New Hunstanton in September 2004. This flint chequerwork tower has visual links to the building of the Hall in Old Hunstanton and the Scottish Arts and Crafts Movement (see pages 6 and 7).
It has been an interesting and profitable winter with a rich programme of meetings covering Gildhalls, the manifold uses of lime, the complexities of Medieval shops and Nineteenth Century Breckland Estates. The members’ evening showed the depth and range of research undertaken by members and at the first Autumn meeting the dendro results for New Buckenham were announced and discussed. In February the party at the Fenners’ struck its usual note of urban festivity. We held meetings at four different venues around the County and inaugurated our co-operation with the Breckland Society project to survey the vernacular buildings of their region.

The Summer programme, to be found on the back page, promises to be as intriguing, enlightening and enjoyable as in the past with the added fun of the New Buckenham Study Day on July 9th. The organizing team have put in considerable effort to generate this level of activity.

The training group which started last September at Tibenham is still running, so if you would like to learn about recording buildings contact Sue Brown on 01362 688362. The Churches Study Group is making real progress with its current project, as you will see from the item in this Newsletter and they are keen to recruit members; contact Ian Hinton on 01502 475287.

As you see, the editorial team have done another excellent job with this Newsletter, and the second Journal is in the final stages of preparation, so we are well on track for another useful year for the Group.

Michael Brown
01362 688362

This Journal will provide a comprehensive report on the buildings surveyed, abbreviated documentary reports*, the dendrochronological report of eight buildings undertaken by Ian Tyers of Sheffield University, and an over-arching summary placing the town in its landscape context. (price TBA)

The Journal will be available at the Study Day in New Buckenham on 9 July 2005. To order other copies please contact: Jill Napier, 62 Norwich Road, Tacolneston, Norfolk NRF16 1BY. Tel: 01508 489469 e.mail: jenapier@hotmail.com

*See copies of Paul Rutledge’s book for a fuller documentary history: New Buckenham: A Planned Town at Work 1530—1780 (@ £8.00 plus p&p) Available through the Group.

Tumbling or Tumbling-In

On a visit during the summer the question of what was tumbling-in was raised. Below is an extract from Alec Clifton-Taylor, The Pattern of English Building. Faber and Faber, 1972, p251

A simple but very effective example of patterning is afforded by a device known as brick tumbling. On end-walls and gables and sometimes at the base of chimney-stacks, the bricks would be laid diagonally to form a series of triangles, which were not only ornamental but practical also as the bricks were laid at right angles to the slope of the roof and thereby form a smooth base for the coping. This device, of which many examples are seen in Holland, Belgium and Picardy, won considerable favour in the eastern counties from Kent to Lincolnshire in the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries.
Visit to the Church of South Burlingham St Edmund

Sue and Tony Wright

On a warm August morning we gathered at the picturesque church of St Edmund at South Burlingham, with Stephen Heywood, our tutor. Fields surround the church with only the Church Farm opposite for company.

Viewing the south aspect, the buttressed tower is Perpendicular, the pointed top shown in Ladbrooke’s drawing was lost in rebuilding later. Stephen noted gault bricks around the bell openings and at the corners of the upper part of the tower. The nave and chancel are under one continuous thatched roof with the walls constructed of coursed flints in a herringbone pattern indicative of twelfth century work. Stephen noted the Y-tracery windows typical of the thirteenth century were probably inserted in the nave when the chancel was rebuilt. The four-light east window has intersecting Y tracery.

The mediaeval south porch is also thatched and constructed of brick and ashlar stone. The Norman arched south door has a two-centred Gothic arch behind. Stephen advised us to look at the inside of doorways as these are seldom altered. Could the Norman arch have been inserted at a later date? The North door, also Norman, is blocked and was intended to have beakhead ornamentation in the arch but this was never completed. Stephen asked where the only secular beakhead carving was to be seen in Norfolk and Ian Hinton had the answer – the entrance arch to Norwich Castle. The North nave wall also has a small blocked Norman window.

Going inside the Church there is a thirteenth century font and the nave has a fine original scissor braced roof with the ashlar struts visible. They are inserted into the inner of two wall plates.

The church’s great treasure is the very fine carved fifteenth century pulpit, the finest in Norfolk. It has richly carved narrow oak panels with painting and gilding, beautifully restored in 1964. The Latin inscription around the circumference refers to John the Baptist. Later additions are the Jacobean backboard and tester, and the hour glass in its stand.

The Screen is delicate with open tracery, ogee arches and creasing. In contrast the communion rails are sturdy seventeenth century turned balusters. Some of the poppy heads in the chancel have pierced, traceryed backs.

The church also has some very interesting wall paintings. Stephen remarked that the large St Christopher on the north wall of the nave was, as usual, visible from the main entrance as he is the patron saint of travellers. In this case the saint is partly overlying thirteenth century masonry pattern. The reveal of the window in the north wall of the nave has a tromp l’oeil niche and in the chancel is an unusual late fourteenth century wall painting of the murder of St Thomas Becket.

After this enjoyable and interesting visit it was a short drive to the Old Hall where we had a picnic lunch in the garden (see page 4).
Visit to Old Hall South Burlingham

Denis Argyle

After lunch Peter Scupham and Margaret Steward, the owners of Old Hall led us inside for some preliminary remarks by Peter and Stephen Heyward who, we gathered, had been instrumental in persuading Peter and Margaret to take over the house in the 1980s. Prior to this it had had various roles: from its original manorial status it had declined into a farmhouse, then after the Great War it had been bought by Norfolk County Council and converted into two houses, under the government scheme to provide smallholdings for returning servicemen. In the 1980s, after the last tenants had gone, the NCC put it on the market.

Although much remains to be done, it is clear that the work carried out by Peter and Margaret since then has transformed the building; indeed it would be fair to say that without their work it probably would not have survived, certain walls having been in a parlous state. Peter paid generous tribute to the craftsmen involved.

Old Hall was built in the 1580s. It is thatched, and at first sight appears to be brick-built, but it was originally timber framed with brick gable ends incorporating chimney stacks. The hall is at the north end and a parlour at the south, and on the east front is a fine projecting (off-centre) porch. This has fluted pilasters and a four-centred arch with a pediment above in which appear the initials ‘RY’ and ‘EY’, which has led to conjecture that the builders may have been named ‘Younger’. Another pediment over the first floor window of the porch incorporates a brightly coloured mermaid and merman holding a cartouche with a head and a rose and what appears to be a pomegranate. They may well be unique, and it has been suggested that they could signify that the house was built by a merchant who traded with the Low Countries. Like so much else in the house they came to light during restoration work, when layers of paint were removed. The porch gable has round decorated brick finials, which also appear on the north gable of the house.

The walls to the north and south of the porch, and at the back of the house, have been clad in what looks like 18th century brick, however some fragments of the original timber framing remains. It has been removed from the front but in the back wall there is evidence of a wall post and a tie beam in which there is a mortice for a brace from the wall post, and in the smaller attic at the north end ashlar pieces can be seen. It is clear the layout of the house has been altered considerably over the years: the hall, for instance has been made smaller by the introduction of a partition.

The fireplaces in the house, only revealed in the restorations, are of great interest. The hall had a large hearth and mantel beam, indicating that cooking was done there, but others have four-centred arches, some have 16th-century marbling and in the solar is a striking example with some colouring evident.

But the glory of the house lies in the central attic - a sort of small Long Gallery, which was probably once used for entertaining. Here, in the 1990s, wall paintings dating from the 1580s and executed in grisaille were discovered. Little is known about secular wall paintings of this period, but scholars have suggested that these are representations of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem at one end, and of Old Hall itself at the other (although it bears little resemblance to it) divided...
Continued from page 4

by a landscape with animals being hunted by men and dogs, urged on by a horseman with a hunting horn. Is it possible that these paintings exist because the builder of the house ran out of money and could not afford tapestries? At right angles to this attic is another, smaller, room (yet to be restored) with fragments of more coloured murals above the door, still with its original frame.

Outside, to the north of the house are a granary, restored in 1749, and a stable block of about the same date. Both are brick and, like the house, thatched: in the case of the house probably less than a century ago. The granary in particular was very solidly built - to carry the weight of the grain on the first floor and to counteract the resulting pressure on the walls.

Our thanks go to Peter Scupham and Margaret Steward for making us so welcome, to Stephan Heyward for his expert guidance and to Rosemary Forrest for organising such a fascinating day.

South Burlingham Old Hall
Documentary report by Paul Rutledge,
August 2004

South Burlingham parish is not well documented. The County history, Blomefield’s Norfolk (1), is very thin here and the Frere MSS, which usually amplify it, have nothing on the parish (2). Pevsner and Wilson (3) date the wall-painting in the house to about 1580 and one of the barns to about 1590 and this, with the initial Y on the porch, allows it to be attributed to the Younger or Yonger family. They were at South Burlingham from at least 1581 when Thomas Younger (no parents named) was baptised until at least 1605 when Anne Yonger married Thomas Freman there. There were at least two generation at South Burlingham since Thomasin wife of Thomas Younger was buried in 1593 and Thomas Younger gent. in 1602, children of Robert Younger were baptised in 1590-95, and Mr William Younger and Ellen Nicholls were married in 1602 (4). Robert Yonger gent of South Burlingham was evidently head of the family by 1601 when he was in dispute over copyhold land (5).

The name implies that the Old Hall was the manor house, but it may have been separated from the manor at some stage. A court book of the manor of South Burlingham covers the years 1684-1773 (6). Entries retrospective to 1680 show that William Linstead gent. was lord of the manor. He was succeeded by 1684 by Edward Heyward gent. Another Edward Heyward gent. held his first court in 1726 and in 1761-3 Charles Buckle Esq. of Norwich was lord. William Linstead is well evidenced. He is recorded at South Burlingham in 1660 and 1664 and died in 1680 aged 64 and is buried in the church (7). His only child Francis died before him (8). By his will dated 1677 (9) William wished to be buried without pomp, the money thus saved to be given to the poor, and in default of issue left the bulk of his property in South Burlingham and elsewhere to his wife Barbara, anticipating that she would leave a good part to his brother Thomas and his children ‘leaving it to her good nature of which I am fully satisfied as had I thousands more then I have I would in conscience noe otherwise dispose thereof.’

By the time of Faden’s County map of 1797 (10) the house was owned by James Burkin Burroughes of North Burlingham Hall. By 1845 the Burroughes owned the whole of South Burlingham parish (11). Originally of Wymondham, this upwardly mobile family acquired property in the Burlinghams by marriage into the Burkins (12); John Burkin gent. was a landowner in South Burlingham in 1692 and was succeeded by James Burkin Esq. (13); Jeremiah Burroughes married James Burkin’s daughter. It is possible that the Old Hall passed by this route to the Burroughes rather than with the manor.

Sources

(1) Francis Blomefield and others, History of Norfolk, VII (1807), 227.
(2) Norfolk Record Office, Frere MSS.
(4) South Burlingham parish register, NRO PD 181/1.
(6) NRO, NRS 16693, 39F (MF/X/935).
(7) T. Hugh Bryant, Norfolk Churches, Blofield Hundred: new cuttings in Norfolk Studies section of the Millennium Library, Norwich.
(8) Norfolk Record Society IV (1934), 124.
(9) NRO, Norwich Arch. wills 1680, 235 (MF 308).
(10) Published by Norfolk Record Society, XLIII, 1975; reissued by Larks Press.
(13) NRO, DN/TER 37/1-37.
Adrian Parker, former Director of Planning for King’s Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council began at Hunstanton Hall, describing the geology of the area, drawing attention to the ‘redrock’, carstone (a), ‘puddingstone’(b), flint and chalk used for building locally, and to local techniques for using these for building materials.

He gave a brief account of the le Stranges, owners of the hall and estate since the eleventh century. The first phase of the hall, begun c 1309 on a site close to a water source, to provide drainage, is of brick imported from Flanders. (For details see Nikolaus Pevsner and Bill Wilson Buildings of England :Norfolk 2 North West and South, 2nd ed. 1999 pp.439-442) The seventeenth century ranges and the domestic ranges to the east are of clunch, pudding stone and flint, with a chequer-work pattern on the hall and galleting in the mortar of the domestic ranges (c,d). The nineteenth century north range of the hall is of carstone.

Old Hunstanton is essentially an estate village, developed from the 1920s. Attention was drawn to 1920s concrete block semi-detached and pyramid houses in Hamilton Road (e,f). A cottage opposite the Lodge Hotel, has on the north gable white ‘field’ flint and puddingstone arranged in chequer pattern, directly comparable to the Hall (g). In Sea Lane attention was drawn to cottages with early brickwork, and including ‘river’ flint, redrock, clunch, chalk and puddingstone, and some with pieces of dressed stone, of unknown provenance, and a corrugated iron shop, probably by Boulton and Paul (h,i). One single-storey cottage survives, and others appear to have originated as single storey structures. A group of cottages, close to the beach, has a cobbled industrial yard (j). The le Strange Arms is a late eighteenth century farmhouse extended c1890 when the golf links were laid. On the main road, the Big Yard is a series of seventeenth century barns of mixed materials and techniques converted to cottages. Opposite are cottages with gables to the road of chalk, redstone and brick, but with fronts faced with carstone. The Jubilee Hall illustrates nineteenth century use of carstone, blocked and coursed (a). The Lodge Hotel is a eighteenth farmhouse, with bay windows added to the northwing in 1789. Opposite Cliff Farm, a barn of dressed stone was puzzled over (k). The National School of 1843 and 1849 in Tudor style is in dressed carstone, and Neptune Cottage, opposite, of c1825 has a door header similar to many in King’s Lynn. The morning ended at Caley Hall, where the east wing, of rubble construction, including clunch and brick, is early seventeenth century, and the north wing with a datestone of 1648 has flushwork, using flint and galleting. The south gable and part of the east front has an extraordinary brick arcaded plinth, almost Romanesque in style, built against grit stone (l).

**Bibliography for Old and New Hunstanton:**

With minds full of carstone in its seemingly infinite varieties of colour and style, combined with flint “field, knapped or piece” the Group thankfully retired to the seventeenth century Caley Hall for a substantial refuelling stop before Adrian Parker introduced us to the speculative, planned town of New Hunstanton. Here again we found the distinctive local materials, this time brought up to date, “blocked”, “randomised”, with decorative, wide mortar. Sadly, the treatment had little of the charm of the buildings of Old Hunstanton. What caught the eye in New Hunstanton was the decorative detail and the almost Scots-Baronial style of some of the houses (see cover photo and (a) James MacLaren’s Extension to Stirling High School, 1887).

This resort town began rather haphazardly in the 1840s, its aim to take advantage of the craze for sea bathing, but it was not until architect William Butterfield took on the challenge to advise on a townscape whose houses should be formed, “singly and in groups, in masses of irregular form and size, interspersed with gardens and open spaces”, coupled with the arrival of the railway in 1860, that the gamble paid dividends. Our walk around the town revealed that these objectives were attained, The Green, Boston and Lincoln Squares (b), the major gardens and greens, being generous open spaces. On the seafront, The Green, triangular in shape, lends weight to the classically inspired civic buildings, banks and hotels of the 1870s; the rectangular squares off Cliff Road are surrounded by terraced houses, some of which are clearly in the Arts and Crafts’ style (c,d). This Scottish theme seemed to permeate several buildings as turrets, towers, and ‘oriel’ windows were given prominence. It should first be noted that the living quarters for artisans were not overlooked in the desire to provide holiday accommodation for the more wealthy members of society, Church Street is a good example of sturdy, terraced cottages (e).

St Edmunds Church was designed by Frederick Preedy between 1865 and 69. It was not the church itself which caught our attention: the vicarage (f) and an art-noveau panel on a later annex were greeted with fascination and delight (g). No non-conformist church was allowed until after 1870 when the Union Chapel was built. The surprising art-noveau interior has become an exhibition space due to the introduction of fittings by the architect’s family as a memorial (h,i,j); sample of Mackintosh’s work in Glasgow School of Art(k). It would be interesting to discover where the Ibberson family gained their affection for this style, the Arts and Craft Movement, and Scottish architecture (note: see reference on previous page for more information on this, the connections between Norfolk families, and architects).

Whilst it is not possible here to describe in detail the variety, styles and materials in New Hunstanton’s built environment it is possible to urge you to go and look for yourselves and seek the detailing in the architecture. You will be well rewarded.

Many thanks to Adrian for undertaking such a lot of homework and sharing his findings with us, and also to Bill Jacob who insisted we visit the Union Chapel.

Bibliography for New Hunstanton
Christopher Stell, An Inventory of Nonconformist Chapels and meeting-houses in Eastern England, English Heritage, 2002, p 248
JMckean,JBaxter, Charles R Mackintosh, Lomond Books. p 194
W Buchanan (ed), Mackintosh’s Masterwork, Chambers 1994
Medieval Gildhalls

Report of Lecture by Leigh Alston on 29 November 2004

Leigh Alston has long been seeking medieval gildhalls in Essex and Suffolk and in a riveting talk described the great variety of types that he has found.

A gildhall was the meeting place for the local gild, (Leigh’s preferred spelling) which was a socio-religious group (not a craft organisation) that maintained an altar or chantry in the local church to assist the souls of members through Purgatory, and also helped the families left behind - a sort of holy Christmas Club.

How does one recognise a gildhall? Are there structural grounds on which they can be identified? On the whole they tend to be unheated first-floor open halls, usually (but not always) near the church, but there are many variations. This can lead to confusion. For example the first slide was the famous little Thaxted building, with arcaded ground floor and double jetty above which was actually a market hall, used for pie-powder (pied poudre) courts of dusty feet on market days. Another at Hadleigh, double-jettied with later wings, was documented as a market hall in 1476. Some were only reputed to be gildhalls, which then hardened into fact but turned out, on investigation, to be spurious, as at Gislingham and Cratfield.

Gilds were always fundraising, for their members and also for their parish church. They organised church ales, performances of plays and other festivities, so the hall would be used for committee meetings or for events to take place in bad weather, as well as for gild business. It might act as a dressing-up room for participants in the many saints’ days processions and could also be income-generating by being rented out – a forerunner of today’s village hall.

Suffolk is rich in gildhalls: 540 are known so far, largely (pied poudre) courts of dusty feet on market days. Another at Hadleigh, double-jettied with later wings, was documented as a market hall in 1476. Some were only reputed to be gildhalls, which then hardened into fact but turned out, on investigation, to be spurious, as at Gislingham and Cratfield.

Felstead School was originally called the Old Gildhall in documentary evidence of the 1570s, and has archetypal features. There is a first floor hall, jettied front and back and it lies between the churchyard and the marketplace. Underneath the hall are shops with arched windows (like those in Garsett House in Norwich) and more unheated rooms, not the standard pattern at all. Perhaps these rooms were let out.

These buildings often underwent much alteration, as at Lavenham which has been turned into a row of cottages. It was a long building with shop fronts and lower rooms, but it also had a cross passage with a stair turret at the rear. Similarly the very grand Gildhall at Nayland with carved beams of 1520s-30s, had two shops below with rear stair turret (now a room) but also a small anteroom leading to a garderobe.

It seems clear that the need to accommodate crowds must have necessitated catering facilities. A picture of 1812 of a Breughel-like village celebration at Worlingworth with everyone gathered outside the gildhall gives some idea of how it must have been 300 years earlier. The gildhall there had two halls, a garderobe and a kitchen. Another variation at Palgrave (which needs documentary evidence) also had a kitchen, plus a serving hatch at the foot of the stair, while the hall at Yaxley had a very domestic set-up on the ground floor with a vast great fireplace, while upstairs the gild sat in hierarchical order, under an arch-braced roof, the high end of the hall lit by a nice little moulded mullion window.

The absence of a kitchen in a potential gildhall today may simply mean that it has not survived, or that the gild did not go in for self-catering but preferred to use the pub next door. At Debenham they had their own brew house. Some gildhalls take a lot of finding, being heavily disguised. A spectacular example is urban, at Bury St.Edmunds, a thirteenth-century gild merchants’ hall, which has an exuberant eighteenth-century façade with a thirteenth-century doorway, and thirteenth-century porch which once had a safe in the wall of the chamber above for the gild plate and documents. There is an enormous ground floor hall, with eighteenth-century décor and hidden above, an 11-bay fourteenth-century roof coloured with yellow ochre.

Lavenham once had four gildhalls round the marketplace. A disneyfied cottage was once the wing of a lost hall, with a serving hatch at the foot of the stair, while the hall at Yaxley had a very domestic set-up on the ground floor with a vast great fireplace, while upstairs the gild sat in hierarchical order, under an arch-braced roof, the high end of the hall lit by a nice little moulded mullion window.

The absence of a kitchen in a potential gildhall today may simply mean that it has not survived, or that the gild did not go in for self-catering but preferred to use the pub next door. At Debenham they had their own brew house. Some gildhalls take a lot of finding, being heavily disguised. A spectacular example is urban, at Bury St.Edmunds, a thirteenth-century gild merchants’ hall, which has an exuberant eighteenth-century façade with a thirteenth-century doorway, and thirteenth-century porch which once had a safe in the wall of the chamber above for the gild plate and documents. There is an enormous ground floor hall, with eighteenth-century décor and hidden above, an 11-bay fourteenth-century roof coloured with yellow ochre.

Lavenham once had four gildhalls round the marketplace. A disneyfied cottage was once the wing of a lost hall, with a serving hatch at the foot of the stair, while the hall at Yaxley had a very domestic set-up on the ground floor with a vast great fireplace, while upstairs the gild sat in hierarchical order, under an arch-braced roof, the high end of the hall lit by a nice little moulded mullion window.

The absence of a kitchen in a potential gildhall today may simply mean that it has not survived, or that the gild did not go in for self-catering but preferred to use the pub next door. At Debenham they had their own brew house. Some gildhalls take a lot of finding, being heavily disguised. A spectacular example is urban, at Bury St.Edmunds, a thirteenth-century gild merchants’ hall, which has an exuberant eighteenth-century façade with a thirteenth-century doorway, and thirteenth-century porch which once had a safe in the wall of the chamber above for the gild plate and documents. There is an enormous ground floor hall, with eighteenth-century décor and hidden above, an 11-bay fourteenth-century roof coloured with yellow ochre.
Medieval Shops  David Clark  
A synopsis of his talk on 28th January 2005

The shop is a very important element in economic and social history, but perhaps of all building types in the medieval town, has suffered most from the demands of progress. Not only have there been major shifts in the way goods are made and sold, but with town centre land values commanding a substantial premium, demolition of the old and rebuilding anew has removed most of the physical evidence. Towns frequently burned due to timber and thatch constructions, thereby making way for new commercial buildings.

But despite this, there is still a body of architectural evidence which can shed light on the buying and selling activity in medieval towns. The problem is finding it and interpreting it. The talk reviewed the basic thesis of how one might understand the medieval shop, looking at surviving buildings, windows, doors and other features, bringing buildings and documents together and discussing some of the latest findings.

Buildings can be seen as ‘settings’ for human activities, and the structure and layout can be interpreted to cast light on those activities and how they were pursued. Custom has to be attracted, people enticed to buy. Goods have to be kept secure. These often conflicting requirements are expressed architecturally, through design and decoration.

Creating a sale involves a large number of factors and choices, as well as social relationships, and so the shop is a many-layered space which can tell us a lot not only about buying and selling, but about social interactions and potentially much more about the daytime life of the town. An understanding of the shop contributes to and requires an understanding of the economic and social history of the time. Unfortunately, unlike manufacturing, transactions leave little archaeological trace, so the task of interpreting the building evidence is not straightforward.

At one end of the scale, the market represents a basic form of transaction, where barter, haggling, and theft play as much of a part as handing over cash. When the goods have been sold, the seller packs up and goes home. Over time, semi-permanent shops appeared against convenient walls, or as market infill. Some of these were simple one-unit lock-ups, and this is the most basic form of shop type. From this, a hierarchy of shop plans can be built up, using connectivity of spaces as the driving factor. These show the relationship between commercial and domestic spaces, and how these might relate to the rather more complex transactions involved with craftsmen and merchant classes in the medieval town.

The tension between display and security must have been a major concern for the shopkeeper. Some stylistic devices such as dragon posts and jetties may have been used to attract custom, but the window was the clearest indication of a shop, and it had to be properly closed. Various shutter systems were used, but the architectural evidence is sometimes ambiguous.

There are many unanswered questions, such as the purpose of the coffin doors often found in medieval shop buildings, and much more work needs to be done. All shop evidence is important, the documents, the site, the layout, the fittings, the fabric. There is a continuing need to investigate the remaining evidence and record it.

Note: For Bibliography and Gazetteer, see p.18
As part of the Group’s larger study of New Buckenham, a small group of us has also been studying the church and attempting to relate the architectural details to the documentary evidence.

The church has two aisles and the drawings below show details of the arcade piers. They seem to differ by a century or so in architectural style – the south aisle pier (a ‘quatrefoil’, or four-lobed design) pre-dating the north aisle pier (a lozenge style).

Documentary evidence for the building (or possibly rebuilding) of the north aisle is implied in 1479, with a bequest to “lead (roof) the new aisle”, with an additional reference to the chapel of the Guild of St. Mary, which was in the north aisle. (If it was already in the north aisle at the time of the bequest, the aisle must have been re-built.)

Thirty years later in 1509, there were several documentary references to, and a bequest for, the making of “a newe ile at Buckenham church” with £20 for the “ston werk” and £10 for the “tymbre werk”. This can only refer to the south aisle which, architecturally speaking, dates to period a century or so earlier. This indicates that these references are to a re-building rather than a new aisle. Even so, why was the stone of the older arcade piers not replaced with new to match the considerably more “modern” north aisle arcade?

Some of the work at this church is thought to be that of a mason named Aldrych, and two distinct Masons marks “W” and “X” appear in over 20 different places in the church, but all of them in the north aisle. His work is reputedly found in other Norfolk churches, which we intend to follow up.

Neither the documentary, nor the architectural evidence for this church is conclusive, even on something as simple as arcade piers. When the aisle windows are looked at in detail, no two of the nine apparently identical windows are the same!

We intend to extend this study to other churches and publish the results (if worthy) in a future Journal.

**JOIN IN**

One thing has become clear during this study – the more eyes the better. They do not need to be especially expert eyes, just observant! If anyone is interested in joining in with these investigations, or undertaking some other independent church research, call Ian Hinton on 01502 475287 or George Fenner on 01603 620690 for a chat.

**Sources:**

Cattermole & Cotton in *Norfolk Archaeology* 1983, p241

The fabric survey of selected churches in Norfolk that the “church sub-group” are undertaking involved a visit to All Saints’ Old Buckenham. The porch was not part of the survey, but is sufficiently interesting and unusual to warrant attention.

The roof consists of 6 rafters spanning 2.51 m. (8 ft 4 ins.), with a rise of 40cm (16 ins.) to the ridge. Each rafter is 18 cm. (7 ins.) wide with approximately 8 cm. (3 ins.) visible below the plaster level.

Numbering them from the nave wall:-

♦ Rafters 5 and 6 (hidden in the photo) are replacements, each consisting of 2 rafters, lap jointed and pegged at the ridge.

♦ Rafters 2 and 3 each consist of 2 pieces of timber joined with undersquinted splayed scarf joints with 42cm splays and 3 face pegs. Each joint has been reinforced with 4 iron nails. They appear to have bridled abutments, but have no edge pegs through them. (Details of a simple splayed scarf and one with bridled abutments are shown in Hewett’s English Historic Carpentry, pp266/7). These joints are show schematically on the photograph and in more detail in the sketches. The angles of the splays, shown in the sketches, indicate that these are not taken from halves of the same piece of timber. The timber is fairly knotty, indicating that they were unlikely to have been converted from coppiced stock with a natural bend at the base, and have indistinct grain making it difficult to see how they were cut. Similar construction in church porches are known in Essex.

♦ Rafters 1 and 4 are both a single piece of timber. Again, it is difficult to determine from the grain how these pieces were created. No similar work has been found – have any members seen similar construction?

Porch Roof at All Saints Old Buckenham

Ian Hinton

Ian Hinton; e.mail: ian.hinton222@btinternet.com or tel: 01502 475287
would be pleased to hear your comments on this.
Chestnut Cottage
Karen Mackie

Chestnut Cottage is in the hamlet of Forncett End, which lies within the parish of Forncett St. Peter. Work by the documentation team shows there was a building on this site in the sixteenth century, which appears on a map based on a survey of 1565 in ‘The Economic Development of a Norfolk Manor’ by F.G. Davenport. In some respects this building is difficult to interpret because little evidence is visible at ground-floor level. The frame today is encased in render and some sort of clay lump lining. Upstairs however there is good evidence of the frame and roof structure.

The cottage is of three bays, with the chimney contained within the East end bay. There was probably a through passage at the lower end of the hall, away from the fireplace, as the front door is still in this position today and a blocked-up opposing door can be seen in the line of the render on the south side of the building.

One of the main reasons for surveying this particular building was because it has an exceptionally complete set of carpenter’s marks. These are the numbers (in Roman numerals) scribed on each timber by the carpenter to help identify where they belong on the frame. This was necessary because the timbers were often prepared in the carpenter’s yard and then assembled at the building site. On this property they are scribed right across the width of the timbers. The north and east walls have numbers that are tagged (here a half line at 45°). These ensure they do not get mixed up with the timbers of the opposing walls, which have
no tags. The numbering of studs along the wall run continuously, including the storey posts with the other verticals. The north elevation, which provides clearest evidence, has however one or two posts with no number visible and what should be numbers sixteen and seventeen both appear to say twelve! The inverted arch braces are separately numbered, as are the wind braces in the roof. The carpenter’s marks suggest that the same carpenter built all the elevations and the roof. This is important because it means we have a single age for the whole building.

Continued on page 14

Upstairs the wall plates contain a face-halved scarf joint,
which is most likely to be seventeenth-century in date. Long jowls on the storey posts however, as we have here, normally predate the seventeenth century. The roof with its purlins clasped between the collar and principal rafters are probably seventeenth-century. However the recent dendro-dating of the Old Swan in New Buckenham has shown that this type of roof was in existence only a few miles down the road as early as 1573.

Good evidence remains of the original diamond mullion windows. These are timber verticals that divide the window. They are turned on edge to form a diamond-shape. The photograph of the central window on the north wall shows the mortice holes cut into the wall plate to take these mullions. The position of the sill is indicated by pegholes on the north elevation. The cut-through tenon can also still be seen on the side of the window frame. This is important because it confirms this bay was floored and not just the end bays. In medieval buildings the central bay is normally open to the roof to accommodate a open fire. The flat-laid joists visible downstairs in this central bay suggest that the building was floored in the sixteenth century and thus presumably when first built. The brick fireplace is built in English bond. Its mantel beam is a re-used timber fronted with a chamfered plank attached to it, which is carved with bar, shield and notch of c.1600. The chimney could thus be part of the original build too.

Upstairs the low roof height means that the tie beams would have obstructed the doorways upstairs if the house was floored throughout. The fact that the tie beams had to be cut through might at first appear to suggest that the house was not originally fully floored. On the other hand there would have been no need for doors until people slept upstairs, often not until comparatively late in the seventeenth century. I think however that this is an example of a house built with interrupted tie beams since the tie beam appears to be jointed to a substantial doorframe rather than abutted against it. The door lintel is also pegged to the jambs of the doorframe. There is also evidence of an arch brace having existed on the north side of the doorway and no clear evidence of one on the south side.

This house appears to have all been built in the late sixteenth century. The single build is suggested by the carpenter’s marks. The tie beams and upstairs windows suggest the building was floored throughout when built. This date for Chestnut Cottage is based on the combination of medieval and post-medieval features: the cross passage plan form, low roof height, flat-laid joists and scribed carpenter’s marks of pre-seventeenth together with the clasped purlin roof, the face-halved scarf joint and long jowls on the storey post of the post-sixteenth century.

Solomon’s Temple, Welborne Common, nr. Mattishall
Fancy Bricks

The owners of this unusual brick house have documentary evidence which refers to the property as ‘new built’ in 1842. It formed part of an Enclosure allotment of 1812. Included in the Title Deeds is an indenture which refers to Edward Randall, Tile maker. The owners wonder whether the house was connected with the neighbouring brickworks, possibly in the form of an office or show house. A sample tile of the larger freize around the front is quite distinctive. It has a prominent feature which looks like a thistle, possibly also a rose, and a ?. I wonder whether anyone has seen anything similar. The tiles in the Plantation Garden, I understand, are not quite the same. As yet I have been unable to trace a pattern but have only been able to look in one version of Gunton’s of Costessey Brickwork catalogue.

Rosamry Forrest
01603 742315
roakief@yahoo.co.uk
To Build a Malthouse
Paul Rutledge

Most timber-framed buildings were no doubt constructed without a formal written agreement. However, one such agreement is to be found in a solicitor’s collection in the Norfolk Record Office (1). It relates to a malthouse on the Waveney marshes at Toft Monks. The Aylsham Collection of which it forms a part includes papers of the Browne family, lawyers and diocesan officials, and it is in fact in the hand of John Browne who signs it as a witness to its sealing.

Barley production was of particular importance in Norfolk. This malthouse was well sited both for the collection of the grain via the river systems of East Norfolk and its redistribution as malt either through Breydon Water for export out of Yarmouth or down the Waveney and up the Yare to the brewers of Norwich.

The agreement is dated the 22nd of May 1587 and it is between Anthony Lyndolne, carpenter of Howe, who signs by mark (2), and Henry Smythe, gentleman of Caistor St Edmund. For £20 down and £90 13s. 4d. thereafter Lyncolne is at his own cost to ‘well & workemanlye make frame erecte & fulllye sett upp’ before the 24th of August following on part of Rypsskotte Marsh in Toft Monks occupied by Edward Duke Esq. a ‘maltinge howse’ for which Smythe was to find oak timber, ‘harte without any sapp’. The internal measurement was to be 100 foot in length from the outer side of the small studs and 20 ft in breadth to be measured at the top of the frames ‘and have fowre ynches srydde (3) beneathe’. The scantlings are to be – each groundsell (4) 10 inches square ‘& clapsed rounded’, each principal stud to be 12 x 9 inches squared, 14 ft long, and between principal and principal 9 ft, the small studs to be 6 x 4 inches squared and 2 ft between nail and nail (5), the gurdinges (6) to be 9 x 6 inches squared, the overweys (7) to be 10 x 8 inches, the dormantes (8) to be 14 x 13 inches squared, the beams to be 12 x 11 inches ‘somewhat crowninge’ (9), all the joists to be 6 x 5 inches squared and set 10 inches apart, the single spars (10) to be 3 1/2 ins. beneath and 3 ins thick above and 6 ins broad beneath and 5 ins in the top and between spar and spar 12 ins, the principal spars (11) to be 8 ins thick beneath and 7 ins at the top, the lower belfries (12) to be framed into the principal spars, the upper purlin to have collar beams similarly framed, every principal spar to be double braced with sufficient wind beams, the beams to be well braced with ‘wronge brases’ (13).

Lyncolne is also to make, frame and set up a ‘sisterne howse’ on the east side of the malthouse as near to the north end as possible measuring 20 ft square internally, the timber to be all of oak and the scantlings to be as the malthouse, with two planchers (floors) exactly like those of the malthouse but to be only 2 ft between nail and nail. Also another building, internal measurement 26 x 20 ft, to be sited at the west end of the malthouse next the lead (20) house, the timber to be oak, ash or elm, of scantlings as the malthouse timber, and to measure 2 ft between nail and nail. Also to find all timber necessary for a kyll (21) and to frame and set it up, to floor it with well-seasoned oak board ‘at the brest of the kyll’, with three windows and a falling door ‘and to plancher it over the kyll’, and with three windows for the kiln house chamber similar to those in the main building, with pillars, loops and rails, all the joists and studs to be placed as in the main building and to frame into every other stud in the outside of the kiln house spurs of heart of oak ‘with certen sooles (22) at the feate of the said spurs’ (23). Smythe is to cart from Helmer Wood in Saxlingham (24) all timber, spars, joists and boards as opportunity arises and to provide all iron hooks, hengells (25) and nails for the doors, windows and floors. Lyncolne is to receive £10 13s. 4d. on 3rd June, £20 by 1st August, £30 at the raising of the buildings and £30 at their completion ‘in carpenters crafte’.

With the document is another agreement of which the names of the parties, the place and the date are so heavily scored out that they cannot be read even under ultra-violet light. Building details are similar but the cost is less (£80 6s. 8d.) and the dimensions of the main building are only 60 x 20 ft. No doubt is was used as a draft for the present document. Some calculations

1. Norfolk Record Office, Aylsham Collection
2. He was not necessarily illiterate; the mark may have served almost as a logo. He could presumably read and understand this specification.
3. Plinth (see p. 16).
4. Groundsill, the timber forming the footing of a timber-framed wall.
5. Peg (two feet centres, one foot six inches apart). (floors) exactly like those of the malthouse but to be only 2 ft between nail and nail.
6. Girts or girts.
7. Wallplates.
8. Principal joists.
9. Slightly arched tie beams.
11. Principal rafters.
12. Perhaps lower purlins.
13. Rung (arched) braces.
14. Floor.

My thanks to Susan and Michael Brown for their help with technical terms.

(1) Norfolk Record Office, Aylsham Collection 154.
(2) He was not necessarily illiterate; the mark may have served almost as a logo. He could presumably read and understand this specification.
(3) Plinth (see p. 16).
(4) Groundsill, the timber forming the footing of a timber-framed wall.
(5) Peg (two feet centres, one foot six inches apart).
(6) Girts or girts.
(7) Wallplates.
(8) Principal joists.
(9) Slightly arched tie beams.
(10) Common rafters.
(11) Principal rafters.
(12) Perhaps lower purlins.
(13) Rung (arched) braces.
(14) Floor.
News and Views

Editor

Welcome to our Ninth Newsletter, Spring 2005 (which surely will be along in a minute!) and many thanks to our contributors who reported on meetings or sent in pieces of their own research or experience. Please keep them coming.

As usual we have an exciting summer programme, and I’m, particularly glad to see that the South Burlingham day is to be repeated in June. I missed it last year and long to see those wall paintings (see p.4).

Alayne Fenner,
Newsletter Editor
13 Heigham Grove, Norwich NR2 3DQ
01603 620690
e.mail: a.fenner@macunlimited.net

Pips Cottage: Progress

This summer’s project was to rebuild the front and back walls of Pips Cottage, my medieval hall house. First the sole plate was partly replaced as fifty years of damp-trapping cement render had allowed it to rot away to dust. Then came the hard graft of wattle and daubing between the studs, followed by lath and lime plaster on the outside, with a simple parget pattern incised in the plaster. Those of you who have done major building work will know how filthy everything becomes and after LOTS of cleaning what a relief it is to have a proper home again. As summer turned to autumn I became a demon with insulation as I bunged up wind holes along the junction between repaired and to-be-repaired work.

During the Christmas holiday I pulled ivy trees off a very overgrown brick and flint garden wall and discovered that the ivy had damaged the wall badly in places, so next spring I shall be teaching myself a new skill - flint wall repairing using lime mortar.

Pictures of the Pips Cottage rebuild works can be seen at www.kettlenet.co.uk

Anna Kettle

Note received from Adam Longcroft

P S  I have just received from the distinguished editor of the journal Post-Medieval Archaeology (Prof John R Kenyon) a review of our Journal Vol 1. It is, again, very positive indeed, and ends with the line: “The Norfolk Historic Buildings Group is to be congratulated on this journal, which bodes well for the future and may even suggest a strategy for similar, or aspiring groups elsewhere”.

Current Archaeology

Michael Brown tells me that Current Archaeology No. 196 has printed a letter from him about the gatehouse in New Buckenham. We are hoping to hear views from outside Norfolk.

Comments from the Newsletter No 8 with refer-
ence to The Dower House pp 10-14

From Brenda Watkin, Great Leigs, Chelmsford

The rectangular section (see Figs 8a & b) of the purlin is interesting. Is this section common to Norfolk, as I have only rarely seen it in Essex where they tend to be more of a square section. I have recently revisited Littly Park where the 1 1/2 storey range, thought to be c.1580, has been undergoing considerable repair. As such the roof space was open for the first time in many years and it was very surprising to see that it contained a soot blackened side purlin roof with purlins of rectangular section.

The construction of the western wall and the rise in the floor level almost implies that the carpenter had not fully thought out the implications of the change in the direction of joists but I wonder if the southern room of the low end was a parlour. It has a very deep window for a service room (in fact, it is identical in hierarchy to that in the hall) (see Fig 2) and the change of joist direction would give a slightly higher ceiling. The layout then would also provide a parlour chamber but I would have then preferred to see the stairs from the north service room accessing a closed chamber rather than one that is open to the rest of the house. As a matter of interest, ho many times do you get divided chambers above the service end? (see Fig 4a) Even when we find that there is a joint use of the two lower rooms as parlour/service room, the upper bay is undivided. Continuing the thought process of the existence of an unheated parlour, this could also explain the need for an extension at the time, or very soon after, the house was finished?

Can any other members offer any further comment on these matters?

Alayne Fenner

UEA Summer School in conjunction with SHARP 2005 at Sedgeford

To Build a Malthouse Glossary diagrams (cont. from p 15)
**Day Schools & Courses**

Details of the SHARP programme including Recording and Interpreting Standing Buildings. Please contact:

Brenda Huggins, 67 Victoria Avenue, Hunstanton, Norfolk PE36 6BY
(01485) 532343

---

**UEA Course at Fakenham**

**Architecture: Contemporary - 20th Century and after (T506004C)**

**Vic Nierop-Reading**

Summer Term 10 wks from 29th April

Details: Fakenham, Wells & District Adult Education Service
tel: 01328-851223 (10.00 am - 4.00 pm)
e.mail: fakenham.adult.edu@norfolk.gov.uk

---

**Essex Historic Building Group**

Day School: Saturday June 18th, 2005 at Cressing Temple

**Building the Medieval Timber-Framed Building**

Cost: non-members £18.00; lunch £5.00 extra
Contact: Ian Greenfield on 01371 830416

---

**Suffolk Historic Buildings Group**

**Bottom Rung of the Housing Ladder?**

Sat 11 June 2005 at Haughley Park, Suffolk

Cost: £ 20.00 including lunch
Small Medieval and post Medieval houses
Contact: Jane Gosling—01787 247646

---

**Vernacular Architecture Group**

28-30 October 2005

**Diffusion and Invention: Vernacular Building in England and the New World**

Building practice in both England and the eastern seaboard of the US and the English Caribbean.

Oxford University Depart of Cont Ed
(e.mail ppdayweek@contend.ox.ac.uk or 01865 270380 for details.
The NHBG is an associate member and two of our members are entitled to go. Places do book up very fast. There is a fee.

---

**Book Review**


This is another of Shire’s inexpensive but authoritative little books on subjects that interest our members. The title was first published in 1983, but this third edition is greatly enlarged and improved, with most of the author’s excellent photographs now reproduced in colour.

Any misconceptions about the true nature of clay lump walls and cob cottages which the new reader may be harbouring will quickly be dispelled by the book’s initial very clear descriptions of the four methods of building in unfired earth: cob, shuttered earth, clay lump and *pisè*. Various regional names for these techniques are also mentioned.

A summary of the history of earthen walling follows. A key point for East Anglian readers is that, although several reputable authors have claimed that clay lump was a traditional way of building in Norfolk and Suffolk, in fact no standing buildings of clay lump earlier than the nineteenth century have been identified. It was used for new buildings required on heavy clay lands newly converted to arable but remote from the water transport which supplied other areas with established materials.

The third part of the book has been expanded the most of all, and is now lavishly illustrated. It comprehensively describes the pattern of earthen buildings across the regions, mentioning all those areas of England, Wales and Scotland where such buildings survive and some of the local variants to be seen.

Finally, an account is given of the survival of the old methods into the twentieth century and of their recent revival in a number of places. As well as being necessary for the satisfactory repair of existing earthen buildings, use of these techniques allows the creation of exciting architectural forms with minimal consumption of energy.

The book contains useful lists of further reading and other sources of information. The third edition is fully indexed.

This slim volume is surely a “must” for all vernacular architecture enthusiasts, since considerations of cost and shelf space hardly apply.

*Alan Bayford*

---

*A Norfolk eighteenth century, clay lump cottage (and very proud owner) in Church Street, Carbrooke.*

Note the plinth and the tumbling-in (see p.2).
Some Examples of medieval shops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shop Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ely</td>
<td>Market Place</td>
<td>c.1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Wymborne</td>
<td>Church Lane</td>
<td>late 15c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>Leche House, Watergate Street</td>
<td>15c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felsted</td>
<td>Old Grammar School (Trinity Guildhall)</td>
<td>15c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saffron Walden</td>
<td>34-38 Gold Street</td>
<td>early 16c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saffron Walden</td>
<td>YMA Myddylton Place</td>
<td>c16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saffron Walden</td>
<td>Former Hoops PK, King Street</td>
<td>c16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thaxted</td>
<td>5 Newbiggen Street</td>
<td>c16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tewkesbury</td>
<td>Abbey Cottages, 34-50 Church Street</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>58 French Street</td>
<td>c14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester</td>
<td>33-34 High Street</td>
<td>1465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ware</td>
<td>94 High Street</td>
<td>c15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>41-44 Burgate</td>
<td>1449-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>The Cheker of the Hope, Mercery Lane</td>
<td>1392-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>Jew’s House, 15 The Stray</td>
<td>1170-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>26-28 Cornmarket</td>
<td>c.1386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>106/107 High Street</td>
<td>1291-1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>John Knox House, High Street</td>
<td>c16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Gladstone’s Land, Lawmarket</td>
<td>c15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludlow</td>
<td>Bodenheim’s: 20 King St, 1 Broad St</td>
<td>1405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrewsbury</td>
<td>Abbot’s House, Butchers Row</td>
<td>1469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldeburgh</td>
<td>Most Hall</td>
<td>1512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keswick</td>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>c15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavenham</td>
<td>10-11 Lady Street</td>
<td>late 15c, early 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavenham</td>
<td>Market Place</td>
<td>c15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nayland</td>
<td>16 Fen Street</td>
<td>mid-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingfield</td>
<td>Pollard Cottage</td>
<td>early 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singleton</td>
<td>Middle Street, Horsham</td>
<td>late 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>Old Crown, Deritend</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Architectural Gallery at the V&A

Cordelia Jones

A new architectural gallery was opened at the V&A in November in collaboration with the RIBA. It is well worth a visit. Obviously there is not room for whole buildings in a relatively small gallery on the top floor, but they have brought together every means of representing architecture: there are actual bits of stonework and woodwork; architectural drawings; drawings and prints of buildings and of classical remains; architectural models; computer displays.

Computer displays come in different sorts: for instance, there are the mathematical calculations which lie behind the generation of the “gherkin”, and there are fly-throughs. I always wish, particularly with the fly-throughs, that the viewer could be given more control. I look forward to the day when one is allowed to stop, look round, get one’s bearings in the virtual building instead of hurtling headlong along a route which would be impossible without a powered broomstick. Just to be able to pause would be a bonus.

Models serve different purposes, as the excellent annotations explain: a model may be part of the process of design; or it may be intended to guide the builder; or, perhaps most frequently, to seduce the client, especially if there is a competition; though one model shown here was made after the design had failed to carry off the prize, as if it was necessary to have something to show for so much work (unless it was done in the hope of capturing another client, as in the famous story of St Pancras Station, a drawing for which is among the exhibits). Then there are models made to re-imagine past states of a building, to show how surviving fragments may have hung together.

The display in the main gallery is broken down into styles (Gothic/classical etc.) and into types of buildings (dwellings, offices, places of worship). An attempt has been made to touch all periods, all round the world, but the emphasis is on Europe and as we approach the present day the examples naturally become much more numerous. I suspect the V&A and the RIBA between them did not always possess examples which would best illustrate oriental architecture. For instance, the charming model of the sanctuary of a mosque in Ahmmedabad stands in for all the mosques in the world, but being without a courtyard gives little idea of the typical interpenetration of external and internal space.

Beneath the displays on the walls are drawers, as of a plan chest, labelled with the names of architects - Bramante, Wren, Lutyens, Scapar, etc; one can pull them out to see drawings under glass. I found this a particularly happy arrangement, as it made so much material available without overwhelming the viewer. In addition, alongside the main gallery, they have cut a small new gallery out of the roofspace. The display here will be changed three times a year. It is currently “Great Buildings of the World”. It took me two hours to look at everything, and I shall have to go back.
This summer we have eleven events ranging from town walks, a large prodigy house, vernacular ones, churches, farm buildings, and a Study Day in New Buckenham. You are spoilt for choice. This year only two events are held during mid-week days and this should allow a wider range of members to attend. We have one repeat visit, to the church and Old Hall at South Burlingham. The tickets will provide the final details.

One of the more pleasurable features of our summer events has been the pub lunches which have provided not only a welcome rest but also an opportunity for members to have time to talk to each other. Previously we have pre-ordered sandwiches to cut down on the waiting time and to help, very often, small pubs; members paid for the lunch on the day. This has been a hit and miss method but on the whole it has given good value and efficiency. Costs are kept to a minimum but it does depend on where we are meeting. This year the organisers thought they would like to ask you to pay for the sandwiches in with your ticket but we shall still pre-order. If this is a problem for you, please take the matter up with the individual organiser.

It is very difficult allocating tickets: events must be primarily for members, and then on a first come first served basis. I would ask you to apply early for any of the events you would like to attend, particularly as more are at weekends and the demand will be greater.

Not only am I always looking for ideas for both winter and summer events but I am also looking for volunteers to become involved in the organising of them. Organising an individual event does not cause too much effort but if you have more than one, it does become very time consuming. As a Group we aim to keep membership as open as possible and for members to become actively involved.

Please fill in the ticket applications carefully as we do have to inform the organisers of numbers involved.

**NHBG Summer 2005**

---

**Redenhall Church with Harleston Town Walk**

**Date:** Thursday 28 April  
(a) Redenhall Church  
...Alayne Fenner and Ian Hinton  
**Time:** 9.30—10.15 am  
Thereafter  
(b) Harleston Town Walk  
...Mark Kenyon  
**Time:** 10.30 am  
**Meet:** The Merchant’s House (A Member’s home)  
**Car Park:** Public free car park behind The Merchant’s House  
**Walking:** Yes, a lot  
**Food:** Coffee/Pub Lunch/Tea (included)  
**Tickets:** £15 members/£30 non  
**Limit:** 20  
**Contact:** Carol Nutt (01379 640007 or e.mail: carol.nutt@btinternet.com)

Visit the magnificent Redenhall church where Ian will look at the structure and Alayne the history. If you cannot make the church at 9.30 am start, at The Merchant’s House for a walk around Harleston, a medieval town with a Georgian façade. We shall visit one or two buildings, one of which is an aised hall. Mark is a local architect with a wide knowledge of local buildings.

**Gowthorpe Manor, Wymondham**  
...Mr and Mrs D Watkinson  
**Date:** Wednesday 4 May  
**Meet:** At the House: East of B.1113 in Swardeston. Map Ref: TG207024  
**Time:** 6.30 pm  
**Food:** Wine (included)  
**Ticket:** £5.00 members / £10.00 non  
**Limit:** 30  
**Contact:** Tony Wright, Cantley House, Cantley Lane, Cringleford, Norwich NR4 6TF  
Tel: 01603 452041 e.mail: tony-wright@nfk2.freeserve.co.uk

Gowthorpe is a Tudor Manor House built around 1540 for Augustine Steward and occupied by his descendents apart from a period of sixty years in the eighteenth century. Mrs Watkinson is a Steward. Not normally open to the public.

---

**Cromer—A Late Victorian Seaside Town**  
...Andy Boyce  
**Date:** Saturday 14 May  
**Time:** 10.30am — about 3.30 pm  
**Meet:** By the south door of the Parish Church  
**Walking:** Yes. A lot, and some cliff paths  
**Lunch:** Probably at the Pier Café (included)

Visit the magnificent Redenhall church where Ian will look at the structure and Alayne the history. If you cannot make the church at 9.30 am start, at The Merchant’s House for a walk around Harleston, a medieval town with a Georgian façade. We shall visit one or two buildings, one of which is an aised hall. Mark is a local architect with a wide knowledge of local buildings.

---

**Tacolneston Dower House**  
...The Tacolneston Four  
**Date:** Tuesday 31 May  
**Time:** 6.30 pm— 8.30 pm  
**Place:** High Street, Tacolneston, S Norfolk

Visit the magnificent Redenhall church where Ian will look at the structure and Alayne the history. If you cannot make the church at 9.30 am start, at The Merchant’s House for a walk around Harleston, a medieval town with a Georgian façade. We shall visit one or two buildings, one of which is an aised hall. Mark is a local architect with a wide knowledge of local buildings.

---

**Contact details: Membership—Ian Hinton–tel: 01502 475287–e.mail: ian.hinton222@btinternet.com  
Events—Rosemary Forrest–tel: 01603 742315 – e.mail: forrest.rosemary@gmail.com**

---

Andy Boyce is a member of the Cromer Preservation Society. There will be a lot of walking, both along the sea front to look at hotels and guest houses, and in the residential areas at the villas. Although most of the walk with look at the heyday of Cromer’s late Victorian architecture, there will be examples of earlier work.
Two of Norfolk’s Great Barns: Hemsby and Waxham

Anthony Rossi was involved in the restoration of the Waxham and Paston Barns (sadly the bats prevent us visiting the latter) and knows Hemsby. He has kindly agreed to introduce us to their intricacies and differences. Members who visited Godwick will find interesting comparisons. Hemsby is Medieval and Waxham falls just outside the Medieval period.

Repeat Visit

Burlingham St Edmund Church and Old Hall

Swaffham Town and Church

Contact details: Membership—Ian Hinton–tel: 01502 475287–e.mail: ian.hinton222@btinternet.com Events—Rosemary Forrest–tel: 01603 742315–e.mail: forrest.rosemary@gmail.com

In the morning we plan to look with Vic Nierop-Reading at the Georgian developments in Swaffham and hear some of its history. After lunch at Strattons, itself an intriguing building, Sandy Heslop will give us his interpretation of the Parish Church, St Peter & St Paul.

Aylsham: A North Norfolk Market Town

Roger is a member of NHBG and also a local historian. The question is, shall we find Aylsham is a brick built town or, once again, will the timber-frames be hidden behind its red brick facades. Another member has been working on the documentary evidence for No 18 Red Lion Street and hopefully she will be able to share some of the information with us.

To find out about this visit read the articles in this Newsletter. Alayne Fenner will help you explore the church and the owners of the Old Hall will be on hand to share their house and wall paintings. Once again, they have kindly made the garden available for a picnic lunch

Raynham Hall, nr Fakenham

…Scilla Lansdale

A wonderful opportunity to visit this seventeenth century house, described as being ‘the paramount house of its date in Norfolk’. Pevsner and Wilson, Norfolk 2, has nine pages of description and plans, so do your homework and then Scilla (our guide in Walsingham) will undoubtedly provide the detail from the wealth of documentary evidence available.

Farm Buildings of the Holkham Estate

…Susanna Wade-Martins

The farm improvements of Thomas William Coke, the owner of the Holkham estate from 1776 to 1843 were legendary within his own lifetime. We shall be looking at two of the model farms within the park and then, after lunch, two outside, one good example of a planned farm of the first agricultural revolution, built before 1790 and the other an example of the buildings for High Farming, built in 1850.

Annual General Meeting

Date: Saturday June 4
Place: The Café, Waxham Barn, Waxham,
Time: 4.30 pm for 5.00 pm

We are again supporting the Norfolk Historic Buildings Trust by holding our AGM at Waxham Barn. Full details will follow but the Committee do hope that members will come and explore this corner of Norfolk before or after the meeting. The barn should be open to the public and we shall organise the key for the church.

Contact: Tony Wright, Cantley House, Cantley Lane, Cingleford, Norwich NR4 6TF
01603 452041 e.mail: tonywright@nfk2.freeserve.co.uk

Note

Tickets: £12.00 members / £24 non members
Limit: 30
Contact: Penny Clarke (01263 833280 or e.mail: pennyclarke@sizzel.net)

Another member has been working on the documentary evidence for No 18 Red Lion Street and hopefully she will be able to share some of the information with us.