junction of Fore Street and the dockside, which should be celebrated as the gateway to the town centre, in conjunction with other works as discussed in subsequent sections. Enhancement should give priority to pedestrians and could be coupled to improvements to the adjacent grassed area.

- The northern and eastern harbourside, where an improved paving scheme could replace the existing tarmac and concrete surfaces. Some small removal of parking in order to minimise pedestrian/vehicle conflict would further enhance the pedestrian experience by creating a ‘shared surface’ without the current distinction between pavement and road as occurs for part of this area. Such works would denote this side of the dock as the key ‘visitor’ area in contrast to the more ‘working’ side opposite, where the current functional surfaces should be maintained. In conjunction with these works, the pier could be opened (in good weather, and subject to health and safety clearance).

- **Bay View Terrace**: repairs to the failing retaining wall, railings, steps and path. The ambiguous ownership of this area will need to be resolved to allow these urgent works to proceed.
Signage

Much of Porthleven is not characterised by a plethora of signage, though there are some intrusively large traffic signs (e.g. at the foot of Methleigh Bottoms) and a rather cluttered arrangement of advertising at ‘the Square’ which could be improved whilst performing much the same function.

Principles:

1.6 Street and traffic signage should be carefully located, and mounted on walls or existing posts (e.g. telegraph poles) rather than new posts where this is possible without damaging historic built fabric.

1.7 Signage design should complement the qualities of the Conservation Area: standard solutions e.g. for street nameplates should be avoided as far as is practical where this would not be the case.

1.8 Signs or street markings should be avoided wherever other, less intrusive measures (such as changes in road surface) could be taken.

Action:

The local authority, Harbour & Dock Company, Town Council and local business owners should work to improve the advertising signage at ‘the Square’ as a matter of priority.

Interpretative signage outlining aspects of Porthleven’s history could be further deployed.

Lighting

Street lighting in Porthleven is currently provided by a variety of means: standalone lamp posts, lamps mounted on telegraph poles, and coloured lights strung between poles around the harbour. Where new fittings are introduced, the use of standard catalogue items should be avoided in favour of designs which – whether historic or, where suitable, contemporary – complement the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in their form and scale. The continued mounting of light units on telegraph poles or onto walls (where this will not damage buildings) may well be the best way to avoid clutter away from the dockside.

Principles:

1.9 The size and scale of street lighting fixtures should respond to the height of the surrounding buildings.

1.10 Tall structures which tower above the street should be avoided where other solutions would achieve the required level of lighting.

1.11 Where possible, fittings should be incorporated into the existing fabric, using wall mountings (subject to appropriate consents), but should be designed to avoid damage to historic buildings as well as being appropriate in scale.

1.12 The provision and style of lighting should recognise the character of Porthleven as a working harbour and historic port, not an urban area.

Action:

The local authority should develop an integrated lighting strategy for Porthleven, working in conjunction with the Town Council and other local stakeholders such as the Harbour & Dock Company, and those responsible for the coloured harbourside lighting.

The strategy should include:

• consideration of street lighting (design/location)
• options for feature lighting of key buildings/landmarks
• options to enhance the popular coloured lights.

Street furniture and art

The effective use of ‘street furniture’ presents the opportunity to create a lively, attractive public realm. A good example of the benefits which well-designed street furniture can provide is found in Helston, adjacent to the Guildhall, where a curved stone bench responds to its site and the prevailing local palette of materials. In Porthleven, the grassed area at the northern end of the harbour may be a good candidate for similar enhancement in the medium term, perhaps with the introduction of an artwork celebrating local history.

Necessary items, such as railings, benches and litter bins should be considered in a holistic way: standard catalogue items should be avoided and the location of these items carefully considered.

Again, the fact that Porthleven is a rural settlement and working harbour should guide the level and style of interventions.

Principles:

1.13 The style and location of benches, litter bins, railings, bus shelters, and other essential items of street furniture should respect the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in their design, be that historic or, where appropriate, contemporary.

1.14 Standard ‘catalogue’ items should be avoided in favour of designs which echo (and ideally imaginatively re-interpret) local traditions and which complement their setting.

1.15 New street furniture should not create intrusive visual ‘clutter’ and should be carefully located in relation to historic buildings, spaces and views.

1.16 Where ‘boxes’ are required to house controls for electronic telephone equipment; these should be located as unobtrusively as practically possible and should be detailed so that they do not detract from the Conservation Area’s character or appearance.

Action:

The railings separating the footpath of Bay View Terrace from the harbourside below should be repaired and as a matter of priority. If replacements are required to meet the relevant Health and Safety guidelines, a sympathetic design should be developed.

Any possible reworking of ‘The Square’ (see above) could productively incorporate a work of art, reflecting the historic use of this area as a focal place of commemoration that is evident in the existing lantern.
Landscape, planting and green space

The Appraisal noted that there is relatively little public open space within the Conservation Area, other than the harbour, its quaysides and the beach, but that there are significant areas of recreational ground immediately outside the Conservation Area. The agricultural land which forms the setting for Porthleven plays an important role in generating the character of the town through its omnipresence in views. It has been recognised by the designation of an Open Area of Local Significance in the Kerrier District Local Plan. In addition, there are green ‘wedges’ created by hillsides on which building is impossible above harbourside housing (Peverell Terrace/Bay View Terrace, Beacon Road/Mount Pleasant Road).

Principles:

2.1 Property owners across the whole Conservation Area should maintain and enhance their gardens.

2.2 The Local Authority and their local partners (where appropriate) should work to maintain and enhance the appearance of public open space.

2.3 Proposals for development which would affect Porthleven’s important landscape setting should be carefully reviewed in the light of the relevant Kerrier Local Plan Policies, especially ENV5 and 6 (as well as the discussion of Views in the next section of this Strategy). These policies protect open land which makes an important contribution to a settlement or its setting.

2.4 The loss of historic front gardens for car parking or sitting areas (e.g. Unity Road for the former, or Bay View Terrace for the latter) should be resisted, and policies towards on-street parking which would prompt demand for off-street parking should not be implemented. Where gardens are altered, traditional walling materials and methods should be used in place of breeze-block construction, and driveways denoted with gateposts of an appropriate design.

2.5 New residential properties should have walled front gardens where this is an element of local character rather than solely providing off-street parking.

2.6 Monoblock brick paving should be avoided throughout the Conservation Area.

2.7 Planting should favour local and regional species where appropriate.

2.8 ‘Green wedges’ above harbourside housing (e.g. between Bay View Terrace and Peverell Terrace) should be retained where possible as these semi-wild areas make an important contribution to local character. Where development is absolutely essential, it should be subject to very carefully defined height/mass constraints.

2.9 Open recreational areas make a valuable contribution to the Conservation Area and its setting: opportunities to enhance them should be explored.

Action:

A contest such as ‘Porthleven in Bloom’ could be used to strengthen the sense of local pride. This could be organised by Town Council with support from the local authority and other local stakeholders.

Access to the beach for new facilities could be improved: an architectural competition could be held, co-ordinated by the local authority with local stakeholder input.

As part of works to repair the wall below Bay View Terrace, the opportunity to redesign the sitting areas at the front of the terrace houses should be taken so that these patios not only present a more attractive appearance that compliments the houses but also so that they do not cause further structural problems in future.

A full tree survey should be carried out within the Conservation Area, to the relevant national standards. A tree management plan should be developed and implemented.

The rectangular grass area forming the north end of the harbour is very cluttered and lacks a defined purpose. As the most visible green area within the town centre, it would greatly benefit from investment to create a more aesthetic usable space as a fitting frame to the harbour which is the town’s premier open facility.
8.0 Management and enhancement principles

Views and landmarks

Views into and out of Porthleven are a characteristic feature: it is a focus for long views from the A394, and itself enjoys good views by virtue of its elevated position. As the Appraisal noted, buildings which are not especially visible close up often are prominent in longer-range views across the harbour.

Principles:

3.1 New building, street furniture, and other developments (e.g. solar panels) should have particular regard to views into and out of Porthleven. English Heritage’s Seeing the history in the view: a method for assessing heritage significance within views should form the basis of such assessments.

Action:

The Local Planning Authority should protect and manage the significant views noted within the Conservation Area Appraisal, and should include these views within the Local Development Framework.

Traffic and movement

A particular issue in Conservation Areas generally is the rise of the car, and the pressure which car use places upon roads which were not designed for motorised traffic. In many places, one of the biggest threats to the quality of conservation areas is not the way in which buildings are treated, but rather the negative effects of traffic and parking. There is a significant degree of on-street parking, much of it necessary parking by local residents, and much congestion.

If traffic calming measures are ever thought necessary, there is much which can be done by thinking about the subject creatively. Speed reductions, for example, can often be achieved through the strategic deployment of different surface materials, such as brick bands, and this solution is far less intrusive whilst also being more appropriate to rural settlements than chicanes or speed cushions.

The ‘De Facto’ study made various suggestions for improved traffic flow, including one-way streets and better car park signposting.

Principles:

4.1 The need for on-street parking should be balanced with the need to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area (as an extreme example, banning on street parking might encourage the loss of front gardens to create off-street parking).

4.2 New buildings should face pedestrian and vehicular movement routes, and should avoid the entirely introverted nature of typical modern developments.

4.3 Traffic calming measures, should respect the character of Porthleven. Standard solutions should be avoided wherever possible.

Action:

An integrated traffic and movement strategy should be developed and implemented, taking up the ideas of the ‘De Facto’ report in terms of one-way streets, new pavements, pedestrian priority, ‘access only’, removal of parking from certain streets e.g. Fore Street, improvements to visitors’ car parks.

As was discussed in the ‘Public Realm’ section of this Management Strategy, removal of parking from the eastern harbourside (and creation of a more pedestrian-friendly environment by means of new surfaces/street furniture) would be a significant benefit.

Measures to improve pedestrian/cycle routes into Porthleven (e.g. from Helston, in conjunction with the National Trust) should be investigated.

The possibility of a Park and Ride scheme should be investigated by the local authority and their local partners, coupled to rationalisation and better signage of Porthleven’s car parks. Can a better bus service run on summer weekends between Helston and Porthleven, allowing visitors to park at Helston and then enjoy the attractions of both places?
Opportunity sites and new development

Carefully-designed new buildings provide an opportunity to enhance the quality of the conservation area and perhaps to provide useful local facilities. New buildings or extensions to existing ones need not be historic in style (in fact contemporary buildings, if designed creatively, can make an attractive contribution to conservation areas, as the ‘Dockside Trading Company’ building on the harbourside shows) but should use local materials (rough-finished kilns, slate, granite details), and should acknowledge prevailing local features as detailed in the Appraisal (essentially: pitched roofs, some rendering to walls, stone garden walls, variety of style/height/detail between adjacent properties).

There are a number of opportunity sites on the western side of the harbour, and some pressure to convert dockside buildings for entertainment use. Care should be taken, however: the character of this side of the dock is a working space: perhaps small business units or craft workshops could be created here, adding to the year-round economy?

Principles:

5.1 New building should reflect the grain of the historic settlement, respect important views (see also principle 3.1), and should be inspired by the proportions, massing and materials of surrounding historic buildings. The English Heritage/CABE document Building in context: new development in historic areas should be used by property owners, developers and the local authority as a particular guide when building anew or extending/restoring existing properties (see also principles 7.1-7.6).

5.2 New developments should add to the variety and texture of the Conservation Area.

5.3 The Local Planning Authority should where possible and practicable promote the redevelopment of gap and opportunity sites, and the enhancement/replacement of the building deemed in the Appraisal to make a negative contribution to the quality of the Conservation Area in accordance with policies set out in the relevant Local Plan and in national planning guidance.

Action:

Options for the enhancement of the sites identified in the Appraisal should be considered. These options may be as straightforward as landscaping in the short term.

The local authority should consider whether development briefs would be appropriate for the sensitive dockside sites and should press for development of the highest architectural quality on these sites, bearing in mind their prominence in views.

‘Dockside Trading Company’ building marries local materials with a contemporary idiom

‘Dockside Trading Company’ building marries local materials with a contemporary idiom

Away from the harbourfront, this new house respects local traditions – perhaps almost too much!

New flats at Methleigh Bottoms: good reconciliation of traditional materials and a contemporary architectural expression
Building maintenance

The focus of Conservation Area measures is on times of change – proposals to develop or alter buildings or to change the landscape and planting. However, the quality of a Conservation Area depends as much on everyday care and maintenance: whether the footways are weeded, gutters and drains cleared; old notices removed and buildings repaired. People generally recognise the need to redecorate their houses or premises, but they often feel less responsible for the public face of their buildings and the streets where they stand.

Community action can also reap rich rewards, particularly in residential areas. Elsewhere in the country and indeed the county there are useful examples of grassroots schemes for street improvements, such as the DIY street projects managed by Sustrans. The aim is for individual building owners to look after their buildings and to help people to become involved.

Principles:

6.1 Residents and property owners are encouraged to carry out individual and collective maintenance of their buildings and common areas; the Local Authority, Harbour & Dock Company and Town Council should take the lead in promoting such work.

Action:

A leaflet outlining possible collective DIY measures, including practical advice, would be an incentive and should be produced by the Local Authority and/or their local partners.

The Local Authority and/or their local partners should also provide residents with a maintenance guide for specialist items (such as slated roofs and historic boundary walls) – see also the next sections on historic detailing and windows.

Funding should be sought for repairs to the dock wall as a matter of priority, ideally as part of a more comprehensive survey and restoration of the listed harbour structure.

Thomas Terrace: a building at risk where urgent maintenance would be beneficial
**8.0 Management and enhancement principles**

**Principles:**

7.1 There should be a presumption that historic architectural details and features (as discussed in the Appraisal) are to be retained. These may include: sash windows (see also below), doors, chimneys, stone detailing, historic boundary walls.

7.2 Where replacement of historic architectural features is essential, these should match the original as closely as possible in terms of material, style, colour and form. Advice should be sought from the Local Authority’s Conservation Officer.

7.3 Local materials should be used wherever possible, and their arrangement/use inspired by prevailing historic patterns (such as vertical stacked courses for garden walls).

7.4 Stonework should not be painted or rendered except where this is already the case. In addition, conservation area designation restricts the addition of cladding.

7.5 Where roofs are replaced, a close match with traditional materials and method of deployment should be found. Generally this will mean slate.

7.6 Where skylights are required as part of loft conversions, these should be located on rear or side elevations, and should be of traditional design.

7.7 Properties affected by an Article 4 direction which currently have uPVC windows are encouraged to use wooden replacements of appropriate design, when the uPVC items fail.

**Action:**

Article 4 directions should be implemented and enforced by the Local Authority to protect historic features (see Chapter 9).

Listed buildings should be reviewed for possible unauthorised work (see Chapter 9).

The Local Planning Authority and/or their local partners should prepare a leaflet outlining the benefits of sash window repair and refurbishment as a practical, efficient, sustainable and character-retaining alternative to uPVC replacements.

Where front boundary walls have been remodelled with concrete blockwork, either to accommodate parking or for other reasons (e.g. sitting areas on Bay View Terrace), the Local Authority and their local partners should encourage their reconstruction with more appropriate materials and in a more appropriate style.

---

**Historic architectural detailing and local materials**

A good proportion of buildings within the Conservation Area were built before 1939, meaning that Porthleven is remarkably homogenous in terms of the age of its building stock. However, various pressures and the costs of general maintenance have seen the loss of original historic features, such as boundary walls, roof slates, and chimneys.

Well-intentioned works, such as the replacement of degraded historic windows or gutters with uPVC items, can often damage the character and appearance of a Conservation Area whilst – in the longer term – being environmentally unsustainable.

Local materials make an important contribution to special character, and their use is encouraged. The local authority has produced a document summarising what is available and where it may be sourced, which can be downloaded at www.cornwall.gov.uk

---

**Historic windows and shopfront, Peverell Road**

**Thomas St: good survival of historic detailing and features**

**On unlisted buildings, double-glazed units can be detailed so that they are virtually indistinguishable from the original units. Replacement should be a last resort, but if necessary, discussions with the Conservation Officer and good design can yield dividends.**
8.0 Management and enhancement principles

Sustainability and heritage

The application of Part L of the Building Regulations to buildings in the Conservation Area is at the discretion of the building control officer and conservation officer and does not need to be fully applied. However, households and businesses occupying these buildings (and the local authority) should still do as much as they can to reduce their energy consumption and carbon emissions—which will not only target climate change but can also be financially advantageous. This said, a balance must be struck between measures to reduce energy use and the need to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Pre-1939 buildings are often ‘low-energy’ in their very nature, having being designed to make maximum use of daylight, to retain heat in winter and to be cool in summer in an age where electric lighting and central heating were not widespread or indeed invented. Often the sustainability of these buildings can be enhanced by considering the ways in which they were intended to be used, ventilated and heated. Sash windows, for example, are extremely effective ventilators when used as originally conceived, with the upper and lower halves opened to the same amount.

Fortunately, the most effective measures for reducing energy consumption are those that require least intervention in the fabric of the buildings and townscape, and often are not visible from outside the building. For example, attic roof insulation is the best way to reduce heat loss from a building but cannot be seen externally and so has no impact on the Conservation Area (except in the rare instances that the roof line needs to be altered to install it). However, the installation of photovoltaic cells and wind turbines on buildings can potentially have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and less interventionist measures to reduce energy consumption should be implemented before micro-renewables are considered. Compounding this, micro-renewable energy generation is currently not very efficient and the production of photovoltaic cells for example is energy intensive; renewable energy generation is substantially more effective at the macro level, with, for example, large-scale off-shore wind farms.

Insulation

There is potentially a conflict between the need for an historic building to ‘breathe’ (to prevent water particles from collecting, causing damp and consequent decay) and the need for airtight buildings to prevent heat loss. However, the inclusion of a special membrane that prevents the transfer of heat but not the passage of water next to the insulation can mitigate this. Insulation in the roof is most effective as a significant proportion of heat can be lost here (1/3 of central heating); ventilators may be required in the eaves, to ensure that the loft does not become damp once it is insulated. However, adding wall insulation, even internally, can cause unacceptable changes in the proportion of a room and the loss of historic features. Insulation of external walls is also unlikely to be appropriate on listed buildings, and would need to be very carefully designed to minimise the impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area when proposed for unlisted buildings and is unlikely to be appropriate when the external walls are unrendered stone.

This diagram illustrates that low intervention measures to reduce energy consumption should be implemented before micro-renewables are considered.
Windows
There is a presumption in favour of the retention of original windows. Draught-proofing windows and secondary glazing are very effective low-interventionist measures to reduce heat loss. Reinstating internal wooden shutters where these have been lost can also be very effective. Many windows in the Conservation Area have been replaced with uPVC items, but although they reduce energy loss, these windows are not sustainable, because they:

- are not easily repairable and have a limited life span (usually less than 20 years);
- have a high embodied energy (this is the energy used in manufacture);
- create pollution during manufacture.

The local authority should encourage residents and businesses to replace uPVC windows with double-glazed replicas of the original window in wood, to the original proportions; potentially this could be facilitated with grants. Such replacements would have the additional benefit of improving the character and appearance of the conservation area. The authorities should also promote the refurbishment of existing sash windows where these remain, which may involve replacing damaged window cords, repairing stuck sashes, removing rot, and draughtproofing.

Materials
The materials used to construct new buildings and repair or alter existing buildings can have a significant environmental impact. This partly relates to the embodied energy used in their manufacture, but also to the energy used to transport them – building materials are usually heavy so this can be energy intensive. Ideally materials should be:

- locally sourced
- renewable, sustainable sources
- low embodied energy
- free from ozone-damaging chemicals or gases

Frequently traditional materials, such as locally sourced wood and stone, are the most sustainable. The manufacture of concrete releases carbon dioxide.

Renewable energy
As explained above, measures to improve the energy efficiency of buildings should be exhausted before renewable energy generation is considered. Micro-renewables are expensive, are likely to be interventionist, and in many cases are ineffective. Ground source heat pumps are unlikely to have an impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area; although the potential impact on below-ground archaeology should be considered. Photovoltaic cells, solar water heating, and wind turbines are likely to have an impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and should be designed to minimise this; for example photovoltaic cells and solar water heating are likely to be more acceptable on south-facing rear roofs than when visible from the street. English Heritage guidance should be followed when installing micro-renewables in the Conservation Area.

The impact on the setting of the Conservation Area should be properly considered when determining the appropriate location for large-scale renewable energy farms.

Transport
27% of UK carbon emissions are from transport, and much of that from vehicular traffic. The local authority should promote low carbon forms of transport, such as walking and cycling, and the use of public transport over cars. This should be reflected in the design of the urban environment: pedestrians and cyclists should have priority over vehicular traffic, and accessibility to public transport improved. Promotion of Redruth as a destination for cycling holidays or leisure cyclists could also be persued.
Flooding
Climate change means that many places are at greater risk of flooding, including from increased rainfall. However, because the Conservation Area is already fully developed there are few opportunities for flood protection in the conventional way, i.e. through the modification of ground levels. Even the raising of streets or pavements would be inappropriate because it would significantly affect the character and appearance of the area. Within the Conservation Area the most appropriate protection measures will be:

- Temporary flood barriers to doors and windows;
- Permanent flood barriers to property boundaries, designed to prevent flood water reaching the building;
- Modifications to ground floor fittings and services to reduce damage if flood water enters a building.

In order to preserve the character of the Conservation Area flood mitigation measures should be designed to be compatible with the building’s age, style and materials.

Change of use, particularly from commercial or industrial to residential use, may increase flood risk. Where that is proposed in the Conservation Area the potential benefit to the area from the proposed new use will need to be balanced against the impact of flood risk on the end user, especially where the proposed use is residential.

As regards new development, Kerrier District Local Plan Policy CS5 notes that development will not be permitted where:

(i) it would cause significant harm to the quality, supply or replenishment of surface or ground water;
(ii) it would be liable to flood or it would create a risk of or be the cause of significant harm from flooding or to flood control works; or
(iii) it would create a risk of, or be likely to be the cause of, significant harm from pollution to the quality of the water environment, the diversity of its habitats and their associated wildlife and plant life.

Principles:
8.1 Residents and businesses are encouraged to adopt low intervention measures to reduce energy consumption (e.g. roof insulation, thick curtains, low energy light bulbs, energy efficient boiler, secondary glazing) and such changes should be made before permission is granted for more interventionist measures (e.g. replacement windows, photovoltaic panels, solar water heating, wind turbines).
8.2 As was discussed in policy 7.1, there is a presumption in favour of retaining original windows; they should be draught-proofed or secondary glazed to improve energy efficiency rather than replaced.
8.3 There is a preference for building materials that are locally sourced, from renewable, sustainable sources, and manufactured with low embodied energy and without releasing ozone-damaging gases. (See also principle 7.3)
8.4 The local authority should promote walking, cycling and the use of public transport over cars. Design of the public realm should give priority to pedestrians and cyclists over vehicular traffic where appropriate, improve accessibility of public transport.
8.5 There is a presumption in favour of replacing uPVC windows in historic buildings with double-glazed wooden replicas of the original windows.
8.6 The modification of ground levels is not generally an appropriate method of flood prevention in Conservation Areas.
8.7 Where required, flood protection measures should be designed to be compatible with the building’s age, style and materials. They should be provided in a way that minimises their impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area whilst addressing the risk of flooding.

Action:
In the short term, guidance on the best measures to make historic buildings more energy efficient and on microrenewables should be distributed by the local authority, for example via the website and when responding to planning applications.

The local authority and their local partners could encourage businesses providing locally sourced materials. The Council could include publicity for local building materials when responding to planning applications.

The Local Authority should work with local partners and the Environment Agency to address the issue of flooding.

Archaeology

Principle:
9.1 Advice should be sought from the Conservation Officer when planning building work so as to avoid damage to possible archaeological remains through appropriate mitigation measures.
9.0 Protection and enforcement

This section considers how the character and appearance of the Conservation Area can be protected by statutory and local means. These means include: conservation area designation, listing, local listing, and the introduction of Article 4 directions. Again, it is important to note that these designations are not intended to ‘freeze’ the Conservation Area by preventing change, but to make sure that necessary changes are undertaken in an informed and considered manner.

Conservation Areas

Conservation Areas are defined by Planning Policy Guidance 15 as ‘areas of special or architectural interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance’. In this respect, the designation of conservation areas is intended to ensure that policy addresses ‘quality of townscape in its broadest sense as well as the protection of individual buildings’. Factors such as the layout of boundaries and thoroughfares, ‘mix’ of uses, the appropriate scaling and detailing of contemporary buildings, and the quality of advertisements, street furniture and shop fronts are therefore all important. Controls are also placed on the lopping and felling of trees, for which notice to the local authority must be given by property owners.

Conservation area consent is required for the total or substantial demolition of any unlisted building in a conservation area, subject to various exceptions related to the size of the building in question. The 2008 Heritage Protection Bill proposes that this consent be merged with planning permission. Conservation area designation also restricts other ‘permitted development’ rights, requiring permission to be sought for works which would otherwise be automatically allowed including the addition of various types of cladding, alterations to roof forms (such as the addition of dormer windows), the addition of satellite dishes to walls and roofs fronting highways. The size of house and industrial extensions which may be constructed without planning permission is also restricted. Various controls relating to tree pruning and felling also exist. The situation changes periodically, and anyone proposing to undertake work should check with the Local Authority Conservation Officer to be sure.

Commercial properties within conservation areas have very limited permitted development rights, and are required to obtain permission for works including changes to roofing material/roof profile, removal of architectural features, replacement of shop front, replacement of doors and windows except where an identical design/material/finish is used, installation of decorative lighting, addition of solar panels/dormers/rooflights, addition of extraction/ventilation equipment.

The Kerrier Local Plan (Revised Deposit Draft with Summary of Pre-Inquiry Changes) also places restrictions on development within and close to the Conservation Area, affecting buildings and landscape setting: its content is discussed further in the Conservation Area Appraisal.

However the Local Plan is not saved and it has little weight in planning policy terms. In order for the Conservation Area to be properly considered as a material consideration, there should be relevant policies in the Local Development Framework being developed by Cornwall Council.

No extensions to the Conservation Area are proposed at this time.

Action:

In order for the principles in this Management Strategy to be adequately enforced, they should be linked to the emerging policies in the Local Development Framework and the Management Strategy be adopted as material consideration.

The Conservation Area should be reviewed periodically for possible unauthorised changes, e.g. the addition of satellite dishes or aerials to street-facing frontages.

The possibility of a ‘shared dish’ scheme whereby a number of properties share one satellite dish should be investigated, and, if practicable, publicised. This kind of scheme is routinely deployed in blocks of flats to avoid a proliferation of dishes and aerials.
9.0 Protection and enforcement

Existing statutory designations

The existing statutory designations within the Porthleven Conservation Area are detailed in the Conservation Area Appraisal. All listing designations carry the requirement to secure Listed Building Consent for works, in addition to planning permission.

Action:

The Local Planning Authority should periodically review listed buildings for possible unauthorised changes, and should take appropriate enforcement action.

Locally-listed buildings

Local Authorities have the power, though the Local Planning Framework, to include buildings on a local list and to develop policies to protect these buildings from inappropriate change or development. Although these buildings have no statutory designation, their inclusion in a local list can be a material consideration when determining planning applications. In some cases, it may be appropriate to serve an Article 4 direction to remove permitted development rights and thus to secure the building (see below).

The Conservation Area Appraisal identified a number of significant but unlisted buildings and structures. They have been chosen either as important local public buildings, or as being especially fine/intact examples which would merit careful handling. It is recommended that they are added to a local list.

Action:

The Local Planning Authority should develop and publicise a local list of buildings, using the buildings identified in the Conservation Area Appraisal as a starting point. The local list should be periodically reviewed.

Unlisted buildings

Planning Policy Guidance 15 states that there should be a presumption in favour of the retention of unlisted buildings (whether locally-listed or not) that make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of a Conservation Area, and advises that any proposals that include the demolition of such buildings should be assessed against the same broad criteria as proposals for the demolition of a listed building. The quality of a replacement building may be taken into consideration in such cases.

Article 4 directions

A direction under Article 4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 may be enacted to preserve the character or appearance of the conservation area, or part of it. In normal circumstances, small alterations to residential properties of a kind that are generally acceptable are automatically granted planning permission, and are known as ‘permitted development’. However, such alterations – such as the replacement of windows or painting of a stone elevation – can have unfortunate consequences in the case of sensitive buildings or areas. An Article 4 direction restricts the right of landowners to carry out such works. It is not that development can never be carried out, but that it will no longer be automatically permitted. In Porthleven, a particular concern is the introduction of solar panels, which given the hilly topography, could spoil views. Where possible, panels should be located and detailed so that they work well but do not detract from the quality of the built heritage.

It is tempting to propose a blanket Article 4 (2) direction for all unlisted residential properties within the Conservation Area. Such directions, however, require additional resources on the part of the Local Planning Authority and so may be problematic to enforce. Some areas have already seen considerable alteration (in terms of replacement windows and indeed roof slates). Resources should be directed in the first instance to securing an Article 4 direction for those properties highlighted in the adjoining box.

Action:

Subject to a review of policy, resources and further local consultation, the street sections shown on the map are recommended for Article 4 (2) directions, and are summarised below:

To protect historic windows, doors, roof features and walls, and to remove the automatic right to install solar panels on elevations visible from the highway:

- Beacon Road
- Chapel Terrace: nos. 3, 4, 5, 6
- Cliff Road
- Fore Street: nos. 1–6 (west side)
- Institute Hill: nos. 1–7 and ‘Sailaway Cottage’
- Loe Bar Road
- Peverell Road
- Peverell Terrace
- Thomas Street
- Mount Pleasant Road/West End: all unlisted properties

The Local Authority should take action to introduce and enforce these directions. A leaflet explaining their implications should be prepared for affected houses.

Alan Baxter
**Buildings at risk**

A number of buildings/structures at risk were identified in the Conservation Area Appraisal, including the dock wall and a listed property on Peverell Terrace (believed to have been resolved December 2008).

**Action:**

The Local Planning Authority should continue its system of monitoring and reporting buildings at risk or in disrepair. Repairs to such buildings/structures should be undertaken as a matter of priority and, where appropriate, new uses found for them.

Enforcement action (see below) should be taken with regard to the property on Peverell Terrace, if recent change in ownership has not resolved the issues which affect it.

**Repair notices/urgent works notices/Section 215 notices**

Where buildings degenerate to a significant degree, a number of powers exist for local authorities to remedy the situation. The powers include:

- requiring the owner of the building in disrepair to make it safe or demolish it under the terms of the Building Act 1984 (a power which is modified for Conservation Areas so as to prevent the loss of significant buildings)

- repairs under Section 54 of the Listed Buildings Act to make a listed building (and, exceptionally, unlisted buildings in Conservation Areas) wind- and watertight.

- A Section 215 ‘Untidy Site’ notice can be served under the terms of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, requiring owners to improve the appearance of demolition sites and other untidy land. Such notices can be served on buildings, and so are useful for those which are ‘adversely affecting’ the ‘amenity’ of its area. They can also be used creatively on heritage sites: for example, to reinstate an original wall around a site rather than simply tidying the mess.

The simplest, cheapest form of action in the first instance may be for property owners and the local authority to work together to secure guidance for appropriately-qualified specialists. The pursuit of these matters by means of legislation can take a long time – sometimes years or decades.

**Summary**

It is imperative that a consistent, transparent and public approach to enforcement is taken by the Local Authority. This will require appropriate resourcing. The support of local partners should be obtained so that management is a shared undertaking.
The previous chapters have examined the measures which, if carried out, would enhance and protect the Porthleven Conservation Area. This short chapter summarises these measures and suggests an order of priorities. Because of the character of the Conservation Area, the division of responsibility in caring for it is bound to be complex. However, this is a timely moment to implement the recommendations of this strategy, as they can be incorporated within the new Local Development Framework and its associated documents.

Priorities have been devised as follows:

**High:** urgent matters which require immediate attention (within two years) to prevent degradation of the Conservation Area

**Medium:** items which would help protect, manage or improve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, to be undertaken within two-five years

**Low:** enhancement which would have a benefit, but not an immediate priority

### Actions arising from this Management Strategy

**Adopting, monitoring and updating this Plan**

This document has been subject to formal consultation with elected Members, public and stakeholders and has been amended in light of comments made (see Statement of Community Involvement). However, this document was not put to Kerrier District Council for adoption as the mechanism for adopting and making policy ceased as creation of the new unitary Cornwall Council approached. This document should be ratified and adopted by Cornwall Council.

A new Cornwall Local Development Framework team is working on a Core Strategy for Cornwall, bringing together previous saved and draft Local Plan and LDF work. It is recommended that the Management Strategy element of this document, is put forward for adoption as material consideration. The principles in the Management Strategy would need to be reviewed in line with policies in the adopted Core Strategy. A Sustainability Appraisal will need to be produced and the Statement of Community Involvement updated following a statutory period of public consultation.

It is important that the Management Plan is reviewed within five years of its adoption. This review should monitor and assess how many of the actions specified here have been achieved, or how they should be amended in the light of other events. The review process should be accompanied by consultation workshops.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate the principles set out in this document and adopt as local policy</td>
<td>Local authority</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Within two years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt this document as material consideration</td>
<td>Local authority</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Within two years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link the principles set out in this document to policies in the LDF</td>
<td>Local authority</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Within two years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Management and enhancement principles

Chapter 8 set out a series of principles by which the character and appearance of the Breage Conservation Area could be maintained and enhanced, relating to the following themes:

- Public realm, including paving, signage, lighting, street furniture
- Landscape
- Views
- Traffic and movement
- New building
- Building maintenance
- Historic detailing and materials
- Sustainability
Protection and enforcement action points

Chapter 9 discussed how statutory and local policy are essential to the protection of the Conservation Area’s special qualities. A series of Action Points was set out, and these should be implemented within the next three years in the first instance and thereafter on an ongoing basis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application and monitoring of Article 4 directions to protect significant architectural and historic features; produce guide for affected properties</td>
<td>Local authority</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Within 12 months; ongoing monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add buildings identified in the Appraisal as being of local interest to a local list of significant buildings</td>
<td>Local authority</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Within 12 months; ongoing monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement action regarding listed property at risk, Peverell Terrace</td>
<td>Local authority</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Within 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and evaluate options for gap/opportunity sites identified in this document</td>
<td>Local authority with input from local partners</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Within 12–18 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion and protection of views deemed significant in the Appraisal within the Local Development Framework</td>
<td>Local authority</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Within three years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor Buildings at Risk</td>
<td>Local authority and local partners</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Within three years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor and enforce unauthorised changes to listed buildings/changes to unlisted buildings which require permission by virtue of C.A. designation</td>
<td>Local authority, and local partners where appropriate</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve Urgent Works and Untidy Site notices</td>
<td>Local authority</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing, when necessary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Management and enhancement actions

Chapter 8 also set out various action points by which principles could be implemented with special reference to Porthleven. They are summarised here for ease of reference. The Local Authority should take the lead in establishing the feasibility, responsibility and funding for these projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review street furniture and public realm; devise integrated strategies, especially for lighting and traffic management</td>
<td>Local authority with input from local partners as necessary</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Within 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek funding for repairs to listed dock wall/harbour restoration</td>
<td>Local authority and Harbour &amp; Dock Company</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Within 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance Bay View Terrace railings, surface and retaining wall</td>
<td>Local authority and local partners e.g. Harbour &amp; Dock Company where appropriate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Within 12–18 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review, rationalise and enhance signage, advertisements etc</td>
<td>Local authority with local partners</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Within two years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production/publicisation of guidance literature on historic detailing, windows, local materials, community DIY actions, sustainability</td>
<td>Local authority with local partners</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Within two years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance Harbour lighting and paving to eastern side</td>
<td>Local authority and Harbour &amp; Dock Company</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Within two years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance public realm and surfacing, 'The Square', introduce public artwork/sculpture</td>
<td>Local authority with local partners</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Within five years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance public realm and surfacing, Fore Street (to compliment historic surfaces)</td>
<td>Local authority with local partners</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Within five years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Porthleven in Bloom' competition: publicise and develop</td>
<td>Local partners e.g. Town Council, with support from the local authority</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Within five years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage reconstruction of blockwork walls/patios (e.g. Bay View Terrace) with more appropriate materials and in a more appropriate style.</td>
<td>Local authority</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Within five years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design competition for better access to the beach</td>
<td>Local authority to lead</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Within five–ten years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual community ‘tidy up’</td>
<td>Local partners</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resourcing

The preceding section indicates the extent to which the Conservation Area can be a shared responsibility. However, inevitably the principal burden in caring for it falls upon the Local Planning Authority, not least because of the obligations placed upon it by the planning legislation. It is essential that the authority commits adequate resources to enable it to exercise its powers and responsibilities, and – at least as importantly – to be seen to be exercising its powers and responsibilities in a consistent and concerted fashion.
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Appendix 1
Statement of community involvement

In order to create a robust document and gain consensus amongst interested stakeholders and members of the local public, a rigorous consultation process has been undertaken.

A first consultation event was held in December 2008. The draft reports were available for public download on Kerrier District Council’s website, together with a questionnaire. A public exhibition was held at the Harbour and Dock Company for three weeks. Two consultation events were held on 2 December. At the first, for stakeholders, the work was introduced and a walkabout to highlight key issues took place, followed by much productive discussion. An interesting discussion took place which was a chance to capture concerns and comments, and feedback forms also circulated for more detailed responses and technical comments. Attendees included local councillors, members of the Town Council, officers of Kerrier District Council, and representatives of local organisations. Amongst the issues treated to vigorous discussion were possible extensions to the Conservation Area, repairs to the Harbour, opportunities for development, traffic and parking, and open space in/around the town.

Subsequently an open session provided a chance for people from the local communities to see the summary poster boards and the report. This event, attended by c.30 people, provided useful local input and highlighted key issues including particular concerns with traffic and certain historic buildings in the town. Feedback forms were handed out.

This feedback has been carefully registered and each comment or issue responded to by Kerrier District Council.
### Stakeholder Responses from workshop held 3rd December 2008 at Porthleven Public Hall

15 Stakeholders present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principles</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What makes Porthleven distinctive?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A ‘rough diamond’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• People are passionate about the place: this is why people can be awkward – because they feel strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ‘Not a Padstow’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Should keep what’s rough about it but in a nice way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organic growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not too commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Working town at heart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prefer to St Ives, Padstow – unique because not over-commercialised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not as unique as Port Isaac</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Setting important ‘beyond financial measure’.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• People will stop and talk. Still a community spirit. People who move here adopt its friendly nature – some of the strongest voices recently moved here.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There seems to be a need to identify what the community of Porthleven want for their town, perhaps in a town plan if this has not already been prepared. This is because there are tensions between working town but not too commercial, rough but nice. There seems to be a lack of a clear defined vision.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principles</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What threatens Porthleven?</td>
<td>• Architectural problems – things which have been built or extended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Problems e.g. new house below Peverell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Building in all gaps – a problem in Porthleven.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Central government policy can over-ride local policy and promotes e.g. brownfield development on ‘gap’ sites. Failure to recognise garden space as important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 400 people applied for 12 affordable housing (local people from this ward). Low incomes and issue of high house prices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Porthleven actually less than 10% seasonal homes. They’re concentrated mostly in the seaside area. Thomas Street ¼ seasonal lets, this knocks out the stuffing from the street. Only four on Bay View Terrace not holiday homes. NB that not all distant landlords: people who live in Porthleven buy/inherit an additional home and let it out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How many people living in Porthleven work in the village? Where would put workplaces. Harbour Company has wanted to build units but SW Water wouldn’t allow because of a culvert? Land between A394 and Porthleven for commercial units. Largest employers Harbour Co, Tesco, Culdrose. Culdrose has huge impact on Porthleven. Many people came to work here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Traffic. People park anywhere. Thomas Street etc can be chaotic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‒ There is a scheme to allow some parking on Fore Street for the shops. A limited amount of parking could be a good thing. Major problem is at the post office. Disabled badge – can park anywhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‒ Tourists actually put off local people from coming to the shops. Difficulty of parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‒ Too many cars to enforce residents’ parking. Because people know each other, you know where to come and get someone who has blocked you in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‒ Three existing car parks – Shrubberies Hill, Kitto’s etc. Full by half past ten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‒ Ship Yard – trialled this year – did well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‒ Parking also at Football Club – but problem that people won’t walk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‒ Park and Ride was proposed but issue of finance. Road train was not viable in Falmouth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‒ KDC proposes to identify which car park for what – e.g. ‘car park for beach’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‒ Deliveries cause problems. Stop wherever. No place to put an unloading/loading bay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‒ Aerials, cables, satellite dishes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are seasonal lets bad for Porthleven’s economy?
### Principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting and views</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Framed by countryside thought to be very important. Can have countryside and sea view almost simultaneously. This is also what visitors want and which distinguishes from St Ives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key views include:**
- Farmland views. Higher Methleigh
- Changing landscape through seasons
- Porthleven Institute – views in storms.
- Sea and Mount’s Bay
- Topography focuses view onto harbour and out to sea
- Sound of sea
- Glimpses of the sea as you walk around – teased by it.
- View of valley from old Penzance Road.
- View from Tregonning Hill
- View around town from Town Clock
- View from Atlantic

### Comments

### Answers

### Landmarks and key local buildings:
- Institute
- Methodist Chapel – but can loom – imagine impact when was first built
- St Bartholomew’s – not always easily seen.
- Custom House
- Ship Inn
- Harbour Inn – all that side of the harbour
- Coastguard Building. Stone below the pebbledash – could be enhanced. This building was originally white. 
- Old lifeboat house.
- Pill box. (One on Loe Bar [NT] falling down)
- Gatehouse at Penrose/Loe Bar. Architect is same as St Bartholomew’s Church (NT).
- SSSI beyond Gravesend – old mining works
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principles</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public transport</td>
<td>Used to have minibuses but withdrawn.</td>
<td>Smaller buses would have less impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May be some additional services through the estate.</td>
<td>Bus costs more than driving to Helston – should be more subsidy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing – quayside?</td>
<td>Funding application for new crane to be operated by fishermen and permission has been granted for ice house.</td>
<td>Fishing OK in summer but can’t access harbour in winter so most going to Plymouth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most fish is unloaded for market.</td>
<td>Most fishing is lobster, crab.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most fishing is lobster, crab.</td>
<td>Day trips for anglers from Porthleven.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbour</td>
<td>Railings came about in recent years – controversial. Threat to the visual character of the Harbour. Health and safety issue. But even with signs people do still put themselves at risk – yet the sea is still a draw.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>Architectural lighting would be an asset to Porthleven – uniform lighting around the harbour. But should avoid light pollution. £70,000 spent on changing lighting across the harbour head by Harbour Company.</td>
<td>People are very attached to the coloured lighting strings. People appreciate the lights because all year round. Money has been spent on new lighting. People travel round the area to look at towns’ different lights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lamp posts – too high. E.g. by Strawtop.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For consistency, this should apply to the whole town.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement issues – can it be enforced?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What for: roofs, boundary walls, windows.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar panels – positive response to this. Visually they affect view.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satellite dishes: Dishes and aerials have to be mounted where they actually work. Check: what technology exists which could be better? Noise from aerials in the wind is problematic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensions to the C.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park behind Boat Yard – protected but could be lifted by Court of Law. Owned by Town Council. Include within Conservation Area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wooded valley. Methleigh Bottoms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra protection as far as the NT car park at Gravesend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT ownership of the beach/steps – Porthleven West.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local community involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public consultation is needed to explain how the Conservation Area works. There is a lot of apathy unless it affects peoples’ backyard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There might be infighting about which things to enhance/who is involved. Fractious community at times. Different camps with their own agenda. Local authority should lead with input with local groups. Grants are targeted at local groups. Porthleven Business Association – just getting constitution done. Gary Shaneberg – Creations, Fore Street – elected chairman. Porthleven Food Festival – Anthony Worrall Thompson.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business community is getting by – Business Association is trying to improve their businesses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porthleven Development Trust – put together to implement the de facto strategy – trying to get youth facilities. Planning application in at the moment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach cleans by surfers. Porthleven Surf Club.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resource issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This consultation was one opportunity for people to find out about Conservation Areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Much of this goes beyond Conservation Area management and into community planning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections to the document</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Harbour and Dock Company' not Harbour Company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,6 Chapel Terrace (not 1,2,3 as illustration caption)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mounts Bay Cottage (not Mouse Bay)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 29 Salt Cellar Hill.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver Allen's p.31 is the building at risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountant's office – rear building.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porthleven in Bloom – has been running for some time – run by Porthleven Development Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 49 Mounts Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Comments from KDC’s Landscape Architect** | Landscape Character Assessment [Pg 4]  
There is no reference to the Cornwall County Council landscape character assessment project nor to Landscape Character Unit descriptions in the introductory Planning Context chapter Ref. www.cornwalllandscapes.org.uk  
Conservation Area Designation  
The conservation area should be extended if possible to include the eastern part of the coastal housing. | Ensuring the economic viability of the harbour will probably be a factor in raising funds to restore the walls. The Harbour Co would probably restore the harbour as part of a wider regeneration development. Will the community accept development is necessary to finance upkeep of the harbour? |
| **Key Landscape Features** | **Landmarks**  
Harbour walls and retaining walls supporting associated historic housing.  
The Bickford Smith Institute with its clock tower acts as a key focal point along the harbour front.  
The Ship Inn on the western side of the Harbour.  
**Public Realm / Streetscapes**  
The objective for management and enhancement of public realm – paving and streetscapes is well stated. Alteration to surfacing needs to be sensitive to the local organic quality. The buff coloured paving brick tiles are of minor interest and not practical in the long term. These would be better utilised if used as decorative detailing rather than as the main walking surface. Textured granite slabs would be a better alternative to surface the main street pavements. Granite cobbles are durable in the existing location along the eastern harbour front. Areas of tarmac should be replaced with either cobbles or slabs to match.  
The harbour walls and other associated retaining walls need urgent prioritised investment to fund stabilisation repairs. This is crucial to the preservation of the harbour. The best way forward for this is to establish a partnership between the local parish the harbour company and the unitary authority to ensure that any possible funds can be identified and accessed.  
**Significant Tree Cover**  
Tree distribution is rather sparse being confined mainly to the north of the Conservation Area. Significant trees extend northwards along the river valley where the conditions are more sheltered. [see attached plans] | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principles</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A full comprehensive tree survey should be carried out for the Conservation Area and areas outside of it to determine their condition and importance. Significant trees immediately outside the Conservation Area should be covered by TPO protection.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Gardens [Ref Pgs 41] The most important gardenscapes are those on steep slopes either side of the harbour along Beacon Road and Peverel Terrace. It is noted that recent development has encroached into these resulting in a loss of visual amenity. Whilst difficult for private individuals to maintain these semi wild slopes should be preserved to protect the important coastal character of Porthleven. If this is not possible then any development within sloping landscape close to the harbour whether it be for garden shed, annex or new build should be subject to defined height restrictions to prevent loss of harbour side visual amenity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be useful to illustrate the distribution of significant gardens and green areas as an isolated layer in plan. (see attached plan.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space &amp; Parks [Ref. Pgs 24 &amp; 26 &amp; 41] As stated in the draft strategy, the principal effective open space is the harbour itself and the beaches either side. Rather then implying this is a deficiency on page 41 its in fact a strength of the town. Its open harbour is its heart and raison d’etre. Perhaps the most significant and visible open space is the rectangular grass area forming the north end and a narrow strip along the eastern side of the inner harbour. This is very cluttered and lacks a defined purpose and would greatly benefit from investment to create a more aesthetic usable space as a fitting frame to the harbour which is the towns premier open facility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extensive cemetery north of St Bartholomew’s Church is of limited recreational use though holds great historic significance. Could the CA boundary be extended to include it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apart from the harbour and its associated grassed areas all other open space lie outside the conservation Area. The small recreation area along Methleigh Bottoms is privately owned. Another substantial open space with a play area lies to the east off Cliff Road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottoms is privately owned. Another substantial open space with a play area lies to the east off Cliff Road.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look into this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Parking [Pg13&amp;42]</td>
<td>The principle of retaining on-street parking to prevent destruction of front gardens is well stated. It may be possible to extend the public parking provision at the public open space off Cliff Road. Specific Comments On Document:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[pg 3] it would be nicer if the modern image for the east side of the harbour was taken from the same vantage as that of the 1918 image. Some data on images is unclear – can these be sharpened up? [e.g. Pg 4] [pg13] the plan fails to show existing parking off Cliff Road adjacent to the public open space [pg22] ‘Mouse Bay Cottage’ should read ‘Mounts Bay Cottage’ Quite a few photographs are unduly dark e.g. pg 24 [pg 25] ‘historic soakaway’ is known locally as a ‘leat’ or ‘kennel’ [pg 37] typo – ‘railings’ second column.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public consultation – 29 people attended

Key concerns:
- maintenance of dock walls (listed) – possible legal action
- net loft roof extensions
- proposed seating by memorial on dockside
- Oliver Allen building still in use
- Handmaking of nets adds to local character
- Health and Safety at Bay View Terrace (ownership issue)
- Land ownership often unclear and leads to maintenance issues.
- Possible location of craft workshops/shops on western side of the harbour to maintain working use whilst adapting to modern needs

Legal action by whom against whom?

This sounds worth exploring.
Public responses to Questionnaire and Feedback Form

Public exhibition held 24th November – 12th December in Porthleven
Town Hall

Around 30 members of public attended open session with
Consultants on 2nd December

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Please list 3 things you feel are distinctive or special about Porthleven | 1 | 1. Harbour  
2. Not commercialised | What is meant by commercialised? One can either have a commercial and economically active town or not. |
| | 2 | 1. The unspoilt nature of the village centre. The fact that much of it is ‘listed’ | |
| | 3 | 1. The old cottages along the Foreshore  
2. The harbour  
3. The stormy seas  
4. Boats in the harbour | Boats indicate active harbour. |
| | 4 | 1. The fact that it is not over-commercialised (like St Ives, Newquay etc)  
2. The variety of scenery available to residents and visitors alike  
3. The institute/harbour need to be preserved | Does over commercialised equate to more people, or loss of character? |
| | 5 | 1. Maintain sense of working village and port  
2. Self contained in terms of living (shopping etc.) | How can this be achieved? |
| | 6 | 1. Original buildings well maintained but new development/life allowed to develop  
2. Historical context and modern lifestyle side by side  
3. Fantastic character and views  
4. Good community spirit and interest in built environment | A good balance will add to the vibrancy and interest in the town. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7        |            | 1. Working village/harbour  
2. Open-ness of the harbour area |         |
| 8        |            | 1. The harbour, with all its aspects, including the shipyard.  
2. The beach and cliffs running to Loe Bar and along Breage side with their seams exposed by the Atlantic.  
3. The old working buildings, many of them sadly gone over the last decade. I feel they are inspirational in their call to work with the elements of this place. I particularly mourn the loss of the old blacksmith’s shop and of Cowles Garage with its chandlery and marine engineers. But it is the buildings themselves which were so pleasing. |         |
| 9        |            | 1. The harbour and shops  
2. Neighbourliness  
3. Lime kiln and old buildings  
4. Boat yard (as was) |         |
| 10       | The Harbour |         |         |
| 11       |            | 1. Views of the sea  
2. It’s a bit rough around the edges, not too picture box or modern |         |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 12       | (Porthleven Action Group) | 1. Porthleven is unique in that in this one location there are historical buildings that draw from both the mining and fishing industries. Also that we have both a harbour and beach at the one location.  
2. The harbour, with all its aspects, including the shipyard.  
3. The beach and cliffs running to Loe Bar and along Breage side with their seams exposed by the Atlantic.  
4. The old working buildings, many of them sadly gone over the last decade. They are inspirational in their call to work with the elements of this place. We particularly mourn the loss of the old blacksmith’s shop and of Cowles Garage with its chandlery and marine engineers. But it is the buildings themselves which were so pleasing. | |
| 13       | (Porthleven Lights Committee) | 1. UK mainland’s most southerly port  
2. Quaint harbour with expanse of green at the Harbour Head  
3. Some very distinctive buildings  
4. Wonderful location with beautiful coastal views and walks within a very short distance of the harbour | |
| 14       |          | 1. The harbour  
2. The traditional dwellings  
3. The walks in the local area | |
| 16       |          | 1. Institute  
2. Harbour and surrounding area | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 17        |            | 1. Ragged individualism of the buildings  
2. Special working port  
3. Community spirit  
4. Church Row |         |
| 18        |            | 1. Harbour  
2. Institute (clock)  
3. Old lofts around terrace |         |
| 19        |            | 1. Town clock building  
2. Pier  
3. Harbour  
4. Moors area |         |
| 20        |            | 1. Institute building  
2. Harbour  
3. Coastal areas |         |
| 21        |            | 1. Community spirit  
2. Harbour  
3. Beach  
4. Clock tower |         |
| 22        |            | 1. Community spirit  
2. Not over-commercialised  
3. Access to sea/countryside  
4. Friendly welcome to visitors |         |
| 23        |            | 1. Not too commercialised  
2. Not too big |         |
| 24        |            | 1. Harbour  
2. Institute |         |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 25       |            | 1. Harbour  
2. Sea and beaches  
3. Traditional housing  
4. Community spirit |         |
| 26       |            | 1. The unspoiled working harbour  
2. Buildings around harbour – Ship Inn, Bay View, Institute  
3. Lack of usual seaside attractions |         |
| 27       |            | 1. Bickford Smith Institute  
2. Bay View Terrace  
3. The Ship Inn  
4. The Lime Kiln and space around |         |
| 28       |            | 1. The institute  
2. The harbour  
3. Facilities  
4. Views |         |
| 29       |            | 1. The institute  
2. Harbour  
3. Not commercialised |         |
| 30       |            | 1. The spectacular ‘full on’ nature of the sea  
2. The harbour  
3. The Bickford-Smith Institute building  
4. The coastal path walks |         |
| Please tell us which views of Porthleven you enjoy most | | | 1 Being a local person, my home, but all views are enjoyable |
| 2        |            | 1. From the harbour head to the institute  
2. From the seat of Peverell Terrace (at the top of Army Hill) overlooking sea |         |
<p>| 3        |            | View of shore from pier head |         |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4        |            | 1. The Mens’ Institute and beach from Breageside  
2. The harbour and Breageside from Peverell Terrace  
3. Harbour and Breageside and Mens’ Institute from the harbour head |         |
| 5        |            | Breageside from East side of harbour |         |
| 6        |            | Views towards Ship from East side of harbour |         |
| 7        |            | The view when driving down the coast lane from Ashton |         |
| 8        |            | The view from the inner gaps out to the outer harbour. Look over the wall at it.  
The view of the green cliff side above the old buildings and the lime kiln along the breageside of the harbour.  
The view which is gone of the Monterey pine beyond the curved roof of the blacksmith’s shop.  
The view from the pier head encompassing Bay view terrace and the institute, and the old run of houses to the eastern, above the beach. |         |
<p>| 9        |            | I enjoyed the harbour view from Peverell Terrace – before Mr Osborne built Monterey |         |
| 10       |            | Across the harbour from the north towards the Bickford Institute |         |
| 11       |            | Views of the sea |         |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 (Porthleven Action Group)</td>
<td>The views from high on Peverell Terrace looking over the shipyard and out to the Atlantic. The views from Breage side, again looking down on the harbour and along the coastline towards Loe Bar and the Lizard coastline. The view from the inner harbour gaps out to the outer harbour. Look over the wall at it. The view of the green cliff side above the old buildings and the lime kiln along the breageside of the harbour. The view which is gone, of the Monterey pine beyond the curved roof of the blacksmith’s shop. Both the Monterey pine and the blacksmiths shop demolished by the Trevor Osborne Property Development Group. The view from the pier head looking back into Porthleven encompassing Bay view terrace and the institute, and the old run of houses to the eastern, above the beach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 (Porthleven Lights Committee)</td>
<td>Top of Institute Hill looking back down into the harbour and from the Ship Inn looking across and back towards the Harbour Head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>From the harbour head out to sea and from the pier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Looking down into the harbour from the seat at the top of Army Hill/Institute Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Institute from harbour head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Breageside to St. Bartholemews Church Sithney-side to the Lizard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>From the sea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Harbour area and sea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>From institute over Porthleven, West Sands to Loe Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>From Breageside, looking across towards clock tower and to the Lizard beyond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>From Loe Bar Road out to sea and also the wrestling fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sea views &amp; countryside views</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>The sea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>The view across the harbour and out to sea from Bay View Terrace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>Towards the sea from Bay View Terrace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mounts Bay through the institute, view from Breageside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>The sea against the defence wall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Looking along coast from Breageside. Looking down on harbour from Peverell Terrace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are Porthleven’s strengths?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1. Harbour</td>
<td>This balance between tourism and working harbour is tricky to get right, without becoming either too commercial or restricting the viability of working operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Beach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Second Homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1. The size of the village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. There are still many born and bred ‘Porthleveners’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. It remains unspoilt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1. The locals who are left</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. The clock tower</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1. Its scenery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Various facilities – sports, social &amp; religious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1. Self contained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Community feel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. People are interested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1. Lively active village all year round.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Attractive to tourists without losing integrity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Attractive working/industrial character even though it is mainly historical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Fantastic retail outlets for a village of its size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 7        |            | 1. Working, functioning community  
2. Shops  
3. Very attractive |         |
| 8        |            | 1. We do still have a working harbour.  
2. Most people who live here love the place. There is a sense of identity.  
3. It is attractive to tourists for its character as well as its beauty.  
4. We still have a good local supermarket, post office, pubs and restaurants and some quality shops...unfortunately no hardware store or chandlery. |         |
| 9        |            | 1. The people  
2. The old boatyard  
3. The small useful shops  
4. The pubs and cafes |         |
| 10       |            | Sense of identity |         |
| 11       |            | Community spirit |         |
| 12       | (Porthleven Action Group) | 1. We do still have a working harbour – just!  
2. Most people who live here love the place. There is a sense of identity and community.  
3. It is attractive to tourists for its character as well as its beauty.  
4. We still have a good local supermarket, post office, public houses and restaurants and some quality shops...unfortunately no hardware store or chandlery. |         |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 13       | (Porthleven Lights Committee) | 1. Good community spirit with sense of belonging  
2. Many events held throughout the year involving the community and visitors alike: all are made welcome  
3. Opportunity for appropriate development to enhance the Port, but this must be done with the residents in mind and should not affect the traditions that have been accepted within the Port for many years  
4. Good access but adequate car parking is a problem | What are these traditions?  
Park out of town and walk in? |
| 14       |            | 1. Its views  
2. The community |  |
| 15       |            | 1. Unchanging (relatively)  
2. No shops selling utter rubbish  
3. Local people who care about its history |  |
| 16       |            | Unspoilt |  |
| 17       |            | 1. Strong community spirit  
2. Independent individuality of residents  
3. Distinctive Cornish flavours  
4. Proximity to sea |  |
| 18       |            | 1. Unspoilt  
2. Friendly  
3. Harbour  
4. Beach/rock pools |  |
| 19       |            | 1. Its indigenous people  
2. Its Christian heritage  
3. Fishing industry  
4. Welcoming of visitors |  |
<p>| 20       |            | Its community |  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 21       | 1. Community spirit  
          | 2. Setting  
          | 3. Size – large enough to support P.O, surgery etc.  
          | 4. Close to Helston |
| 22       | 1. Its history of a close community  
          | 2. Its harbour, sheltering sea-farers  
          | 3. Christian heritage |
| 23       | Its local history |
| 25       | Community spirit |
| 26       | 1. It has character and is unspoiled  
          | 2. It is still a lived-in village (mostly)  
          | 3. Local amenities, Post Office and Supermarket  
          | 4. Doctors surgery |
| 27       | 1. Harbour and its history  
          | 2. Doctors surgery  
          | 3. Year open supermarket  
          | 4. Post Office |
| 28       | 1. Facilities (shops, Post Office, pubs and restaurants)  
          | 2. Village populace cohesion  
          | 3. Picturesque setting |
| 29       | 5. Close community  
          | 6. Unspoilt in places |
| 30       | 1. Tye Rock (or Rockville as it is more correctly and traditionally known) |

What are the worst aspects of the Conservation Area?

1. Harbour wall falling down  
2. Modern houses being built in the conservation area  
3. No museum or heritage centre for visitors
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2        |            | 1. That owners are allowed to let listed ‘buildings’ fall into disrepair e.g. no’s 7 and 8 Peverell Terrace  
2. The harbour manual baulk crane | Resources issue for local authority. |
| 3        | Some new buildings | What about them? | |
| 4        |            | 1. Buildings not in keeping with the conservation area  
2. Unkept areas within conservation area (e.g. Prospect Place Steps to Peverell Road etc.)  
3. The dreadful state of the harbour and the east side ‘danger areas’ fenced off – lack of seating along that side  
4. Non following up by local authority of planning restrictions etc. | Maintenance is linked to economic activity and regeneration. |
| 5        | New lights around harbour | Resource issue for local authority. | |
| 6        |            | 1. Centre may die due to migration of locals from centre to perimeter  
2. Letting agents labels on holiday lets look unsightly  
3) Sudden over-building of flats  
4) Very large new renovations changing skyline | There is a need to protect views and setting. |
| 7        | Apparent lack of active concern about the deterioration of the harbour walls etc | There is concern but repairs are costly and will be linked to economic viability and regeneration. | |
| 8        |            | 1. It is unclear what we are trying to conserve.  
2. There would seem to be too many ways for unscrupulous operators to get around the rules. What can we do when the whole heart of the place is owned by one man?  
3. No one wants to live in a museum.  
4. In practice the harbour itself is not being conserved. Why? | Single ownership can provide an opportunity for cohesion because there are less parties to bring together. Seek to work with this owner to gain mutual understanding of local needs and the owners commercial needs.  
Lack of resources in local authority to pursue. The need for repairs to be linked to regeneration plans for the harbour and town. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9        | 1. The fact that it isn’t maintained  
           2. The fact that it’s being torn down  
           3. The fact that it’s less workable and being designed for tourism alone  
           4. The new fee-paying car park that was our boatyard | Isn’t tourism vital to the economic future?  
Other comments have indicated that lack of parking is a problem. |
| 10       | 1. Wirescape  
           2. Modern materials in public areas  
           3. Galv railings around the harbour | The detailing of materials and of services can be poor and requires a general commitment to increasing the level of attention given. However, other comments have suggested that rough diamond quality is a positive. |
| 11       | 1. Inappropriate glass and steel modern buildings next to old ones  
           2. The scale of some of the newer buildings  
           3. The proliferation of aerials  
           4. Developments filling in the gaps and the loss of glimpses of the sea | The juxtaposition of old and new can work well in place.  
There is a need to maintain views and setting. |
| 12       | Porthleven Action Group  
           1. It is unclear what we are trying to conserve.  
           2. There would seem to be too many ways for unscrupulous operators to get around the rules. What can we do when the whole heart of the place is owned by one man? The heart of the conservation area is owned and being developed by companies within the Trevor Osborne Property Development Group. These companies have dismantled the old crane which was supposed to have been under a preservation order, cut down the Monterey pine which we thought was protected and developed buildings under conservation at Cowls Garage and Pilchard Project by cladding and redesigning with new windows and roofs so that they have totally lost their original architectural style. This group has developed buildings around the harbour such as St Elvans, Monterey and Pilchard which are architectural eyesores and are not in keeping with the historical architectural style of the conservation area. | What we are trying to preserve is the character identified in the document.  
Singe ownership can provide an opportunity for cohesion because there are fewer parties to bring together. Seek to work with the owner to gain mutual understanding of local needs and the owners commercial needs. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Now the China Clay lanhay is possibly to be treated in the same way. And more developments to come with new shops on Shute Lane corner and a 35 room hotel on Breage harbour side – which we are feared will all be out of architectural character of old Porthleven</td>
<td></td>
<td>New development should respect the character of the Conservation Area but it does not necessarily need to replicate styles or materials to achieve this.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In practice the harbour itself is not being conserved. Why? The Harbour and Dock Company have a statutory requirement to keep the harbour well maintained. Not only has Hospital Corner fallen into the harbour and left as an eyesore over the last ten years but the remainder of the harbour is severely lacking maintenance with the sea washing between the giant granite blocks and is in grave danger of falling into the sea.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Repairs and maintenance are linked to economic viability and will probably be done in association with future regeneration and development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The two old derelict houses on Peverell Terrace currently for sale. It is much hoped that any new developments on this site will require for such to be in keeping with surroundings and be similar to the structures that have decayed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>If it is felt these are an eyesore then a project should be created to redevelop them. This might be done by the Development Trust or a similar voluntary sector organisation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The mass of signage and street furniture on the harbour head, such needs to be replaced with pleasing and harmonious fittings.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rationalisation and improvement to the detailing of public realm works needs to be done.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No one wants to live in a museum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The disrepair of the Listed Harbour/Dock wall</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(Porthleven Lights Committee)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The long term dereliction of 4 &amp; 5 Peverell Terrace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The inconsistent permission granted for ‘modern’ development within the Port</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rather too many second homes/holiday lets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Renovation out of keeping with buildings in the surrounds</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The dockyard area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The sad, falling down harbour walls</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Lack of maintenance of ‘harbour’ by harbour owner</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Greater Grade 2 listing of certain homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Need to address bad design features – plastic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A pity the 1960's houses couldn't be made to be painted colours other than magnolia and white</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unsuitable developments</td>
<td>What is regarded as over-development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Over-development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>The whole harbour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wall under Bay View Terrace which leaks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flooding into the moor area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parking around the harbour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor upkeep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of clarity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>Derelict land by harbour, Breageside, Fore Street, St. Thomas &amp; St Tess</td>
<td>Article 4 directions could manage this in the long term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Empty buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No buildings of great beauty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plastic windows</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harbour wall deteriorating – no ‘painting’ i.e. maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parking restrictions – locals have stated they can no longer drive down to the harbourside just to sit and enjoy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Too many second homes/holiday lets. Prices too high for locals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>A larger part of it are houses owned by people as holiday homes or by letting agencies</td>
<td>Tourism is important to the local economy isn't it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Free parking not available for locals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bay View</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>Building projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not enough money</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 26       |            | 4. The unmended harbour wall  
          5. Bay View Terrace footpath  
          6. Large amounts of rubbish in the harbour  
          7. Tatty around harbour head |         |
| 27       |            | 1. Too many holiday lets  
          2. Plans for large hotel? Lime kiln. | Could a hotel bring employment and income to the town? |
| 28       |            | 1. Poor refurbishment of many cottages (uPVC windows)  
          2. Ad hoc building permitted to houses |         |
| 29       |            | 1. State of Bay View Terrace  
          2. Cobbles on Fore Street - dangerous |         |
| 30       |            | 1. The dull and uninspiring colour of the buildings (excessive use of cream, white and magnolia)  
          both domestic and commercial. Too much dog mess.  
          2. The retaining wall on Bay View Terrace is a dangerous eyesore. |         |

What aspects of the conservation area most need protecting or improving?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harbour, Town institute and clock tower. Village centre.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2        |            | 'Listing' responsibilities need enforcement  
          Resource issue for local authority. |
| 3        |            | The Old Fisherman Lofts and Cottages |
| 4        |            | Harbour Head area – protect/get listed as public open space  
          Shrubberies Hill car park/picnic area & childrens’ play area – protect listed buildings and areas around them  
          Frankie’s Allotment – protect against building |
<p>| 5        |            | Be modern and future thinking |
| 6        |            | Removal/change of fairy lights. While lights around harbour (not up sides) might be attractive, Porthleven needs tourists. Letting properties attract sophisticated, high earners to area to stay in historical fishing village, not Butlins. | Agree. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Of course, the harbour does… with its derrick, and sluices. The shipyard is in need of sensitive restoration as a working area. The lime kiln and the cave behind, and the buildings along the quay there. Tampering with their façade and changing their usage should be rigorously controlled.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The harbour wall and surrounding area where damp is rising the rest of our old buildings!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The harbour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Views, net lofts, the jumble of building styles, cottages tucked away behind others, the precious few bits of green left</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 (Porthleven Action Group)</td>
<td>Of course, the harbour does as it is the jewel in the crown, but this is a statutory requirement of the Harbour and Dock Company... with its derrick, and sluices. The shipyard is in need of sensitive restoration as a working area. The lime kiln and the cave behind, and the buildings along the quay there. Tampering with their façade and changing their usage should be rigorously controlled. But again these are owned by companies within The Trevor Osborne Group and already there are plans drawn up by this group for a 35 room hotel on this site</td>
<td>What might be useful is a masterplan which can be subject of public consultation on plans for the areas around the harbour which might be developed to secure its economic future.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 (Porthleven Lights Committee)</td>
<td>All the owners of the Listed Buildings should be made to keep them in good repair with special emphasis on the Harbour/Dock wall. If need be then the legislation that is in force should be used, something Kerrier Council has failed to do.</td>
<td>Agree, and agree with failure of local authority to make a commitment to put resources to deal with this.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The harbour walls and the recreation area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 15       | 8. The harbour walls  
9. Sympathetic repairs to some properties e.g the house in Peverell Terrace |  |  |
| 16       | Harbour walls (inc pier) and baulk crane |  |  |
| 17       | 7. Architectural styles, wooden windows  
8. Ban plastic windows  
9. Pavements |  |  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Character of harbour area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>Inner harbour wall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>All of it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>Derelict land by harbour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Removal of UPVC windows</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Empty shops in Fore Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harbour walls and adjacent roads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>To keep it as it visually looked and not made into high-rise apartments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>All of it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gravesend, Breageside and particularly the harbour area and Bay View Terrace, particularly the path</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>The gardens at the front of Bay View, the footpath in front and the cast iron sections at the side.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coherent planning permissions for building improvements. Harbour side on Breageside needs improvement (demolish garages etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>The harbour and institute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fishing industry needs protecting – even if that means subsidising (or leaving) the EU. Without fishing boats, Porthleven is finished and there are precious few left (a BMW without an engine)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you agree with the introduction of Article 4 Directions which would require permission to be sought for changes that affect historic features?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Yes. All old buildings should be listed and certainly not modernised.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes. This must be carried out with care – conservation, not preservation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes. Providing conservation, not preservation is the aim. We must keep moving forwards not backwards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Of course I do!</td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes – Thomas Terrace should be added</td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>PAG fervently supports the introduction of Article 4 for Porthleven. However much damage with recent developments despoiling the harbour – this is a little like closing the door after the horse has bolted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Broadly speaking, yes</td>
<td>(Porthleven Action Group)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Yes, all of the Conservation Area should be covered by the Article 4 Directive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Yes, absolutely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Sorry – cannot remember Article 4 and have no online access at the moment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Agree in basis but permissions MUST be coherent across the board. Also, good quality double glazing can be achieved in uPVC to a design which is virtually indistinguishable from wood (we have some!) so uPVC per se should not be discarded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Yes – all of Conservation Area should be included</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>There are very few historic features left to change. Domestic architecture in Porthleven is generally not very remarkable. Listed buildings must be enforced.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Should any other areas of Porthleven be included in the conservation area?</strong></td>
<td><strong>It's a big enough conservation area at present. Protect and improve the conservation area listed at present. Don't be concerned about making it bigger.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Careful attention to the developments of the oldest of Porthleven (Gravesend)</strong></td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The Moors recreation ground, churchyard, cemetery, Vicarage Road areas&lt;br&gt;Shrubberies Hill car park/picnic area &amp; childrens playing field&lt;br&gt;Top of unity road, Sunset Drive and Wellington Road bungalows to junction with Sunset Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>No. This area will manage the core of the village and port.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>No justification to extend any further</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I am not sure this is necessary. We should be concentrating on fulfilling our obligations to what we already have.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Everything that is visible should be conserved before it becomes an ugly backdrop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>No. To widely drawn CAs devalue them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Extended further along Loe Bar Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>(Porthleven Action Group) I am not sure this is necessary. We should be concentrating on fulfilling our obligations to what we already have.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>(Porthleven Lights Committee) No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Baulk crane should be reinstated &amp; ‘Treza Valley’ should remain undeveloped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Possibly extend coastal area alongside to car park by Sithney-side</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Shrubberies Hill area, cliff towards the rock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Shrubberies Hill play areas and car park. If this area is not conserved, it will be built on. Our children need this space.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Area east of Tyr Rock (up to car park)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Shrubberies Hill play area needs to be retained for children and adults for relaxation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>The Moors recreational park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>All Breageside and Gravesend – sorry, cannot remember if these were included already.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>In the event that the Build Centre (was Hoskings) close, re-development should be subject to careful permission and fall within the Conservation Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Should be extended up through the whole of Loe Bar Road to Carn Del area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>No – it is already too large to mean anything. Porthleven is not a chocolate box village and in many ways this is where its strength lies. Change is good done properly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any other comments?

1. Nothing from this meeting, like many others held in the village, will come to anything.

2. The Methleigh/Treza Valley should remain undeveloped and kept as flood plain/recreation areas.

4. A copy of Phillip Arthur’s book ‘Porthleven – Through all the Changing Seasons’ is enclosed for information (including old photographs) [Don’t know where this is – MM]

1) Having been born in Porthleven over 70 years ago, I feel sad at the state of the harbour. My father was one of the harbour pilots and one would not be able to bring a steamer (coaster) into the inner harbour today. It has been allowed to silt up and no use has been made of the sluice gate for years (if it had been used, a channel would have been maintained in the outer harbour)

3) If plans go ahead to ‘re-point’ etc the harbour walls and the improvement of the fenced off Easy Quay, the first priority should be to dredge the harbour so that access can be gained to the foundation granite stones to enable them to be examined and repaired.

4) There are, I understand, various minerals and other substances in the mud of the harbour – including traces of arsenic – probably washed down from the mine workings in Breage and Sithney parishes. (The harbour is used for swimming etc. and needs examination for possible contamination. The owner/s should be requested to have the area examined and steps taken to clean up the problem.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5) Shrubberies Hill – playground, picnic area and car park should be kept as an open space and building should not be allowed on any of it. The picnic area could be landscaped to improve it and the car park improved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) ‘Frankie’s Allotment’ – Breageside. In 2000, approval was obtained and £130,000 of funding agreed by KDC (Mr Robert Grose was the Officer dealing with finance) to make that area into gardens to mark the Millennium. A deed was drawn up for a 60 year lease but the owner never signed it and consequently the money never materialised. It would be good for the ‘outlook’ and use of residents and visitors if this land could be acquired for either gardens or a public open space be made there.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Lamp Monument – The Square. Remove the base materials (earth and grass) to show the granite base of the monument. (a beautiful base was covered up several years ago) Put granite seating in the area to commemorate the monumental work areas of yesteryear. Generally tidy the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) It would be great to see ‘overhead cables, poles’ etc be addressed in the draft report. Also, an acknowledgement of the ‘micro’ area of architectural difference, sometimes in the same street e.g. the fishermans’ cottage of the west end of Mounts Road and the more ‘holiday’ influenced buildings of the east end. Again, in the draft report I would like to see more support for fitting solar thermal panels, particularly the more modern less obtrusive designs, when there is no significant impact visually. At the moment the report lumps them in with photovoltaics and wind generation, which I agree are marginal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>In all of Porthleven there is now very little work space and very little to inspire our youth. With the Atlantic Ocean out there, magnificent cliffs to east and west, and a rich maritime history, I find this alarming. We cannot all retire into cushioned modern apartments and virtual reality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Let us save this special town</td>
<td>Save it from what?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>More pro-active action should be recommended with regard to the collapsed harbour wall. Elliston Grdns should be identified as post 1947 on page 10 diagram</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>In all of Porthleven there is now very little work space and very little to inspire our youth. With the Atlantic Ocean out there, magnificent cliffs to east and west, and a rich maritime history, I find this alarming. We cannot all retire into cushioned modern apartments and virtual reality. There is one recent development by the Trevor Osborne Group that actually takes into account our architectural heritage and such is the house on Harbour View, This at least attempts to mirror the other building in the row. This shows that architectural harmony can be achieved. The developer who built the row of houses opposite the Christian Guest House on Loe Bar Road was given strict guide lines as to the stone cladding required and size of windows etc to fit within the architectural style of the area and these look quite fine. These however are outside of the Conservation Area and yet given such stringent guide lines and yet new developments around the harbour and on cliff road were not. It is crazy that more stringent guide lines are imposed outside of the conservation area whereas inside we've seen ultra modern designed developments not in keeping or harmonious with our superb architectural heritage. The new building on Cliff Road and those around the harbour may well be good architectural designs in their own rights but are more befitting for the frontage of Sandbanks rather than within historic Porthleven.</td>
<td>Are we identifying this as a good example?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>More protection for use of the last of the traditional buildings around the harbour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I feel strongly about the Baulk Crane, listed but allowed to fall into disrepair and be ‘replaced’ by a modern mobile crane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sympathetic development is essential and greater controls essential to maintain character of central Porthleven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>We need to preserve our heritage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>On page 31, no’s 4 and 5 Peverell Terrace are quoted as ‘at risk’ and listed. The houses are actually no’s 7 and 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Good document although lights on harbour should stay. The original Conservation documents produced in 1978 – please can this be acted upon and taken into account with reference to any new planning applications.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Very long (2 sided) written response received, summary of which is: The most important structures in Porthleven are the Harbour and Bickford-Smith Institute and financially, conservation should be concentrated on these. Both structures require urgent attention. Retaining wall beneath Bay View Terrace is an eyesore and public danger and author believes there is a real danger it will collapse. Soil pipes that leak onto road below are badly maintained. Uniformity of cream, white and magnolia buildings is uninspiring. Residents should be encouraged to use colour when painting their houses. Contemporary architecture should be encouraged, old and new can work well together. Harbour needs to be protected. Harbour lights should be retained as these are enjoyed by many people. Pier – no reason to keep this chained off all the time, it puts visitors off coming to Porthleven and author feels signs stating that people enter ‘at their own risk’ are contradicted by chains barring entry. Public toilets near clock tower should be opened during school holidays.</td>
<td>How could this be promoted by the Town Council to residents/owners?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Sirs,

Re:- Proposals contained within the “Porthleven Conservation Area : Appraisal and Management Strategy”.

On behalf of the Porthleven Lights committee, I am writing to express our deep concern over the proposals that are contained within the above mentioned document.

The reference made to the “coloured lights” in the section “Characterisation”, Street Lighting on page 26 raises the opinion that the lights add to the cluttered appearance of the Port. The vast majority of the people of Porthleven totally disagree with that opinion.

The proposals put forward in the section “Management and Enhancement Principles”, Action, page 40 that ‘A new coherent strategy would present the opportunity to remove some or all of the coloured light strings.’ That proposal horrifies the residents as they feel that the coloured lights add to the appeal and charm of the Port.

From the Committee’s point of view we would like to point out the following :-

The Harbour Lights have been part of the village for over 20 years.

The lights are in use for over 160 days out of the year.

Our power outlet at Harbour Head is used by various groups throughout the year eg., RNLI Porthleven Gig Club, Fishermens Society, Methodist Church and others for which we make no charge. The removal of light strings would make the retention of that power outlet uneconomic and impractical, thus depriving those groups of much needed power.

We are financed purely by donations and fund raising events and we receive no grants. The monies received comes from residents and visitors alike. All are highly appreciative of the look and effect provided by the lights, if they were not we would not receive the amount that we do. (Has anybody involved with the writing of the report been to see the lights illuminated at Christmas or during the summer months to evaluate the impact the lights have on the appearance of the Port?)

This year we have spent in excess of £3,000 on our lighting with over £1,500 being spent on changing over half of our coloured lights with low energy coloured bulbs which not only saves money but also reduces our carbon footprint by 93%. It is the intention to replace the remaining bulbs prior to our Easter switch on in 2009.

We would respectfully request that the authors/Council of the draft report consider these comments before the completion of the final document and makes changes to the proposals in relation to the removal of some or all the coloured lights. The people of Porthleven do not wish to see the lights removed, they see them as part of the environment of the Port and something to be proud of.

Yours faithfully,

Peter Ward.

Peter Ward.

Head of Displays and Maintenance.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dear Sirs,</strong></td>
<td>• It is clear that the lighting is part of the character of the harbour. Some people feel that the quality of the lighting can be improved. The balance between clutter and over-tidying is difficult to achieve. It is clear that lighting of the harbour area is important but perhaps any review of public realm and street clutter should also review the existing lighting as there is always room for improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re:- Proposals contained within the “Porthleven Conservation Area : Appraisal and Management Strategy”.</td>
<td>• There is also scope for more targeted lighting in the town to highlight historic features, and for public realm lighting to be improved generally in terms of street lighting and lampposts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On behalf of the Porthleven Lights committee, I am writing to express our deep concern over the proposals that are contained within the above mentioned document.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The reference made to the “coloured lights” in the section “Characterisation”, Street Lighting on page 26 raises the opinion that the lights add to the cluttered appearance of the Port. The vast majority of the people of Porthleven totally disagree with that opinion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals put forward in the section “Management and Enhancement Principles”, Action, page 40 that ‘A new coherent strategy would present the opportunity to remove some or all of the coloured light strings.’ That proposal horrifies the residents as they feel that the coloured lights add to the appeal and charm of the Port.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From the Committee’s point of view we would like to point out the following :-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Harbour Lights have been part of the village for over 20 years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lights are in use for over 160 days out of the year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our power outlet at Harbour Head is used by various groups throughout the year eg., RNLI Porthleven Gig Club, Fishermens Society, Methodist Church and others for which we make no charge. The removal of light strings would make the retention of that power outlet uneconomic and impractical, thus depriving those groups of much needed power.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are financed purely by donations and fund raising events and we receive no grants. The monies received comes from residents and visitors alike. All are highly appreciative of the look and effect provided by the lights, if they were not we would not receive the amount that we do. (Has anybody involved with the writing of the report been to see the lights illuminated at Christmas or during the summer months to evaluate the impact the lights have on the appearance of the Port?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This year we have spent in excess of £3,000 on our lighting with over £1,500 being spent on changing over half of our coloured lights with low energy coloured bulbs which not only saves money but also reduces our carbon footprint by 93%. It is the intention to replace the remaining bulbs prior to our Easter switch on in 2009.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We would respectfully request that the authors/Council of the draft report consider these comments before the completion of the final document and makes changes to the proposals in relation to the removal of some or all the coloured lights. The people of Porthleven do not wish to see the lights removed, they see them as part of the environment of the Port and something to be proud of.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yours faithfully,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Ward.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Ward.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Displays and Maintenance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes of meeting with Mr Trevor Osborne, 9th December 2008.</td>
<td>This should be referenced in the Conservation documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The defacto report articulated the vision for Porthleven in a community plan.</td>
<td>Limited resources area available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern over how the Council can implement the Management Plan with the scarce Conservation resources available, which would make Article 4 Directions unviable.</td>
<td>All of these ideas might support the local economy provided the balance of development and conservation of character is achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The local economy needs stimulating, and high quality high spend tourism is important. Holiday homes bring in more people. Good restaurants are needed, a possible hotel on Breageside quay, a smokehouse, a wine bar in the china clay building.</td>
<td>The location of a community building this far out of town does not seem right. The supply and demand for community facilities needs testing as does the viability of having several new venues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car parking is an issue, and a park &amp; ride north of town in could work. Could include a community building at the park &amp; ride and a band stand on the boatyard plus a gig club. There are lots of community groups without premises at moment.</td>
<td>Provision of car parking is both a planning issue, and a marketing/economic issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any plans to stimulate the local economy by attracting more visitors could be dependent on having a park and ride to remove cars from the harbour road and cope with the increased number of visitors.</td>
<td>The Square doesn't function as a pedestrian space or a central point of orientation. It is dominated by vehicle movements on a tight bend. This area could be looked at in a masterplan for a package of improvements, including the boatyard, Square, harbour road, and repair of harbour itself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Fore Street should become a pedestrian priority zone, the Square should become pedestrian friendly (similar to Redruth) and the harbour road should be resurfaced to give pedestrians priority. Cars should be banned altogether in summer. There is a massive opportunity to redevelop around the Square with rebuilding of the corner with a tower to compliment the Institute, create a colonnade of shops along the harbour side. Slow down vehicles. An opportunity to redevelop the Square would address the public realm of the harbour road, the harbour wall, lighting, and Square. A public private partnership would be needed. The harbour road should then be adopted highway.</td>
<td>Could ask Public Art South West (PASW) to get involved in design of lighting strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street lighting is not high quality. Feature lighting might work to highlight buildings.</td>
<td>The repair of the harbour is likely to be tied to any future development plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbour wall was offered a 50% grant from MAFF but Kerrier discovered problems with the claims procedure which meant they wouldn't apply for the grant. It was the failure of Kerrier to find a solution which caused the loss of the grant.</td>
<td>Action: a masterplanning exercise involving the community development trust and others to revisit the aspirations of the community, and examine opportunities for redevelopment in and around the harbour which secures both a viable local economy and improvement to public realm and physical infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>