

Draft Glaven Valley Conservation Area Appraisal – Summary of Consultation Responses
(consultation period 6 October- 27 October 2023)

Total Written Representations: 15

DRAFT

PARISH/TOWN COUNCILS	
Summary of Comments / Issues Raised (including page / paragraph number where indicated)	Council Response and Action / Recommendation
Baconsthorpe PC (ref: PC01)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baconsthorpe Parish Council has no comments to make on the new draft, other than we are very pleased the area around the Castle in Baconsthorpe has been included in the GVCA and thank you all for your hard work to enable this to happen. I noticed two “typos” whilst reading clauses applicable to Baconsthorpe – clause 1.2 refers to page 132, which should be page 134 and on page 245 there should be a full stop after “chapel”, then a new sentence. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. Noted. Page number typo will be amended. There is no mention of a chapel on page 245, unsure which page was meant so cannot check this.
Brinton PC (ref: PC02)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brinton PC would like to thank Purcell and NNDC for all the hard work involved in the preparation of this document and for taking on board the comments made by our PC. We are very pleased that Sharrington has now been included in the Glaven Valley Conservation Area. The PC notes that the totality of the 2 fields either side of Hall Lane in Sharrington have not been included and confirms its original request that they should be. This land was used historically by villagers and their neighbors to graze their animals. In 1086 the village of Sharrington was shown as owning 60 sheep which were probably grazed on these fields, known as the Common Sheepwalk. These fields, which were shown on Jodrell’s map of 1784 as the Sheepwalk Common, demonstrate the historic links between agriculture and our village history and the continued importance of farming and agriculture in the village. The 1784 map shows Shepherds Pightles opposite these fields, this demonstrating the ongoing importance of sheep farming in the village and their surrounding fields. In the 17th and 18th centuries weavers are known to have produced linen in Sharrington. In 1896 the chief crops in Sharrington were recorded as wheat and barley. No doubt the river Glaven and the Glaven ports would have played a key part in Sharrington’s agricultural industry as they did throughout this area. Today these two fields are still farmed as arable fields and are in the ownership of a large estate. One of these fields, which is to the west of Hall Lane, is only partly included in the new boundary for the GVCA and the council requests that it should all be included. It contains the only footpath in the village 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. Noted. There is merit in the cases put forward as part of this consultation for the inclusion of the entirety of the two fields either side of Hall Lane, with the A148 to the north. This will not include any additional dwellings, however, only the fields.

and is the route to 2 of the village ponds which would have played an important role in the agricultural history of the village and are still a destination for residents and visitors. It would also have formed part of the Common Sheepwalk.

- These 2 fields are also very important to the landscape of Sharrington and the Glaven Valley. This entrance into the village and the views across these fields into the village provide an important setting for the village. The field to the east of Hall Lane also provides prominence and a valued setting to 2 pairs of semi-detached estate cottages which are locally listed. The views of these charming cottages, built in the vernacular, from the north across this field forms an important part of the setting of this conservation village and the Glaven Valley Conservation Area.
- We believe these fields are no less important than other fields similarly included in the document and indeed form a historical context to how land has been used over time and contribute to the quality of the area.
- We feel it would be more appropriate to include all of both of these fields, south of the A148, together with Hall Lane to make a smooth contiguous boundary with the rest of the Glaven Valley CA.
- We have also noted that Wiveton and Cley have has their telephone boxes listed and as such they are detailed in this document. There is correspondence between the Conservation department and BT in 2017 confirming that Sharrington's Kiosk is 'an archetypal example of the traditional red phone box (Sir Giles Gilbert Scott's 1935 K6 design), & 'occupies an extremely prominent position within the Sharrington Conservation Area where it is located on the junction of Bale Road and Brinton Road, and has become an established part of the cherished local scene where it makes a positive contribution to the appearance and character of the designated area... the Local Planning Authority would not wish to support the proposed removal in this particular case.' We are therefore requesting that the Sharrington Kiosk should be locally listed and form part of the GVCA Conservation Management plan.
- Whilst we are very pleased to have Sharrington included in the GVCA we query the scant references to Sharrington in the document and particularly under the individual village settlement reference. There is also no reference to our scheduled monument in the form of the ancient stone cross in your scheduled monument section, no mention of the Sharrington historic assets in the Historic assets section, no mention of Sharrington Hall under the large manor houses section, nor

- **Noted.** In order to be consistent with the approach taken elsewhere, the telephone kiosk in Sharrington will now be included on the local list.
- **Noted/Clarification.** The Glaven Valley Conservation Area has within it a number of different villages and Holt, all of which have their own dedicated appraisal with more extensive histories. There is not scope for there to be much more than a summary on each settlement within the Glaven Valley Conservation Area Appraisal. The medieval cross is mentioned on page 23 of the appraisal, however, there is scope for this to be expanded on slightly. All of Sharrington's Heritage Assets are listed in

of our ancient church with its tall tower under your church section, or our former water mill in your 'milling section'. Whilst we appreciate you cannot include a detailed history of each village/parish we note that references have been made to other villages and their assets in the relevant sections of the document.

- We therefore request that you make reference to Sharrington being first documented in the Domesday Book, the spring of the chalk stream at Valley Farm, the historic Sharrington Hall probably dating from the 14th century but possibly much earlier, which for centuries played a key role in the ownership and management of land, the former water mill in Lower Sharrington demonstrating Sharrington's connection with the river Glaven and its water mills. This water mill was referred to in Christopher Daubeney's will of 1584 in which he left the water mill to his son. Also the ancient stone cross which is a scheduled monument which bears witness to Sharrington being part of the important medieval pilgrimage route and its association with pilgrims travelling via the Glaven ports.
- We did find the maps difficult to navigate and we feel it would be helpful to navigate the document if all sections within the appendices are listed in alphabetical order. We also found a number of omissions. Under your section 'Historic development' Brinton village was included but not Sharrington. Under Appendix C Brinton has been omitted and in Appendix E the plan for Sharrington has been omitted.
- We would also like to query why there are exceptions in Sharrington within the GVCA for a number of 'more recently built' properties within the village. We cannot confirm that this has been dealt with in the same way in other villages as we are unable to find the appropriate maps. We would like to query, if this indeed the case, why Sharrington appears to have been treated differently. Sharrington is not a large village and what happens to a property adjacent to the GVCA has an impact on the village and its setting, particularly if the property is within the village and surrounded by the GVCA.

the Appendix C on pages 192-195 and this includes the cross, however, mention of the cross can be added into the discussion of scheduled monuments on page 102. Discussion of Sharrington Hall can be added to page 89/90. As above however, the Glaven Valley Appraisal cannot detail every significant building in every settlement that lies within its boundary, particularly as these are all discussed in more detail in each individual appraisal, not every single church within the Glaven Valley is listed in the section on Churches, the focus is instead on any that fall outside of any settlement boundary as these won't have been covered by any other appraisal. The section on mills discusses only those that remain extant, those that have been converted and those that remain mills, Sharrington's mill does not survive and the exact location is not known, it does not fall into either of these categories. However, the reference to the mill in Daubeney's will can be included here on page 86.

- **Noted.** As above, the Glaven Valley CAA cannot include an exhaustive history of every settlement within it, merely an overview to give an impression of the activity across the area historically. Sharrington being first mentioned in the Domesday Book is covered in the Sharrington Conservation Area Appraisal. **No action recommended.**
- **Noted.** The spring of the chalk stream is mentioned on page 129.
- **Noted.** The appendices can be alphabetized.
- **Noted.** Map showing historic development of Sharrington needs to be included between pages 227-238.
- **Noted.** At Appendix C, the audit of heritage assets for Brinton needs to be added.
- **Clarification.** Sharrington is somewhat of an anomaly within the Glaven Valley Conservation Area in that when the boundary was originally drawn up, it was not included. Because Sharrington is now being added into the boundary, and it is located on the edge of the existing designation it allows an opportunity to draw the boundary a little more precisely than might otherwise be possible. Generally speaking when reviewing conservation areas it is good practice to exclude areas or buildings that do not contribute to the special architectural or historic character. In Sharrington's case, the modern development on the outskirts that was excluded from the village conservation area boundary has also been excluded from the Glaven Valley boundary, for the same reasons. In order to ensure that conservation areas remain relevant and fit for purpose, appraisals are obliged to identify land or buildings which do not make a contribution to the special historic or architectural interest of the

	<p>designation. It is simply an objective assessment of whether a particular building or area is deserving of inclusion or whether it devalues the currency of conservation. No action recommended.</p>
<p>Thornage PC (ref: PC03)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several areas were proposed for exclusion from the GVCA boundary before the [previous] public consultation. The PC note that, following feedback, these have been retained. Additionally, following the consultation, several areas have newly proposed for inclusion within the boundary. • Bearing in mind that this consultation exercise is limited, and, that the significant deficiencies have been addressed the PC require that no further representations need to be made on the text to the appraisal chapters. • Given previous concerns about the impact of tourism on the village it should be noted that section 6.7 remains unchanged. Thornage PC would like to re-iterate its concerns particularly regarding campsites, second homes and holiday lets and would prefer this section to be strengthened to support local residents. • As regards the Management Plan (Chapter 7), the PC recognises that this part of the GVCAA addresses the character and appearance issues, not land management. The PC note their major concern with conservation area setting within the GVCA (section 7.3.6), is now dealt with on a much more robust and comprehensive basis. • Given the Parish Council’s previously articulated concerns during the Thornage Conservation Area Appraisal regarding the lack of realism and the fixation of the authors with modern methods of construction (particularly UPVC windows), satellite dishes etc as well as development management inconsistencies the PC welcomes the modest change in stance but still believes that the lack of significant textual movement on the realities of the other aspects of modern living should be enhanced. • The PC welcome the new recommendations in respect new development proposals as noted in section 7.3.4 and the modest change in stance on the recognition of modern methods of construction. However, the PC would like to suggest the addition of the words “where practicable” and “or side” as this would then at least cover technical considerations to be included in the text. • Thornage Parish Council are concerned that the document makes no mention of provision for domestic drainage protection for the River 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted. ○ Noted/Clarification. Unfortunately it is beyond the remit of the conservation area appraisal to stipulate polices specifically relating to tourism. Whilst it is clearly an important factor in area like North Norfolk, there are limits to the conservation area designation, as it is primarily designed to focus on built heritage. High levels of tourism inevitably impact on the heritage, but the appraisal itself can do little more than highlight the issue. No action recommended. ○ Noted/Clarification. Generally speaking, the language used in the document is consistent with all the other appraisals that we have produced and adopted in conjunction with Purcell. The appraisals strive to provide guidance on how to positively manage change within conservation areas, it is not about preventing appropriate development but instead demonstrates ‘best practice’ as far as this is possible. No action recommended. ○ Noted/Clarification. On page 121, section 7.3.3, paragraph beginning “alterations and extensions should...” final sentence will now read “These should be located, <u>where practicable</u>, on rear <u>or side</u> elevations away from sight of the public highway.” ○ Noted/Clarification. It is beyond the remit of the conservation area designation and in turn the conservation area appraisal to make provision for drainage protection. The conservation area designation does not

<p>Glaven- as proven by the recent flooding events when recent flooding in Thornage, Hunworth and Letheringsett meant there were significant discharges of sewerage from domestic septic tanks in to the River. Concern is also expressed about fine sediment and sand entering the river from Highways work (the current repair of the bridge on the B1110) and cable work by the Hornsea cable line.</p>	<p>provide additional controls over drainage solutions, therefore, it would not be possible for the appraisal to stipulate or enforce policies relating to this. However, what it can do is highlight broader issues that have an impact on the area. Accordingly, there will be an addition to the main body of the appraisal text, and the management plan that highlights the sensitivity of the river to domestic sewage discharge and washed sediment from developments nearby. Due care is needed to guard against such instances occurring.</p>
--	--

Wiveton PC (ref: PC05)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The parish feels strongly the saltmarshes which form the northern part of the conservation area should be retained and are pleased to see this is the case in the revised plan. They are heritage assets as well as being an important feature of the landscape. • We are grateful to see better referencing to the North Norfolk Landscape Character Assessment in the revised plan. • The parish is pleased that the villages are included because of their integral role in the landscape in terms of key views and vistas, and the importance of the churches. • We are disappointed that the car park east of CLEY has not been included. As its derivation was from the CLEY Hall estate, we disagree that it does not contribute to the special interest of the conservation area. Had the prospect of its removal from the GVCAA been raised at the time the village conservation area appraisal was discussed, the village would have objected, but at the time it was felt that this land was protected through its inclusion in the GVCA. The additional protection offers to the trees surrounding it is valued. • We are disappointed that PD rights are not being removed from unlisted buildings through Article 4 directions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted. ○ Noted. ○ Noted. ○ Noted/Clarification. In order to ensure that conservation areas remain relevant and fit for purpose, appraisals are obliged to identify land or buildings which do not make a contribution to the special historic or architectural interest of the designation. It is simply an objective assessment of whether a particular building or area is deserving of inclusion or whether it devalues the currency of conservation. No action recommended. ○ Noted/Clarification. Central Government currently advise that Article 4 Directions should be confined to the smallest possible geographic area where a particular risk of harm has been identified. It would therefore not be appropriate to withdraw PD rights for unlisted buildings across the full designation. No action recommended.
---	---

INTERESTED PARTIES

<p>Summary of Comments / Issues Raised (including page / paragraph number where indicated)</p>	<p>Council Response and Action / Recommendation</p>
---	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The revision following the first consultation have made further improvements, and are very worthwhile. We are supportive of the reinstatement of salt and fresh water of Cley and Blakeney. We did take on board the case that these are heavily designated for wildlife, but felt this rather a technical approach as regards protection. They are also of great interest in landscape terms, and as such better included. • We have previously made a case for a further extension beyond Selbrigg Pond area 01 to reach further and include Baconsthorpe Castle and the surrounding area, and pleased to see that has been proposed. I suggest that a clear map is produced to show the boundary and main assets if adopted, as done for Breck Farm 07. This could be in an appendix; also that for Sharrington if also adopted (and also perhaps some of the more significant small boundary extensions). • RESPONSE TO THE SPECIAL INTEREST PAGES: 18-20; 75-82; AND 51-53. We do not make specific changes to these three sections of text, but take as a whole, to provide some 'background' information, with the aim of showing how points might be linked. Those reading for any revision or rewrite may pick up on some aspects and make use of them. <i>(full comment available to view on request but not included here)</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted. ○ Noted/Clarification. A clearer map will be requested from the Authors to show the area in the box marked 01 in better detail and the other maps will be reviewed to ensure they are clear to read. ○ Noted. Whilst the additional information provided does provide further background on the development of the area, it is not considered necessary to include within the appraisal document as this is meant to provide an overview of the history, not an exhaustive timeline. No action recommended.
NCC Mineral Planning Authority (ref: IP02)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In section 6.1 on page 111 the new sentence added in red states "quarries can be converted to small agricultural reservoirs or landscaped when they cease to be used". As the restoration of mineral workings is conditioned (usually as a phased restoration) as part of the approved planning permission for the extraction sites it would be more accurate to state: "The currently active mineral extraction site near Hunworth will be restored to agricultural reservoirs and agricultural grassland whilst the site south of Holt will mainly be restored to agricultural land on completion of mineral extraction." 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted. This suggestion will be incorporated into the text.
PFA Coastal Ward Member (ref: IP03)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ I'm pleased to see the document has been redrafted to more clearly articulate the special interest of the Glaven Valley. ○ Giving greater weight to the contribution made by the wider landscape is welcomed. ○ Because of their historical and landscape role, the retention of the salt-marshes is essential and I am very pleased to see this has been 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted.

<p>agreed. Including the villages is similarly critical and I am therefore happy to see this revision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ I'm disappointed by the decision not to remove PD rights from unlisted buildings through Article 4 directions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted/Clarification. See earlier response relating to Article 4 Directions.
---	--

Norfolk County Council for the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) (ref: IP04)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Based on matters of relevance for consideration by NCC LLFA (in particular relating to surface water flood risk and drainage), the LLFA welcome that it is proposed that the Glaven Valley Conservation Area be retained (originally designated in 1984) and expanded as this would provide a greater level of protection to the existing and additional areas proposed for inclusion in terms of new development and consideration of any impacts upon drainage and flood risk. It is noted that the designation covers a large area which includes the River Glaven and its many tributaries and springs, the salt marshes of Blakeney and Cley-next-the -Sea, water meadows, lakes and mill ponds including Selbrigg Pond at Hempstead Mill, which all play an important role in shaping the landscape and built character of the area. ● The LLFA welcomes that the Conservation Area Review Documents, in particular the Vulnerability and Opportunities and Management Plan Sections, highlight the need developments to give consideration to surface water drainage and flood risk matters. ● The LLFA recognise that the Glaven Valley Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan, is a document which once adopted, would complement Strategic Planning Policies (at both District and National Level such as the NPPF) which deal with matters in more detail relating to flooding, drainage and climate change in respect of new developments. ● The LLFA would wish to highlight the importance of considering surface water, groundwater and flooding from ordinary watercourses within the Glaven Valley Conservation Area when considering the acceptability of any future development proposals in the area. According to Environment Agency datasets, there are significant areas of local surface water flooding (ponding) and surface water flowpaths present within the Glaven Valley Conservation Area. ● The LLFA also recommends, if applicable, reference being made to the 'Norfolk County Council LLFA Statutory Consultee for Planning: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted/Clarification. Comments duly noted and gratefully acknowledged. See above response relating to drainage issues.
--	--

<p>Guidance Document (using the most up-to-date version when considering development proposals) regarding surface water risk and drainage matters which is available from the "Information for developers" section of the Norfolk County Council website.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We advise that Norfolk County Council, as the LLFA for Norfolk, publish completed flood investigation reports here. 	
---	--

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Summary of Comments / Issues Raised (including page / paragraph number where indicated)	Council Response and Action / Recommendation
--	--

Anonymous (ref: A01)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NNDC officers, Purcell and the PP&BHWP are to be commended on their diligent work in taking note of the feedback from the consultation to produce what is the ninth draft of the Appraisal document. Included are major revisions brought about by the quantity and quality of the 30 pages of responses, as confirmed by the above Committee Chairman at its 11th September 2023 meeting. Since incorporating Sharrington’s Conservation Area and hinterland was a major revision, late insertions, detailing the precise rationale, were needed. It is felt that the content and the style of insertions merit strengthening. This would improve the document in relation to Sharrington’s quintessential relevance to the overall coverage of what makes the GVCA special. Briefly, the iconic religious cross is 78 metres from the Church which would have been the historic centre of the village. It is only a 7 miles walk, straight to the Walsingham Shrine, one the four holiest in the entire Christian world; hence the passage via the Glaven ports. The pilgrims’ route is well documented and went down the eastern side of the Glaven to the first river crossing at the Little Thornage ford, nearby Sharrington. Only a handful of GVCA ancient crosses exist and mostly are stumps. Our cross is full height and has unique history. Inspections were carried out by English Heritage and all its reports stated it marked the pilgrimage route to Walsingham Priory. “The Old Preaching Cross at Sharrington” title is used by Adrian S. Pye. Comments regarding the Cross such as “there is a possibility” or crosses are “common” do not accord with actuality in respect of the GVCA, specifically. <u>Water Mill</u>; Lower Sharrington. Our entry in Domesday and Christopher Dawbeney’s (sic) will 1584 bequeathing his water mill at Sharington(sic) are 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted. ○ Noted. On page 23 further detail will be included about the cross, taken from the information provided. ○ Noted. See an earlier response regarding the mill.
--	--

<p>well documented and merit inclusion. There are strong links with the great landowning families like the Daubeney's and the Jodrells.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Valley Farm</u>; 2 large Grade II buildings not in any C/A. Large field containing chalk stream SPRING. Nationally registered. Close to site of water mill. It is near to the site of the water mill referred to above. These factors are connected and better inserted as such. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted. Valley Farm is mentioned on page 129, an addition mentioning the possible proximity of the site of the former water mill can be added.
Anonymous (ref: A02)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have reviewed the online version of the Glaven Valley Conservation Area Appraisal and management Plan, and I have a couple of comments; less so about what is include in the review ; our feedback following the previous consultation period has been incorporated. Sharrington is now included the appraisal as are the two fields north of Brinton, through which the River Glaven tributary runs through. But the document is, difficult to navigate and inconsistent. • Appendix C - Brinton has been omitted from this section even though the village does have a village conservation area and there are several grade II listed properties within the vicinity of St Andrews Church: https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/map-search?postcode=NR24%202QF&clearresults=True • Appendix E - The plan for Sharrington has been omitted. • It would help with navigation if all sections / appendices where the villages are listed are all in alphabetical order. • And finally, there is a bigger picture issue ; around keeping night light to a minimum and minimal street signage, when I have had two parishioners complain about traffic and speeding, both through the village and along the Brinton section of the Holt road. I don't know what the solution is but some joined up thinking is required to retain the quaintness of our villages whilst addressing parishioner's traffic concerns. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted. ○ Noted. See earlier response regarding appendix omissions and alphabetizing the appendices. ○ Noted/Clarification. It is agreed that lighting and signage levels can have a significant impact upon rural villages and areas. However, it is beyond the remit of a conservation area appraisal to impose restrictions on these issues.
Anonymous (ref: A03)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for now including Sharrington and the majority of its hinterland into its rightful place in the Glaven Valley Conservation Area. However, I am surprised to see that two areas of field are still excluded either side of Upper Hall Lane, south of A148. One is half the field to north of the public footpath, excluding one of the ponds from Glaven Valley. You have clearly just lifted the conservation area of the village, which is odd in its area. Leaving these two areas exposed for the future. You state "...views in and out of conservation areas are important...". One of these areas looks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted. Please see earlier response regarding the two fields either side of Hall Lane.

across to historic farm workers cottages. The other is part of a whole field, half of which is included. Both border the A148 and would make sense to 'tidy' up the boundary. I therefore strongly request that these two small areas are included.

- I am surprised that Sharrington is the only village showing exclusion of a few modern properties on The Street and New Road, plus one marked in the Center/north of the village. No other village show such exclusions. This makes again for a very odd border, one property included next door not! Surely including the whole village up to A148 to future proof the whole village with the now included hinterlands already shown within the Glaven Valley. Frankly, with little development being allowed in these areas, these c1980s buildings will be of historical significance in years to come.
- There is no mention of our working telephone box, which is a sort after design/model. The Sharrington Telephone Box is a Sir Giles Gilbert Scott 1935 K6 design from the reign of George V.
- Sharrington write up needs strengthening compared to other villages. I understand that you have received detailed historic facts from Mr Derek Harris and I support these, which include: The Sharrington Cross - full height, Water Mill, Valley Farm, Reference in the Doomsday book.
- Please note these views represent the three adult residents of this house and should be considered as three submissions.

- **Noted.** Please see earlier response relating to the exclusion of modern development on the edge of the village.
- **Noted.** Please see above response relating to the telephone box.
- **Noted.** Please see earlier responses to several suggestions to strengthen the mentions of Sharrington within the appraisal document.

Anonymous (ref: A04)

- I can find no mention in the doc of any measures to protect the Glaven, surely the heart and soul of the GVCA?
- It is great that the area is to be enlarged to include Bodham and Baconsthorpe, where the river rises. Re the Hornsea cable line - despite meeting with contractors and the EA, NOTHING was done to prevent 3 huge run offs of sand and fine sediment straight into the Glaven in last week's storm. Next time you drive past the cable line, you will see that all vegetation has been removed to expose unstable banks of sand. Btw, everyone knew about lesser run offs, which have been happening (and been documented) all summer.
- The amount of silt and fine sediment entering the river is catastrophic. Please see the attached photo of what used to be Letheringsett Mill's mill pond.
- Why does the GVCA plan make no mention of provision for proper drainage? Last week's flood in Hunworth, Thornage and Letheringsett meant that ALL septic tank tail drains were discharging sewage into the

- **Noted/Clarification.** Although ongoing management of the river and drainage lies with the Environment Agency, please see earlier response relating to the sensitivity of the river.

<p>Glaven and Thornage Beck. Why, for example, doesn't Stody Estate set an example and install Klargesters? We all know that the Hunny Bell septic tank has to be emptied every week in summer when the pub is busy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A and S Harrap at Natural Surroundings suffered from huge sewage spills in the flood, from the Holt works, with paper and other unmentionables gushing down the Glaven. • The inaccuracies in the draft document are legend. My house no longer exists but is instead now called Mill Farm; Elsewhere Thornage Mill is not a mill on the Glaven but then somewhere else it is grade 2* listed with an entirely inaccurate description of the old workings taken from a document in the 1970's. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted/Clarification. Mill Farm and the former Thornage Mill are two separate addresses, mentions of either will checked to ensure the correct one is being referenced.
Anonymous (ref: A05)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As Purcell were presumably not tasked with studying the history of each village it is possibly helpful to further reinforce the inclusion of Sharrington as a unique historical village in the Glaven Valley catchment area. • Until the early 20th C. Sharrington was still a village presided over by a manorial lord. Not only were the Jodrell family of Bayfield Hall patrons of the church, with the right to nominate the rector, the late Sir Alfred Jodrell and 4th Baronet of Salle Park built, in effect, the village we see today. The cottages he had built housed his agricultural workers, in the nineteenth century and are easily distinguishable from later buildings or barn conversions. • Like Glandford and Saxlingham villages, which were also part of Sir Alfred's estate, his desire for his workers to live in well-built vernacular housing and to worship in well maintained churches gives each village a unique character. • Glandford, Saxlingham and Sharrington villages are unique in their development a characteristic not seen in other North Norfolk villages. • Sharrington water mill, referenced in Christopher Daubeney's will dated November 15th 1584. • Without further research in Norfolk Archives the exact location of the mill cannot be pinpointed in the village, but supports the inclusion of the land between Sharrington and Brinton where the possibility of the mills location is highest. • Boundaries of the Glaven Valley Conservation Area; I refer to the Norfolk Rivers Trust boundary of the Glaven Valley which includes Sharrington and clearly shows the tributaries rising in the village and feeding into the River Glaven. Page 37 mentions Glaven river tributaries which .."have shaped the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted. The influence of a former landowner on the character of the village can be reflected in the appraisal document, but the buildings built by Sir Alfred Jodrell need to be identified first. ○ Noted. See earlier response with regard to the water mill. ○ Noted. Without more specific reference to identify the area in question it appears that this area between Brinton Hall and Thornage

<p>landscape”.... The tributaries that collect water from land in Sharrington, flowing through the ornamental lake at Brinton Hall and across fields to Thornage is an equally important reason the landscape here should be included in the conservation area. Protection of these tributaries, which form part of the Glaven valley landscape, is surely an integral part of the conservation area?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selbrigg Pond – a meeting place of Glaven tributaries; as a result of chalk the River Glaven is unique. 85% of the world’s two hundred chalk rivers are found in England and have been managed since Roman times. • Recently the River Glaven has benefited from multi agency financed work to “repair” nineteenth century management: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) 2010 the Hunworth stretch was restored back to its original form having been straightened for milling purposes. b) 2014 in Bayfield a new channel was excavated to divert flow from the man-made lake and culvert built by its former owner Sir Alfred Jodrell. • Selbrigg Pond was restored back in 2017 but recent heavy rainfall has resulted in the catastrophic silt incursion into the River Glaven system, on the 9th of October, as a result of work being carried out by Dong energy. • In retrospect it is easy to say the plan should not have gone ahead due to the disruption and scarring of the landscape across north Norfolk. Offshore wind farms are one way of providing much needed energy. Balanced against the cost to both the environment and our heritage – is it worth it? • The importance of careful development within the Glaven valley catchment should be a consideration of any conservation area plan. Although not Purcells remit it is the uniqueness of the area that attracts the visitors on which many families depend for employment. 	<p>is already being proposed for inclusion in the boundary. Accordingly no change is required. No action recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted. ○ Noted. ○ Noted. See above response discussing management of the river.
<p>Anonymous (ref: A06)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very pleased that Sharrington village is being proposed for inclusion in Glaven Valley Conservation Area. • There are two fields in Sharrington that I feel should be included. The first field is opposite two pairs of locally listed, heritage asset estate workers cottages. The second field contains the only village footpath and leads to the village ponds. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted. ○ Noted. Please see above response for action for the fields in Sharrington.
<p>Anonymous (ref: A07)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you also for all the work your department, the NNDC and Purcell have done in the preparation of this and previous documents. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am very pleased that Sharrington has now been included in the GVCA but would query the complicated boundary south of the A148 which runs through part of the fields either side of Hall Lane. I agree with the submission by Brinton Parish Council and feel strongly that all of both of these fields together with Hall Lane should be included. They have been major contributors to the history of the village and its agricultural and farming heritage, in part made possible by the River Glaven and the Glaven Ports. They contribute to the qualities of the Glaven Valley Conservation Area and provide a valued setting to the village and the GVCA. These fields are no less important than those further east of the village. • I would also concur with the Parish Council's request to have our historic telephone box locally listed and support the reasons given in the Parish council submission. • I would like to have seen more references to Sharrington in the body of the document, particularly with regard to the references under the individual headings in the document and concur with the details supplied by the Parish Council 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted. Please see earlier responses to issues around the fields in Sharrington, the telephone box and references to Sharrington in the document.
Anonymous (ref: A08)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You state you have put Breck Farm yard, our main farmyard, commercial operations, quarrying and reservoirs into the GVCA “following public consultation” however the only mention of this has been from Wiveton Parish Council. Our operations are nowhere near Wiveton and not even in their parish. Our own parish councils, Stody/Hunworth, Briston and Edgefield have not requested it and nor have we. Pls remove. As I said, this looks like a cynical bargaining tool to reject all our other comments. • We continue to see no fair rationale for Stody Lodge, 7x Thatched cottages and Beck Farm, Beck farm Cottage & barn to be locally listed and note that our Parish Council aren't asking for these to be locally listed either. We note our view is also supported by other consultees. • The language around uPVC and energy efficiencies continues to be too restrictive. As already stated, technology has come a long way and, in non-listed buildings, modern timber looking uPVC is entirely suitable and holds up the high standards of conservation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ p107- DISAGREE that uPVC is a “significant threat” to individual buildings and the Conservation area. This is far too strong. uPVC is entirely suitable in non-listed buildings, delivering much required energy efficiency and carbon neutral homes/buildings. There are also modern forms of timber-looking but non timber windows that 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noted/Clarification. NNDC are required to take all comments received into account, regardless of who has submitted them. Having said that, on reflection, there is little merit on balance in retaining this area within the conservation area, it would difficult to argue it makes a contribution to the historic or architectural character of the designation. As such, and by virtue of its position on the outskirts of the designation, the area containing the quarry and Breck Farm will now be removed from the boundary. ○ Noted/Clarification. This is a point that was raised as part of the last consultation, and has this been previously considered by members. Stody Lodge and the cottages demonstrate an atypical style within the conservation area which reinforces their being part of an estate and illustrates how large estates often created/influenced the built environment we see today. They may not be particularly old in building terms, however, this does not diminish the value they contribute to the character of the area. Richness and variety often enhance CAs, it is not always about sameness and uniformity. These are characterful buildings which compare favourably against our adopted local listing criteria. No action recommended.

would not be detrimental to heritage and enable much needed cost and energy efficiency.

- P107 pls remove “uPVC should not be used in historic buildings and are undesirable on modern buildings”.
- We repeat that householders must be allowed to make their homes more energy efficient with solar panels and, if their south facing roof happens to be facing a road, they should still be allowed to install solar.
- The current language continues to be draconian against keeping these villages alive by building, small scale sustainable new housing, including affordable, but clearly in keeping with the local vernacular. These villages are currently unaffordable for local working families.
 - p119 pls remove “New development should be of the same or lesser scale and massing of the buildings around it” and remove “If new development areas are required, these are most likely to be appropriate on the peripheries of the larger settlements of Blakeney and Holt”

- **Noted/Clarification.** This point about language around uPVC and energy efficiency has also been made before and has been considered by members. The appraisal states a preference for replacement of uPVC windows at the end of their lives with new timber windows but that if that is not possible, the uPVC windows should be of high quality and closely imitate timber windows as far as is possible. The appraisal outlines the reasons why uPVC is not well suited to historic buildings. These relate to the loss of historic fabric, aesthetic deficiencies and the impact on breathability. The appraisal therefore makes the case for building conservation being considered alongside energy conservation to ensure that alterations do not negatively impact the conservation area, the planning process requires that every application for energy efficiency improvements are assessed on a case by case basis. It’s important to be aware that cumulatively over time, changes to traditional fenestration can have a negative impact on the character and appearance of an area. **No action recommended.**
- **Noted/Clarification.** Generally speaking, the language used in the document is consistent with all the other appraisals that we have produced and adopted in conjunction with Purcell. The appraisals strive to provide guidance on how to positively manage change within conservation areas, it is not about preventing appropriate development but instead demonstrates ‘best practice’ as far as this is possible. The appraisal has to reflect the wider policy context in which development needs to be sustainable. **No action recommended.**