Norfolk rural schools: the plan of Beighton (NRO P/BG 8) drawn in 1856 shows a library above the porch. The school was built very much as shown in the drawings (see page 16).
Welcome to the nineteenth edition of the NHBG Newsletter. As well as providing information about the coming summer programme of visits (see p.20) this edition includes, as usual, a brief summary of some of the winter lectures which have been based in the INTO building at UEA. The latter were well attended (taking into account the miserable weather this year!) and the speakers all did a terrific job of communicating their enthusiasm and passion for their respective subjects. One of the lectures - on Norfolk Primary Schools - was led by Susanna Wade-Martins. Susanna is an old friend and long-time member of the NHBG and she and I have worked together to develop a UEA project bid to English Heritage which will focus on recording the surviving Victorian and Edwardian schools in our villages and which will involve some of our members as field researchers. This is an exciting development and one that has emerged from the NHBG’s active encouragement of the project in its early stages. In January this year I received a call from the organisers of the Current Archaeology Awards. Apparently they were very impressed by our publication on the Tacolneston Project and we were short-listed (along with 10 other projects) for a national prize. I duly went down to the British Museum and gave a 20 minute presentation on the project to the assembled ranks of the ‘great and the good’, but I’m afraid that we were not one of the two projects to receive an award. Being shortlisted was a wonderful achievement for the Group, regardless, and I am proud to have had the opportunity to represent the Group and all of those involved in the project at such a prestigious event. We have been entered for two other prizes (one at the National Archaeology Awards and one for the local branch of the CPRE) so keep your fingers crossed! The Group seems to be forging an enviable reputation at national level and many people seem to have heard of us and our activities. As we near our 10th anniversary celebrations, I think this is a good time to take stock, consider our collective achievements and take a moment to give ourselves a collective pat on the back - we have come a long, long way in a relatively brief period of time. That we have done so is largely due to the hard work and commitment of our committee members past and present, to the support provided by our members who attend events with tremendous enthusiasm, and to the Group’s success in attracting external funding. With your help I think we can look forwards to the next decade with renewed vigour and confidence. See you in the summer!

Adam Longcroft
Chair, Norfolk Historic Buildings Group
March 2010
a.longcroft@uea.ac.uk

Annual General Meeting, 5.00 pm Saturday 10 July 2010 at Pennoyer’s School Pulham St Mary. Do come! Before the meeting there will be visits to two common-edge houses and then tea and scones.

Tacolneston Project

We have received our first review of The Tacolneston Project, Journal 4, from our sister society the Suffolk Historic Buildings Group in its newsletter “The Eavesdropper”. Written by Tony Broscomb, it is generally enthusiastic: he found the first section – the placing of the buildings in geographical and local historical context - “a fascinating and comprehensive study, well researched and clearly written.” He considered it “an excellent model” for similar projects elsewhere.

He enjoyed the social history of the village revealed by the documentary research - such as the lives and times of the extensive Browne family who owned nearly half the houses in the village and the details of the interiors and furnishings of some of the houses revealed by probate inventories.

Praise was also forthcoming for the section on building materials, carpentry techniques and building layouts, where the apparent absence of soot blackening gave him pause for thought – possibly a result of the timber chimneys and smoke bays found in fourteen of the houses?

The detailed descriptions of the buildings themselves and the “beautiful drawings of the timber framing are outstanding and cannot be faulted.” However his one caveat was that he found this section difficult to read because of insufficient labelling of rooms on the house plans. Nevertheless he considered the Gazetteer “an impressive body of work” and is full of praise for the whole project which “combines archaeological research, architectural history, landscape history and local history into a unified and readable report.”

Copies of Journal 4 are available from Ian Hinton, The Old Rectory, Barnby, Beccles, NR34 7QN together with a cheque (payable to Norfolk Historic Buildings Group) to include postage of £3.00.

Journal No 4 The Tacolneston Project: a study of historic buildings on the claylands of south Norfolk.

Members ..........£10. +£3.00 Postage and Packing
Non members ......£12.00 +£3.00 Postage and Packing
We met at the Greenhouse (right), 42/46 Bethel Street on a cool, grey June day. We had lunch before moving on to Country & Eastern, 34/36 Bethel Street. From there we went down to 3/4 Haymarket which contains Curat’s House.

The Greenhouse has been owned since 1993 by the Greenhouse Trust, a charity deeply committed to environmental education and seeking to create an urban example of energy efficient restoration, conversion and running. The II* listed building (Nos 42-48 Bethel Street) is early nineteenth century timber-framed with a fifteenth century brick undercroft beneath No 48.

The Trust’s initial approach was restrained by the Council and took the form of demolition of some 1950s industrial aspects of the building and exterior walls stripped back to brickwork. Inside there were partition alterations when eco-friendly materials were used and energy conservation enhanced. The changes outside were understandably more contentious. The Trust had been permitted to install on its front roof two thirty tube solar panels and a solar P.V. panel. Three roof mounted wind turbines and a rainwater harvesting structure were not permitted but in the rear yard/garden a larger solar panel was installed. Rainwater harvesting provided water for three public toilets, two hand washbasins and organic herbs and plants; water is stored in butts. A bio-diesel generator is also in the yard. Practical considerations have prevented the systematic use of grey water and the installation of a composting toilet, emphasising the problems, clear throughout our visit, of adding elegantly to existing buildings the current devices for energy conservation.

The Old Skating Rink, now Country & Eastern and the Greenhouse’s almost neighbour, was also acquired, also in poor condition, in 1993 by its present owners, Jeannie and Philip Millward. It was built in 1876 by J W Lacey, and designed by Edward Boardman. It was originally approached from St Giles along a corridor laid with tessellated paving and decorated with flowers, statuary and a waterfall. The high roof was and is supported by elegant and elaborate trusses but the musicians’ gallery with organ and automatic piano at the west end are gone. Spectators’ galleries on the north and south walls remain. Skating by gaslight never really took off and by 1878 the rink had become St Giles Hall and a Vaudeville Theatre with a succession of exotic sounding entertainments. From 1882 to 1892 it was the first Salvation Army Citadel in Norwich and then for a hundred years Lacey & Lincoln’s buildings’ supply warehouse. By 1993 it required urgent attention: the roof was re-slated, new cast iron guttering was fitted with original lions’ heads decoration and the apex skylight was replaced and double glazed.

Inside the gallery balustrades were replaced, the galleries re-plastered and new staircases installed. Paint was removed from large areas of the red brick walls which also required extensive repair. Now the interior has the sense of awe created by a large quiet space and displays a diversity of fascinating and beautiful objects from the east.

Curat’s House was built (c.1480) by John Curat, notary and mercer and, in 1531, Sheriff of Norwich. An 1887 description suggests that it was originally a “stately house with painted gable, spacious courtyard, large gateway, ornate principal wing, mullioned windows and two octagonal stair towers.”. It was substantially altered early in the eighteenth century and again following a nineteenth century roof collapse but in the 1940s it was still possible to eat in the inn that it had become “in the mellowing atmosphere of rich old oak and soothing light”.

A fire in 1962 changed all that. Apart from some impressive roll-moulded ceiling joists as you enter from Haymarket the ground floor has gone and the unity of the first floor is lost in modification and alteration. Perhaps the most intact part of the house as it originally was is the small two-bay vaulted and groined undercroft where we started our visit. This is thought to be fourteenth century and is approached by extensive cellars and passages. It was surprising to find one entrance supporting a carved oak door frame with the 1501 on one spandrel and the Curat rebus (left) on the other.

The main range of the Curat House lies east/west, and the two first floor rooms have very fine moulded ceilings, particularly the east room. There are also two mullioned windows ‘remade from moulded sixteenth century timbers’ (Norfolk Historic Environmental Record) and ‘panelling with Q and rat re-made and re-framed’ in this room, as well as a good flattened arch fire-place. At the north east and north west corners of this range are the remains of spiral staircases, possibly the original octagonal stair towers.

The ‘shop front’ range onto The Haymarket has a Georgian brick façade and is three-storey; it was extended forward in the eighteenth century alterations beyond the former jettied front. These rooms have few historic timbers, but it is difficult to read them. One room contains a fireplace with ?original Delft tiles.

An interesting and disconcerting house – perhaps it could be called the ‘Curat’s egg’?!

Note: There will be a repeat visit to these sites on 15 May 2010.
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Richard Wilson gave the first lecture in the Winter series at UEA on October 14, 2009. Titled ‘Sir John Soane in Norfolk: the Origins of a Famous Career’, it traced these to Soane’s visit to Italy in the late 1770s. Here the brilliant Royal Academy student met, amongst others, three Norfolk young men, Edward Pratt of Ryston, Charles Collyer of Wroxham and John Patteson of Norwich. Through this network Soane obtained almost 30 commissions in East Anglia during the 1780s, the large majority of them in Norfolk, and probably more, and certainly better known, than those executed by the Norwich trio of craftsmen-cum-architects, Thomas Rawlins, the Ivories and William Wilkins.

Two of his Norfolk houses, Letton Hall (1783–87) and Gunthorpe Hall (1789–90) possess good accounts of their construction. From Letton, Soane’s first country house, its costings, use of old materials and the employment of Norwich’s leading craftsmen, the mason John de Carle, the carver William Lane, the carpenter, Thomas Dove and the plasterer James Wilkins can be worked out. Carefully costed at £6,000, Soane visited Letton from London an incredible 38 times. It established his reputation in Norfolk. Other commissions quickly followed: the remodelling and extension of Ryston; Shotesham, Soane’s most important Norfolk country house and major alterations at Norwich Castle to extend the County Goal. Gunthorpe’s accounts are detailed since Soane had oversight of its construction from London though he did visit the site a dozen times. Like many country house commissions it was the extension of an older house. This was converted into service accommodation, a new front of more fashionable entertaining and bed and dressing rooms added. These, costing £3,000 and little more extensive than a good sized rectory of the period, were built by a workforce of between ten and twenty workmen Soane recruited in London, some of whom had come on from Tendring Hall in Suffolk which he had just competed.

Then in 1790 Soane’s career in Norfolk ends abruptly. Working on the Bank of England, deeply involved in the affairs of the Royal Academy, Soane had become one of the country’s leading architects. Well to do, his practice was impervious to the recession in country house commissions which marked the worst years of the long French Wars. Soane’s fame lay beyond the Norfolk years of the 1780s, but you can see all the features of his later make up in that decade: his meticulous professionalism, his total enthusiasm for architecture as a discipline; his interest in the play of light and shadow; his love of line and blank arches and of layered brickwork; his adherence to symmetry and his genius in arranging internal spaces and in creating routes through buildings.
Over the past third of a century the majority of the surviving pre-1750 domestic buildings in the three Sussex Cinque-Port towns of Hastings, Winchelsea and Rye have been recorded – the individual surveys are publicly accessible at the East Sussex Record Office. But a collection of surveys is just that – in themselves the individual reports do not reveal the story these buildings can tell regarding the communities they served. A recent initiative funded by English Heritage and Romney Marsh Research Trust has allowed the data to be analysed and integrated with documentary research to tell the stories of these three port towns. What this shows is that although the three posts could coexist within a short length of coast, only one could prosper at any one time.

At the Conquest Hastings was the principal town, but, due to coastal change, during the twelfth century trade shifted east to a developing protected estuary harbour. Here, the towns of Winchelsea and Rye occupied opposite banks. Of the two, during the four-hundred year period up to the early years of the sixteenth century Winchelsea dominated. Being threatened by the sea, it had moved to its present site in the 1280s. From this period survive over 30 accessible vaulted wine cellars and several good-quality stone-built houses – others are known from excavation. At its height, the town had more than 800 dwellings, but it suffered badly during the middle years of the fourteenth century, not least from a devastating French raid in 1360. Confined to the north-eastern corner of the original site, there was still sufficient money available in the late fifteenth century for aging houses to be rebuilt. These include four fully-floored dwellings dating from the final decades of the century. But these represent the last flowering of the town. Early in the sixteenth century the
river which served it became silted and major decline set in – by the seventeenth century perhaps as few as 30 houses remained.

Being further down the estuary, Rye was at this time not affected, allowing it to fill the vacuum left by Winchelsea. In 1500 Rye had about 200 houses – by 1565 the total was 580 and still growing. Rye was certainly not poor in the fifteenth century – a considerable number of good medieval houses survive. Most are large and stand detached. The layouts hardly differ from those in rural contexts. All this changed in the sixteenth century. Many of the large number of survivors from this period show innovative urban designs on confined plots. But Rye’s period of dominance was short lived. By the last decades of the century silting was affecting this town too, and early in the seventeenth century it lost most of its maritime activity. Most merchants moved east to the developing port of Dover, whilst the fishermen went west to Brighton and Hastings. By the mid seventeenth century the town was half the size it was at its height and served principally as a local market centre, with few maritime interests remaining. Not surprisingly, seventeenth-century building work is absent.

Those fishermen who moved to Hastings had to make do with an exposed beach – a poor substitute for a protected harbour, but better than nothing. Although insignificant compared to Winchelsea, in the fifteenth century Hastings had been larger than Rye, but not so wealthy. The town had, however, had a disastrous sixteenth century – it had been partially burnt, its beach facilities had been neglected, and many of its not inconsiderable number of small surviving medieval houses show no signs of having been upgraded to modern standards: a number show very clear signs of neglect. But the influx of new residents from c.1600 onwards boosted the economy sufficiently to promote a revival. The number of houses increased from 280 in 1565 to just over 400 a century later, with further increase subsequently. A new suburb was formed, existing houses were subdivided (as had been the case in Rye the previous century), and the existing housing stock was either renovated or rebuilt. In particular, projecting windows flanked by clerestory openings and capped by overhanging gables became numerous. Superficially at least, Hastings took on the appearance of a prosperous community. The wheel had turned full circle. As at the Conquest, Hastings was once more the dominant local town: it remains so to this day.

To summarize the results of the recent study in any meaningful way in the space available here is an impossible task but, luckily, most of the work is now available in published form. *New Winchelsea Sussex: a medieval port town* was published in 2004 and *Rye Rebuilt* in 2009.

Hastings is written, but awaiting publication.
Highly praised for the quality of its painting; Norfolk’s medieval stained glass features in many of the world’s great art collections. But there is no need to fly to the Metropolitan in New York to see it, as an amazing amount of glass survives in the county’s parish churches.

Norwich was a great centre for glass painting in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Glass was not produced in Norfolk but the county’s excellent links with the continent and particularly the Low Countries allowed the medieval craftsman ready access to the necessary materials.

Seventy glaziers are known to have lived in the city between 1280 and 1570 largely clustered between the Cathedral precinct and the river. Workshops were engaged on temporary contracts and jobs were often priced by square foot of glass, with labour included in this cost.

The amount of stained glass produced in Norfolk is testimony to the number of wealthy patrons in the area looking to commission a panel. Biblical scenes but particularly saints were a popular choice of subject. These figures were often set below canopies of feathery angels playing musical instruments to create the impression of the heavenly host.

The Dance of Death window in St Andrews, Norwich is an example of the increased representations of cadavers in the medieval arts following the devastating impact of the Black Death. It is believed to be the only surviving example of this theme in the medium of glass in England.

It is often the incidental details that make for the most appealing glass panels. Stained glass has long been studied by costume historians for its reference to contemporary dress and the visitation panel from St Peter Mancroft shows Mary with a panel sown into her dress to create medieval maternity wear.

At Saxlingham Nethergate a panel (above) of St Edmund from thirteenth century is one of the earliest remaining in the county. Opaque blue, green, red and yellow glass was made by adding oxides to the glass at the molten stage. The lead, into which the cut pieces were set, forms the outline of the figure of St Edmund.

As techniques developed panels became more complicated. At Mileham a fourteenth century panel of St Katherine shows a greater variety of colours, Katherine is surrounded by an architectural canopy, the folds in the material of her dress and facial details pre-empt the delicate portraiture for which Norwich glass painters would become famous.

Norfolk’s fifteenth century glass has beautifully painted figures which transcended the lead into which the glass is set. The use of a technique called Silver Stain allowed more than one colour to be applied to the same piece of glass and the development of perspective led to detailed narrative backgrounds.

Hungate Medieval Art, St Peter Hungate features an exhibition on Norfolk’s Medieval Stained Glass curated by Claire Daunton of University of East Anglia.

A set of Stained Glass Trails by David King, UEA, are available, grouping some of the most interesting glass in the county into ten fun afternoons out!

To see this image of St Edmund, Saxlingham Nethergate in colour please go to: http://www.nhbg.org.uk/Events/Previous-Events/2009

For details of their events and for more general information, please visit: www.hungate.org.uk or ring Tel. 01603 623254.
Manor Farm, Pulham Market, Norfolk
Susan and Michael Brown, Ian Tyers

We have been able to show that the window shutter of the Manor Farm, Pulham Market, are of the same date as the house. So far as we know this is the first time this has been done.

We are grateful to the Landmark Trust for permission to study The Manor Farm, Pulham Market. This house owes its unusually original state of preservation not only to the meticulous care of the Trust but to the vision of Mr. & Mrs. Dance of SPAB, the couple who bought the near derelict building in 1948 and subsequently passed it into the care of the Trust (Photo 1.)

The house appears to be of two builds (Fig. 1) plus the nineteenth century extension (not recorded), the parlour end having a much higher ground sill than the hall and service and a correspondingly higher girt (Fig. 2). The principal timbers in the parlour end are of elm (Ian Tyers) and are not suitable for dendrochronology. The parlour end wallplate protrudes into the chimney bay as though the hall, service and chimney bay were built against an existing structure. At roof level the principal rafters above the parlour end (also elm) and the chimney bay are diminished and have clasped collars. Above the parlour end is a third purlin with associated mortices in the gable end and the next truss for a raised ceiling to the parlour chamber (Fig. 3) (see The Rookery, Fundenhall which is included in NHBG Journal No 4 The Tacolneston Project and has a similar structure still in place). Above the hall and service the principal rafters are undiminished and the purliins are shaved. However, the rafters of the pair respecting the hall/chimney bay partition are diminished with a clasped collar, perhaps to give greater integrity as the common rafters are breached by the chimney and are therefore not tenoned at the apex. Four of the dendro cores taken from these six rafters produced a date after 1597 (Table 1) (see dendro date for the tie beam given below).

Remarkably for a Norfolk house, plank and muntin construction has been used, not only for the hall screen (Fig. 4) as might be expected, but also for the service wall on ground and first floors, for the partition wall between the service rooms on the ground floor, for the partition wall between the twin service chambers on the first floor, and to form the wall of a corridor between service and parlour chambers on the first floor (Fig. 5). As the drawings show, these plank and muntin panels are consistent in dimensions and uniform in construction, there being fifty planks in total. The muntins of the service wall are tenoned into the transverse joist and the tie beam, indicating that they are integral with the frame and original to the build rather than a later insertion. The axial walls have their own top and bottom rails so are not tenoned to the frame but the uniformity of design strongly suggests that the whole set of walls is contemporary.

The general description of the planks is that they are of locally grown oak, they have been pit sawn and they have “thinning” across the grain at the tops and the best side has been “dressed” and finished with a shave. In the drawing of the service wall (Fig. 6) it can be seen that the stud above

The sampled roof timbers:
14. south principal
15. north principal
16. south principal
17. north principal
18. intermediate north principal
19. intermediate south principal
15, 16, 17, 19 date; 14 doesn’t; sample 18 wasn’t useful.

---

Table 1 Dendrochronological Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manor Farm, Pulham Market</th>
<th>Span of ring sequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tiebeam</td>
<td>AD1615 winter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal rafters</td>
<td>AD1602 after AD1602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower shutter</td>
<td>AD1572 after AD1596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper shutter</td>
<td>AD1591 after AD1599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calendar Years</td>
<td>AD1500 AD1550 AD1600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

White bars heartwood, shaded bar sapwood
Fig. 1  Ground Floor Plan
Manor Farm, Pulham Market

Fig. 2  East Parlour End
Manor Farm, Pulham Market

Fig. 3  North Elevation
Manor Farm, Pulham Market

Fig. 4  Cross-passage screen
Manor Farm, Pulham Market

Fig. 5  Corridor and service chamber partition (first floor)
cross-passage and service partition (ground Floor)
Manor Farm, Pulham Market
the southern doorhead is pegged to the tie beam and to the lintel whereas the north doorhead is only pegged to the tie beam; the girt above the service doors is pegged but not the lintel. Stylistically the panels above the lintel seem to be the same as the other planks. It is possible that the carpenter soon found that it was easier to have a single plank laid horizontally than a series of short planks. There is no reason why a carpenter should not adapt his techniques in what may have been an experimental building.

In the dendro survey it was from the service partition tie beam that Ian Tyers obtained a sample that gave a felling date of winter 1615/16. Subsequent to the article in NHBG Journal No. 3 First Floor Corridors in Some Norfolk Houses of the Sixteenth & Seventeenth Centuries we have examined the planks more thoroughly and found that the corridor partition has all of the planks numbered on the north side with faint scribed carpenter’s assembly marks: from the east (chimney bay) I & II, the doorway, III, arabic 4 (Ⅳ) under the tie beam, then V to VIII and  with the last plank not numbered (Fig. 5). These planks had to respect the doorway and the tie beam so are not of a consistent size with the other planks in the building, hence the need for numbering. The marks are not all at the same height suggesting that the planks were numbered before being assembled into the muntins. The marks are very difficult to see and no others were found on any of the other partitions except for the service chamber partition where the third muntin is marked with a III. The first and second muntins in this partition are part of the door frame to the south service chamber. As in the corridor partition, the carpenter needed to record a specific placing. This arrangement also indicates the originality of the doorway to a separate service chamber which is secured by being accessible only through the hall chamber (see the access analysis diagram p. 55, NHBG Journal 3). However immediately opposite the corridor partition is a shutter in a shutter groove with a rail below. This shutter is matched by one in the north service room that has a rail top and bottom.

As can be seen from the drawings both of these shutters have the same cut-out in the left hand board which enables the shutter to be moved away from the cross wall (Fig. 7 & Photo 2). Also they have the same faint scribed carpenter’s assembly marks which cross the join between the boards I, II & III from left to right. Arguably the shutter was made by the same hand as the corridor partition. The ground floor shutter has a rebated top edge which retains white paint and this rebate may be original.

The doors, which hang on pintles, were then examined and again the faint scribed lines I & II were found on all the doors that have three planks; the two-plank doors were not numbered (Fig. 6). The door to the extension is a reused door upside down. By measuring the panels and the pintle positions it was found that this door would fit on the empty pintles for a door to the north chimney bay (the stairs). It would seem logical that the hand that made the corridor partition also made the shutters and all the doors.

As we had a secure dendro date for the building it was decided that Ian Tyers would examine the shutters using the technique usually employed for paintings on panel (Photo 3). Under the microscope it was seen that the panels were “slab” cut with the two outer panels (A & D) from the same tree and the two inner panels (B & C) from another tree. The outer panels are constructed with the centre or pith of the tree arranged to the outside of the shutter (which can also be seen in panel paintings). The last ring to give a date was 1589 (heartwood) which would give a date range of 1599 – 1635. It is highly unlikely that any carpenter making shutters at a later date would have randomly chosen timber that matched
Shutters are a very rare survival and it is often assumed that they must be replacements. We would suggest that in future the onus is on the recorder to prove that shutters are not original rather than the other way round.

In the service end wall at first floor level there was no window originally (Fig. 8). As can be seen from the drawing of the west gable wall the window was inserted at a later date in the place of studs which are pegged. At ground floor level there is a window to the north of the partition and it seems as though the partition meets an ovolo moulded mullion. To the south there is a later inserted doorway to the clay lump extension and there are pegs above the lintel either for a window or for studs. Stylistically these planks are the same as the others in the building and it is possible that the partition always interrupted the window. At Kettleton, Fornsett St. Peter a service partition divides a three light diamond mullion window that serves both rooms. When the plank and muntin is constructed the final plank may have a separate chamfer beading to hold it in place and this can be seen in both the service room partition and the service wall itself at ground floor level.

A particularly interesting feature of the house is the first floor corridor. This gives direct access from the stair to the north service chamber, preserving the privacy of the (heated) hall chamber and that of the south service chamber, which can only be accessed via the hall chamber (Fig. 9). This is reminiscent of the pattern of secured rooms seen in the Manor House Tacolneston (NHBG Journals 3 & 4) where one of the attic chambers is entered only through the parlour chamber, in both cases presumably to secure valued goods and dependants.

The dendro result of Winter 1615/16 for the partition wall tie beam and 1597 plus sapwood for the rafters can be taken to date the original hall and service end. It is interesting that the date of 1589 plus sapwood for the shutters is so similar to the roof and this strongly suggests that the shutters are contemporary with the house. The parlour end has been extensively altered and presents its own problems which we have not looked at in detail.

We would like again to thank the Landmark Trust for giving us permission to examine the house and we would also like to thank the housekeeper for being so welcoming on “changeover day” when we made more dust for her to clean.

Historic features dated:

- Tripartite plan with undated parlour
- Two service rooms
- Two service chambers
- Cross-passage with screen
- Stack at parlour end of hall
- Winder stair by the stack
- First floor corridor
- Plank and muntin partitions
- Ovolo mullion windows
- Sliding shutters
- Undiminished principals (1604 – 40; 1607 – 43)
- Diminished principals (after 1602)
- Shaved purlins in two tiers
- Cranked wind braces
- Slightly arched collars
- Three plank doors with carpenter’s marks
- Shield chamfer stops
- Original floored attic accessed by stair
Like in so much of Norfolk, the farmhouses in the north of
the two Pulham parishes not only encapsulate much of the
farming history and past prosperity of the County but also
describe a major earlier feature of the landscape, as they
surround many of the large medieval greens and commons
that were an integral part of the medieval and post-medieval
farming structure.

Pulham North Green, shown on the map in its extent at
the end of the eighteenth century at the time of Faden’s map,
is delineated by farmhouses dated in the Norfolk Historic
Environment Record as of the seventeenth century. There are
only two farms located on the old common which post-date
the 1838/9 Parliamentary Enclosure Act – Rose Farm and
Ashleigh farm.

Susan & Michael Brown and Adam Longcroft have
been involved in examining three of these houses in detail –
Manor Farm, now dated by dendro at around 1615, Elmmtree
Farm probably of a similar date and Ashtree Farm which
appears to be an earlier hall house. Each has a position at
the edge of the large common which originally extended
into the neighbouring parishes of Wacton, Long Stratton,
Morningthorpe, Hardwick and Shelton.

The small horseshoe-shaped and square objects on the
map are the remains of moated sites probably from the
twelfth to fifteenth centuries, which with the exception of
the one in the centre of Hardwick, probably represent the
sites of the early yeoman farms and they can be seen to
occupy ‘holes’ in the common where the early farmsteads
were assarted from the original larger area of common. This
was probably the heaviest and wettest area of land in these
parishes as it sits on the watershed and so was later in the
conversion to arable from open grazing – the northern part
drains into the Tas and Yare, the southern part drains into the
Waveney.

The process of nibbling away at the commonland
continued right up until the Enclosure Act of 1838/9 – even
as late as 1836, 20 acres that bridged the parish boundary
between Pulham St Mary and Pulham Market was sold to
fund the building of the Hundred’s ‘House of Industry’ – the
Poor House on the Norwich Road.

Many of the ditches which had to delineate the commons
to prevent grazing animals straying on to the arable fields
that surrounded them have been ploughed out since 1839, but
others still exist, even to the extent of preserving the slight
dip in the roads that cross them. These and other landscape
features such as hedges and field patterns still reflect the
position of the old commons, but none so much as the rows
of farmhouses set well back from the roads laid out as part of
the final enclosure.

Note: We shall be visiting The Pulhams this Summer in July and
September.
Friday Cottage is situated in the southwest corner of Friday Market, Little Walsingham, Norfolk, on an axis roughly northeast/southwest. It is provisionally dated to the late 15th–early 16th Century. It is built of flint rubble, faced with knapped flint and brick quoins on the NE elevation up to the first floor, with a timber framed upper storey. This forms a continuous jetty facing Friday Market. There is evidence that the frame once supported a four bay crown post roof. This, together with high ceilings on the ground floor and surviving painted beams and fragments of wall paintings, suggest a building of some status. It is likely that it was built as a pilgrim hostelry. It could also have been the gatehouse to the nearby Friary, before the dissolution.

The two principal joists supporting the first floor common joists, form a T shape. (see plan) The principal transverse joist spans the SW end of the building and sits against the chimney stack and winder stairs, both in original positions, but much altered. Slightly off centre, to compensate for the jetty, the principal axial joist runs the full length of the building to the later inserted stack at the northeast end. Originally, it must have run to the gable end, a total of 33 feet (approx 10 metres).

The axial joist is 1ft. (30 cm) wide at the junction with the transverse joist tapering to 9inches (23 cm) at the NE end. Ogee and quarter circle mouldings run for 21feet (6m. 42cm) then taper out. At this point, the joist is too narrow and irregular for mouldings.

Over time, a noticeable shake line has developed along the axial joist. At the SW end, it starts at the edge of the

**Glossary**

Shake: Cracking of timber due to stresses of growth, impact of felling or drying.
Principal axial joist
Conjectural oak timber conversion

joist and runs diagonally to the point where the mouldings run out. A substantial knot at the side of the joist suggests that a large, but bent branch at this point, was a continuation of the tree trunk. This seems to indicate that a side branch, which grew more inline with the trunk, was utilised to obtain the full length of the joist. This branch was only just big enough to enable the carpenter to cut the required length of joist. The last 10 feet (3 m) is not fully squared off along this section. The accompanying drawing is a conjectural reconstruction of how the joist may have been converted from the oak tree. It is a testament to the carpenter, who had to choose a suitable tree for conversion, that he could envisage the outcome while the tree was still standing in the wood!

Principal axial joist
32 ft long
x 11.25 inches wide, tapering to
9 inches wide at north end
x 9.5 inches deep

Contact details: Membership—Ian Hinton—tel: 01502 475287—e.mail: ian.hinton222@btinternet.com
Anyone who has spent a little time investigating the parish churches of Norfolk will know that there was a great rebuilding in the later Middle Ages. There are few churches in the county that do not show evidence of some work carried out after the middle of the fourteenth century. Later aisles, clerestories and porches are indicated by moulding profiles and tracery patterns designed according to the new tastes of the age, those which became later known as Perpendicular.

One of the most remarkable features of the rebuilding of parish churches in this period is the attention given to the construction of towers. Over 90 existing towers can be securely dated by documentation or by heraldry displayed on their fabric to between 1375 and 1540, and another 70 or so can be confidently placed within this chronological frame on the basis of architectural style. It is probable that dozens more were built during the period, but which do not display sufficiently clear stylistic motifs to allow a confident assessment of their date.

Of these new towers, the great majority were built at the western ends of their churches on the main east-west axis, although there are a few, largely in north-west Norfolk that were constructed as tower porches on the south side of the church. Most strikingly, they usually show a much greater level of ambition than the types of tower they replaced. Often, as at Erpingham or Trunch, for example, they were built considerably taller than the length of the nave of the church to which they are attached. An examination of the wills kept in the Norfolk Record Office confirms that the expenditure on towers as a proportion of total spending on church fabric in this period is very high. This is reflected not only in the size of the buildings, but in the elaboration of their architectural and decorative motifs.

Other than size, the most striking innovation was the inclusion of west doors in the majority of tower designs. Of 165 towers built after 1375, 107 have an entrance in their western sides. This represents a significant change from earlier towers, very few of which have portals. These doors focused attention on the western faces of towers which became more elaborate and decorative. West windows were designed larger and with more ambitious tracery patterns and were often united with the doors beneath them in large framing devices such as can be seen at Salle (above) or Foulsham (below). Displays of dynastic heraldry and religious emblems, most commonly the Arms of the Passion and the monogram of Mary, were concentrated around entrances, as well as on base courses, buttresses and parapets. In short, towers were being designed in the late Middle Ages not only as bell-towers, but as the facades which their churches had hitherto lacked.
The Norfolk Rural Schools Survey
Susanna Wade Martins

As I write plans are afoot for the Norfolk Rural Schools Survey to enter a new phase as we receive English Heritage (EH) funding to help both with travelling and publication expenses and to allow me to spend more time collating and analysing the findings as part of a programme of thematic surveys of schools being currently undertaken by EH. This is an exciting development which will enable the project to proceed faster and also allow us to buy in computer help to digitize the findings. It is also encouraging to know that our work will be part of a national survey which will enhance its value as a piece of academic research.

Field work is progressing apace as a dedicated band of about 20 NHBG members fan out across the county and over 150 pro-forma are already completed. As a member said to me, one of the most enjoyable things about the project is that you never know what sort of building awaits around the corner – a gothic extravaganza, or a simple rustic ‘cottage style’ building such as the thatched school at Witton built by dowager Lady Wodehouse in 1845 (Fig. 1). While our earliest schools are often church schools located in church yards, as at Billingford, near Dereham (Fig. 2), later examples are within their own grounds. Some are dated, either by a simple plaque, or, as at Reepham, on a wide panel (Fig 3). Some of the most ornate are those built by landowners, but also some of the Board schools, built after 1870 can have architectural pretensions as at Beeston, near Mileham (Fig. 4). Full use is being made of Privy Council plans in the NRO which has kindly granted members of the team free photography if working on the survey. Some of these reveal fascinating detail, as at Beighton where a ‘library’ was situated above the porch (see front cover).

Although it is early days, we can already see a pattern emerging with one-roomed plain or simple ‘Early English gothic more typical of the earlier church schools, while later examples usually have two rooms (a ‘school’ and a ‘class’ room where smaller groups could be taught). Sometimes there was also an infants’ room. Later schools are often built in an H-plan with a school house in one wing as at Blofield and Bracon Ash (Figs 5 & 6).

After 1870 what was termed a ‘Queen Anne style’ was generally thought more suitable or board schools, breaking away from the ecclesiastical architecture of the church schools. This rather vague term generally implied a plainer approach with sash windows replacing gothic tracery, although it could well include such elements as stepped and elaborate Dutch gables as at Hindolveston (Fig. 7). After 1902, when the County Council took over responsibility for school buildings the importance of light and fresh air was stressed. New buildings had large, multi-paned windows as at Freethorpe (Fig. 8) and many older buildings had new or enlarged windows inserted.

However, it is still early days and we look forward to many more discoveries which not only may cause us to revise our ideas, but also produce more examples of fine detailing and individuality which make every school a new discovery.

We plan a field day in April, perhaps to the recently closed multi-period school at Castle Acre.

If you would like to join the group or be added to our e-mail list so that you can receive details of our activities, the please contact Susanna at scwmartins@hotmail.com.
Court Church. Shops, of course, can be found on any street, and market courts held but at Lavenham the building had no gildhalls could also have functioned as Market Halls with any trade, to which most adults belonged. It is supposed that it doesn’t have the expected large upper hall for meeting that gildhalls were Church Guilds, not associated or dining, though it does have a shop on the ground floor.

Leigh Alston pointed out that the famous gildhall at Lavenham was used as documents record the conversion of town houses for the position of an earlier market, now lost, in Winchelsea as a survey was undertaken in 1415 to determine the route of a market cross and other market buildings. Income was then derived by charging a toll to enter the market of lordly power; fine buildings overlooking the lord’s market place would enhance his prestige. Leigh Alston quoted a documentary reference to the making of market stalls which were obviously quite substantial as it was 5 weeks’ work to make them. Planks and timber were brought in, there was no wattle and daub, and the whole thing cost £6. Further, there is a reference in Colchester to stalls with a chamber above and it becomes clear that a semi-permanent stall could, in time, become a permanently occupied dwelling. There is documentary record of 3ft between permanent stalls in market wasn’t functioning. A lock-up was also needed. There are documentary references to stocks houses, presumably so that the rain would be kept off the felon while he was pelted with rotten food (I paraphrase Leigh Alston).

Market encroachment, which seems to have started as soon as a market place was formed, was discussed by various lecturers. There seemed to be a consensus that building on the market place was usually sanctioned by the landlord. As said above, markets were highly regulated and generated income for the landowner so if part of the land was unused then permission might be given for building. Adam gave the example of the row of buildings which front the market place in New Buckenham now called Oak Cottage and Yellow Cottage. These were dated 1473 by dendrochronology and are thus an advanced design being fully floored. He suggested that such buildings were physical manifestations of lordly power; fine buildings overlooking the lord’s market place would enhance his prestige. Leigh Alston quoted a documentary reference to the making of market stalls which were obviously quite substantial as it was 5 weeks’ work to make them. Planks and timber were brought in, there was no wattle and daub, and the whole thing cost £6. Further, there is a reference in Colchester to stalls with a chamber above and it becomes clear that a semi-permanent stall could, in time, become a permanently occupied dwelling. There is documentary record of 3ft between permanent stalls in Debenham and Adam spoke of the complete infill of market places such as Holt and Harleston which still have narrow passages between the houses. These houses may date from the 16th to the 20th centuries but could be on the footprint of an earlier structure. The final sort of market encroachment is the piecemeal taking of small parcels of land and Adam gave an earlier structure. The final sort of market encroachment is the piecemeal taking of small parcels of land and Adam gave the example of a shop in Diss which was extended onto the street by a small bay of 3 or 4 feet.

So, to sum up, it was a simulating, thought-provoking and enjoyable weekend being the first of this type of conference I have attended. Stamina required!

Remember:

The Group is a Member of the Vernacular Architecture Group and is willing to discuss the possibility of some financial support for any member wishing to attend a VAG conference or meeting (see page 19).

Please speak to any committee member for more information.
EDITOR

I hope that by the time you read this that Spring will really be with us and that this durance vile of soggy grey skies and bitter wind will be gone at last. In spite of the weather our winter meetings have been well attended in the new venue, which is warm and pleasant - a great success all round. The summer programme also bodes well - I’m especially pleased that the Norwich day (p. 20) which I missed, is to be repeated, as we did once have dinner at the Curat House in, I suppose, about 1960, and I well remember the wonderful atmosphere with candle light on the panelling and the smell of good food, as it might well have been in John Curat’s day. Thank you for your contributions to this issue - please keep them coming.

Alayne Fenner
Editor

A Digest of Buildings Visited Since September 2009

This is a digest of all the Norfolk houses which the NHBG has been invited to look at and to prepare brief reports on. These are ALL private houses and NO contact may be made with the owners in any way except through the Committee. This list is to inform members of the work undertaken on behalf of the Group, and will not be printed on the Internet.

Church House, Besthorpe

A two storey plus attic lobby entrance house with ogee chamfers and elaborate chamfer stops to the parlour and parlour chamber. AQ decorative plaster mantle to the parlour chamber.

Sue Brown

The Croft, Forncett St Mary

A tripartite one and a half storey house incorporating an earlier building within the parlour end. Originally with a crown post roof.

Church Farm, Alburgh

A tripartite one and a half storey house incorporating an earlier building within the parlour end. Originally with a crown post roof.

NHBG Committee

The AGM is coming around which means that the Committee has to be elected, re-elected, and new members sought. There will be vacancies coming up and Lynne Hodge (01362 620 690) would be delighted to hear from anyone who might be interested in joining. The Group has an exciting programme and many thoughts for future projects and the Committee would welcome fresh input, enthusiasm and commitment. Do think about joining us.

Adam Longcroft
Chairman/Journal Editor
School of Education and Life Long Learning, UEA, Norwich, NR4 7TJ
01603 592 261 [w] e.mail: a.longcroft@uea.ac.uk

Alayne Fenner
Deputy Chairman/Newsletter Editor
24 Mount Pleasant, Norwich, NR2 2DG
01603 452204 e.mail: alayne.fenner@btinternet.com

Lynne Hodge
Committee Secretary
Tannery House Worthing, Dereham NR20 5RH
01362 668847 e.mail: lynne@walknorfolk.co.uk

Sue Shand
Treasurer
e.mail: sushand@hotmail.co.uk

Ian Hinton
Membership Secretary
The Old Rectory, Barnby, Beccles, NR34 7QN
01508 488467 e.mail: ian.hinton222@btinternet.com

Michael and Sue Brown
Buildings
Woodlands, Bylaugh Park, Dereham NR20 4RL
01362 688 362 [h]

Mary Ash
Winter Programme/Publications
107 St Leonards Road, Norwich, NR1 4JF
01603 616285 [h] e.mail: mary.ash@ntlworld.com

Dominic Summers
Summer Events
17 Alan Road, Norwich, NR1 2BX
01603 663554 e.mail: d.summers1@btinternet.com

Rosemary Forrest
Newsletter
3 Highlunds, Costessey, NR8 5EA
01603 742 315 e.mail: forrest.rosemary@gmail.com

Richard Coulton
Little Ketlam, Low Road, Pentney, King’s Lynn PE32 1JF
01553 691 661[h]

Karen Mackie
44 Norwich Road, Tacolneston NR16 1BY
01508 488467 e.mail: karen_mackie@btinternet.com

Jackie Simpson
The Chestnuts, Church Road, Neatishead, Norfolk
01692 630639 e.mail: jackie.g.simpson@btinternet.com

Diane Barr
24 The Shrubblands, Horsford, NR10 3EL
01603 898928 e.mail: di.barr@btinternet.com

Newsletter Request

Please do not forget that we are always looking for articles, items of interest, queries, photographs, or anything which has taken your interest to include in newsletters.

Alayne Fenner: 01603 452204
Rosemary Forrest: 01603 742315
Courses & Day Schools

Medieval Domestic Cultures
Friday 24 – Sunday 26 September 2010
Rowley House, 1 Wellington Square, Oxford
Vernacular Architecture Group/Society for Medieval Archaeology

This weekend school will bring together leading experts in the fields of vernacular architecture, artefacts and documentary evidence to explore domestic life in medieval Britain. Ways of life in town and country and in different parts of Britain will be explored, and the strengths of different kinds of evidence will be assessed.

Contact: Short Courses Administrator, OUDCE, 1 Wellington Square, Oxford OX1 2J; Tel: 01865 270380 or email: ppday@conted.ox.ac.uk

Norwich HEART

Do not forget to check out Norwich HEART Website for buildings’ related events over the summer.
Heritage Open Days: 9–12 September 2010

www.heritagecity.org/hods

Book Review

The Toll Houses of Norfolk by Patrick Taylor.
(76pp, b&w photos) Published by Polystar Press ISBN 976 1 907154 02 7

Tolls began in the late seventeenth century for major roads and were formalized by the creation of the Turnpike Roads of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The need for buildings to shelter and house the toll gatherers saw the proliferation of small often interestingly-shaped buildings associated with the toll gates and bars. During the late eighteenth century there was a boom in the creation of Turnpike Trusts, particularly radiating out from Lynn and Norwich. Perhaps seeming irrelevant these days, this book draws an interesting parallel between the late sixteenth century and today in that it talks about taxes raised for road repair not being applied fairly and also failing to address the issue of ‘the polluter pays’—plus ça change!

Ian Hinton

Essex Historic Buildings Group Cressing Day School
Saturday 3 July 2010

Uncovering Medieval Houses:
The Archaeology of Houses

Cost: £20 (EHBG members £18), lunch extra at £8.
Bookings to Ian Greenfield, Yew Tree Cottage, Stanbrook, Thaxted, Essex, CM6 2NL Tel: 01371 830416

Suffolk Historic Buildings Group Lavenham Day School
Saturday 26 June 2010
‘Suffolk Farmsteads & Farming from Medieval Times—19th C’

Changes in farming practices and the impact on these on far buildings.
Cost: £32.50
Bookings to Jane Gosling, SHBG, 1 Lady Street, Lavenham CO10 9RA
Tel: 01787 247646

If anyone would like to go to the above meetings please let Rosemary Forrest (01603 742315/ forrest.rosemary@gmail.com) know and she will endeavour to arrange lift sharing.

www.heritagecity.org/hods
Summer Events 2010

Once again, the summer programme has been put together to provide a catholic range of treats for NHBG members. In the west of the county there is Ryston Hall, a country squire’s residence of the late seventeenth century built by the important gentleman architect Sir Roger Pratt for himself and later remodelled by Sir John Soane, amongst others. To the north-west of Norwich a tour of Foulsham with Andrew Macnair will give an insight into the rebuilding of a small market town after a devastating fire. The AGM at Pennoyer’s school in Pulham St Mary, with a tour of some of the important buildings of the village, should attract a good crowd, especially as the famous scones will be available. Later in the year we return to the Pulhams, this time to Manor Farm in Pulham Market, where Michael and Sue Brown will provide expert tours of a little-altered sixteenth century yeoman’s house (see pp 8-11 of this Newsletter). Our church day takes in a couple of magnificent towers with extravagant flushwork decoration either side of the Norfolk – Suffolk border, together with a Tudor guildhall, a sixteenth century farmhouse converted into a seventeenth century puritan chapel and a charming historic pub. On top of all this we are repeating two of last year’s trips by popular demand. I hope you find something in the programme to interest you and look forward to seeing you at sometime in the next few months.

Norwich Miscellany (Repeat)

Date: Saturday 15 May 2010
Time: 10.45 am – 4.30ish
Meet: The Greenhouse, Bethel Street, Norwich
Cost: £10.00
Contact: Carol Nutt
01379 640007

Ryston Hall & Church, Ryston, nr Downham Market

Date: Thursday 20 May 2010
Time: 10.00 am
Meet: in front of the Hall
Cost: £12.00
Contact: Peter Craness
pscraness@hotmail.co.uk
01603 300395

Foulsham before and after the great fire of 1770

Date: Thursday 3 June 2010
Time: 10.15 for 10.30 am
Meet: Town Square
Cost: £12.00
Contact: Lynne Hodge
01362 668847
lynne@walknorfolk.co.uk

Barningham Hall (Repeat)

Date: Wednesday 30 June 2010
Time: 10.00am – 12.00pm
Meet: Barningham Hall, nr Matlaske
Cost: £10.00
Contact: Dominic Summers
01603 663554
d.summersl@btinternet.com

Ashtree and Elmtree Farms, and St Mary’s Church, Pulham St Mary, south Norfolk

Date: Saturday 10 July 2010
Time: 2.00 pm – 4.00 pm
Meet: Ashtree Farm
Note: MAP with AGM papers
Cost: Nil
Contact: Rosemary Forrest
01603 742315
forrest.rosemary@gmail.com
4.00 – 5.00
Tea and Scones will be served at Pennoyer’s School, Pulham St Mary
MAP with AGM papers

Annual General Meeting
5.00 pm
Pennoyer’s School

Pulham St Mary

Church Day: Laxfield, Walpole and Redenhall

Date: Saturday 14 August 2010
Time: 10.30am – 4.30pm
Meet: Laxfield Church
Cost: £10.00
Contact: Ian Hinton
01502 475287
ian.hinton222@btinternet.com

A visit to Manor Farm, Pulham Market (see pages 8-11), south Norfolk
by kind permission of The Landmark Trust

Date: Monday 13 September 2010
Time: 2.00 pm to 5.00 pm
Meet: Manor Farm
Cost: £5.00 Members Only
Note: Optional guided tours at 2.15 pm and 3.30 pm
Bring indoor shoes
Contact: Susan Brown
01362 688362

For full details of the summer events please see individual sheets