

## Heritage Asset Review Group

Notes of Meeting held on Friday 7 November 2014 starting at 13.00pm.

### Present:

Colin Gould – in the Chair  
Mike Barnard  
Julie Brociek-Coulton  
Stephen Johnson

**Also Present:** Jacquie Burgess

### In attendance:

Ben Hogg – Historic Environment Manager  
Simon Hooton – Head of Strategy and Projects  
Prue Smith – Consultant on Cultural Heritage  
Andrea Long – Director of Planning and Resources  
Will Burchnall – Project Manager  
Kayleigh Wood – Planning Officer  
Lesley Marsden – Landscape Architect  
Sandra Beckett – Administrative Officer

### 15/1 Apologies for absence and welcome

Apologies for absence were received from Murray Gray.

### 15/2 To receive the note of the fourteenth meeting held on 18 July 2014

The Note of the fourteenth meeting of HARG held on 18 July 2014 was received as a correct record.

### 15/3 Points of Information arising from the last meeting

There were no further points of information arising from the last meeting other than those to be discussed within the agenda.

*The Group agreed to vary the order of the agenda and deal with those items involving presentations first.*

### 15/4 Water, Mills and Marshes: The Broads Landscape Partnership Bid

Will Burchnall, the Project Manager provided the group with a presentation as part of the report on the Authority's Heritage Lottery Funding bid (HLF) for The Broads Landscape Partnership to be titled Water, Mills and Marshes. This included a series of projects relating to the cultural landscape of Halvergate and its surrounding area. It would be area based with multiple partners and multiple projects. The Key aspirations for the project were: to undertake conservation work to mills; biodiversity enhancements for the area, to reconnect communities with their local landscape, provide skills training, and to improve and make available more information about the history of the

area for use in educational projects and interpretation. The Bid was due to be submitted by 1 June 2015 with a decision in October 2015. The development phase would then take up to 25 months in order to submit a second round application. Once HLF approval had been given it was intended that the 5 year delivery phase would be from 2017/18 to 2022/23.

The Project Manager explained that officers were still in the process of defining the Landscape Partnership area with the intention of extending this into Suffolk by including Beccles as well as Lowestoft based on the Landscape Character Assessment. The Project Manager ran through the main themes and aims of the project in detail and invited Members comments.

The Group welcomed the proposed legacy of the project and noted the partners involved in the Project Board meeting to be held on 13 November 2014. The Group gave consideration to the representation and commented that there were few Local Authorities included within the list of the Project Board. The Project Manager explained that they would be critical to the development process and likely to be included at later stages. With reference to the question of branding the Broads as a National Park, the Project Manager commented that the HLF considered it would be very useful and beneficial to the bid particularly as it was landscape based. The Landscape Partnership project could also be beneficial in establishing the brand.

The Group considered the inclusion of Beccles as another gateway with the River Waveney to be beneficial. They advocated reference and inclusion of the River Waveney Trust as an example of achievement and another important partner providing links with the educational elements of the project. They recognised the Education elements as being very important.

The group commented that the LPS could be a key delivery mechanism for the Mill action plans for those Mills within the project area.

The Group welcomed the report and presentation and considered that the project provided exciting possibilities and were fully supportive. They congratulated the Project Manager and team on the progress .

## **15/5 The Local List – Candidates for 2014**

Further to Note 13/5 and 14/5 Kayleigh Wood (Planning Officer) provided a presentation giving an update on the progress being made on Waterside Chalets for inclusion on the Local List, the work on which she was undertaking as part of her Masters degree.

Questionnaires had been sent out in August to 500 people with 100 responses being received. In September nomination forms had been distributed with five formal nominations being received back. In October and November the owners/occupiers of the waterside chalets had been notified and formal surveys of chalets on the Long list were being undertaken. This included:

- 71 chalets in total
- 54 chalets surveyed
- 17 chalets were yet to be surveyed
- About 6 were identified for National Listing
- Around 45-50 had been identified for Local Listing
- Around 25 were questionable

The Planning Officer provided the Group with photographs of chalets to be put forward for national listing. This included Whitesea Lodge at Hickling, a Bolton and Paul property at Potter Heigham, Leisure Hour and the converted helter skelter previously in Yarmouth. In addition she provided photographs of examples of properties identified for the Local List and some that had been discounted after the survey stage.

The Group noted the work still to be undertaken which included:

- *Completing the formal surveys of the chalets on the long list*
- *Checking through the formal surveys to ensure all put forward meet the criteria*
- *December- formally consult with owners of chalets on the list giving them 1 month to submit comments*
- *January/February - bring list and owner comments to Planning Committee for adoption.*

The Planning Officer commented that there had been a very positive response. However, she sought advice from the Group on how to deal with negative responses, explaining that there had only been two received. The Group suggested that further engagement with these owners, further explaining that the aim was to collect data for a public record and gain a comprehensive picture of the whole of the Broads and not leave gaps, would be a positive step. It was appreciated that there could be a misconception of what the Authority was attempting to do and a fear of the future imposition of more regulations and invasion of privacy and therefore attempts should be made to reassure them.

Members were in favour of some form of plaque being used to recognise those properties on the Local List. They considered that as part of the additional consultation and survey process those properties identified be asked for their views on the plaque as well as providing any more information they felt worthy of inclusion.

The Group considered that only two negative responses being received was excellent. They considered that the work being undertaken was an exceedingly valuable and significant contribution to understanding the Broads landscape. The Group were very encouraged by the progress being made and congratulated the Planning Officer on the achievements so far.

## **15/6 English Heritage Exceptional Waterlogged Archaeological Sites Designation -**

Further to note 13/7 and 14/9 Lesley Marsden, the Landscape Officer

referred to the paper by Peter Murphy BSc, Mphil, MIFA on the potential importance of Archaeology in the Broads which had been edited and revised since the last HARG meeting. This provided an insight into the evolution of Broads Landscape and would contribute to the Placemaking project. In addition, to complement the paper, she provided the Group with a Summary Story Board for the Historic Environment/Timeline which included comments from Tim Holt Wilson. (Peter Murphy would be providing a presentation to the Broads Authority on 21 November 2014.)

The Landscape Officer provided the group with an explanation of how it was intended to use all the information acquired so far and provide the background information for the HLF Bid, using the principles of the European Landscape convention. The Placemaking Project was to be web based and aimed to encourage those using it to delve deeper into the information available if they so wished. The aim was to make it accessible to as many audiences as possible for different requirements. In addition to the review of archaeology, there would also be geological and human time lines. It was intended to provide this as a story board.

Members suggested the possibility of using 3D images and a fly-through video. However, it was recognised that this would incur a cost. At present the Web Page Project was funded from the Authority's Project Pot but there could be contributions from external funding, and other partners and or contributions of information from organisations such as the BBC and College of Art.

The Group noted and welcomed the report, recognising that there was a great deal more work to be done on the project particularly in coordinating the information and provide consistency in the messages.

The Group thanked the Landscape Officer for the interesting presentation.

## **15/7 Conservation Area Re-Appraisals**

Progress was reported on the following Conservation Areas.

### **(1) Oulton Broad**

The Group noted that the draft Oulton Broad Conservation Area re-appraisal had been updated and amended prior to by the Planning Committee on 15 August 2014 when it had been formally adopted for public consultation. It had been available for the Waveney Parish Forum in September. The main comments had focussed on the impacts for the Bridge Road area and in particular the impacts on the businesses and parking. One resident had very strong views and the Historic Environment Manager had arranged meeting with him to address the concerns. A report following the consultation would be submitted to the Planning Committee in February 2015

(2) **Halvergate Marshes Conservation Area –Consultation.**

Further to HARG Note 14/4, the Group noted that the Halvergate Marshes Conservation Area Re-Appraisal had been published for public consultation at the end of July with an extended period to allow for the holiday period. Understandably there had been few responses due to the limited number of residents in the area. However, all of those received had provided positive feedback. Welcome responses had been received from the statutory authorities, English Heritage and Historic Environment Services at Norfolk County Council. A report would be submitted to the Planning Committee in February 2015.

(3) **Beccles Conservation Area Re-Appraisal**

The Group noted that the Re-Appraisal for the Beccles Conservation Area within the Authority's boundary had been formally adopted by the Broads Authority in September 2014.

(4) **Future Re-Appraisal Work**

It was noted that there were 5 Re-Appraisals still to do, which included Loddon and Chedgrave, Ludham, Horning, Stalham Staithe and West Somerton. Ben Hogg, Historic Environment Manager reported that the aim would be to attempt to fast track at least two of these prior to the Landscape Partnership Bid proceeding. However, it would be necessary to discuss the programme with the associated Local Authorities. As not all of these fell wholly within the Broads Authority's area, the Group considered that those areas which had a greater part of the Conservation Area within the Broads should be dealt with in the first instance. ie: Stalham Staithe, West Somerton and then perhaps Ludham.

- (5) A member referred to the concerns relating to **Beccles Quay** which had been raised by the Town Council. It was noted that it did fall within the Beccles Conservation Area. Mike Barnard commented that as far as Waveney District Council and Beccles town council were concerned there was not a business case at present for a viable project at the quay but further options are being explored.

The Historic Environment Manager confirmed that the Authority was aware of the concerns, a scheme was being drawn up and Tom Hunter, the Rivers Engineer was providing advice.

**15/8 Heritage at Risk**

***Buildings at Risk Schedule 2014***

The Group received the updated Schedules relating to the Buildings At Risk Survey as well as the Schedule relating to current and potential Enforcement issues.

The Group noted the report and that several of the buildings had been on the

list for some time with no further progress being made despite polite letters and several meetings. It was now necessary to consider how to progress these further. The Historic Environment Manager explained that there were two mechanisms for consideration: An Urgent Works Notice or Repairs Notice. (Details of these are attached at Appendix 1).

The Urgent Works notice could be served on the owner of the building to ensure that the building was water tight and reduce further deterioration. Various guidance could be given together with a time frame within which the works should be carried out.

The issuing of a Repairs Notice was more stringent requiring a thorough survey of the building with a schedule of works required to bring the building back into a "good" state of repair. Should the owner not carry this out, the onus would be on the LPA to purchase the property and to put steps in place to do so.

The Group considered that the owners should be informed that the Authority intends to consider such action unless positive works were carried out within a specified time period. Any action to be taken would require authorisation from the Planning Committee. It was considered that the threat of a Repairs notice would have more of an effect than an Urgent Works Notice.

It was agreed that the Mills within the Halvergate Area should not be included for consideration of this action in that they would be included as part of the Landscape Partnership Project.

It was noted that in the case of Bridge Farmhouse, Low Road, Mettingham that as part of a Section 106 Agreement the planning permission for another dwelling was dependent on works being carried out to the farmhouse and this permission would expire in 2015. Attempts had been made to make the owner aware of this but with no success as yet.

It was also noted that Kerrisons Level Mill at Halvergate and the Five Mile House Drainage Mill at Mautby could be removed from the BAR as work was now being carried out or was complete.

#### **15/9 Norfolk Windmills Trust**

Jacque Burgess and Colin Gould had attended a meeting of the Norfolk Windmills Trust on 15 October 2014. The work on the Stracey Arms Project with the HLF bid being successful was progressing. The Historic Environment Manager had attended a meeting with the NWT in order to examine ways of working together particularly linking in with the Landscape Partnership bid.

#### **15/10 Any Other Business**

No further business.

**15/11 Date of Next Meeting – 6 March 2015**

It was noted that the next meeting of the Heritage Asset Review Group would take place on Friday **6 March 2015** following the Planning Committee meeting.

The meeting concluded at 14.57pm

DRAFT

## Securing Repairs to Listed Buildings

Although there is no statutory obligation upon the owner of a listed building to keep their property in a good state of repair, it is usually in their interest to do so. However, action can be taken by a local authority when it is concerned about the continued conservation of a building.

**Urgent works notice** - Used to secure repairs urgently necessary for the preservation of a listed building:

- Works restricted to making the building wind and watertight, safe from structural collapse and to prevent unauthorised entry, vandalism or theft
- Can only be served on a vacant building or on vacant parts of a listed building
- The cost of carrying out the work may be recovered by the local authority from the owner and can include the continued expense of providing temporary support or shelter of the building
- In some circumstances can be served on an unlisted building in a conservation area where the preservation of the building is important for maintaining the character or appearance of the area.

It is good practice to notify the owner that the local authority is considering serving an urgent works notice – in many cases this is enough to prompt the owner to carry out the necessary works.

If this is not the case, the local authority can carry out the work, but must serve the owner with written notice of its intention, a minimum of 7 days before it intends to implement the work, giving details of what work is required.

When the works are complete, the local authority can serve notice on the owner requiring repayment of the costs incurred. The owner has 28 days to appeal to the Secretary of State against this notice on the following grounds;

- Some or all of the works were unnecessary.
- Temporary works have continued for an unreasonable length of time.
- The amounts were unreasonable.
- Recovery would cause hardship.

Urgent works notices cannot be served on:

- Land owned by the Crown
- Buildings subject to the ecclesiastical exemption (churches in use)
- Scheduled monuments, which are subject to separate legislation

**Repairs notice** – used to enable the long-term conservation of a building

- wider financial implications as it could lead to compulsory purchase by the local authority
- often used in a 'back-to-back' arrangement with a Preservation Trust or third party doing the work as part of a larger project, which considerably reduce the financial liability to the local authority.