

# Heritage Asset Review Group

## Notes of the meeting held on 12 March 2021

### Contents

1.	Apologies and welcome	1
2.	Declarations of interest and introductions	1
3.	Notes of HARG meeting held on 18 December 2020	1
4.	Points of information arising from the minutes	1
5.	Historic Environment Team progress report	2
6.	Any other business	5
7.	Date of next meeting	6

### Present

Chair - Melanie Vigo di Gallidoro, Harry Blathwayt, Stephen Bolt, Bill Dickson, Lana Hempsall, Tim Jickells, Bruce Keith

### In attendance

Kayleigh Judson – Heritage Planning Officer, Kate Knights – Historic Environment Manager, Cally Smith – Head of Planning and Sara Utting - Governance Officer

## 1. Apologies and welcome

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

## 2. Declarations of interest and introductions

No further declarations of interest were made in addition to those already registered.

## 3. Notes of HARG meeting held on 18 December 2020

The notes of the meeting held on 18 December 2020 were received. These had been submitted to the Planning Committee on 5 February 2021.

## 4. Points of information arising from the minutes

**Minute no 6 – Listing application for The Nebb, Blundeston**

The Heritage Planning Officer reported that she had visited the new owners of this property and had been involved in pre-application discussions.

### **Minute no 8 – Grove House and Farm, Irstead**

The owners had now acquired the adjacent site and had submitted an application to convert part of the thatched barn into an annexe, but retaining the main elements of the barn.

## **5. 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 December 2020 and March 2021.

### **Conservation Area Review**

The Historic Environment Manager (HEM) advised that the draft reappraisal for Belaugh was almost complete and on schedule for consideration by Planning Committee in April. Consideration had been given as to whether it would be appropriate to serve any Article 4 Directions, the purpose of which was to protect the character of an area by the removal of certain householders' Permitted Development rights and requiring a planning application for specified works. Guidance stated that these should only be used in exceptional circumstances where the exercise of PD rights would harm local amenity, the historic environment or proper planning of the area. There was a group of semi-detached workers' cottages in Belaugh, positioned in-between Top Road and Church Lane and officers were proposing that an Article 4 Direction be put in place to ensure that planning permission would be needed to replace their thatch with a different roof covering as the thatch was a key character of the buildings. However, this could be removed and replaced at any time without the need for planning permission. As the properties were semi-detached, it could really detract from the whole group if one half of a property's thatched roof were to be replaced. In addition, consideration was also being given to serving an Article 4 Direction to ensure planning permission was required for solar or PV panels in certain locations, such as on properties fronting certain locations such as The Street. The Direction would not prevent the works happening but would require planning consent and provide an additional level of control to ensure the panels were positioned in the most unobtrusive locations.

Members supported the officers' view but questioned what would be the likely response from the public. The Historic Environment Manager advised that there had been a very high level of engagement during the consultation in 2011 and hoped the proposals would be supported. It was quite common for Article 4 Directions to be applied in Conservation Areas, in focussed areas and not a wholesale use. In response to a question on whether the proposals for Article 4 Directions would be included within the consultation documents, the Historic Environment Manager replied in the affirmative and advised that, initially, a provisional Notice would be served for up to six months, with a 28 day consultation period and ideally this would run at the same time as the consultation on the Conservation Area. The confirmation of the Direction would likely to be reported to the Planning Committee for determination.

It was noted that officers were in discussions with Broadland District Council on the current appraisal for Halvergate and Tunstall.

In terms of Horning, unfortunately Covid-19 restrictions had impacted on the public consultation event, which had been requested by the parish council. Therefore, the situation would be reassessed in two months' time. A member questioned the extent of the Conservation Area, referring to the residential moorings which had been allocated and if these would be affected. The Head of Planning (HoP) responded that the Conservation Area would extend to the riverbank and therefore, if planning permission was needed for the moorings, this would be a material planning consideration. The member queried what the physical environment would look like and, in response, the HoP commented that the principle of use was acceptable and there was no reason why the moorings could not be compatible with the Conservation Area. Furthermore, the extension of the CA would not compromise the allocation for residential moorings coming forward.

### **Listed Buildings – local listing project**

The HEM reported that, unfortunately, the bid for funding referred to at the last meeting had been unsuccessful, possibly as a result of the project being very heavily subscribed to. This project remained something officers needed to consider and rationalise. In conjunction with this, it was hoped to provide an update on the Heritage Plan shortly which would reflect revised guidance by Historic England on Local Listing and the Government's "Planning for the Future" White Paper. This Plan would look at all aspects of the team's work, set out procedures and review areas of focus.

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

The HEM advised that Norwich City College had remained closed in recent months which meant that no students had been out on site and BA staff had not been able to access the college workshop. However, students had very recently returned and the workshop was now accessible again. It was hoped to be back on site with the students in April.

Work to repair Six Mile House Mill at Runham was effectively complete. There had been new ecology measures such as bat and owl boxes and a bat hibernaculum. Historically, the mill would have been painted in tar but as this was now banned a petroleum based paint had been used as a substitute. Work was ongoing on trying to find the best replacement for tar. Officers were clearing the site for the owner and making good the parking area etc. A member commented that the mill looked fantastic and queried what was the intended future use. He also asked if the Authority could get back the time lost by the students and whether the funding would be rolled-over. The HEM responded that the project with the students had been extended by 12 months (to 2023) and the funding had been rolled-over. In terms of this building, there was no planned use but the owner was keen to ensure it was regularly maintained as it was apparent that a lack of maintenance led to expensive repairs. It was appreciated that this would not be an easy task due to the building's height and remote location. Another member asked if it was proposed to make the mill more accessible and the

HEM responded that there would be no public access inside the mill but the Authority was working with the owner to provide additional mooring points near the mill and there was a public footpath that ran along the bank from Stracey Mill. Whilst the access track remained in a very poor condition (due to a lack of maintenance as a result of Covid-19), access for vehicles was problematic but hopefully this would be resolved by the time the next round of maintenance was required.

The HEM then presented details of the next projects – one at North Mill where a new inset cap was being installed and Oby Mill, where the windows were due to be installed. Works on High's Mill would be starting shortly to replace brickwork, repair the tower and repair and replace joinery, including the floor joists. At Muttons Mill work would progress to remove the two remaining sails for repair at ground level, hopefully in May.

### **Matters for information – Caister Castle/Hall and Motor Museum**

The Heritage Planning Officer (HPO) advised that an application had been determined under delegated powers for the conversion of an outbuilding to a tearoom at Caister Castle & Motor Museum, which was considered to be of interest to the group. She provided a detailed presentation, including slides of the site and the proposals.

The site was a unique and interesting visitor attraction comprising Caister Castle, a Grade I Listed Building and Scheduled Ancient Monument, Caister Hall, a Grade II\* Listed Building and an outbuilding which was formerly a 19<sup>th</sup> C cart lodge. The proposal was for the conversion of this outbuilding into a tearoom which was currently sited inside the Hall but not readily visible or accessible. Putting the site in context, the HPO explained that this was one of the first brick houses to be built in England. Caister Castle was developed from Caister Hall in the late medieval period by Sir John Fastolf who was the prototype, in part, of Shakespeare's character Sir John Falstaff. The castle had a moat surrounding it and adaptations had included new walls and a concrete bridge over the moat. The Cart lodge, now store, had a frontage of slate roof, barn doors and an historic arch window with a fireplace inside. The rearside was red pantile roof with historic windows.

This was a very sensitive site – a building attached to a Grade II\* Listed Building within the setting of a Grade I Listed and Scheduled castle all within the boundary of the Broads, so it was very important to secure a sensitive scheme. The initial scheme included glazed elements comprising a glazed terrace area onto the rear elevation of the building; new arched windows (which meant the removal of the curious circular window); insertion of double doors; removal of an internal fireplace and removal of the chimney stack. Officers supported in principle but had concerns at the level of alterations and the impact this would have on the integrity of the building itself. Of particular concern was the rear elevation and the level of fabric removal (chimney and fireplace). Officers negotiated the revised scheme which included: removal of glazed terraced area with the aim of achieving a more informal and less prominent seating area out onto the existing lawn; inclusion of landscaping to soften that; reduction in the door and window scale and retention of the circular window and a small internal change which would allow for the retention of the chimney and fireplace. In conclusion, this was considered an appropriate viable use for the building and provide improvements to the offer of a visitor

facility, whilst also retaining key historic features of significance and protecting the wider setting of the castle and hall.

In response to a question on the status of the planning application, the HPO advised that it had received conditional approval under delegated powers. The Ancient Monuments Society had withdrawn its objection upon receipt of the amended plans.

## **6. Any other business**

### **Martham Mill – unauthorised works**

The Heritage Planning Officer (HPO) presented a matter which had been brought to officers' attention since the agenda papers had been circulated. This involved unauthorised works to Martham Mill which was a Grade II Listed Building with a holiday-home use. It had a flat roofed extension off the side and also accommodation within the mill itself.

Officers had received a number of telephone calls advising that scaffolding had been erected at the site. Whilst they had previously been made aware by the owner of issues with the cap, removal of the cladding had subsequently identified that the cap was in a worse state than hoped. Photographs shown by the HPO demonstrated that the cap was severely damaged and was slumped on one side as there were no castor wheels on this side. Fortunately, the cap was fairly modern and the contractor, who was a boat builder, had managed to salvage some elements to reuse in the cap. The loss of fabric was not a major concern but the works required Listed Building consent. Therefore, officers intended to take a soft approach in enforcing as this was something that had originally been a relatively simple, albeit expensive, job but had spiralled into something quite significant. The owner was costing out the repairs and was in dialogue with officers including the submission of a Listed Building application. Therefore, officers had allowed works to continue whilst the application was submitted. Normally, officers would seek to get any works stopped but, in this situation, it was hoped to work with the owner to get the replacement cap regularised.

In conclusion, it was noted that officers, including the Enforcement Officer, would monitor the situation and members would be updated in due course.

### **Heritage Alliance**

A member referred to his membership of the Heritage Alliance which comprised around 150 organisations ranging from the National Trust to very small societies. Ken Smith, an Archaeologist and former employee of the Peak District National Park was now the Vice-Chair of that Authority and had recently joined the Heritage Alliance. However, it was unclear if Mr Smith was representing just the Peak District or the National Park Authorities collectively and, if the former, whether the Broads Authority should be represented on the Alliance, either through an officer or a member.

The Historic Environment Manager advised that she would investigate and report back to members. She was a member of the Historic Environment Group for the National Parks which met twice per annum and regularly responded to consultations etc but was unaware if this

group was represented on the Heritage Alliance. The Head of Planning added that the website did not show the National Park Authorities having representation on the Alliance but confirmed officers would look into and report back at the next meeting.

## 7. Date of next meeting

The next HARG meeting would be held on **Friday 25 June 2021 at 10am.**

The meeting ended at 11am

Signed by

Chairman