

Heritage Asset Review Group

Notes of the meeting held on 08 March 2024

Contents

1.	Notes of HARG meeting held on 15 December 2023	1
2.	Historic Environment Team progress report	1
	Conservation areas – update	1
	Listed buildings	2
	Water, Mills and Marshes - update	4
	Matters for information	5
3.	Any other business	5
4.	Date of next meeting	5

Present

Harry Blathwayt – in the Chair, Stephen Bolt, Mark Collins, Bill Dickson, Tony Grayling, Tim Jickells, Kevin Maguire, Keith Patience, and Melanie Vigo di Gallidoro

In attendance

Kayleigh Judson – Heritage Planning Officer, Kate Knights – Historic Environment Manager and Lorraine Taylor - Governance Officer

1. Notes of HARG meeting held on 15 December 2023

The notes of the meeting held on 15 December 2023 were received. These had been submitted to the Planning Committee on 02 February 2024.

2. Historic Environment Team progress report

The Historic Environment Manager and the Heritage Planning Officer presented the report providing an update on progress with key items of work by the Historic Environment Team between 16 December and 08 March 2024.

Conservation areas – update

The Historic Environment Manager (HEM) provided an update on the conservation area review and confirmed that work on the Neatishead conservation area was still ongoing and a structure had been put together for the new document. The HEM said that since the last

meeting, the Historic Environment Team (HET) had visited Limekiln Dyke via boat, as that area was an important aspect of the conservation area, and had met with councillors from Neatishead Parish Council. The Parish Council provided a lot of very useful background information about the area and said that they would spread the word about the conservation area appraisal and talk about it at their next parish council meeting. They would also be providing suggestions for the Management Enhancement Policy that needs to be contained within the conservation area. The Parish Council also suggested that the Broads Authority might consider extending the conservation area boundary to include Threehammer Common and Butcher's Common which, although were separate settlements in terms of their physical location, were part of Neatishead. The HEM pointed out that those two areas contained some very interesting buildings including an 18th century thatched cottage and a Grade II listed generator house. The generator house was a standby generator which was part of the Neatishead radar station and was built in the style of a chapel with an attached belfry to blend into the surrounding countryside as a disguise in the event of any military activity. The HEM advised that she had spoken to North Norfolk District Council (NNDC) as both areas were in the North Norfolk area. NNDC did not think that the buildings had sufficient architectural or historic value.

It was pointed out at the meeting with Neatishead Parish Council that part of the area was within Barton Turf Parish Council and the Historic Management Team were due to meet with them in the near future.

Listed buildings

The Historic Environment Manager (HEM) provided an update on the Quinquennial Survey. Since the last meeting, the Historic Environment Team (HET) had continued to inspect the listed buildings within the Broads Authority area. The HEM said that she had visited the interesting St Peter and St Paul's church at Runham. The building dated from the 14th or 15th century but contained earlier material. It stopped being used in the 1930s and by 1962 it had become derelict and had been subject to decay and vandalism. Because it had never been formally declared redundant, in 1968 the Bishop approved discontinuation of services. In 1980, it was suggested that the church should be kept open and should become a separate parish. Despite being in quite decrepit condition, the Friends of Runham Church was formed and they carried out fundraising to fully repair the building and it was now back in use. The HEM said that the building itself was a prominent building across the wider landscape and it featured a distinctive parapet which could be seen for miles around.

The HET have also visited other buildings since the last meeting:

- Manor Farm cottages in Runham which dated from circa 1850s. Built in the neo-gothic style, they would originally have been farmworkers cottages.
- Glebe Farmhouse on the edge of Stokesby. This building was listed as being early 18th century, however, it was likely that part of the building was much older. The owner was a retired archaeologist and had done a lot of research on the building. He had discovered that the building had belonged to the church and originally the footprint of

the building was larger than it was now, and he therefore intended to do some digging in the garden to see what could be uncovered.

- Stokesby Hall, a 17th century building in part with additions made in the 18th century. On the gable end, there was a date stone which read 1718. The HEM said that it was an unusual building using flint rubble and older brickwork in parts which suggested that the building was built using rubble from an earlier building on the site. Records showed that a family lived on the site from about 1422 and there was some discussion about whether the remains of that building became the foundation of the current building. The HEM added that the building was not in great condition and parts were in need of repair, however, the Broads Authority had granted building consent for the repair of some of the windows in 2020/21 and some of those had been replaced. The Hall was still used as a farm and had a lot of land associated with it as well as a complex of large, thatched barns dating from the 18th century. The HEM said when the last Quinquennial Survey was completed, the barns were derelict, however, they had since been renovated into a complex of barn conversions.

The HEM provided an update on the Locally Listed Buildings and in particular the Eel Set on Candle Dyke which led up to Hickling Broad. The HEM said that it was thought that the Eel Set dated from around the turn of the 20th century and was thought that it was the only functioning eel set in East Anglia and possibly in Great Britain. The HEM said that this was an example of the types of buildings which were on the Local List. Buildings on the Local List were considered heritage assets which were – as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework – buildings, sites, monuments, places, areas, or landscapes that were identified as having a degree of significance and heritage interest which merited consideration in planning decisions. At present, the Local List mainly contained mills, chalets and World War defence structures, along with buildings that were identified through conservation areas.

The HEM referred to the proposed template for the selection process which was attached to the Historic Environment Team progress report submitted to the meeting as Appendix 2. The original template was in need of being updated to make it more robust and less open to the suggestion of it being subjective. It was proposed that the existing template be updated to have a scoring element added so that it could be demonstrated that a building had met the criteria.

The Chair asked whether Members had any comments. A Member asked what would happen if a building on the Local List was sold and whether there was a requirement that the information be passed on to the new owners. The HEM said that this was something that would need to be considered as they would not necessarily know when buildings were sold.

A Member asked whether there was a certain standard that the buildings could fall into to stop it being worthwhile rescuing them. The HEM said that it was not necessarily about the condition of the building, although there was a category for condition, but in terms of the assessment it was more about the importance of the building and its architectural and historical significance.

A Member asked whether the buildings included on the Local List would be added to the interactive map that was being compiled. The HEM said that the Authority did have an internal GIS mapping system where all of the buildings are mapped. She confirmed that any heritage buildings would also be added to the Norfolk Historic Environment Record (HER) and therefore plotted on the Heritage Explorer website that was shown to the group at a previous meeting, and as part of the revised Local Plan, there would be some publicly available mapping which should contain a number of layers such as heritage buildings, TPOs etc.

In response to a question on who the owners of the Eel Set were, the Heritage Planning Officer (HPO) said that there was a complicated ownership agreement surrounding who looked after it and who owned it, and that it was partly managed by the Broads Authority, the Broads Society, and the landowner which was the Cadbury family¹.

The Chair asked if everyone was happy with the proposed changes to the template and there was unanimous agreement.

Water, Mills and Marshes - update

The Historic Environment Manager (HEM) provided an update on the Water, Mills and Marshes project and confirmed that the Mutton's Mill project was almost complete. Some work had been completed since the last meeting which included the installation of the sail bars. Some final touching up of the paintwork was still required, however, this work would have to wait until the weather improved.

A Member asked what happened next for the Mill in terms of maintenance. The HEM replied that the building was owned by two gentlemen and the Mill would be passed back into their hands as soon as the works had been finished. The hope was that they would continue to maintain the Mill, however, as it was a highly graded listed building, if it started to deteriorate, the Authority could step in and request that maintenance works were carried out, but it would have to be in a poor condition before any action could be taken.

A Member asked whether, once the Mill was handed back to the owners, could they sell it and make a lot of money from the repairs. The HEM replied that she did not think that would be the case as the owners loved the Mill and were very enthusiastic about it and added that the Mill could not be converted into a domestic property so it was highly unlikely. There was a legal document between the Broads Authority and the owners which ensured that everyone was aware of the various responsibilities and what would happen if certain circumstances arose.

A Member commented that he hoped that once the Mill had been handed back to the owners that arrangements could be made for the public to visit the Mill.

¹ Since the meeting it has been confirmed that the owner of the Eel Set is the Kinder family and not the Cadbury family as stated in the meeting.

Enforcement

The HEM provided an update on Holly Lodge which was discussed at February's Planning Committee where it was agreed that officers could proceed to serve a Listed Building Enforcement Notice to reverse the unauthorised works. The owner had appointed an agent and there had been some discussion on how to move forward on this issue.

Matters for information

The Heritage Planning Officer (HPO) gave an update on the Grade II* listed Herringfleet Smock Mill in Somerleyton, which was the subject of planning and listed building consent. The application was approved under delegated powers for works which included underpinning and the removal, repair and reinstatement of the sails. The HPO said that the Mill featured in many photographs and was well-loved and well-known by locals and visitors. The Mill had an octagonal timber frame, a wooden clad tower and a traditional boat-shaped timber cap on the top. The Mill had undergone a number of repairs in the past and therefore there was a mix of historic and modern timbers internally. The HPO reported that the Mill had lost two of its sails and the remaining two would have to be removed for safety reasons. The application for the underpinning and repair had been supported and recommended for approval, subject to conditions.

A Member asked whether the Mill was on the Somerleyton Estate. The Historic Environment Manager (HEM) confirmed that it was and added that the Mill was one that had originally been included in the Water, Mills and Marshes project and a schedule of works and a planning application had been drawn up. However, due to time and cost constraints, the works did not go ahead. The Mill was a very important building, being the only Smock Mill in the Broads Authority area, and could be seen across a wide area. The HEM said that the Estate had now set up a Trust to look after the Mill.

The report was noted.

The Chair asked that it be recorded that, as usual, the Committee had received wonderful, professional presentations and added that the Committee was truly spoilt. He thanked the Historic Environment Manager and Historic Planning Officer.

3. Any other business

There was no other business.

4. Date of next meeting

The next HARG meeting would be held on Friday 14 June 2024, at Ludham Village Hall.

The meeting ended at 10:45am

Signed by

Chair