

# Heritage Asset Review Group

## Notes of the meeting held on 16 December 2022

### Contents

1.	Notes of HARG meeting held on 28 October 2022	1
2.	Historic Environment Team progress report	1
	Conservation areas – update	1
	Listed buildings	2
	Water, Mills and Marshes - update	2
	Matters for information	3
3.	Any other business	6
	Venue for next meeting	6
4.	Date of next meeting	6

### Present

Harry Blathwayt – in the Chair, Bill Dickson, Andrée Gee, Tony Grayling, Tim Jickells and Melanie Vigo di Gallidoro

### In attendance

Jason Brewster – Governance Officer, Kayleigh Judson – Heritage Planning Officer and Kate Knights – Historic Environment Manager

## 1. Notes of HARG meeting held on 28 October 2022

The notes of the meeting held on 28 October 2022 (originally scheduled for 9 September) were received. These had been submitted to the Planning Committee on 09 December 2022.

## 2. Historic Environment Team progress report

The Historic Environment Management and the Heritage Planning Officer presented the report providing an update on progress with key items of work by the Historic Environment Team between the end of 10 September and 16 December 2022.

### Conservation areas – update

The Historic Environment Manager (HEM) confirmed that the re-appraisal of the Halvergate and Tunstall Conservation Area was nearly complete with the first draft of the appraisal

nearing completion. When finished, the appraisal would be issued to Broadland District Council and Halvergate and Tunstall Parish Council for their initial comments before being issued for wider consultation.

The presentation included photographs of buildings within the Conservation Area showing mature trees and a member asked whether the trees were or would need to be protected by Tree Preservation Orders. The HEM confirmed that the fact that the trees were within a Conservation Area would require any proposed tree work to be agreed beforehand with the Authority or Broadland District Council.

## **Listed buildings**

### **Quinquennial Survey**

The Historic Environment Manager (HEM) provided an update on listed buildings surveyed since the last meeting with photographs of various buildings included in the presentation.

Tunstall Dyke Drainage Mill was surveyed and, as demonstrated by the photograph (left hand side slide 4), there was work required to remove the ivy covering the building which had penetrated the interior between the cap and the top of the brickwork tower.

West Somerton Marsh Draining Pump had been visited and this building was deemed to be in good repair, as seen in the photograph on right hand side of slide 4. The owner, Norfolk Wildlife Trust, had recently replaced the timber cladding on the cap and replaced the wooden gantry. The HEM explained that the replacement metal version was of a high quality with detailing very similar to that of the original. The HEM added that the timber used for the cladding had been funded via a grant from the Farming in Protected Landscapes programme.

The HEM indicated the Historic Environment Team (HET) had attempted to survey Tunstall Dyke Smock Mill, however they were not prepared for the thick reed bed surrounding this structure; the team will attempt to identify the owner and then liaise with them to secure better access.

Other buildings surveyed by the HET were Horsey Mill, the Church of St Edmund at Thurne, the Thurne War Memorial, Thurne Dyke Windpump and another property in Somerton; these buildings were found to be in good condition.

The HET had also been liaising with property owners from previous quinquennial surveys where repairs were required.

### **Water, Mills and Marshes - update**

The Heritage Environment Manager (HEM) provided an update on the Water, Mills and Marshes (WMM) project.

### **Heritage Skills Training**

Decorating students from City College had been engaged in the tar work at Muttons Mill. The Heritage Skills Coordinator had confirmed that they would not be renewing their contract. This would mean that, in the short term, there would be no-one to supervise students on site unless their tutors attended to provide some supervision. As a result the HEM expected fewer

students to be on-site after Christmas. The project was due to complete in 5-6 months and the HEM explained that the WMM Carpenter would, after some training, take on the role of site foreman.

### Land of the Windmills

The HEM explained that work on the exterior of Muttons Mill had been delayed by the recent cold weather although repair work to internal joist ends had been undertaken.

The HEM was pleased to announce that work at Strumpshaw Steam Engine House would continue following a grant of £60,000 from Defra. The HEM showed photographs of the damage to the retaining wall of the outflow drainage channel, from an extremely high tide in February, and the resulting temporary repair using sand bags. The HEM explained that the drainage channel would be repaired and restored, the pipe would be extended to the river and the channel backfilled. This should mitigate damage from future flooding, simplify maintenance and remove any ongoing risk to the wildlife and public presented by the drainage channel.

The Defra funding had to be committed before the end of March 2023 and, given that a number of permissions would be required to complete the work at Strumpshaw, this was the priority activity for the HET.

The Chair and Vice-Chair of the Planning Committee both indicated that they would support an additional ad-hoc committee meeting if it would help to expedite the planning application associated with work at Strumpshaw.

### Matters for information

#### Shoal's Cottage, Irstead

The Heritage Planning Officer (HPO) discussed recent planning applications at Shoal's Cottage, Irstead and the possible implications on thatched properties in the Broads. The presentation showed various photographs of the property and included architectural drawings of the front, rear and side elevations of the property and proposed extension.

The existing property, located on the river Ant to the south of Barton Broad, dated back to the 1920's when it was a quite small waterside chalet. It had since been extended quite significantly over time although the original Arts and Crafts character had been retained; the dwelling had been constructed in half timber and render panelling, with a brick plinth, all under a thatched roof, with brick chimneys in a 'mock Tudor' style.

Planning permission had been granted, under delegated powers, for a substantial, almost two-storey, extension to be erected on the southern elevation (BA/2022/0030/HOUSEH). The proposed extension retained the Arts and Crafts character of the original building. Thatched roofs are typical of the Arts and Crafts movement (which uses raw, truthful materials with a focus on their natural qualities) and makes a significant positive contribution to the character of this property specifically. The use of thatch on the extension was considered essential and a planning condition was imposed to ensure this.

When work commenced the owners failed to secure a thatcher and subsequently submitted a planning application (BA/2022/0309/COND) to change the proposed thatched roof covering the new extension from thatch to tile, with a thought to also changing the existing roof from thatch to tile under permitted development. Given the loss of thatch, and the impact on the wider Broads area and on this property in particular, the application was refused under delegated powers. The HPO expected this decision would potentially result in the owners submitting an appeal, and it would be interesting to see how the Planning Inspectorate would respond.

This application highlighted the risk to existing thatched properties in the Broads area and the HPO explained that the Development Management team had begun to use conditions to remove permitted development rights that allowed thatch to be removed from properties without first seeking planning consent. Although these conditions would address new developments (including extensions), they would not be applicable for thatched roofs on existing properties.

This had prompted the officers to consider Article 4 directions as a means of restricting permitted development rights in the context of particular sites and/or areas; in this case removing the permitted development right to replace thatch with another material.

In conjunction to Article 4 directions the Authority was also considering the wider issues such as the supply of local reed, the reduction in local thatchers and reed cutters, the associated low wages and the lack of affordable housing in the Broads. The HPO concluded by seeking members' feedback on this matter.

Members were keen to understand whether there was any advantage to bringing more applications relating to Heritage Assets to committee; this would highlight the risks to these properties to all members of the Planning Committee. The HEM explained that members could call in applications under certain criteria as detailed in the Scheme of Delegation. The HEM didn't think it would be possible to bring listed building consent applications to planning committee unless there were reasons that would require it, as set out in the Scheme of Delegation and, by appearing to treat some applications differently, this action could prove counterproductive. The HEM confirmed that whether a planning decision was taken by committee or under delegated powers had no bearing on decisions made by the Planning Inspectorate.

Members acknowledged the commitment and expense associated with owning a thatched property and sympathised with the owners of Shoal's Cottage. Members recognised the need to protect the cultural heritage of the Broads and therefore supported the refusal of the planning application. Members were supportive of any policy changes that would preserve Heritage Assets within the Broads; the proposed use of Article 4 directions was consistent with that taken by the Authority in the context of solar panels within the Belaugh Conservation Area.

A member suggested lobbying government to reform permitted development rights in the circumstances presented by Shoal's Cottage thereby removing the risk to existing thatched

properties when they are extended. The member recommended other members contacting their local MP to highlight this risk to thatched properties within the Broads.

Given the heritage skills training provided by the Water, Mills and Marshes (WMM) project members were keen to understand whether an equivalent project could be initiated in this context. The HEM confirmed that a successor to the WMM project(s) was being investigated and that the provision of further/wider heritage skills training (e.g. millwrighting, thatching, flintwork) would be a factor when considering the scope of a future project.

#### Manor House, Lodge and Cottage, Yarmouth Road, Thorpe St Andrew

The Heritage Planning Officer (HPO) presented an approved application, under delegated powers, for the Grade II listed dwelling Manor House (including Manor Lodge and Well Cottage) to restore the property to a single residence. The presentation included location maps, a site map, various photographs of the interior and exterior of the properties, floorplans of the ground and first floor and historic development plans of both floors.

The main building, the Manor House, had a Georgian façade with 7 bays facing the river to the South, with a long linear garden in between. The other properties, Well Cottage and Manor Lodge, are to the rear of the main building running to the North along the eastern boundary with Yarmouth Road forming the northern boundary. The property slopes North to South down towards the river with a driveway leading off Yarmouth to the main access of the three properties to the rear of Manor House. Manor House is the southernmost structure, Well Cottage is in the middle and Manor Lodge abuts the Northern boundary.

The owners had submitted floorplans that had been colour coded to show the development history of the building. These had revealed that the western half of Manor House dated back to probably the 17<sup>th</sup> century. The eastern half of Manor House and what is now Well Cottage and the southern part of Manor Lodge were added sometime in 17<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup> century. The northern part of Manor Lodge was added in the 19<sup>th</sup> century and the property was subdivided into the current three dwelling during the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The HPO indicated that these diagrams had proved useful when assessing the appropriateness of the proposed alterations.

Planning permission had been sought for the physical alterations required to remove the previous partitions associated with the three dwellings. This work would restore ground floor and first floor access between Manor House and Well Cottage. The ground floor changes would facilitate a better entrance to Manor House and a snug. The first floor change would provide a dressing room to the now adjoining master bedroom in Manor House.

The application included alterations to the Well Cottage bedroom to improve the energy efficiency of the property. This work would add internal insulation to the external facing wall and the installation of secondary glazing to the two historic windows. The internal wall insulation would cover exposed timbers however it was consistent with previous work in the master bedroom. Sheep's wool would be used for the wall insulation and this natural breathable material was deemed appropriate.

Externally the owners intended to regrade the driveway from Yarmouth Road and formalise it using granite paving leading to a gravel parking area with York stone to delineate the property

entrance. The application proposed to re-render Well Cottage and Manor Lodge to match the previously lime rendered Manor House. The HPO explained that the external wall of Well Cottage had a modern breeze block construction on the ground floor while the first floor was the original timber frame construction with lath and plaster. For this reason detailing of the rendering had been conditioned to enable the most appropriate method to be assessed.

The HPO confirmed that this development work had commenced and she would provide updates on progress at future meetings.

Members thanked the Heritage Environment Manager and Heritage Planning Officer for their comprehensive reports and presentation.

### **3. Any other business**

#### **Venue for next meeting**

The Heritage Environment Manager (HEM) indicated that the intention was to hold the next meeting at the Lowestoft Museum. The Museum is set within Nicholas Everitt Park which is adjacent to Oulton Broad and the railway journey from Norwich provides a wonderful opportunity to admire the Broads landscape.

### **4. Date of next meeting**

The next HARG meeting would be held on Friday 10 March 2023 at 10am.

The meeting ended at 10:58am.

Signed by

Chair