

Draft Glaven Valley Conservation Area Appraisal's - Consultation Responses

(consultation period 22 November- 21 January 2022)

Total Written Representations: 32

| PARISH/TOWN COUNCILS | |
|--|--|
| Summary of Comments / Issues Raised (including page / paragraph number where indicated) | Council Response and Action / Recommendation |
| Brinton (ref: PC01) | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The PC is pleased the draft appraisal recognises the unique qualities of both the villages of Brinton & Sharrington. A request that the boundary on the Eastern side of the map be clearly outlined Stonewall Cottage is mentioned on pages 58 and 59. The correct name of the cottage is Stonewall Cottage as having 'particularly attractive sash windows and Gothick style glazing bars on the front door'. This text should relate to Daubeney Cottage instead, two houses further along The Street. We believe there is some confusion between properties, Brook House and the Villa. The photograph on page 26 is of Brook House and not the Villa as stated | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. No additional action recommended. Agree. This has been marked in the final version. Noted. This has been amended in the text. Noted. Text has been amended. |
| Edgefield (ref: PC02) | |
| No comments received during the consultation period. | |
| Stody with Hunworth (ref: PC03) | |
| <p>Major Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> That we are required to accept/agree with recommendations in both documents, without knowing what will be in the forthcoming Glaven Valley Conservation Draft Appraisal. The recommendations in Sections 8 for both Stody and Hunworth CAs seem to the PC, too prescriptive, and certainly many of them are quite expensive, which would adversely affect those on lower incomes, thereby accelerating the 'gentrification' of both Hunworth and Stody. The recommendations causing concern are for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replacement of doors and windows with wood rather than uPVC or metal. Cast iron not plastic gutter Screening of cars and wheelie bins | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarification. In large part, the majority of the Conservation Areas in question currently fall into both their own Conservation Area designation, as well as the larger Glaven Valley Conservation Area. Therefore, generally speaking many of the boundary changes proposed remove parts of the current boundaries from the village conservation areas, but they remain in the Glaven Valley, therefore, they lose none of their Conservation Area status or protection, they merely no longer fall into both designations unnecessarily. With regard to the contents of the appraisals, much of the content of the village appraisals will apply equally to the Glaven Valley Conservation Area, the main difference will be that the Glaven Valley covers a much wider area and is made up of much more landscape and |

- Hard standing surfaces
- Undesirable conservatories
- Use of lime mortar rather than cement
- Like for like repairs
- TV aerials & satellite dishes
- More discreet, narrower road marking (already our white road markings are often covered in mud, so more discrete ones would be ineffective)
- It is not clear if these recommendations will be advisory or mandatory? Although in an ideal world many of the recommendations are desirable, if they become mandatory then Stody with Hunworth PC is very worried that many of the recommendations in Sections 8 could be an unreasonable burden to homeowners and landlords. Also not clear how such guidelines could be implemented.

General Points:

- Stody with Hunworth PC understands that the original 1975 Conservation Area have been lost, and so clear replacements need to be drawn up, with an eye to the next few decades. Much has changed in the 40 years plus since the mid-1970s, but we believe strongly that the guidelines for the Glaven Valley CA have served our two village and the landscape around them, very well.
- Both Appraisals contain photographs of “undesirable” features on houses, walls, roofs etc. Some residents feel very uncomfortable and upset that they have been, as it were – named and shamed, and placed on a “Naughty List”, without their consent! Surely, we all know what a satellite dish, plastic guttering and a uPVC window look like? The PC feels that in this instance, NNDC has adopted an improper and unprofessional approach.
- The two Appraisals focus strongly on the buildings in Hunworth and Stody, especially their heritage elements. It seems strange in the present times that there is very little comment on environmental aspects, particularly the current drive to go green, reduce carbon footprint and improve properties so as to gain better EPC ratings?
- There is also a lack of discussion about the benefits of our current mixed communities in both villages, which are evidence of the variety of properties therein.
- NNDC failed to adequately inform residents in all six villages of the “Consultation Process” for their Draft Appraisals. The Thornage and

isolated dwellings as opposed to concentrated settlements. **No additional action recommended.**

- **Noted/Clarification.** All of the recommendations made within the appraisals are advisory, following nationally recognised best practice as set by various conservation bodies including government advisors Historic England. Historic England produce wide reaching guidance on all aspects of conservation best practice. The recommendations made are intended to present the ideal approach to conservation area management, however, NNDC recognise that best practice will not always be possible, for a variety of reasons. Despite that, as the appraisals are working documents it is important that an ideal baseline is set, each individual situation will dictate how closely this can be followed, and as the recommendations are advisory it is ultimately up to the individual how best to follow the guidance. Although it is important to note that the conservation area designation does bring with it some restrictions on permitted development, demolition, and tree works, advice should be sought from NNDC planning department if in any doubt. **No additional action recommended.**
- **Noted.** It is the case with the vast majority of North Norfolk’s conservation areas that the only documentation surviving is the original boundary line drawn, with no rationale left to explain the decisions made at the time. Whilst broadly speaking the designations have successfully served their purpose during that time, it is a statutory requirement for local authorities to review their conservation areas from time to time, part of which involves publishing appraisals to better understand their significance and to aid their long term management. **No additional action recommended.**
- **Noted/Clarification.** Part of a robust appraisal process has to take into consideration both positive and negative aspects of the conservation area in order to make an assessment of significance, it is recognised that on occasion this can be a difficult judgement to make. The appraisals have been drafted on behalf of NNDC, working to standards as set out by Historic England when reviewing conservation areas, the following is taken from the guidance note ‘*Conservation Area Appraisal, Designation and Management*’: “The appraisal is the vehicle for understanding both the significance of an area and the effect of those impacts bearing negatively on its significance.” The appraisals are about providing a balanced assessment of an area, both good and bad. The aim is not to name and shame, rather it is to raise awareness in a measured way. Ignoring negative features would not bring about positive change to the

Edgefield residents agreed that their consultation process had been conducted somewhat under the radar, so no similar well-attended meeting had taken place in Edgefield. There was no attempt to inform residents of the Consultation Process through parish magazines or village websites.

- At the 15 December afternoon Consultation Session, the NNDC officers Chris Young, Head of Conservation, and Alana Hogarth from the Planning & Development Department, were accompanied by Rowenna Wood from consultants PURCELL. Their original plan was to be there to answer resident’s queries about any of Conservation Area Appraisals for the six villages. However, CY was persuaded to address the assembled gathering, explaining the raison d’etre for the Appraisals and some key aspects of the recommendations therein. This was very useful. Cllr Andrew Brown also delivered an informative precis of the Appraisals. CY, AH, RW and AB then answered many questions from residents & parish councillors. We felt this was a much more satisfactory “public consultation”, than individuals posing questions to an officer in front of their own village’s display board. There were too many attendees to have made that work.
- In answer to a question, CY admitted that the appraisal for each village is costing c. £15,000. He also revealed that there are 81 Conservation Areas within NNDC’s boundaries. The six villages in this particular consultation process are the final six within the existing Glaven Valley Conservation Area - Blakeney, Holt, Hempstead, Letheringsett etc have already been done. Each of our two documents run to around 100 pages. Much of the text makes for very interesting reading and it is commendable in its scope. There is a good deal of “cut & paste” ie repeated sections. We note, this Appraisal process is not a national process but one initiated by NNDC.

New Stody Village CA:

- Hitherto, Stody village has been part of the wider Glaven Valley Conservation Area, whereas apparently Hunworth Village Conservation Area has existed as a separate entity since conservation areas were first introduced in 1975. NNDC proposes to create a new Stody Village Conservation Area (see map on p.79) centered on Stody Church and Stody Hall and extending up along Brinton Road as far as the turn up to the Thornage Electricity Sub Station.

conservation, which would be in contradiction of our statutory requirements. **However, some images have been removed from both Stody and Hunworth drafts and some text has been re-worded in the Stody draft.**

- **Noted/Clarification.** The remit of the conservation area designation and the subsequent appraisal process is by nature focused largely on the built environment as this is what the designation is intended to protect. The appraisals do discuss the wider environment and setting as far as it contributes to the immediate area, however it is beyond the remit of the appraisal process to engage in detailed discussion of environmental measures more broadly. Despite this, an additional passage has been added into each appraisal providing further detail on where care of heritage assets intersects with sustainability, pointing to a wealth of Historic England guidance. **No additional action recommended.**
- **Noted/Clarification.** A variety of methods were employed in order to notify as many people as reasonably possible, whilst also recognising that to reach every single resident affected would be a task beyond the resources available to NNDC. There is never an intention to act ‘under the radar’ as it were, but the process does to some degree rely on word of mouth in addition to the proactive measures taken. However, the feedback on the process is noted, and will inform our approach to future consultation processes. Outreach carried out included:
 - Each Parish Council affected, as well as the Local Member and the local church wardens were informed of the consultation process prior to it starting.
 - The CAA documents and associated material made available on the Councils website.
 - Dedicated content created on the NNDC website introducing the work and explaining the changes.
 - Press release to various media outlets.
 - Councils own social media campaign.
 - Posters distributed locally.
 - Exhibitions within each local church for the duration of the consultation.
 - Leaflets delivered by residents locally where requested.
- **Noted/Clarification.** The public consultation events were intended to be drop-in sessions, across two hours in each location, in an effort to avoid too many people congregating at one time in light of the situation with COVID 19. It was felt that it would be irresponsible to encourage a large mass of

- It is proposed that Stody Hall, previously not listed, is given a Grade 2 local listing. This is fine by us, however oddly, this new Stody Village Conservation Area excludes the houses clustered near to Letterbox House. There are 9 houses in this patch, including Grade 2 Vale House and Grade 2 Nos. 5 & 6 Hunworth Road, Stody - they all appear to remain in the general GVCA?

Hunworth Village Conservation Area:

- (Nobody on our PC was aware that there has been a Hunworth Village Conservation Area for over 40 years, it has never been cited!). It is proposed that Grade 2* Hunworth Mill will be removed from the HVCA, and placed into the GVCA because of the Mill's industrial importance. Have the other remaining mills on the Glaven eg. Thornage, Letheringsett, Glandford and Hempstead been treated in the same way?
- In addition to Hunworth Mill, five other open areas also designated for exclusion from HVCA are shown in orange on a new boundaries map on p. 94. These several areas of land, are to be removed from GVCA and incorporated within HVCA. The existing HVCA is shown in map on p. 81. On the p.94 map, the five new inclusion areas are shown in blue. It seems bizarre to the PC that the Dutch Barn Yard next to the Hunworth Bell, still very much a working agricultural area (Blue Area C on p.94 map), is to be removed from GVCA and incorporated into HVCA? The PC is against this. Our view on this is supported by Cllr Andrew Brown.
- The PC also favours that the row of six Coronation Cottages remain in the GVCA. They are good examples of interwar farm workers houses, and they do not seem obvious candidates to join the Hunworth Village Conservation area
- Castle Hill Fort – are the recommendations regarding this Scheduled Ancient Monument (p.92), advisory or mandatory? At present, the ring fort is preserved through lack of public access. There is no footpath, and never has been.

Corrections:

- General points – road names incorrect eg. Edgefield Road NOT Ramsgate St. PINKNEY LANE, not PINKLEY Lane. BRISTON RD, not HUNWORTH ROAD (going towards Stody Lodge). STODY RD, not

people, many of which may be more vulnerable, to gather in one space at the same time. All the information that was published advertising the events made it clear that the sessions would be drop-in style, however, in Hunworth over 30 people arrived at the village hall at the same time, making it impossible to follow efficient social distancing or to continue with initial plan and required an adjustment that had not been anticipated.

- **Noted/Clarification.** It was said that the Conservation Area Appraisals cost c.£90K but this covers 11 village CAAs and part of the GVCAA also, as well the time of the consultants to take part in consultation activities.
- **Noted/Clarification.** Stody Hall has been proposed for Local Listing, but it is important to note there are no grade distinctions within the Local List. **The boundary has been re-drawn following consultation to include the houses clustered near Letterbox House.**
- **Clarification.** The other mills were either already outside the village conservation area or have been moved out as part of the review.
- **Agreed.** The boundary has been amended to exclude the Dutch Barn Yard from the Hunworth CA and it remains in the GVCA.
- **Clarification.** Coronation Cottages may be farm workers cottages but they clearly read as part of the village and make much more sense to be part of the village CA than the Glaven Valley CA. **No additional action recommended.**
- **Clarification.** The recommendations regarding Castle Hill Fort are advisory rather than mandatory, however, reference to the footpath has been removed.
- **Agreed.** All points have been amended in the text.

present owners in 2002...and entrance hall. The adjoining barn was renovated for use as part of the venue in the 1990s.

- p.24 MAP Church Barn, opposite Hunworth Church was built in the 1906-58 period, so should be shown as GREEN
- p.43.C1 The Green consists of four wide.....
- p.52.C3 Shaped gable of Hunworth Hall from Stody Road.
- p.57.C2 bottom para. In the barn complex north of Hunworth Hall, five buildings remain....
- p.64.C2 bottom para. Line 4. Edmund Britiffe
- p.76.C3 REMOVE public footpath x 2
- p.84.C2. REMOVE “ “ and mention of Interpretation!!
- p.87.C2. para 2. Who determines what is urban or suburban??
- Last para. Can NNDC enforce that the ring fort be better preserved & interpreted?
- p.105. Village Green PHOTO IS WRONG WAY ROUND (aka photo of Stody Church on p.89 of STODY doc.)
- p.107. C3. Are there remains of buildings within the Ring Fort ??

Stody

- p.7 C1 penultimate line. landscape together with the Briningham and Burgh Beck tributaries to the River Glaven, contribute.....
- p.13.C1. line 5. Two tributaries to the River Glaven which cut through the village from east to west. These are flanked by quite steep hilly terrain. Surely fishing was the main industry of North Norfolk?? NOT water milling?
- p.13.C2. para 2. line 3. the streams which cut through.....
- p.16.C1 Stody is included in a 1726 estate plan of Edmund Britiffe’s former land and buildings, which had passed to his brother Robert around 1717. In that year Robert’s daughter Judith married John Hobart, 1st Earl of Buckinghamshire and owner of Blickling Hall and estate. (The plan also shows outlying lands at Holt, Thornage and Briningham.) Robert Britiffe was a very successful barrister, Recorder

- **Agree.** Text has been amended accordingly.
- **Agree.** Text has been amended accordingly.
- **Agree.** Text has been amended accordingly.
- **Agree.** Text has been amended accordingly.
- **Agree.** Text has been amended accordingly.
- **Clarification.** There is no mention of a public footpath here. The suggestion of interpretation on the street is considered a reasonable suggestion given its interest and importance to the area. **No additional action recommended.**
- **Noted/Clarification.** Not permitting urban/suburban incursions to preserve the rural character is sensible. Ideally homeowners would self-regulate for minor elements and NNDC where planning permission is required. **No additional action recommended.**
- **Clarification.** Historic England administers scheduled monuments, not NNDC. The interpretation is expressed as desirable and is up to the owners or local residents. The CAA is meant to be a document that provides guidance for all, rather than act as a rule book for the Council to enforce.
- **Noted.** Text amended accordingly.
- **Clarification.** According to the scheduling there may be remains of buildings below ground.
- **Noted.** Text amended accordingly.
- **Noted.** The text has been revised.
- **Noted.** Text has been amended though not to this exact wording.

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>for Norwich and King's Lynn and acted as a legal advisor to both Sir Robert Walpole and the Marquis Townshend at Raynham Hall. He served as a Whig MP for Norwich for nearly twenty years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • p.21. C1 para 2. <u>Some</u> of the Stody Estate.....not affected. Stody Hall however, was sold • p.54 C3. Does a "locally listed building" have the same protection as one listed by EH in the 1980s?? • p.56. C2. CUT from "Castle Hill Ringwork – Norman." • p.59. C3 Two streams run east-west through the village, and the bridges over these streams have white rails in an appropriate vernacular style. • p.73.The CONSERVATION PHILOSOPHY is too draconian! • p.89. The photo is the WRONG way round – cf. p.105 in the HUNWORTH doc. which is also reversed. • p.90. Stody Hall box. Remove sentence starting, North elevation.....to original entrance. (no dormers or projecting range). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted. Text amended. ○ Clarification. A locally listed building does not benefit from the same protection as a statutorily listed building. Nor does it bring with it any additional planning controls, it is merely a means of highlighting historic buildings that contribute positively to the character and appearance of the conservation area. ○ Clarification. The archaeology typically covers a particularly area (1sq km) and the ringwork at Hunworth is a major feature within that area. This is the character area appraisal so refers to a specific part of the CA, not the whole CA. ○ Noted. Text has been amended. ○ Noted. Text amended. |
| Sharrington (ref: PC04) | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognise the importance of the natural landscape setting as being a fundamental part of the character of the village, and the views across our fields both in and out are an important contributor to the setting of the Conservation Area. The PC would like to see further areas of field into the Conservation Area. • Firstly, the field which lies between Ash Yard and Upper Hall Lane is one of those fields which is an important contributor to the village setting and we would like to see an extension of the Conservation Area boundaries to include 'A' (map page 99) rather than exclude this area. In fact we would suggest that the existing boundary between Ash Yard and Upper Hall Lane should be moved northwards to include the second of the 2 ponds in the field and the northern part of Upper Hall Lane and the whole of the avenue of trees on Hall Lane which form an important part of the approach to the village • Secondly, the field situated in the Street (East-West) opposite the cluster of late 19thC estate cottages is also an important contributor to the village setting and, in particular, this cluster of attractive and historic estate cottages which help define the form and character of this part of Sharrington. The field impacts on the views into and out of the village and as such we would like to see this field incorporated into the | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted/Clarification. The fields are an important contributor to the setting of the village but they are not part of the village and therefore should not be included in the designation of the village conservation area. No additional action recommended. |

Conservation Area. The view of the estate cottages through this field forms an important approach to the village.

- Thirdly, the appraisal suggests extension of the conservation area to include gardens behind properties on the Bale Road as well as areas fronting the Bale Road (E on the map page 99). It would make sense to regularise this boundary by running this extension further along the Bale Road to include an additional area of the field which borders the Bale Road and the garden and boundary of the property known as Valley View. The views into and out of the Conservation Area from this point in the village are an important asset to the village and provide a strong landscape context. The field provides long views to the south and south-west over open countryside towards Thornage and the Glaven Valley.
- Acknowledging the changes which are suggested to regularise the boundaries to follow garden boundaries (page 97 of the report), we have been asked why this principle has not been applied to the properties on The Street (North-South). Amending the boundary to regularise and included the accompanying plots/gardens would provide important historical context.
- The appraisal has included in the local listing numbers 16 and 17 The Street. These are semi-detached 19thC brick and flint estate cottages. There are several pairs of these cottages in the village. On this area of The Street, semi-detached cottages 18 and 19 sit adjacent to numbers 16 and 17. All 4 cottages sit prominently on the skyline and this cluster are important contributors to the approach and setting of the village Conservation Area. We therefore feel that the integrity of all 4 cottages should be acknowledged by locally listing.
- There is no mention in the appraisal of Michael's House, Bale Road, which is situated on the corner of Bale Road and the road which leads down to Brinton. Parts of the main house date from the seventeen hundreds and possibly earlier. The house has been unoccupied for years and whilst modernisation would need to take place to make it habitable, the property is unique, unspoilt and of historic and visual importance within the village. Further details regarding house attached separately.
- The council agrees with the statements regarding the importance of boundary treatments to properties and this was highlighted a few years ago by the sudden removal of a large number of mature trees at Broadacres, New Road, which had an adverse impact on the Conservation Area. This property and the adjacent bungalow were

- **Noted.** If this refers to the gardens of Farm Cottage, Sharrington Barn and Hazel Nuts, these have been incorporated.
- **Noted.** The intention was to select the best example for local listing, however, on the feedback of the PC this has been amended.
- **Noted.** No name for the property was found previously and it has limited visibility from the road but we were aware of a historic house in this location. The additional info included was a sales brochure and did not include anything that could really be incorporated into the appraisal. **No additional action recommended.**

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>adjacent to and just outside the original conservation area boundary. The new boundary plans propose to remove the adjacent properties, Whimbrel and Hogpenny which were in the original Conservation Area but retain their boundary demarcation in the Conservation Area. As the importance of boundaries and their proximity to the Conservation Area is recognised, we would like to request that the boundaries of all 4 properties on New Road be considered for inclusion in the Conservation Area because of their importance, proximity and effect on the Conservation Area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 41 Rovalé not Royale. Page 47 speed restriction signs seen in the village. Where are these as we are not aware of any? Page 53 ‘like Brinton Hall’ should this read ‘Sharrington Hall’? Page 55- Stiles Farmhouse- divided to create multi occupancy, this is not the case. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted/Clarification. The retention of the boundaries of Whimbrel and Hogpenny was a compromise – they are already in the CA. To include boundaries of two properties that have always been outside the CA and are not in the historic locations of property boundaries seems to stretch the function of the CA. The buildings and their boundaries are part of the setting of the CA. But the argument that they are part of the approach to the CA is recognised. No additional action recommended. ○ Noted. All amended. |
|--|--|

Thornage (ref: PC06)

| | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although it has taken some time to emerge into the public domain for consultation the draft Thornage Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan ¹(“TCAA”) appears to be a historically well-researched and thorough piece of work. This should be commended. It even bears out village residents’ concerns about the effects of speeding traffic. • Nonetheless, there remains a significant contextual shortcoming which also, currently, poses a challenge within this latest consultation exercise; for NNDC has chosen to consult upon individual settlement CAAs and yet has not published, even in draft, the overall Glaven Valley Conservation Area Appraisal & Management Plan (“GVCA/GVCAA”) into which the Thornage Conservation Area (“CA”) and its neighbouring village CAs are to sit nor how the GVCAA will then inter-act with the village CAAs. Current “intel” is that it will not be until Spring 2022 that the consultation draft GVCAA will be published but not what will then happen thereafter. • Further, the publication of the consultation Regulation 19 Draft Local Plan (“DLP”) in the final week of consultation on this round of CAAs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted/Clarification. All of the conservation areas, with the exception of Sharrington, that have most recently been consulted on fall into the Glaven Valley Conservation Area, in addition to having their own separate designation. The only new conservation area proposed is that at Stody, as it remains the only settlement within the Glaven Valley that does not have its own designation, and its character is notably different to the wide rolling landscape of the Glaven Valley, meaning it would be difficult to define its significance without separating the two. The decision was taken early in the review programme to complete and finalise the village boundaries before publishing any proposals for the wider Glaven Valley so that it could take into account any changes made to the villages after they had been through the consultation process. For the areas around the villages that also fall into |
|---|--|

adds an additional level of complexity and uncertainty, given that DLP policy ENV7 is intended to give effect to all the CAA including the TCAA². This includes, as policy ENV 7(8), the development management implication of the TCAA: ‘8. Development proposals will conserve and where opportunities arise, enhance the character and appearance of Conservation Areas, where account will be taken of any relevant Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plans in determining proposals’

- Surely, until the outcome of the consultation GVCAA is known it would be premature to adopt, in final form, any of the applicable village CAAs for the purposes of implementing DLP policy ENV7? This is because of their complementary but differing focuses.
- Accordingly, we suggest that where (a) “consulted” CAAs have already been adopted and (b) “consulting CAAs” are to be adopted ahead of the DLP’s formal statutory submission/examination then, in the case of category (a) they should be the subject of applicable revision/supplement and then re-adopted, and, in the case of category (b) , into which the TCAA would fall, it is formally recognised that the TCAA constitutes an interim document and will be the subject of further revision/supplement before final adoption following the GVCAA consultation exercise.
- As a re-consultation exercise this could be sensibly and economically undertaken at the same time as the GVCAA consultation exercise this Spring. Indeed, at its most distilled, the question could be asked: *“Are there any amendments or additions to the current Conservation Area Appraisal for your village [[link](#)] that you would wish to see take place, and, if so what?”*
- This current strategic shortcoming is highlighted, for example, by the way in which the issue of setting would be addressed.
- In Section 2 (p13) of the TCAA the following summary is provided: *‘The open meadows to the west of Thornage are a particularly significant element of the setting of the Conservation Area as they facilitate views of the north and south ends of the village and*

the Glaven Valley CA, any removals from the boundary will automatically still be included in the Glaven Valley and therefore no level of protection will be lost, for example the piece of land between Brinton and Thornage. It is however, best practice to remove large areas of field from settlement conservation areas, and in Thornage the area immediately surrounding Thornage Hall will actually see an addition to the boundary. The areas around Thornage that are already outside the boundary of the conservation area but not in the Glaven Valley CA will still form part of the setting to the conservation area, as they do now, which in itself gives the area a degree of weight with regard to the planning process, this will not change following the adoption of the draft appraisal.

contribute to the open character of the southern half of the Conservation Area. The footpath across the meadows reflects the historic links with Brinton. Elsewhere, the agricultural fields and blocks of woodland plantations are also important contributors to the setting of the village as are the River Glaven and the wider valley through which it runs.'

- Section 4.2 (at pp.34-45) provides greater detail, though, unhelpfully the text mixes views into with those within the Thornage CA. It also currently lacks the level of detail to support this aspect of the Conservation Philosophy of the proposed Management Plan (@ p.99): *'The setting of the village contributes considerably to its special interest and will be maintained. The meadow, agricultural land and planted woodland surrounding the village will be preserved'*.
- However, until the draft GVCAA is published the reader cannot know which of these setting aspects have enhanced statutory protection because they fall within the GVCA boundaries and which are/would be only DLP policy protected because they lie without and are only a material planning consideration. This is highlighted by how, for example, the north-western side of the village would be treated³ where there is, currently, no overlap between the Thornage CA and the GVCA boundaries around Thornage Hall.
- It follows that this uncertainty needs to be the subject of clarification, and, where appropriate additional text in the finally adopted TCAA as well as express consideration, hopefully, within the draft GVCAA before it is published for consultation, and, certainly before that document is finally adopted.
- Policy ENV7(8) of the DLP now makes clear that a CAA Management Plan will have adopted development plan status for the purposes of future planning application determinations. However, there is the potential for confusion and inconsistency as well as a lack of appreciation of what can or should be achieved or regulated in the "real world" when reference, in the case of Thornage, is made to the TCAA
- Fundamentally, this turns on the issue of permitted development rights of unlisted properties. By way of context, Section 7.2 sets out an

extensive list of vulnerabilities with p.90 setting out a list of examples of “modern accretions to buildings” which negatively affect appearances and other examples. We would add that these fail to appreciate the realities of modern living as well as income differentials of villagers. Section 8.3 then sets out an extensive list of recommendations. These include unsightly solar panels and satellite dishes; but the text fails to acknowledge that the locations may be the only places where aspect or signal can be achieved. While these are currently “recommendations” we are concerned about their future outworking, given that the foregoing enjoy permitted development status on unlisted properties.

- We further note that page 102 (central block of text) proposes no Article 4 Directions for individual properties nor makes mention of any Article 4 Direction covering certain types of permitted development at the present time. While such an approach to Article 4 Directions may be justified, it is seemingly based simply on the views of Purcell, the authors. On its face, without say limitations on certain types of permitted development right, it will only be where a householder is obliged to submit a planning application where these recommendations could be applied, which could lead to inconsistency and unfairness.
- Accordingly, we would suggest that this aspect warrants careful re-consideration by NNDC and articulation as to what it wants, as the local planning authority, to achieve in terms of ongoing village conservation area management within the Glaven Valley, how it needs to be addressed on a village by village basis, and, in what form? In turn, we would suggest that even some minor textual changes would be beneficial, for example to identify what is advisory rather than mandatory, and, would be pleased to work with NNDC officers on the final version of the TCAA.
- Because of the timing of the TCAA’s consultation in the period preceding the extended holiday period Christmas and New Year 2021, and, the holding of two public meetings only on 15th December 2021 the Parish Council remains concerned that there has been an insufficient level of public engagement. We would add that this is despite Parish Council members hand delivering to all households an

- **Noted/Clarification.** As discussed above, the recommendations made are advisory in nature and follow nationally set best practice in conservation area management. NNDC recognise that it will not always be possible to meet the ideal requirement, which is why when a planning application comes forward each case is considered on its own merits and often if best practice is not achievable we will look to mitigate harm where possible through alternative options. None of the appraisals recommend any further curtailing of permitted development rights, beyond those that already accompany a conservation area designation, through the use of an Article 4(2) direction, this would only be a consideration if the condition of the conservation area were to significantly deteriorate.

- **Noted/Clarification.** The decision was taken to begin the consultation in December rather than delay further and wait until after the Christmas season. Usually we would only run the public consultation for the standard 6 weeks, but in this case to account for the Christmas period and to allow further consideration of the proposals whilst many people would have time off, the consultation period was extended to 9 weeks. All outreach undertaken to advertise the consultation period is detailed above.

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>urgent newsletter and a NNDC generated leaflet (when finally available the day before the public meetings) as quickly as possible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accordingly, for the reasons explained above, there needs to be another opportunity to understand and comment upon how the village CAAs will inter-act with the GVCAA as well as the content of that latter document. Therefore, we would commend to officers the need to announce, with a longer lead time, the consultation on the Draft Appraisal and Management Plan for the GVCA, and, to publicise and hold of NNDC staffed public meetings on more dates. In that way, better outcomes are more likely to be achieved. • Finally, we would welcome the opportunity to maintain a dialogue with NNDC officers as well as with and through Cllr Andrew Brown, our NNDC ward councilor, both as to how to improve consultation processes as well as the content of the final version of the TCAA, and, the GVCAA. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted/Clarification. The feedback we have received regarding the consultation process will be taken into consideration and will influence the manner in which the consultation is carried out for the Glaven Valley Conservation Area. |
|--|---|

| OTHER BODIES | |
|--|--|
| Summary of Comments / Issues Raised (including page / paragraph number where indicated) | Council Response and Action / Recommendation |
| Trustees of Sharrington Village Hall (ref: OB01) | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The trustees of Sharrington village hall are agreeable to its inclusion into the Conservation area in principle. As the remaining village amenity this would seem sensible, although we do still have our church. • The concerns we raised during the verbal consultation remain, on the selling of the plot, if the hall had to close. You admitted getting planning permission to change usage would be complicated and we have taken the view that as trustees we would not want to allow the hall to fall into disuse. We hope that the hall will continue to be the focus of village activities but provision of a new roof remains a long term goal due to its age and construction. We would be looking to the North Norfolk District Council to assist on advice for any grants for the roof replacement. | |

Sharrington Parochial Church Council (ref: OB02)

- In general we welcome the report and have no major concerns about many of the forward recommendations, though we offer comments on some of the detail. We do however wish to register our disappointment that the place and role of the Church in the continued health of the 'area of special architectural or historic interest' is understated in the report.
- The report does recognise (p.61) that the church is an 'important communal building' but the challenges facing the church in fulfilling this role have been ignored or misunderstood. At its simplest we feel that there is an underlying assumption that the church will be there whatever, when in fact, the maintenance of the church at its current standard requires considerable ongoing efforts from local volunteers.
- The closure of the Church as a place of worship would have a profoundly negative impact on aspirations for conservation.
- The PCC believes that this legacy should not be regarded as a burden but as an opportunity to maintain the place of the Church in a village. In terms of what is 'desirable to preserve or enhance' (p.7 of the report), the church is central to the fabric and texture of the community and valued by many- irrespective of their religious beliefs. People want the church to continue.
- Although the churchgoing population has declined, it should be noted that All Saints Church is a vibrant organization.
- In the churchyard there is a single bench with a WW1 dedication installed in 2018, we are therefore puzzled by the description in the report, (p.47), of benches (plural) with 'dedication messages to a deceased member of the community or a patron'. We suspect that these phantom benches are located in an entirely different churchyard.
- It was significant that in 2010 the then Archbishop of Canterbury, The Most Rev, and Rt. Hon. Rowan Williams made a visit to All Saints Sharrington and chose to make it the occasion to make a major statement on the role of the Church in the rural community. This visit would be considered by many as at least as important a 'memorable event' as a visit by two cast members of the Archers.
- Since the churchyard has been identified in the report (p.49) as an 'attractive green space' with 'a private and quiet character that forms a reflective space', a comment on the costs involved may assist. Care of the churchyard to current standards requires an outlay of some

- **Noted/Clarification.** P61 is in the building types section – it is purely descriptive and not the place for a discussion of challenges. However, new text added to section 7:

7.6 Communal Buildings

Sharrington is fortunate in having two functioning communal buildings: the church and the village hall. Both are run by small groups of local residents and face considerable challenges in gaining sufficient income and other funding to maintain and operate the buildings. Whilst special funding may be available for certain projects relating to the conservation and upkeep of the buildings, the process of applying for funds can be arduous and put further strain on the small team running the building. It is important to balance the benefits of maintaining these communal facilities for the benefit of local residents and ensuring the aesthetic value of the listed church and the conservation area are maintained in the long term.

- **Noted.** Text has been amended.

- **Noted.** Text amended to include this.

- **Noted/Clarification.** The report seeks to make no assumptions, but does not focus on any one particular building or area in any great detail as the

£800 a year. Here we are most grateful to the Parish Council who over recent years have made a donation to this expenditure. It is against this financial background that the PCC wish to draw attention to the vulnerable position of the Church and the challenges involved in maintain its community role. We feel that the report assumes the Church will be there whatever, when in fact the maintenance of the church requires considerable efforts from local volunteers.

- We must stress that any works of Church buildings and their curtilages are governed by Faculty Rules, the Church of England's own planning system, and not by the local authority.
- P.16 3.2, P.52 4.4.1- The report recognises the central importance to the village, of the attractive exterior of the Church and the need to maintain visibility from different directions. It does not however comment on the value of the heritage of the interior: this may have been outside the scope of the report. However, the PCC feel that it is important, in our submission, to register an accurate record and this is included as an appendix.
- P.50 4.3.5, P.96 8.3.4- We welcome the comments and approach set out on trees and vegetation. Here it should be emphasized that all work on these trees is subject to the Church of England Faculty system as well as the requisite consent from the local authority tree officer.
- P.70/71BALE ROAD- At this stage we would simply like to record that the PCC is currently in discussion with UK Power Networks on some aspects of the cables immediately outside the Church.
- P.70/71 BALE ROAD, P.96 8.3.5- there is a particularly prominent warning sign that a burglar alarm is in place; it is there to act as a clear deterrent to lead theft and we were encouraged to position it there by the police and our insurers. We will discuss the best way of producing alternative signage, while retaining the deterrent effect.
- P.70/71 BALE ROAD- the churchyard does contain many old gravestones and the ravages of time are evident on a number of these. However, regular checks are made to ensure none are safety hazards, and most of the oldest gravestones are located in the wildlife area. Moving them should never be taken lightly and only be considered if strictly necessary. We do not consider this to be the case.
- P.70/71- it is worth recording here that, for many years, the Church bins have been kept in a special concealed area out of view at the rear of the Church and brought out to the road only on collection days. We

significance of the conservation area is derived from a multitude of different elements. It would not be appropriate to discuss the financial struggles of a particular institution without giving the same attention to others, which would be beyond both the resource and the remit of the appraisal process.

- **Noted.** Text has been amended (although it can be more complicated than this).
- **Noted/Clarification.** The interior of the church possesses a great degree of significance, however, the conservation area appraisal does not focus on the interior of any building within the designation. Further details regarding the significance of the Church can be found elsewhere, including its listing details from Historic England.
- **Noted.** Text amended
- **Noted.** Text amended
- **Noted.** The comments made regarding waste bins are made more broadly about the village rather than highlighting any individual building.

| | |
|--|--|
| would note that we are puzzled by the comment, and wonder whether the Purcell consultant made their visit on collection day. | |
|--|--|

| BRINTON (Public) | |
|---|---|
| Summary of Comments / Issues Raised (including page / paragraph number where indicated) | Council Response and Action / Recommendation |
| Anonymous (ref: B01) | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The draft report on Brinton is a very detailed document and we look forward to seeing the finalized copy being produced, please pass on our thanks to the team who produced it. • Stone Wall Cottage is mentioned in report on pages 58 & 59 which is actually named Stonewall Cottage and should be corrected. • On page 58 para 3 the report notes Stonewall Cottage as having ‘particularly attractive sash windows and Gothick style glazing bars on the front door’. Stonewall Cottage does not have these features and we believe this text should relate Daubeney Cottage two houses further along The Street. This is reinforced by the photographs on page 59 and the photo titles ‘Stone Wall Cottage’ which is in fact Daubeney Cottage. The actual Stonewall Cottage is shown on the lower left side photo titled ‘cobble flint and red brick cottage lining The Street and we would be grateful if the above details could be amended. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted. Amended ○ Noted. Amended |
| Anonymous (ref: B02) | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wholly in agreement and favour of the plan, but with some additional comments. • Important to retain the character of the village and save it from further inappropriate development- enough damage done already. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted. |
| Anonymous (ref: B03) | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Increasing damage to the built and natural environment due to traffic, including volume, width and weight of vehicles. Difficulties of people being to appreciate the areas as no safe walking routes through many of the areas. District and parish councils must ensure the national and county council highways and public utility providers must work to maintain and improve the conservation areas. Brinton, Thornage and Sharrington are all | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted. Whilst valid concerns, they are beyond the remit of the conservation area appraisal to address in any meaningful way. |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>being eroded by the traffic, including the cross country routes to the coast and frequent closure of the B1110 at Thornage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It is not clear what partners will ensure the plans are followed. ○ NNDC needs to do more to advise the owners of listed buildings and parish councils in non-conservation areas to maintain their properties and area, in line with these good practice recommendations. There are many good photographs of good and poor practice in these documents which should be produced in a leaflet for public use. | |
|--|--|

| EDGEFIELD (PUBLIC) | |
|--|--|
| Summary of Comments / Issues Raised (including page / paragraph number where indicated) | Council Response and Action / Recommendation |
| Anonymous (ref: E01) | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Paper is poorly put together, recommendations for the way forward are unclear. Cannot believe there is a picture of a rubbish bin featured on one page, looks like a paper submitted for a GCSE exam. I hope this did not cost a lot of tax payer's money, perhaps you could clarify how much it cost. Very disappointed, not worth the paper. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted. Please see earlier discussion of costs above. |
| Anonymous (ref: E02) | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It is a quiet, rural, agricultural village with wide-sweeping views over open agricultural land. Wildlife/birdlife and natural habitats within the countryside are of great importance. Therefore, important to preserve the biodiversity of the immediate area. ○ Traditional Norfolk banks and verges fronting properties are important characteristic, and hedges and walls enhance the visual amenity. ○ Increased traffic using Sands Loke, has caused noise disturbance and detracts from the usual quietness of neighbourhood. ○ Signage/furniture detracts from the natural surroundings, and parked vehicles on agricultural land detracts from visual amenity ○ Increased noise/pollution in a normally extremely quiet neighbourhood ○ Concerned that Sands Loke and neighbouring fields are no longer included in the Conservation Area, even though the Loke and field plots are shown on the 1886 map. Feel they should remain in Conservation Area | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted. ○ Noted. The buildings are all modern in appearance and there is a general principle of removing fields from the CAs. There is nothing to alter that principle here. |

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Agree with the need to protect and preserve the heritage and feel of the village for the present local community and for generations to come○ Concerned about the negative impact the dog activity is having on the natural surroundings and amenity of local residents living close by and the loss of wildlife/habitat in the area, as well as noise/disturbance as a result of dog activity. | |
|--|--|

| HUNWORTH (PUBLIC) | |
|---|---|
| Summary of Comments / Issues Raised (including page / paragraph number where indicated) | Council Response and Action / Recommendation |
| Anonymous (ref: H01) | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Hunworth CA has virtually no affordable or social housing, lacks public transport links. • There is a need for assistance in finding mechanisms to make older properties more energy efficient. • There is limited access to walking routes/footpaths in the immediate area. • It is my understanding that the draft conservation area appraisal is intended to be a reference document or aid for planning officers when looking at planning applications for an area with which they might not be familiar. If so it might be better to have a more technical approach and as such could benefit editing to remove content which is more suited to an estate agent introducing prospective buyers to the village. • As it is a draft that I have seen I am sure this will already be in hand but there are a number of phrases and passages which have been ‘copied and pasted’ between sections, this is obvious and for me as the reader undermines the integrity and credibility of the content. • I and others in the village feel that the level of ‘tidying’ proposed/aspired to was not reflective of life in a living community (cars parked out of sight, televisions aerials to be hidden, wheelie bins to be hidden) and was not really likely to be of much relevance to planning officers. • Additionally Councillor Brown present at the consultation meeting and the PC discussion confirmed when asked that energy efficiency and conservation considerations would be considered as equal in importance to the ‘heritage’ aesthetic elements discussed in the appraisal document and it is hoped this will be firmly established for consideration in any future proposals from villagers to improve the energy efficiency of older properties. • I am not quite sure what message the front cover image conveys but I would hope that it would be possible to find an image [without a Porsche sports car] which conveys better the image of the tranquil rural haven the document attempts to portray. <p>Intro 1.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The increasing volume of very heavy farm vehicles on roads and lanes is having a major impact – part of any appraisal should look into the sympathetic management of the ever increasing size of the tractors, | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted/Clarification. The final documents are intended to provide guidance to a wide range of interested parties, not just planning officers, the language employed therefore, needs to be clear and understandable to those without any great prior knowledge in order for it to be a useful working document. ○ Noted. Reviewed and updated ○ Noted/Clarification. The document is multi-functional and is intended in many ways to demonstrate best practice rather than set mandatory requirements across the board. ○ Noted. Image cropped to remove cars on either side |

machinery and trailers and the speeds at which they move around both the lanes and within the village.

- It is one thing to be prescriptive on the 'built environment' but there is little point in discussing conservation or preservation if the fabric of the rural area in which these buildings sit continues to be eroded without check or consideration.

Page 13, section 2

- Perhaps the stone in the windows and other sections was imported, but the knapped flint a non-local building material?

Page 22, section 3

- It might be worth noting that in 1940 when it was considered a possible Nazi invasion force could choose the North Norfolk Coast as a possible site, batteries of artillery guns were stationed inland to fire on any landing enemy forces and provide protection to those defending the area. One such battery was positioned on Hunworth Common until after the Battle of Britain and it was thought unlikely the Nazis would follow through their plans.

Page 28, section 4.2.1

- The river is hidden from view over most of its length other than at fords or bridged crossings due to private ownership of the land through which the river flows.

Page 29, section 4.2.2

- There are similar open central greens in Briston, Edgefield, Swanton Novers and Cley, Blakeney and Wiveton.

Page 33, view 09

- This view is to and around, not through Hunworth Common. It is in part a metalled road and a Boat, Old Holt Road or Common Lane according to NNDC.
- Image 09 shows modern house, discomfort that the isolated position of the house is highlighted in a public forum, so would be grateful if the image could be removed.

Page 44, section 4.3.5

- Could you confirm that there is a walking route? Currently the understanding in the village is that Castle Hill which is owned by Stody Estate is not accessible to the public. Also mentioned on page 76, section 6.

Page 44, section 4.3.5

- Are you able to provide the mapping/documentation that shows trees extending across to line Hunworth Road as being on Hunworth common?

- **Noted.** See above discussion on remits of the conservation area appraisal.

- **Noted.** Updated wording to clarify.

- **Noted.** This has been added on p23.

- **Noted.** Added section 4.2.1, para. 2

- **Noted.** Reference to it being unusually wide compared to other villages has been removed, also removed reference p13.

- **Noted.** Updated to 'View along Common Lane' also for view 19.

- **Noted.** The image has been updated for one which is along the track but does not show the house

- **Noted.** Reference to a walking route on p44 has already been removed. Deleted on p76.

- **Noted.** Reference to Hunworth Road already updated to Holt Road, no further action necessary.

Page 46, section 4.3.6

- It isn't actually a weir it is simply a log lying across the stream and the river at the ford makes that sound whether it is there or not- also mentioned on Page 75, section 6.5. For the most part the river is either within woodland or people's gardens/fields and does the river itself and its sound not indicate its presence? Currently the woodland and trees which line much of the river bank are in a state of neglect with fallen and overhanging trees, not a rural feel simple neglect.

Page 48, section 4.3.1

- Corrugated iron sheeting patented in 1828 is a light, effective and most practical covering for roofs and shelters whether permanent or temporary- does being around for close on 200 years not give it a little bit of context?

Page 50, section 4.4.2

- [on the unsympathetic use of uPVC] there is no mention of environmental impact as a reason not have uPVC over wood. Cost can be more than 4x to have wood units. When questioned Cllr Brown confirmed that environmental impact took equal precedent with heritage/aesthetics so it would be better to have a house double glazed in uPVC than to have it remain single glazed and environmentally inefficient simply because the owner could not afford the higher cost of wooden windows.

Page 66, section 6

- The map courtesy of OS and NNDC indicates that Hunworth Common extends from the conservation area northern boundary to Common Lane/Old Holt Road and south to the river. Is this correct? Also link to point on area of Hunworth Common at para 4.3.5.

Page 67, section 6.7

- Is the indication here that people living in rural area do not need to use or should not own cars?

Page 69, section 6.2 King Street

- [Presence of wires, telegraph poles and aerials clutter rural image of street] as for point 6.1, this is not a period movie set, it is a living village.

Page 70, section 6.2 King Street

- [Alternative methods for receiving telephone reception such as underground cables would help] as for 6.1. it would be interesting to hear the view of planning officers on the value they would place on this as a proposal, how it might be funded and the likelihood of it happening and if they felt it viable and worthwhile then by all means include it.

- **Noted.** Reference to weir removed. Wording amended regarding row of trees indicating the presence of water to also include the sound of the river. Reference to Weir removed on p75.

- **Noted.** Added reference to it having been used for the last two centuries as a practical roof material but that today it contrasts with the pantiles on the rest of the buildings, so have left the reference to its use being limited in the CA.

- **Noted.** See above for discussion on where sustainability and heritage intersect.

- **Noted.** The assessment area name has been changed to Hunworth Common and Blickling House. This is assuming Hunworth Common is the land to the north of the track (Common Lane).

- **Noted.** See above discussion of best practice ideals. What is the change required here?

Page 72, section 6.3

- Bins can be heavy and the older or less able residents need to be able to get them to the collection point easily.

Page 75, section 6.5

- Same comment about map on page 66.

Page 75, section 6.5

- If you check with NNDC you will find this 'windy stretch' is Common Lane/Old Holt Road.

Page 79, section 7.2

- Cast iron guttering/downpipe is available but 10x the cost of plastic. Almost all modern houses use plastic/PVC 'rainware'. For many in the Valley aerial/satellite dishes are the only way to get a TV signal. In some areas even that does not work and we are reliant on snail speed internet feed. TV aerials, satellite dishes and solar panels need to be in a particular face or side of a building for obvious reasons. The question to the planners is should alternative energy sources solar panels not be installed or rendered useless because they face the wrong way because they might cause offence to an occasional passer-by?

Page 79, section 7.2

- [regarding wheelie bins being an unfortunate feature] I feel this is a little precious and does not really justify featuring in the appraisal. The majority of bins in the UK are council issued and are not an urban vs. rural issue, they are the efficient way of simplifying waste collection.

Page 82, section 7.3 – pressure from development

- [regards spread of development into GV] is this a bad thing? The risk will be that it will only be high value dwellings which will not help support lower income families.
- [re. planning legislation] this is contradictory, on the one hand 'high design quality' among the mention of 'vernacular' and 'contextual relationship' swiftly followed by a statement which intimates one can build anything as long as it is of 'high quality design' and does not necessarily need to match existing buildings.
- One doesn't have to travel too far to see some pretty extreme examples of what one presumes must be considered 'high design quality' that definitely fit the 'do not necessarily need to match existing buildings' and the new structures certainly do not sit 'harmoniously within the streetscape' but somehow they are there? I struggle to grasp how this is so when on the other hand there seems to be huge concern exercised over whether a traditionally tiles roof on a flint house has visible solar panels on it.

- **Noted.** Reference to Common Lane/Old Holt Road added.

- **Noted.** See above discussion for expansion on where sustainability and heritage intersect.

Page 82, section 7.4

- Hunworth is simple a pretty village surrounded by farmland- truly rural character is a thing of the past. If a village has rural character it comes from being originally and intimately connected to the land, those that live there having a close relationship with place, either through working on, having an understanding of, or sympathetic relationship with the surrounding land.
- In agreement with the impact of light pollution on night skies.

Page 83, section 7.5

- [increased traffic levels] the link to holiday properties/traffic increases is tenuous as if a house if occupied by full-time resident there would still be traffic, occasional visitors staying in that same house if it were a holiday let are not likely to result in an increase. In fact it might be less especially if the full time family has more than one vehicle.

Page 84, section 7.8

- [Increased rainfall/gutters and drainpipes] what does this really mean? Most of the nations will have guttering, down pipe, waste water and soakaways calculated according to proven guidance and building regulations. Is this a new phenomenon that we should be aware of?

Page 87, section 8.2

- What quite does the ‘rural character of the village should be preserved’ mean, what point in history would you like to go back to?

Page 87, section 8.2

- [front gardens should not be lost to driveways] there is a bit of a conflict between this and the statement on p.68, para 6.1.

Page 87, section 8.2

- [the agricultural land and woodland surrounding the village will be preserved] what does this mean? Preserved by whom and under what guidelines/direction? The area around Hunworth in farmed on an industrial scale, there are very few small farms just estates- often they will employ contractors who come for short spells.
- It is my understanding that the government do offer incentive to landowners to put conservation measures in place and worthy projects may well be in progress but unlike the village there is no way of knowing what is or isn't being done in the way of preservation.
- Is there to be a similar appraisal of the natural/non-built environment and will the public be involved?

Page 88, section 8.3.1

- I struggle to imagine why any property owner (or at least owner occupier) would not maintain their property where finances permit- it is the latter

- **Noted/Clarification.** The pressures of the historic environment from climate change is well documented. A further note has been added about increased intensity of storms in the future.

- **Noted/Clarification.** As a rural village, it would be undesirable to see an influx of typically urban or suburban features become commonplace, and damage the existing rural character. However, ‘new’ has been before ‘driveways’.

- **Noted.** This has been changed from ‘preserved’ to ‘retained’.

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>point that is a key constraint for some. (Same for preserving historic windows/doors)</p> | |
| <p>Anonymous (ref: H02)</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is a comment in the draft about the lack of publications on the history of Hunworth. I have been studying the history of Hunworth in the early modern period for the last 15 years. I find much to comment on with many examples of is-interpretation or mis-understanding, mistakes and questionable assumptions which reflect the reliance of the writers of this draft on secondary resources. ○ On page 17, the building of Hunworth Hall is incorrectly attributed to Edmund Britiffe [1700-1770] the son of Edmund Britiffe [1669-1726] who was responsible for the Hall. The survey map of the Estate drawn up by James Corbridge for Robert Britiffe in 1726 only record the land and property held and of interest to the Britiffe family. It is therefore an incomplete record of the village, which was more extensive as evidenced from the research in the tax and probate records. ○ On page 18, I can find no record of the chapel built by the Rev Giles Say of Guestwick in any source currently available from the Norfolk Record Office. There is, however, evidence from the Britliffe papers of a land grant to the Quakers for a barn/meeting place in Hunworth at the beginning of the 17thC. Also on page 18 an incorrect reference to the estate passing into the Blickling ownership in the early 18thC through marriage: in fact it was sold by Edmund Britliffe [1700-1770] to Lord Hobart for the sum of £10356 – 10s- 2 ½ p in March 1738/9. ○ Further examples: page 11 ‘Hunworth exists because it was located at the confluence of two rivers, as reflected in its name’. Hunworth is located on a single river, the Glaven into which flows two becks: Stody Beck and Thornage Beck. ○ On page 15, Hunworth is described in the Domesday Book as having 11 households. The Domesday Book did not record households but land held from the King and his fiefs. ○ On page 15 ‘the ownership by the monarch may have given King Street its name’: all roads were ultimately owned by the King and there is a long tradition of calling major roads: King Street or Regia Via. ○ On page 16, the Church of St Lawrence is described as being rebuilt in the 15th C. a more accurate description would refer to the extension of the | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted. The reference to lack of publications on p15 para 3 has been deleted. In the preparation of Conservation Areas extensive research into primary documentation would take a lot of time and be more detail than is usually required. Secondary sources are often therefore relied on. ○ Noted. Birth/death dates of Edmund Britiffe added. Added that the map is incomplete but that it is representative of the area at the time. ○ Noted. This reference is from Bartram, Len, <i>Hunworth and Stody</i>, 1999. Reference added. Note on Quaker meeting house added. Amended reference to sale of land. ○ Noted/Clarification. The River Glaven Conservation Group (https://www.riverglaven.co.uk/index.php/about-the-river-glaven/) call these Stody Beck and Thornage Beck so a note has been added to p26 para 3. NB – the Parish Council stated: <i>Two tributaries join the Glaven within the village: the Burgh Beck stream reaches the river just north of Hunworth Hall barns, and the larger Gunthorpe Stream flows in under the road further north by Beck Farm, forming the boundary between the parishes of Hunworth and Thornage.</i> ○ Noted. Reference to households has been removed. ○ Noted. ‘reconstructed’ has been amended to ‘extended’. |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>church with the addition of porch and south transept probably paid from the estate of Braunch family post Black Death.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ However, I would prefer to comment on the more questionable assumptions which permeate this draft and reflect an outdated view of historical village development and the management of land and property through the manorial system. The first is the linking of Hunworth Hall with the Church: the assumption being that the Lord of the Manor’s residence was located near to the church. Hunworth Hall was built in 1700, there is little evidence to suggest that there was a previous building on this site and certainly the Bacon family did not reside in Hunworth. Land in Hunworth, until consolidated by the Britiffe family in the early eighteenth century, was held by several manors. ○ Secondly, I would question the assumption that the Village Green dates back to the medieval period. There is no evidence to support this assumption in any of the documents I have read relating to Hunworth. Indeed, the configuration of the Green on a major crossroads would make it unsuitable for stock management. However, the Common is mentioned in the 1592 Field Books and would have been the chosen location for villagers to raise stock. The first reference to Village Green I have found is on the first OS Map of 1886 where it is positioned to the south west of the current Green. ○ On page 11 ‘Hunworth seems to have had an open landscape of predominantly heathland since pre-Conquest times and the survival of Hunworth Common to the north and Hunworth Heath to the south of the village are important contributors to its special interest. [I’m not sure where Hunworth Heath is today. A lack of reference to the agricultural history of Hunworth is obvious in this draft. Whilst the ‘uplands’ were most probably heathland pre-Conquest, they were soon cultivated in the sheep/corn & fold systems of agriculture which were quite common in this area of England. ○ Despite my own commitment to the study of local history and my particular interest in the early modern period, I fail to see the relevance of much of the medieval and early modern period to the objectives of this document. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted. The reference to the hall has been deleted p15 para 3, also deleted reference to ‘manor’ house in significance statement p.13 para.4. ○ Noted. Deleted reference to the green p15 para 4. Clarified the Green on p18 paras 1 and 2 is what it is known as today, and p.19 para 1. ○ Noted/Clarification. Hunworth Heath is shown on OS maps today (e.g. via Magic) as a patch of woodland as a patch of woodland south of the village between Pinkney lane and Briston Road. This reference is on p13. Have removed the reference to ‘open’ (p13 and 15) as Hunworth Heath and Hunworth Common today seem to refer to woodland. Reference to Liddiard’s article added to link to source material. |
| <p>Anonymous (ref: H03)</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Key characteristics of the conservation area are the River Glaven with 2 fords, Kings Street, St Lawrence Church, Hall and Hall Farm, Village Green, Water Mill, the Valley topography, its position into 2 parts by the Briston Holt Road made possible by the construction of the brick bridge funded (so | |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>it is said) by a local doctor in Victorian times. The old Holt Road (running past ‘The Firs’) then becoming a byway. The intermittent development of frontage, leaving green spaces between. No pavements, no streetlights.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some call the village ‘millionaires graveyard’. The inclusion of Coronation Cottages is long overdue. Restoration of roadside verges and banks by the ‘white van epidemic’ providing rapid delivery. Better if were all delivered by the postman in a daily visit. ○ Agricultural vehicles which are wider than the roadway width in many places, government legislation about vehicle width permitted does not seem to engage reality. ○ A bus shelter on both sides of the road would be welcome, but is not easy to achieve without spoiling the Green. ○ If the cost of this exercise as stated in the meeting (was this the cost of consultants only or did it include NNDC staff time?) it is very considerable and perhaps would have been better put to researching climate change options. ○ The overwhelming issue of climate change which dictates surely all that you may wish to preserve/enhance in Hunworth. We have an obligation to make our homes better insulated and more efficiently heated. This may not mean that timber windows are necessarily the best long term solution to existing or new homes in the village. ○ The sensitive recognition of key/valuable features in and around the village is in some ways quite pretty and ‘wordsworthian’. It underscores how privileged we are to live in this part of Gods creation. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted. Whilst a valid concern regarding vehicle width legislation, it would be beyond the remit of the conservation area appraisal to make any recommendations this. ○ Noted. See above discussion on heritage and sustainability. |
|---|---|

Anonymous (ref: H04)

| | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Key characteristics of the Conservation Area include variety of building style and age, no street lighting, limited use of street furniture, variety of native tree and hedge species, open views and spaces in village including the Green, River Glaven and adjoining meadows. ○ A move away from traditional materials and styles has a high negative impact on CA when side elevations and frontage can be seen from public highways or neighbors houses. Inappropriate infilling is also a concern, as is the replacement of trees and hedges with non-native species, and removal of hedges for wooden strip fencing. ○ The increase in number, size, and speed of farm and delivery vehicles is concerning and damages verges. A 20mph speed limit in the village would help stop this and large vehicle restriction on Stody, King Street and Edgefield Road. | |
|---|--|

| | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Higher rainfall, higher water table, septic tanks and the river means the village is in need of mains sewerage system. | |
| Anonymous (ref: H05) | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ As with many villages/towns in North Norfolk, we would like to see priority given to housing people/families from the immediate area and/or with family links. Hunworth and Stody are in danger of being part time villages with many second/holiday homes and are no longer working villages. ○ A speed limit is needed on the Brinton Road from the West End, Briston junction down into Stody up to the Old Chapel junction. | |
| Anonymous (ref: H06) | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ I have seen this poorly written report and am glad that at least the parishioners will have the right to reply. ○ However, what really concerns me is a photograph of my property (Blickling House, Holt Road, Hunworth) taken from a position to the rear through the woods. We are concerned about the impact on security and would like to see the photo removed from the report. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted. This has been removed. |
| Anonymous (ref: H07) | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no, nor has there ever been, a public footpath up Castle Hill Medieval ringwork. The site is already within our environmental stewardship scheme, under a heritage protection that doesn't allow footfall, in order to preserve the site. Please could we be told where the consultant read that it is a public footpath, so that we can get this corrected? And all references/ request for footpath and signage removed please. • p.79, please remove "<i>are undesirable on modern buildings</i>" (re uPVCs) and "<i>If deemed appropriate</i>" (re PV). We seriously worry how working, low income families will be able to afford to make their homes greener? Which is clearly an imperative for all and actually a legal requirement for landlords. We cannot see how we can make our own properties greener with the current drafting of the Cas. • p.90 – pls remove "<i>primary elevations</i>". We would argue solar panels are a key and affordable method in meeting climate change and to be effective can only go on southern roofs which if happen to be primary and/or street elevations, shouldn't be banned? • p.82 – Unfortunately we seriously object to the current drafting of para 2. This is only looking at future development from a narrow heritage angle however for any village to survive, its economic, social and environmental prospects must also be considered. We worry that a narrow reading of the | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted. This has been removed/amended. ○ Noted/Clarification. The conservation area designation has always had restrictions on permitted development, the wording of the appraisal only follows both this and the recommendations of Historic England when it comes to conservation best practice. Please above discussion on how the recommendations are made in light of best practice guidance. |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>current drafting precludes sensitive, small scale and much needed development. An alternative to the 2nd para could be: <i>“While housing will be required, this should be weighed against need and carefully planned to be located as sensitively as possible with minimal impact on heritage assets. Developments should take into account the characteristics of the immediate neighbouring houses and heritage and fit the available lot size.”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • p. 87 – pls remove <i>“It should be the minimum necessary to meet the required demands for housing”</i> • p.90 – Why shouldn’t sensible open plots be very sensitively filled in? It’s actually the only place sustainable housing can go to meet economic, social, environmental and heritage needs. We also believe it appropriate and in keeping with what is already in the village to allow some modern materials (because they are already there). Pls remove <i>“limited”</i> twice in far right hand paras. • We question why it is proposed to include Coronation Cottages, (6 more modern brick houses on King Street) within the Hunworth Conservation Area (“CA”)? They are similar to many working family / low income homes in Edgefield that are not included in its Conservation area. They would hugely benefit from sensible PV solar panels, nor would timber windows be at all appropriate. • We also question why it is proposed to include the working farm yard, Green Farm Yard, in the Hunworth CA? It is very much a working farm yard linked to the fields around it. Again we don’t see other working farm yards, with modern agri-buildings, included within Village Conservation Areas? • Pinkney Lane is spelt with a second “n” | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted. This has been amended. ○ Noted/Clarification. The current wording says ‘open plots...should not be <u>completely</u> filled in...’, rather than prohibiting all infill development it makes the recommendation that where it is necessary, it should be sensitive and proportionate. ‘Limited’ has been amended. ○ Noted/Clarification. The cottages clearly read as part of the village and are good examples of early twentieth century housing. We do not propose to alter this recommendation. ○ Noted/Clarification. This area of farmyard is being excluded from not included within the Hunworth CA (but remains within the Glaven Valley CA) ○ Noted. Pinkley changed to Pinkney on p93 |
| <p>Anonymous (ref: H08)</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Report states that there is a public footpath to Castle Mound in Hunworth- is this correct? As I thought it is not accessible, I think access to it would be a good change. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted. This has been amended |

| SHARRINGTON (PUBLIC) | |
|---|--|
| Summary of Comments / Issues Raised (including page / paragraph number where indicated) | Council Response and Action / Recommendation |
| <p>Anonymous (ref: S01)</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am disappointed in the inaccuracies in the report. Interviews rather than observation might have produced greater accuracy. | |

| | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is significant is that numbers 16 & 17 The Street and numbers 18 & 19 have an untouched frontage and remain semi-detached. They were lived in and used as estate cottages within living memory of Sharrington residents. • It is due to the fact that the pair of estate cottages, 16 & 17 plus 18 & 19, are still original that both should be considered suitable for inclusion in the Norfolk locally listed heritage assets. • Possibly more controversial is the entry on the monkey puzzle tree located in the front garden of a house in The Street (East-West) as being ‘inappropriate to the setting’ (no comment has been made about another in the village conservation area). This species is now internationally protected due to being one of the most endangered trees in the world. I would prefer the reference to this tree be removed particularly as the other tree in the conservation area has not been targeted in the same way. • Will North Norfolk planning enforce these recommendations when deciding planning issues? Currently we have a plethora of inappropriate planning requests for doubling the size of ‘historic’ properties and using ‘modern’ materials that are not in keeping- timber walls and a metal roof being just one example. • How are the recommendations made to be enforced and monitored? • Where will the final document be published? • Will there be a summary page, on the Councils website, for Parish councils or local people to access outlining responsibilities when altering property in a conservation area? It may cut down on inappropriate changes being made to property. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted. However, there are lots of estate cottages – we have not plotted them out or sought to mention them all. This does not imply however, that they not contribute to the significance of the conservation area. Although both 16-17 and 18-19 are now included for local listing. ○ Noted/Clarification. It might be internationally protected but it does appear out of place in a rural UK village, as it is non-native. However, the text has been amended slightly to reflect its international status. |
| Anonymous (ref: S02) | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ On page 56 there is an inaccuracy. Stiles Farmhouse in The Street has not been divided into ‘multiple occupancy’. A check on council tax payments would have clarified this. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted. This has been amended. |
| Anonymous (ref: S03) | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ On a brick pillar between the flint work of the wall forming the rear of the small barn behind this property are a set of initials and a date as shown on the accompanying photographs. The engraving is very beautifully done and probably with a semiprofessional eye as can be seen by the use of the ‘tails’ to the letters etc. the date of 1862 or 1867 would probably indicate the age of the barns to the rear. Due to weathering of the brickwork it is difficult to tell as to whether the date is 1862 or 1867. I would like to see them preserved and conserved as a record of the age of these barns. ○ There is a photograph of the front of The Old Barn shown on page 23 of the plans, however, the photograph is now out of date as two years ago the | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted. Reference to date stone has been added into text. ○ Noted. It has not been possible to update all the photos – as most were taken in the late summer of 2020. |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>original window frame had to be replaced so you may wish to update the photo.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ You are producing a lovely and interesting document and I look forward to reading the finalised result. | |
| Anonymous (ref: S04) | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Thank you for the comprehensive and interesting report on our village of Sharrington, I must congratulate you on producing such a splendid document which will add greatly to our understanding and appreciation of Sharrington. ○ Page 32- View 04, this is Lower Hall Lane and not Lower Hall Street. Page 33- View 07, this is Bale Road and not The Street. Page 33- View 08, the view is 'eastwards' and not 'westwards'. Page 59, the photo in the top right hand corner named Lantern Barn is in fact the Hayloft, Lantern Barn is at the other end of the barn conversions. ○ I would also like to take issue with the statement in Section 7, page 87 as follows: 'whilst holiday cottages do generate some local jobs and revenue, second homes generally do not'. For a start I think the local builders would disagree. Furthermore, owners of holiday cottages often live at a distance from the village and rarely play any part in village life while it is more likely that second home owners will want to become part of the village and can be generous in giving time ad support to village events and institutions such as the church and village hall. Many second home owners then become full-time residents and very much part of village life so I feel your statement is misleading in our village. Holiday makers, while supporting local hospitality and some retail outlets are more than likely to bring their own provisions for the week from outside the area or rely on large supermarkets. However, even as I write this we are finding that more outside investors are buying cottages in the village to extend and run them as holiday cottages so over time this will change the profile of Sharrington and not in a good way. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted. The text has been amended accordingly. ○ Noted. Text has been amended. |
| Anonymous (ref: S05) | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Page 8; I'm requesting a change to the boundary to follow the hedge line on my field as marked in the enclosed map. ○ Page 13, paragraph 5; I feel the draft is making Sharrington into a historic and interesting village on par with some of the beautiful villages we have in North Norfolk, but due to the spread of the village and the eclectic mix of housing designs in my opinion it is failing in this regard. ○ Page 13, paragraph 9; I feel that this is also not true, as the word vibrant implies a good mix of young and old, local working and retired inhabitants, which hasn't happened in Sharrington. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted. Amendment to boundary has been made. |

| | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Page 18, paragraph 5; at the house called ‘The Chequers’, the porch with the imitation Doric columns was added in the 1980s. ○ Page 38; the views 22, 3, and 24 are of small value as there are no vehicle stopping areas, and walkers very rarely use this route due to traffic speed and density. View 26 also has no safe stopping area without blocking other vehicles rights of way. ○ View 25, as above, and to see a small area of the conservation area requires you to stand on private land. View 27 is of small value when trying to view the conservation area. ○ Page 53, 4.4.2; why has there been a reference to a dwelling in a neighbouring village which is nothing like Sharrington and not in the conservation area being referred to? ○ Page 71; farmers are encouraged by the environment agency to let hedges grow bigger to improve the habitat for native birds. They also set time restraints for trimming of hedges. If the appraisal is recommending hedges should be cut regularly then the hedge to the south of The Chequers should be removed from the conservation area. ○ Page 85; the appraisal doesn’t seem to value the environment by encouraging the use of sustainable building materials in future building projects. Sustainable power sources also seem frowned upon contrary to global warming projections. ○ Page 87- paragraph 7.5; re second homes, ‘the grandest example in the village situated in a prominent position within the conservation area’ is used as a second/holiday home, contrary to the ideals set out in the appraisal. ○ Page 87- paragraph 7.7; are local people who earn their living in the village to be subjected to extra pressure on the structure of their business by the appraisal, outside of the normal planning laws? ○ I feel the time and money spent on this appraisal would have been better spent on improving the drainage system in the village. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted. Amended ○ Noted. This may be the case, but they are nonetheless views from a public road. ○ Noted/Clarification. All views were photographed from the public highway or public footpaths ○ Noted. This was an error and has been corrected. ○ Noted. The frequency of cutting can be adapted to suit but the principle of maintaining hedges within the CA is a sound one. |
| <p>Anonymous (ref: S06)</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Page 22, 3.6- the names of the actors from the Archers’ cast are incorrect. The names should be Joy Davies and Leslie Bowmar. June Spencer and Patricia Greene, the top stars of The Archers spent two days here, celebrating the first refurbishment of the village hall, completed in 1988. We have recently completed the third refurbishment. ○ Page 59; the photograph in the top right hand corner is described as being of Lantern Barn. The photograph is of Hayloft, Lower Hall Lane. ○ The date of designation is incorrect, it is 1979 not 1977. ○ Your appraisal and recommendations are admirable, well done. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted. Text has been amended. ○ Noted. Text amended. ○ Noted. Date amended. |

Anonymous (ref: S07)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We welcome the review and broadly support the various identification of issues and recommendations, specifically with regard to Lower Hall Lane and the proposed extension of the Conservation area boundary to include land to the rear of Daubeney Hall Farm within the boundary of the property. ○ Since 2004 and for many years previously the ‘Farmhouse’ at Daubeney Hall Farm has been known as, (and the Post Office address likewise) Daubeney Hall Farm. The cottage has a separate postal address of Daubeney Cottage. The ‘two storey stables’ building to the South has also been known for many years preceding as ‘The Granary’. It is accepted that this is the description in the Grade 2 listing is <i>Daubeney Hall Farmhouse & attached stable to South</i>. You appear to have adopted this description for the Appraisal. ○ On page 55 under <i>Farm Buildings: most farm buildings within the village have been converted to residential use. However the stable belonging to Daubeney Hall Farmhouse on Lower Hall Lane is intact. It is of two storeys and has a loft attached at south with flint and brick dressings with a red clay pantile roof.</i> ○ Some years ago the ‘Granary’ or ‘two-storey stable’ was converted to a holiday let. It is unclear what the reference to ‘a loft attached’ means. In 2006/07 when planning and listed building consent was granted for comprehensive refurbishment of Daubeney Hall Farm, the Granary became a utility room and office annex to Daubeney Hall Farm and Daubeney Cottage. ○ Apart from the conversion of the old tractor shed to an office, the barn at the front has remained unchanged – one of the few remaining in the village and still used as a barn and workshop. ○ Attached are historical notes which were provided by the previous owners of the property. It refers to the barn in some detail and the ‘stable and granary’. ○ We support the proposed inclusion of 16-17 The Street- a pair of traditional estate cottages which although extended in the 1960s, which retain the essential symmetry and character of the pair. There are in fact three similar examples in the Street. The pair immediately to the South 18 & 19 The Street have similarly remained unchanged since similarly sympathetically extended in the 1960s. ○ We propose that 18-19 The Street should also be included as they are similar to 16-16 and would qualify as per page 65 of the appraisal.it is | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted. Text Amended ○ Noted. Text Amended ○ Noted. Text Amended ○ Noted. Text Amended |
|---|--|

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>illogical to pick one pair of cottages when in fact both pairs combined contribute significantly to the conservation area.</p> | |
| <p>Anonymous (ref: S08)</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Report, [P.98], recommends extending the boundary of the Conservation Area to include the garden and orchard belonging to All Saints Cottage. We have no objection to this proposal; on the contrary it is welcome. • [P.54] incorrectly describes the property as one of a pair of <i>'semi-detached cottages in cobble flint which are positioned at the edge of the road, a typical position for cottages through the village'</i>. In fact, All Saints Cottage, Church Barn and Long Barn were agricultural buildings until the 1970s when they were converted to residential use. • [P.70] <i>'Prominent bins left on street in front view of properties'</i>. Did the field worker visit the village on collection day? Our bins and those of our immediate neighbours (and the Church) are put out on the day of collection and returned to the garage once emptied. • [P.70] The windows of All Saints Cottage are timber not PVC. • [P.95] The satellite dish at All Saints Cottage is situated at the rear, out of sight of the road and visible only from our garden. The Sky engineer refused to remove a previous dish (visible from the churchyard) on health and safety grounds. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted. Text Amended ○ Noted. Site visits were made by the consultants on several occasions and the case was always the same. But it is possible the visits always occurred on bin day. ○ Noted/Clarification. It doesn't say that they are PVC, it says some of the buildings in the character area have UPVC windows. ○ Noted/Clarification. Again the satellite comment is general, not specific to any property. |
| <p>Anonymous (ref: S09)</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This Report gives much emphasis to setting and views, but totally ignores the one element that underpins the whole village – ie the problems caused by the high water table flooding septic tanks, on which most of Sharrington relies. Rather than spending an undisclosed sum of money on producing this Report, it would have been more beneficial to connect Sharrington to mains drainage. If the surface water does not drain away, even the most sophisticated private sewage works cannot operate legally. • Much is made in the Report of what is considered "suburban". This is a pejorative and subjective term which is not helpful, is used throughout in a disparaging tone, and denies personal preferences in house and garden style and design. Satellite dishes, wheelie bins and solar panels are all part of modern life. • The comments regarding UPVC are out of date – earlier versions may have been unsightly, but modern standards are high and many are hard to distinguish from wood. Surely the important fact is what something looks like, not what it is made from. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted/Clarification. The conservation area designation has no influence over local drainage issues, it would be beyond the remit of the appraisal to make any recommendations regarding this. |

- | | |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We feel that the restrictions necessary for listed buildings are being applied to a Conservation Area. Sharrington is not a “chocolate box” village and too many restrictions will not do any favours to a small community that would not be harmed by extra housing. Despite assurances in the Report, we feel that new builds are generally disliked, and not enough importance is placed on good design. • We also query why no permission was sought before land or buildings have had their status changed. This is discourteous at best. We do not believe including the Village Hall has any benefit. • We do not agree with the importance placed on views, which we consider to be an ever-changing aspect of our countryside. Is the Report suggesting that a homeowner should be prevented from planting trees in their own garden in case it interferes with some random person who looks in that direction from a mile away? • The recommendations in Section 8 are high-handed and authoritarian. Whilst all who have chosen Sharrington as their home must appreciate rural buildings, it is worrying to learn that current buildings or features that detract from the Conservation Area could be demolished. • We consider this Report to be an inappropriate use of Council money. It is not long ago that an industrial development on Thornage Road, Sharrington was attempted; illegal use occurred, but NNDC failed to enforce restrictions time after time because the relevant departments were understaffed. Mains drainage should be the focus of NNDC. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted. The consultation process is the opportunity for residents to offer their views on the report and any changes proposed, the documents are all in draft form until they have been through the consultation process and have been recommended for adoption by Working Party to Cabinet. ○ Noted. See above discussion of the recommendations made. The appraisal does not dictate that buildings should be demolished, only that where the opportunity arises to make improvements these should be utilised. |
|---|---|

| STODY (PUBLIC) | |
|---|--|
| Summary of Comments / Issues Raised (including page / paragraph number where indicated) | Council Response and Action / Recommendation |
| Anonymous (ref: SD01) | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ P.10 We ask why <i>“extent of permitted development should be restricted”</i>, instead would it not be fairer to read <i>“permitted development should adhere to the broad Conservation and Heritage characteristics of the area”</i> ○ Stody village has to date been developed/alterd in a highly sensitive and sustainable way. To our knowledge there are no major heritage issues or concerns. This is widely recognised in the proposed doc. ○ p13 say <i>“Conversion of buildings from their original use have been sensitive and subtle throughout the village”</i>. ○ p.64 states the condition of the area as <i>“very good”</i>. ○ p47 <i>“modern extensions respect the materials of the area.”</i> ○ Therefore, other than simply for bureaucracy, we see no compelling reason why Stody suddenly needs its own, new Conservation Area? ○ Even if one is forced on Stody, the current CAA doc has missed completely the evolution at Stody Hall barns. They are already an active, commercial site with modern offices, warehousing and distribution. All of which have been developed highly sensitively, in close coordination with NNDC and in keeping / enhancing the local heritage. Therefore, similar to other modern, office and warehousing sites, this area should be not be included within any new Village CA. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted/Clarification. This is the agreed wording used in all the CAAs. It is general about CAs and not specific to Stody. ○ Noted. The Statement of Significance has been revised. ○ Noted. Please see earlier discussion against Stody PC comments for more on this. ○ Noted. The barns have been mentioned now as offices and warehousing. The reuse does not mean that they should be excluded from the CA but indicate sensitive adaptation. |
| Anonymous (ref: SD02) | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The area between Stody and Hunworth, Hunworth Road, properties around Barbers Lane do not appear to be included within the Conservation area where it has always been part of the Glaven Valley Conservation area before. Can you clarify why please? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted. This has been Included |

| THORNAGE (PUBLIC) | |
|--|--|
| Summary of Comments / Issues Raised (including page / paragraph number where indicated) | Council Response and Action / Recommendation |
| Anonymous (ref: T01) | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have read the Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan for Thornage with great interest, and find the detailed analysis of the built environment and the setting of Thornage to be commendable in its grasp and detail. • However I have the following comments on the recommendations set out in the Management Plan at Section 8: • Section 8.3.6 recognises the fact that the setting of Thornage contributes to its special interest. As a long-standing resident I do think that this point needs to be stressed. Thornage is an interesting and in some ways attractive village, but the character of the village is very dependent on its setting. • The recommendations at 8.3.6 state that "the setting of the conservation area will be protected from inappropriate development", but section 8.3.7 goes on to propose changes to the boundary of the conservation area. In particular, the proposed changes would exclude the following areas from the conservation area: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) The meadow between Brinton and Thornage. I would like to stress just how very important the meadows are to the setting and character of Thornage. B) The fields to the north of the village. This area important to the setting of Thornage Hall and the welcome inclusion of the north-east corner of the Thornage Hall grounds. It is also very important to residents as it forms the setting for perhaps the most popular short walk around the village taking in Letheringsett Road, the lane cutting across to the edge of the Thornage Hall grounds and the return to the village with views of Thornage Hall to the right. • I feel that these changes go against the spirit of the importance attached to the setting of Thornage in 8.3.6 and I do not find that the reasons given provide sufficient justification to make changes that in my opinion could threaten the setting of Thornage. • Moreover, I find it very difficult to understand why these changes are being proposed at the moment even though the NNDC has not yet published its proposals for the overall Glaven Valley Conservation Appraisal. This makes it impossible to understand what is to happen to the areas adjacent to the | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted. Amended wording slightly ○ Noted/Clarification. There is a fundamental difference between a heritage asset and its setting. Bringing the setting into the designation makes it part of the heritage asset but the meadows and fields are clearly of a different character to the village and therefore do not form part of the village so should not be included in the designation. ○ See above. |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Thornage Conservation Area boundaries, and this is particularly worrying in respect of the meadow between Brinton and Thornage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I accordingly urge NNDC not to proceed with the proposed boundary changes A and B set out in Section 8.3.7. | |
| Anonymous (ref: T02) | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The variety of types and sizes of dwellings along the ribbon development of the High Street and Letheringsett Road reflect the gradual evolution of Thornage, its residents and its industries - this variety should be maintained and appreciated. • Not all residents will have the capacity to achieve an 'ideal appearance' to their dwellings but I think most people do appreciate the special Glaven Valley qualities and historical significance - there should not be an emphasis on external maintenance • The discrete nature of the Glaven Valley villages is essential to their character - the agricultural countryside between them and along adjacent lanes, dark skies and tranquility should be preserved. • The through traffic on the B1110 and on Letheringsett Road is at the expense of residents - heavy lorries ignore warnings and pedestrians struggle to find somewhere to walk safely. • Letheringsett Road is a narrow, single track road whose verges are constantly damaged by both parked vehicles and those trying to pass them and each other. Traffic management is a key issue. • I think the initial report was blinkered and did not appreciate that real people with their varying needs, temperaments and abilities are the inhabitants. A village must be seen as a dynamic system both in terms of its buildings and its residents. • These villages need to be protected from commercialism: their unique and surprising characteristics are the result of centuries of interaction between the Glaven Valley geology and its inhabitants. | |
| Anonymous (ref: T03) | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The key characteristics of the conservation area in its reduced state is the built environment. • Is the meadow area between Thornage and Brinton to be included in the Glaven Valley conservation area? • How do these ideas fit in with the Governments Green and totally unreliable agenda? • Since 1975 the village has gone from self-sufficient agricultural community to one which has a large percentage of holiday homes. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Clarification. Yes, see above against PC comments for further discussion. ○ Clarification. Text added into appraisal on sustainability |

- The management proposals are probably too much aspiration and too much local authority involvement. Not all people can afford specialist building and old fashioned materials. Bear in mind that what you seek to protect evolved without planners or local government. The worst parts of the village are the later additions.
- There is a plague of signs- Thornage Hall is the worst offender- plus even more road traffic additions.
- Outside high level lights are very intrusive, Thornage Hall is lit like an out of town supermarket and has installed its own version of street lighting.