

Draft Glaven Valley Conservation Area Appraisals - Consultation Responses
 (consultation period 1 February- 12 March 2021)

Total Written Representations: 16

PARISH/TOWN COUNCILS	
Summary of Comments / Issues Raised (including page / paragraph number where indicated)	Council Response and Action / Recommendation
Holt (ref: PC01)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments received during the Consultation Period. 	
Hempstead (ref: PC02)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Parish Council welcomes the content of the document and is pleased the boundaries of the conservation area are not being changed, and that the general character of the area is being retained. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. No additional action recommended.
Glandford (ref: PC03)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The link of the double Cottage with Dutch Gable to those in the Village raises the issue of social housing, and their maintenance. The deficiency in finance has long been an acute problem. This will be exacerbated by the debts brought about by Covid-19. This will also be an issue for Holt and many other Conservation Areas. I would just like to make 1 or 2 comments on Glandford, speaking as the local landowner and Chairman of Holt Housing Society, which now owns the majority of the Victorian cottages in Glandford. Firstly I would like to pay tribute to a generally very fair, balanced report on our little village, which rightly emphasises the historic mainly Victorian nature of the built environment. However as with all such reports it makes sweeping recommendations as to the future care and maintenance of some features. In particular I disagree completely with the notion that all upvc windows and doors should be replaced at the end of their lives and replaced with wooden versions. I totally agree that the modern upvc is unsightly and nowhere near as attractive as its wooden equivalent, however it is much cheaper and easier to maintain. Coupled with the ever increasing regulations surrounding energy conservation in homes and the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree. Although it is usually preferable to repair historic timber windows, it is sometimes the case that the fabric is beyond reasonable repair in which case it would be necessary for these to be replaced. In the first instance it would be advisable to replace them 'like-for-like', replicating the materials, design and proportions, but it has to be recognised that this isn't always feasible. Therefore, any discussion of uPVC has been revised to reflect the nuance of its use within a conservation area. Agree. Similarly to uPVC, the appropriate placement of solar panels and satellites is dependent on a number of factors, any discussion of both within the text has been revised to demonstrate that each case has to be assessed on an individual basis.

<p>endless complaints from tenants about drafts, these new windows and doors make perfect sense.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would argue that in time more acceptable replacements will hopefully come onto the market combining both aesthetic appeal and functionality, these can then replace units as they become due for change. It makes no sense to go back to a material that is not now as high quality as the originals. Some of the windows replaced over the last decades or so were the Victorian originals, to try to replicate that would be beyond the Society and to put in the basic wooden versions available now would mean endless very expensive maintenance, despite which they will still have a short lifespan. • Secondly the notion that solar panels and satellites can be placed away from the visible frontages. Unfortunately in Glandford the visible fronts face south, which clearly both technologies need. Who will pay for each satellite dish to be re-erected in back gardens, even if the correct angles can be found. Similarly with the mass of utility wires, both electric and BT, their installation long predates any thought of what they might look like. • Finally the general comments about signage and tidiness in some of the yards owned by Bayfield. These I completely accept and the signage will be much improved over the next year or so as the new units are finished at Manor Farm. Similarly it is in my interest to keep these yards as spick and span. 	
---	--

Letheringsett (ref: PC04)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We welcome the coupling of Letheringsett and Little Thornage as a defined Conservation Area. While they are in close proximity, they are separate through a long history going back beyond Domesday. You could say they have gone on different pathways, and what determined that is the River Glaven and the land around it. While we support much of the document, including the proposals for local listing, we feel that there more that can be said as regards the early history and the historic development. • You can broadly say that Letheringsett from around 1750 to 1830 was a rural example of the Industrial Revolution, while Little Thornage carried on as rural and agricultural, with small farms, meadows valued more than arable land; by the 1600s innovation in the use of winter water irrigation of the meadows for an early flush of grass for grazing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted/Clarification. Although the additional information provided in relation to the historic development of Letheringsett is important, the Conservation Area Appraisal is not intended to be a full history of a settlement. There are other resources that solely focus on Letheringsett’s history, some of which have been referred to in the comments, however, the appraisal provides a snapshot of what makes an area special, part of which will be influenced by its historic development and requires an overview for context, but much of the appraisal focuses on the current character and condition of the conservation area. Including what issues the area faces, and recommendations for change that will help to protect the identified special interest. However, some of the background information provided regarding the history and development of the
--	--

- For 1811 map Tithe Map of Letheringsett I centre on field number 99 as being of particular interest. Old place names are very helpful, and a field now called Four Acres, has the historic name Mill Holm. Both Basil Cozens-Hardy and Norfolk Industrial Archaeological Society (NIAS) consider that the bulge in the river at Mill Holm marks the previous site for the Mill. The Mill we see now was built in 1798, and re-located much further downstream.
- However the most direct and important evidence comes from the researches of Basil Cozens-Hardy. The first east-west crossing of the Glaven was the Little Thornage Ford, and it was part of a pilgrimage route to Little Walsingham (Basil C-H, page 105). The revised Pevsner tells us that in medieval times visits to Walsingham were second only to Canterbury, but today with a revival of interest the positions are reversed. It was called in early times Long Water Walsingham Way. In some tithe and estate maps this is abbreviated to Long Water. There was a Pack Horse stone bridge there, and the first part on the way to Hunworth was Stone Brig Lane.
- In all the document maps showing the present Conservation Area boundary, Long Water Walsingham Way is shown as a continuation of Riverside Road, presumably with the rise of sat nav in vehicles. This is not helpful in that it distorts and totally works against the history of the hamlet, and the sense of place. It implies that there was just settlement as a rectangular block.
- The seat shown on the 'not-the-Riverside Road' at page 44 is some 20 yards from Glaven Farm and another 80 yards to the Ford, on Long Water Lane. Sit there, or better stand alongside. There is southerly open view over Little Thornage meadows, the best view of all looking out of the Conservation Area, but no decent photographs to show this. The document at page 37 top right shows the ditch through bramble growth on the post and barbed wire fencing (this is not the river bed). Walking a little further up the lane there is a seat on the right, pictured at page 44 centre top.
- It can also be argued that the best view into the Area is a short way up the hill on the public footpath to Holt, and looking down to the Little Thornage hamlet. Both maps show the whole length of the pilgrim route in the area, and the first crossing of the Glaven. The approach from the east is at the bottom right on the map. And crosses what is now the Hunworth Road'

village has been incorporated into the appraisal document to provide further context for understanding the settlement.

- **Noted/Clarification.** Although all the background information provided relating to the Little Thornage Water Meadows is an important part in understanding their importance, the meadows actually fall into the Glaven Valley Conservation Area, so they already benefit from the same level of protection as both Letheringsett and Little Thornage. It is considered more appropriate for the meadows to remain as part of the Glaven Valley Conservation Area as it better relates to the characteristics of the Glaven Valley, which tends to focus on the landscape between settlements that has been shaped by historic industry and agricultural practice. **No additional action recommended.**
- **Noted/Clarification.** The maps within the conservation area appraisal use the most up to date Ordnance Survey data available as a base, the road names shown, therefore, are those supplied via that data. **No additional action recommended.**
- **Agree.** The additional views described have been captured and included within the text.
- **Noted/Clarification.** Although a valid point is made about the importance of recording historic buildings prior to, and during any works, it is beyond the remit of the Conservation Area Appraisal to place a blanket requirement for building recordings across the conservation area. As applications for planning permission affecting both designated and non-designated heritage assets come in, the requirement for a building recording to be carried out will have to continue to be assessed on a case by case basis. **No additional action recommended.**
- **Noted/Clarification.** The wording on page 55 has been updated for clarification.
- **Noted/Clarification.** With regards to the suggestion of including the village sign and the letterboxes on the Local List; although the importance of these structures is recognised, it is not considered that they carry enough significance to merit Locally Listed Building status. We have to be conscious of not devaluing the currency. **No additional action recommended.**

with a curving swing to the right. As it straightens again, there is a pit. It is from that area a fine view into the Little Thornage hamlet, we would claim the best in the Conservation Area.

- The meadows as whole extend south to abut Astley estate land. Those at Little Thornage have much historic interest in the use of winter irrigation, going back to 1600 (topic 6, in overview of Margaret Bird eight books). They were used for other purposes since, including the Hardy's from 1784 to 1798 (RGCG A20), both water power from the river, and soft water from drainage for porter beer. We consider that to truncate the Little Thornage meadows gives a lesser importance of realising the relationship between buildings and their link to the meadows and the river.
- Many of the pre-1800 listed vernacular buildings in the Conservation Area will have seen changes. These can be revealed in restoration work to the building, and the finding of the unexpected. I see this as a gain by having a greater understanding of past history of the building, and should be recorded, and compared with that which might be found in other vernacular build At present there is mechanism to do this; perhaps by making this part of the Conservation Area remit at Objective 1?
- Who is to 'police' the many things highlighted in the consultation document over undesirable features such as plastic windows or doors, badly sited satellite dishes, dangling TV aerials or ivy growth? It is not going to be either the district council, or residents. It has to be the use of information and persuasion. Conservation Management Plans could be used as part of a persuasion approach, and not be restricted mainly to planning applications.
- The two cottages shown at top left adjoining Barn Cottage are shown at page 55; they have long been converted from what was a barn, as the brickwork above the flint indicates.
- For local listing there is support for the cast iron Letheringsett sign on the Thornage Road, and Honeysuckle Cottage on the small island at the Little Thornage crossroads; the Old Rectory; the Kings Head pub. The letter boxes in the street and at Little Thornage could be considered before the internet takes over 100%.
- At page 55 there is a photograph captioned 'Pair of cottages on Blakeney Road with Dutch Gables, part of a group with buildings in Glandford'.

- **Noted/Clarification.** With regards to the map shown at page 64, this shows the proposed boundary changes seen at page 91, which includes an extension along Blakeney Road. At the time of consultation not all of the maps within the document had been updated with the proposed boundary shown. However, all maps have now been updated. The proposed boundary change is discussed on page 90 as part of the management plan.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At page 64 a map shows the current northern boundary of the Conservation Area as a finger (colour pale blue) along the Blakeney Road, but the first and much smaller only in the finger as being in the Conservation Area. • Page 66 is headed: BLAKENEY ROAD (currently partly outside the Conservation Area). There is no discussion on this, but suggests there could be a boundary change. That would mean an extension from Meadow Farm to Home Farm. This would provide consistency in the CA remit, and otherwise the extension falls into a black hole. This assumes that Glandford Village was part of the 2018 Glaven Ports CA Appraisal, and Home Farm was seen an out-flyer and ass such excluded. 	
<p>Baconsthorpe (ref: PC05)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Parish Council would wish the boundary to remain as it is, in particular the southern boundary should include the area of fields within the current boundary and not exclude it. There could very well be planning applications for that area, in particular no doubt, applications for exception housing, and the Parish Council would wish the area to be protected by this designation so that future applications would be required to take account of the constraints imposed and remain in character with the rest of the village. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted/Clarification. The fields proposed for removal from the Baconsthorpe Conservation Area currently also fall into the Glaven Valley Conservation Area. In removing them from Baconsthorpe, they remain part of the Glaven Valley, therefore, would benefit from the same level of protections as they currently do. Open agricultural fields are also more suited to the characteristics of the Glaven Valley, which tends to focus on the landscape between settlements that has been shaped by historic industry and agricultural practice. No additional action recommended.
<p>Thornage (ref: PC06)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments received during the Consultation Period. 	

EXTERNAL CONSULTEES	
Summary of Comments / Issues Raised (including page / paragraph number where indicated)	Council Response and Action / Recommendation
The Holt Society (ref: EC01)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Conservation Area in Holt benefits from a tight boundary which helps to preserve it from development and enhances the appeal for residents and visitors alike. Key issues affecting the conservation area are the amount of inappropriate signage cluttering the fascia's of the buildings. Often ill-suited in scale and use of material. The use of a non-Georgian colour pallet on exterior shop front/door cases. RE the proposed change to area A on the map of Holt, we would like to see all of the high flint wall which forms the boundary between the rear of Mill Street and the footpath/vehicle access to the allotments included within the conservation area boundary. This wall is deteriorating though we believe it should be maintained by the original Mill Court developers (Broadlands). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree. Proposed boundary amended to retain the section marked as A, in order to retain the protection offered to the important flint wall identified.

HEMPSTEAD (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"> There are several references in the document to 'Hempstead Mill' but as the mill is in the Parish of Holt, the mill is actually called Holt Mill. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. The text has been amended to include both names.
Anonymous (ref: H02)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any modern development within or nearby the village envelope will have a detrimental effect on this historic village. There should be a ban on any new developments in or within half a mile of the village envelope, other than single infill or replacement. It's the size of the houses and their layout that detracts from historic villages, not the type materials used to build them. At times the appraisal is a little subjective, e.g. any farm buildings or sheds were a detraction, yet this is an agricultural area and some buildings are a beauty to behold. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted/Clarification. It is beyond the remit of the conservation area appraisal to place a ban on new development, however, once adopted, the appraisal will be a useful tool in ensuring any new development protects or enhances the character and appearance of the conservation area. Agree. The text has been amended to reflect the fact that a working agricultural area requires some degree of functional

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Green Farm should be included within the conservation area, as it is only 185 yards outside the present envelope. 	<p>buildings that don't necessarily reflect the character of the rest of the conservation area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted/Clarification. Green Farm is slightly removed from the village itself and the current boundary of the conservation area, it would be more appropriate to include within the Glaven Valley Conservation Area when it is reviewed, as much of this designation covers a number of outlying farmsteads as opposed to concentrated settlements.
Anonymous (ref: H03)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with the analysis of key characteristics. The threat of inappropriate development is always with us. This document does not spell out clearly what should and what should not be permitted. Considerable effort and financial resources have been devoted to this appraisal. In order to warrant this investment there needs to be some grants available to augment the proposals. Take exception to the disparaging remarks about the village hall, it was manufactured along with many others as a kit by Boulton & Paul of Norwich after WW1. Many were Chapels as well as village halls and some are now listed buildings. It is insulting to call it a hut (p40). It has not been converted to a dwelling (p42) and I am curious as to which 'former village hall' is now a dwelling. The Forge was a working smithy up to the 1930s, it has never been called The Old Forge Cottage (pp29, 38, 43 etc). White Horse Cottages: we applaud your admiration for these, and your criticism of the dreadful repointing job. uPVC: your dismissal of this material in favour of wood for windows is mistaken. Wood is a wonderful material but it is not fit for purpose outside (rot, distortion, beauty hidden by paint). uPVC is far better and can be made to look just like a traditional wooden frame. Green Verges: Very desirable, but have been vandalized by passing vehicles and no longer look attractive. Green Farm: these once attractive buildings are being allowed to fall into decay. They should be included in the conservation area. The name of the verger of the Church gate who served 50 years is Henry Mack not Vick. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted/Clarification. The Conservation Area Appraisal cannot be too prescriptive in its discussion of what type of design is or is not appropriate, it can only make recommendations that the prevailing character and appearance is respected by any new development. This leaves scope for individual creativity and avoids all new development becoming a pastiche of the existing historic buildings. Each application for new development has to be assessed on its own merits, on a case by case basis. No additional action recommended. Noted/Clarification. Whilst financial resources would of course be welcome to support any enhancement schemes, the investment and resources involved can more properly be justified through the appraisal's contribution to the planning system and in raising local awareness. No additional action recommended. Agree. The description of the village hall has been amended. Agree. Any reference to The Old Forge Cottage has been amended to the correct name. Noted. See above for full comments on uPVC. Any discussion of uPVC has been revised to reflect the nuance of its use within a conservation area. Noted/Clarification. See discussion of Green Farm above. Noted/Clarification. As the majority of hedges and verges are either in private ownership or managed by Norfolk County Council, it is beyond the remit of the conservation

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cupressus Lawsoniana: more attention should be given in the survey to inappropriate vegetation. Another example is eucalyptus. 	<p>area appraisal to control their maintenance, any works would be carried out by owners or the County Council.</p>
<p>Anonymous (ref: H04)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As the owner of Tinkers Cottage, Marlpit Lane, I was dismayed to find out that my bungalow was being put forward for local listing. My family has lived in this cottage for over 120 years some as agricultural workers for whom the cottages were intended. • Your listing seems out of date, 45/46 are no on building- Tinkers Cottage, likewise 43/44 now called Marlpits. Also on Pond Hills Road is an identical bungalow that was 41/42 is not mentioned for listing, why is this? • I myself am an old age pensioner and can ill afford the extra house insurance cost and other issues, Tinkers Cottage is tastefully modified as are other older properties in the village to accommodate modern living. • Another building on the list is Old School House, why? It is three quarters new build. • Hempstead is very overgrown, hedges out of control touching mains electric cables and telephone lines. Badly maintained drainage on Marlpit Lane. • I do not see any reason for Hempstead to be a conservation area or any new listing of buildings in the village. • Note solar panels must face south, and satellite dishes must face satellite without obstruction. I see no visual difference between a dish on the wall and a large aerial on a chimney. • Also note reference to some pointing on White Horse Cottages, it is clear to me that this was done using lime mortar hence the colour and freshly done by experienced builders, the mortar will weather back in a few years. This is how they were built in the first place. There really seems little knowledge or common sense in this appraisal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted/Clarification. The criteria that NNDC use for deciding locally listed buildings includes, age, rarity, landmark quality, aesthetic value, group value, archaeological interest and social/communal value, these criteria are derived from Historic England guidance, although how many of these criteria must be met is assessed on a case-by-case basis. Local list designation does not bring with it any additional planning controls outside of those already in place by virtue of being within a conservation area. However, when planning applications for changes outside of permitted development rights within a conservation area are submitted to NNDC this designation will be a material consideration in the planning process, to ensure that the special interest of the buildings and their setting within the conservation area is preserved. The characteristics and features that Purcell considered Tinkers Cottage and Marlpits possess that make them worthy of being recognised on our Local List include the use of locally available vernacular materials (flint, soft red brick, red clay pantiles) to create interesting detailing such the decorative gables and brick dressings; their contribution as a fairly uniform group largely derived from the fact that they were likely built as estate cottages for local workers, and though they have inevitably undergone alterations over time, the original design and form remains readily apparent particularly when viewed in context with their immediate setting. No additional action recommended. • Noted/Clarification. The Old School Rooms are recommended for local listing in part for their connection to local social history and their community value, in addition to their historic value. This communal value is retained despite the building having been converted and altered, it remains recognisable as a former school building. No additional action recommended.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted/Clarification. It is not clear which building on Pond Hills Road is being referred to, however, the only building that bares any similarities appears to have undergone much more significant and obvious modern alterations, and therefore is not considered to retain enough special interest to warrant it being added to the local list. No additional action recommended.
<p>Anonymous (ref: H05)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about the inclusion of ‘Marlpits’, 43/44 Marlpit Lane, Hempstead, into your local listing consideration within the proposed conservation area. Please could you advise how Marlpits was chosen as it does not fit into the stated NNDC criteria. • Marlpits was originally two derelict farm worker’s cottages that my parents renovated in 1970-72, making it one property and extending out the back on both sides. Although the front fascia appears basically original, the windows and doors have changed. The side extensions are not matched and were done apropos to the time. My understanding is that locally listed buildings should be principally original and unspoilt. Please advise on the implications of local listing on the future renovation of the property. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted. See above for discussion of Marlpits and Tinkers Cottage.
<p>Anonymous (ref: H06)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the main I fully understand the intent and need for what is in effect a 'Stock Take' of the villages and environment of the Glaven Valley and indeed of other areas of North Norfolk. Much of the document reflects what we already know and why we live here. North Norfolk being a wonderful, diverse and precious environment in which to live, indeed it is the people of Norfolk who have built much of this environment and continue to do so. • Overall, my main issue with this well presented draft document is the apparent unwillingness to see the conservation areas as living environments, updated and changed by the different generations. Purcell in documents form seems to want to turn the clock back to an earlier time, applauding heritage assets but being sometimes scathing about developments that have taken place over more recent years. This is at time comical, identifying for instance a local water tower 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree. Although 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 ‘<i>Conservation Area Appraisal, Designation and Management</i>’: “The appraisal is the vehicle for understanding both the significance of an area and the effect of those impacts bearing negatively on its significance.” With that in mind, the wording used when

as a 'Negative Feature' and elsewhere in documents stating that negative features should be removed when possible.

- In Hempstead's case negative features were highlighted as the Poultry Farm and other farm buildings, are we not in a rural and agricultural environment. The structures relating to one of the two largest industries in Norfolk as being 'out of character' is surely subjective and not valid in what should be an objective appraisal of any conservation area.
- Local vernacular is a term often used in the Purcell reports, yet dismisses the fact that farm buildings are and always have been very much part of the local vernacular.
- I believe Purcell's decision making on what is or is not a 'Negative Feature' is both misguided and misleading and once more a subjective judgement.
- Furthermore, the publishing of images (carefully taken from public spaces) of individuals' houses and gardens including locations clearly identified on maps and those then being highlighted as 'Negative Features' or as 'An untidy front yard' should be a great cause for concern to NNDC. Any action that 'humiliates, belittles or degrades the recipient' is classed as a sign of bullying and it beggars belief that NNDC passed these without concerning themselves about the legal and moral issues. I would hope that all such identifying references be removed before any documents are formally accepted by NNDC.
- It will have escaped no one reading the Hempstead report or any of the other reports, that Purcell have decided uVPC is one of the worst aspects of modern construction. So much so that they suggest that even in modern buildings within the CA when currently used uVPC comes to the end of its life, that it is replaced by a wood based alternative - this even if wood windows and doors were never used in the first place. Notwithstanding current and much needed efforts to maintain heat within our homes and reduce our carbon footprint by efficient use of fuel, Purcell seem to be behind the times in this regard. Modern uVPC Heritage windows and doors are being used throughout the UK in conservation areas and in listed buildings. With new foil techniques and wood style joints they are near undetectable from wooden alternatives. Newer uVPC windows and doors are recyclable and help and data is available from the GGF on this matter. I would suggest some balance in this matter would help the validity of this aspect of these reports.
- On understanding that the Hempstead Conservation Appraisal in draft form was to be evaluated and indeed as invited, for residents to comment on and for

discussing modern agricultural buildings has been adjusted to reflect the fact that as part of a rural working community, such buildings remain a necessity.

- **Noted/Clarification.** In reference to the photographs used within the appraisal document; the appraisals are about providing a balanced assessment of an area, including the good, bad and the ugly. The aim is not to humiliate owners or residents, rather it is to raise awareness in a measures way. The language used is not accusatory and all images are taken from public vantage points. Ignoring negative features would not bring about positive change to the conservation area, which would be in contradiction of our statutory requirements. **No additional action recommended.**
- **Noted.** See above for full comments on uPVC, but any discussion of uPVC has been revised to reflect the nuance of its use within a conservation area.
- **Noted/Clarification.** The Hempstead Conservation Area has not been reviewed since its designation in 1975, the purpose of reviewing the designation and producing a conservation area appraisal is in order to ensure that the boundary as originally drawn remains relevant. Following thorough review, it was considered that the existing boundary is fit for purpose, and covers all the historic development within the conservation area apart from the later houses on Chapel Lane. See discussion of Green Farm above. The purpose of the consultation process is to provide interested parties and members of the public the opportunity to comment on whether the content of the appraisals is correct, and whether the boundary changes (where proposed) are appropriate, equally it provides an opportunity to gather additional information that may have been omitted or unknown at the time of drafting. **No additional action recommended.**

<p>those comments to be considered, it's surprising that The Conservation Area itself has already been decided. Surely some part of this is still due for consideration. Green Farm in particular is kept outside of the Hempstead Conservation Area despite being a Grade 2 listed feature of the village. It forms the entrance to Hempstead village being well beyond Court Green and our village sign - surely this both deserves to be included and indeed is, an important 'sentry building' to Hempstead village.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In concluding I'm sorry to say I found the Purcell review of our village one of the most sterile reports I have ever read, devoid of the very thing that makes this village, this conservation area special - the people who live in, work in and help shape the environment. It is people who make our villages special and perhaps more consideration of that might have better informed the Purcell reports. Engagement is key to conservation and sympathetic development. 	
---	--

HOLT (PUBLIC)	
Summary of Comments / Issues Raised (including page / paragraph number where indicated)	Council Response and Action / Recommendation
Anonymous (ref: HT01)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fragile infrastructure of towns and villages needs to be enhanced by a Conservation Area that can accommodate the needs of modern lifestyles without destroying the spectacular countryside setting for which the Glaven Valley is particularly renown. • The overdevelopment of the town of Holt in recent years has seen acres of green space lost to create substantial residential areas which have not brought significant housing benefits for the indigenous population. The boundaries of the small country town of Holt are merely seen as opportunities for infill. • Investment needs to be provided in the form of appropriate edge-of-town car and coach parking provision which will assist in lowering the level of traffic movements in the centre, promote the town as an attractive place to visit, safeguard access to residential properties and businesses operating in the town 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted. This is why the designation is a conservation area as opposed to a preservation area. • Noted. The development boundaries of Holt are outside the remit of a Conservation Area Appraisal. • Noted/Clarification. It is acknowledged that the issue of parking has been a sensitive one within the town for a number of years. However, a conservation area appraisal can only ever refer to this in general terms. The conflicts that sometimes exist between economic viability are recognised. Equally, however, enhancing the built environment often also enhances footfall and trading conditions.

centre and remove unsightly, indiscriminate parking areas currently spoiling the rural approaches to the town.

- Until car parking and coach parking is properly addressed, the commercial success and attractiveness to visit Holt will continue to decline. If the concept of the Management Proposals are to retain a vibrant bustling town centre, then careful consideration needs to be given to the creation of 'static' public areas which might convey an aesthetically pleasing appearance, but nonetheless remove the traders reliability on continuous footfall. A conflict of interest arises where Conservation measures interfere with the well-being of a trading centre. The current on-street, short-term parking measures remain an absolutely essential factor to the survival of the towns commercial success, alongside access constantly being maintained for delivery vehicles.
- A degree of protection should be considered in the Appraisal where edge-of-town retail areas are strongly resisted. The Industrial Estate should be designated with preventative measures restricting retail units and outlets.
- Greater levels of enforcement should be encouraged where Listed Buildings are converted arising from miniscule public notice or awareness.
- The future of Holt Community Primary School on Norwich Road is currently under discussion and should now be seriously considered for Listed Grade Status as it is already incorporated within Holt's Conservation Area.
- The green belt running both sides along the full length of the A148 Holt Bypass should be preserved to maintain a natural visual screen, wildlife environment and effective sound barrier for residential properties.
- Very careful consideration needs to be given to land purchases and plans currently being proposed by the Norfolk Orbital Railway where the laying of a track bed could desecrate this natural barrier and pose an even greater threat as it reaches the proximity of the Glaven Valley.
- The importance to preserve and protect the designated footpath leading from Valley Lane along the old railway track bed to Letheringsett, with access to Spout Hills and the woodland known as 'Runton Poor', is considered one of Holt's most attractive and well loved walks.

- **Noted.** Comments duly noted, but this would be outside of the remit of the conservation area appraisal.
- **Noted.** The Council's combined Enforcement Team already tend to prioritise unauthorized works to listed buildings.
- **Noted.** Holt Community Primary School is already a Locally Listed Building, it is unlikely to meet sufficient criteria to be designated by Historic England as a nationally listed building.
- **Noted.** The preservation of the green belt along the A148, land purchases and the footpath along the former railway line are not directly pertinent to the conservation area appraisal.

GLANDFORD (PUBLIC)	
Summary of Comments / Issues Raised (including page / paragraph number where indicated)	Council Response and Action / Recommendation
Anonymous (ref: G01)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Glandford is a very unusual village for the North Norfolk Coastal strip and to a lesser extent the Glaven valley in that it has no second homes and only one small holiday let. Many of the houses are owned by the Holt housing association. This is, in my view, one of the most important characteristics of the village and I feel aeriels, dishes, signs and plastic windows should be a secondary consideration. We want a working village as it is now not a picture postcard for tourists. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree. Comments welcomed and taken into consideration in updating the draft. No additional action recommended.

BACONSTHORPE (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"> On the whole, I was delighted to read the sensible and honest appraisal of Baconsthorpe. In particular the management of the very qualities that make this a unique historical settlement, the hedges, the narrow lanes, the spaces between buildings and fields, the views and the dark skies. We are lucky enough to be able to see across the open field in between the church, school and the manor house and value in addition to the darkness, the wildlife this space attracts. For all of the above it is vital to maintain and protect the integrity of Baconsthorpe and to prevent "developers" from in - filling on the pretence of providing social housing! There are after all, vast developments outside Holt and further building planned on the Cley Road/ New Road, which are standing empty. I would however question the reason for removing the fields on School Lane from the Conservation Area. They are very near to the barns and the school, if building consent was given, the light would pollute the skies and change forever the sense of space within the village. Light pollution is as important as conservation and darkness is really necessary for many threatened animals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree. Comments welcomed and taken into consideration in updating the draft. Noted/Clarification. At the moment this area along School Lane falls into both the Baconsthorpe and Glaven Valley Conservation Areas, in being removed from the Baconsthorpe boundary the fields would still fall under the Glaven Valley Designation and retain the same level of protection as they do currently. Open agricultural fields are also more suited to the characteristics of the Glaven Valley, which tends to focus on the landscape between settlements that has been shaped by historic industry and agricultural practice, including outlying farmsteads. No additional action recommended.

Anonymous (ref: B02)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is noted that the Baconsthorpe Conservation Area Appraisal & Management Plan recommends at section 8.3.7, that the boundary of the Conservation Area be amended to include additional land at Pitt Farm. The reason given for the proposed change is to rationalize the boundary as it currently cuts through an existing modern farm building. The proposed new boundary would encompass all this building, together with a number of smaller buildings which form part of the Baconsthorpe Meadows Camp Site, including a small reception building, toilet/shower blocks and adjacent car parking. • It is considered that, in this case, the objective of the proposed change would be better served by the new boundary being drawn further to the north to exclude the modern farm building and ancillary camp site buildings altogether. The revised boundary would then be defined by the arrangement of the older buildings at Pitt Farm, which make a positive contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area. • It is requested respectfully that further consideration be given to the proposed extension to the boundary of the Baconsthorpe Conservation Area to the rear of Pitt Farm, Baconsthorpe. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree. The boundary has been amended to exclude modern agricultural buildings and structures associated with the campsite.
Anonymous (ref: B03)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baconsthorpe is, as the report largely describes, characterized by the variety of buildings, many built in the local vernacular, with open spaces between creating a visual link across the fields and gardens. There are also some more suburban style buildings that do not sit so well. • As with most rural areas there is an ageing population and a lack of amenities, i.e. no shop or regular bus link. • There is also the danger of development that compromises the character of the village and is in contradiction of the Conservation Plan. • I would not remove the fields (marked A) on the south edge of the current conservation area as these also provide uninterrupted views to the Church, Old Rectory and Manor from a number of different viewpoints, namely along Long Lane (Jolly Lane) and The Pyghtle. • I am glad to see the fields in the middle of the village remain within the Conservation Area, as they do provide that vital visual link for the village, along with uninterrupted views to the Castle, Church etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree. Comments welcomed and taken into consideration in updating the draft (see comments above re. the removal of the areas marked A on the plans). No action recommended. • Noted/Clarification. As the majority of hedges and verges are either in private ownership or managed by Norfolk County Council, it is beyond the remit of the conservation area appraisal to control their maintenance, any works would be carried out by owners or the County Council. • Agree. Any reference to Jolly Lane has been amended accordingly.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The hedges and verges are mentioned as being a feature of the village, but there is no particular mention of the importance of retaining and managing them. Currently they are cut far too frequently and harshly. • Jolly Lane is misnamed in the report as it is called Long Lane and has been for many years. 	
---	--

LEATHERINGSETT (PUBLIC)	
Summary of Comments / Issues Raised (including page / paragraph number where indicated)	Council Response and Action / Recommendation
Anonymous (ref: L01)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key importance for me is retention of character and character development which enhances. • Issues for most settings is traffic and through traffic which overwhelms distracting from appreciation for example in Letheringsett. Vehicle pollution destroys the facades of the buildings and the noise is all pervading. Increased development elsewhere contributes to increased traffic flow through these conservation areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree. The impacts of high traffic levels are discussed at 7.3, 7.5 and recommendations at 8.3.7 within the document.