

Ludham Conservation Area re-appraisal

Consultation results

The re-appraisal was prepared in consultation with North Norfolk District Council as part of the conservation area is within their boundary.

A public exhibition was due to be held on Saturday 21 March 2020, at the St Catherine's Church Rooms, Ludham. Unfortunately the public exhibition was cancelled due to the government restrictions imposed surrounding Covid 19. However, a leaflet was delivered to all residents and businesses within the conservation area boundary and within the proposed amended areas, site notices were erected, an advertisement placed in the Parish Newsletter, and copies of the appraisal documents were made available both online and in hard copy format which could be sent out from the Broads Authority office. The leaflet included a comments section and consultees were also able to comment online and via email. The consultation ran from Thursday 12th March and was extended from Friday 17th April to Friday 15th May 2020 to give more time for response following the Covid-19 Lockdown. We received 20 responses to the consultation as highlighted in the table below:

From	Comment	BA Response
Resident	Didn't understand what is being proposed. Also line of the conservation area appears to go through her property.	Now understands proposed changes. Boundary amended and now outside CA. No further comments. Document amended
Resident	Would like to know what extension means for development in part of garden that was previously excluded	Responded advising of changes that would apply – no further comments submitted No changes made to document
Business Owner	Would have effect on Womack Staithe. Supportive of CA document and level of information on Womack Staithe, would like to encourage more people to the area as many people do not know about the staithe - sign at the top of the road would help, made suggestions on positioning of planting to ensure they do not obscure views to shop and pump out facilities. Carpark privately owned.	Re-appraisal text amended accordingly regarding appropriately positioned planting and directional sign Document amended and will speak to colleagues about signage.
Resident	Supportive of inclusions but not of exclusions, in particular small areas around Horsefen Road. Can't see BA being able to make improvements and highlighted an area at Ludham Manor which 'now looks like a scrap yard', supportive of zebra crossing but	Wrote back to resident explaining why areas are proposed to be removed, that the scrap yard in Manor House grounds - understand this is building site at present for approved scheme and once the

APPENDIX 2

	does not like all other improvements proposed.	works are complete it is expected that the site will be tidied, that there is no plan for zebra crossing at present but enhancement works in proposed village centre should slow traffic which would make crossing the road more easy. No changes made to document
Resident	Would have effect on The District Nurses House, School Road. Does not intend to extend or change the house so inclusion in the CA is considered to be pointless. North Norfolk can be trusted to look after the school as they have done previously. Does not want the District Nurses House to be in the CA boundary. Considers boundary should be left where it is.	Concerns noted however the District Nurse House is still considered to be worthy of inclusion in the CA area due to both its cultural and historic significance. Further justification for its inclusion included within re-appraisal. Whilst it is acknowledged that no changes are proposed currently, future owners may wish to alter the house. Document amended.
Resident	Would have effect on St Benet's Cottage, Cold Harbour Lane. Objects. Why are we revising the CA? Why are we including St Benet's Cottage? What implications will it have? Why are we removing the field adjacent to St Benet's Cottage? Suspicious of our motives and considers it to interfere with his family life at the property.	Responded with email answering each question. It is considered that the property is worth of inclusion given its age and local vernacular and therefore proposed to be retained in inclusion. No changes made to document.
Resident	Complaint re: NNDC Planning Dept and proposal for site on Lover's Lane. Commends the Conservation Area re-appraisal and the BA's professional planners Stresses the importance of aesthetics in the village centre but not at the expense of H&S - dangerous junction from Staithe Road to main road and car parking should be restricted in village centre and at top of Staithe Road as it restricts access for emergency vehicles at present.	Noted Noted Re-appraisal text amended to help address car domination issues and parking rationalisation. Document amended.
Resident	Objection to planning application (NNDC) at the White House, Staithe Road and query as to how it can be considered to be acceptable within the conservation area.	Noted and asked NNDC to be consulted on the application.

APPENDIX 2

		No changes made to document.
Resident	Objection to planning application (NNDC) at the White House, Staithe Road and query as to how it can be considered to be acceptable within the conservation area.	Noted and asked NNDC to be consulted on the application. No changes made to document.
Resident	Why is the appraisal being carried out? Why are fields being removed and will it make them more likely to be developed?	Responded explaining why the CAA is being carried out and why the fields don't meet the criteria and how it doesn't make them more likely to be developed. No changes made to document.
Resident	<p>Would like to see hard copies of documents. Would like to lobby strongly for an extension to the consultation deadline as there has been no public meeting and loss in time whilst everyone gets use to working from home etc. due to Covid-19</p> <p>CA appraisal 'really very good' and appreciates amount of work involved in its preparation.</p> <p>LPA has been derelict in regards of not providing a CAA in the 46 years since designation of the CA. Good that is happening now.</p> <p>Unfortunate that restrictions re: Covid-19 meant cancellation of public consultation event. Appreciates that the consultation period has been extended but feels that a public event should be held as soon as is possible and the consultation period extended further to suit.</p> <p>Extension on School Road to include School and Nurses House 'entirely appropriate'. Reflect important welfare changes in wider community and village</p> <p>Significance of C19th workshop adjacent to 12 School Road - Blacksmith's shop. Suggests site -specific brief</p>	<p>Documents sent and consultation extended in response to government restrictions surrounding Covid-19.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>It is deeply regretted that the public consultation event could not take place however it is not clear when this can go ahead safely and as the amount of consultation has been undertaken in accordance with regulations then advise we continue without.</p> <p>Re-appraisal text amended accordingly</p> <p>Re-appraisal text amended accordingly. A site specific brief is not considered appropriate here given there are other sites of equal significance in the village and a comprehensive approach would be better. Noted also that planning permission has been</p>

	<p>Could we consider extension along Catfield Road and Broad House on Malthouse Lane? Semi-detached workers cottages are characteristic of well-mannered, modest dwellings in rural Norfolk.</p> <p>Agree Latchmoor Park should be removed.</p> <p>Believes triangular island is remnant of old street pattern and should therefore be retained in CA. Also that the two houses on the island are good quality design that make reference to vernacular. Retention of existing CA controls desirable here.</p> <p>Agrees rationalisation of boundary to east of Horsefen Road needed, but wonders if all yard area and large barn should be included so CA boundary follows settlement boundary.</p> <p>Agrees with assessment of Woodlands and proposal to include it and that two other buildings here have been altered too significantly.</p> <p>Can imagine it is necessary to rationalise CA boundary next to Hunter's Dyke and Womack Dyke as proposed.</p> <p>Agrees not appropriate to include farmland in CA</p> <p>Agrees the CA should include St Benet's Cottage. Suggests a 'plot' of the field between Hall Common Cottage and Hall Common Farm should be retained in the CA to link the two rather than having a satellite area just linked by the road and to prevent development.</p> <p>Suggests we include allotments, last vestige of 'feudal strips for domestic food production and important feature of social history.</p>	<p>granted for demolition and redevelopment with 3 bungalows.</p> <p>The significance of these dwellings are borderline.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Do not reflect the ancient street pattern, but do form part of the history of village and the properties have some merit. Propose to retain in CA.</p> <p>Noted regarding rationalisation, but no strong justification for inclusion.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Agreed to make sense of the boundary here it would be beneficial to include strip of land between the two plots – map amended.</p> <p>Noted and understood. However, historic maps and aerial images suggest these are of late 20th Century origin, so given these allotments are not historical it is not proposed for them to be included</p>
--	---	---

APPENDIX 2

	<p>Agrees with removal of fields but suggests boundary follows garden boundaries so retain buildings within CA.</p> <p>Suggests retaining plot to W of Heronway on Norwich Road within CA to control development</p> <p>Suggests assessing all sites within the CA (e.g. positive or negative contributors) with appropriate enhancement policies for negative sites.</p> <p>Keep informed of timetable for adoption</p> <p>Made us aware of planning permission to replace workshop on 12 School Road with 3x bungalows- Fri 14 Jun 2019- PF/19/0130</p>	<p>These properties are fairly modern and whilst pleasant it is not considered there is sufficient justification for retention within the CA.</p> <p>Noted, however, this is effectively a small field that is not considered to be appropriate to include as not sufficiently special. Should any development proposals come forward the impact on the setting of the adjoining CA would be considered.</p> <p>There is a list of buildings which make a positive contribution to the character of the CA in the appendix- Whilst this is a helpful reference and a technique used in some CAA, there would be concerns with highlighting negative contributors specifically given a high percentage are people's own homes. General areas for improvement have been highlighted also.</p> <p>Advised of current timetable</p> <p>Noted but as not built yet reference to workshop to be retained in appraisal</p> <p>Document amended</p>
Resident	Our concern is that any narrowing of this space (behind village stores) due to planting, might cause difficulty for ourselves and delivery vehicles which may have to stop in the street.	<p>Re-appraisal text amended accordingly</p> <p>Document amended</p>
Resident	Concerns over removal of farmland from CA and thinks this would allow for development.	<p>Advised that removal doesn't impact on the development potential of the areas</p> <p>No changes made to document</p>
Facebook Comment	Why is the photo of Horning?	<p>Photo was of St Benets Abbey, which is in Horning parish.</p> <p>Photo changed</p>

APPENDIX 2

Facebook Comment	Has family connections to Ludham. A beautiful village.	Noted
Facebook Comment	Loves Ludham and walks around it. Particularly the shops, café, pub and church. The village is steeped in history with fabulous countryside.	Noted
Facebook Comment	Lovely walks. A peaceful, relaxing and calm place.	Noted
Facebook Comment	Unspoilt natural beauty.	Noted
Facebook Comment	Unspoilt walks.	Noted
Facebook Comment	Ludham is special in winter	Noted

From the statutory/amenity bodies consulted, responses were received as follows:

Organisation	Comment	BA response
Ludham Parish Council	No response	None
Historic England	No response	None
Norfolk County Council's Historic Environment Services	No comment	None
Councillor Richard Price (NCC)	No response	None
Councillor Adam Vardy (NNDC)	No response	None