

CHARNWOOD BOROUGH COUNCIL

CHARNWOOD CONSERVATION AREA REVIEW

Report on Consultation

Head of Planning & Regeneration

14/03/2019

Q1 Do you feel that providing greater protection to Charnwood's heritage is important?

Answered: 10 Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	100%	10
No	0%	0
Total		10

	Additional Comments Received	Response of the Head of Planning & Regeneration
1	Due to the amount of development that is happening and proposed in the area.	Noted.
2	In terms of preserving the heritage whilst allowing sympathetic new build which enhances the street scene.	Noted.

Q2 There are a number of areas within the villages that will be included in the new proposed conservation areas. Do you feel we have got these correct?

Answered: 10 Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	70.00%	7
No	30.00%	3
Total		10

	Additional Comments Received	Response of the Head of Planning & Regeneration
1	In Beeby, I would like to see the fields at 2, 3 & 6 included. The fields make up the distinct nature of the village and should be protected. I would also propose the field at the back of the cottages at 5.	Field at 2 has been reassessed and the conservation area boundary has been amended to include this field. The fields at 3 and 6 do not display distinct historic evidence of past village activity; they do however contribute to the setting of the conservation area.
2	Queniborough, the new Conservation Area includes an additional area at Coppice Lane adjacent to the Old Hall, as well as the original section adjacent to the Primary School. Given the current and on going issues with parking and access to the school it may be worth reviewing the extent of the Conservation Area here and removing Coppice Lane completely from the area. No 1 Coppice Lane is a mixture of Victorian with 20 th Century additions to both sides including outbuilding. I believe that the line of the new Conservation Area cuts through an on going development at Manor Farm opposite the church?	1. Coppice Lane – Noted. It is considered that the features on both sides of the lane contribute significantly to the character. Inclusion within the conservation area will not prevent parking issues being resolved. 2. The boundary at Manor Farm follows historic field boundaries and also the limits to development

Q3 Do you know of any reason why any of these areas should not be included within the new proposed boundaries?

Answered: 10 Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	20%	2
No	80%	8
Total		10

	Additional Comments Received	Response of the Head of Planning & Regeneration
1	Please see question 2 above. The issue of the school parking and traffic needs to be followed through, currently parking on Coppice Lane by the school could prevent the access of emergency vehicles to Coppice Lane and Coppice Farm properties!	Inclusion within the conservation area will not prevent parking issues being resolved.
2	I agree with the principle of including properties in the conservation to protect the street scene. However buildings (eg. Garages) that are behind the houses and therefore not in view from the street should not be included. These are on private property and have no impact on the street scene, so are of no relevance to the conservation area.	It is good practice to attempt to avoid, wherever possible, arbitrary boundaries and to include the whole parcel of land. This generally aids landowners with future management of their land/property.

Q4 There are a number of areas within the villages that will be omitted from the new proposed conservation areas. Do you feel we have got these correct?

Answered: 9 Skipped: 1

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	33.33%	3
No	66.66%	6
Total		9

	Additional Comments Received	Response of the Head of Planning & Regeneration
1	Within the Beeby Conservation Area. Area 2 field to the east of Beeby Manor should be included.	Field at 2 has been reassessed and the conservation area boundary has been amended to include this field.
2	Our response is regarding the BEEBY conservation area review. It follows a meeting we have had with the Chairman of the village meeting whose views we fully endorse. In the 2005 review 6 areas were considered as possible additional inclusions. Only 1 of these areas has been included in the current review,	Field at 2 has been reassessed and the conservation area boundary has been amended to include this field. The field at 6 does not display distinct historic evidence of past village activity; it does however contribute to the setting of the conservation area.

Charnwood Conservation Areas Boundary Review

	Additional Comments Received	Response of the Head of Planning & Regeneration
	this being area 1 the field north east of the church. We agree fully with the inclusion of this area but feel that other areas should be included. The area 2 which is the field to the east of Beeby Manor, Fox End and Lane End Farm should be included. This field is of great historical importance in that it includes the original medieval settlements and has ridge and furrow from the times of the open field system. Also the view looking south from this field looks across the whole of the centre of the village to the fields beyond and shows the nature of the village in its rural setting. Area 6 which is the strip field to the west of Scruptoft Lane could also be included since this again, when viewed from the centre of the village by the church, shows the nature of the village in its rural setting, and leads the eye out of the village along Scruptoft Lane.	
3	Beeby - See previous points, I would like to see the fields at 2, 3 and 6 included.	Field at 2 has been reassessed and the conservation area boundary has been amended to include this field. The fields at 3 and 6 do not display distinct historic evidence of past village activity; they do however contribute to the setting of the conservation areas.
4	Queniborough - From the presentation by your officers it has been confirmed that no areas of the existing Conservation Area have been omitted.	Correct.
5	50 Wide Street is part of the Old Forge Close development which is due to be omitted from the CA. However according to the proposal the property remains included in the CA. Also the property in the proposal is dated at pre 1884 when in fact it was built in 1992 – significant error.	This has been reassessed and the conservation area boundary adjusted to exclude No. 50 Wide Street.

Q5 Do you know of any reason why any of these areas should stay within the new proposed boundaries?

Answered: 9 Skipped: 1

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	55.55%	5
No	44.44%	4
	Total	9

Additional Comments Received	Response of the Head of Planning & Regeneration
------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------

Charnwood Conservation Areas Boundary Review

	Additional Comments Received	Response of the Head of Planning & Regeneration
1	Beeby - Field 2. The opening photograph of the appraisal and the view of field 1 shown from the South Croxton approach to the village cannot be seen by anyone in a car or walking along the road. The photos have been taken by getting onto the extremely overgrown verge and peering over the hedge. The view the appraisal seems to like can easily be seen however from the public footpath that runs through field 2 (Field to the East of Beeby Manor). In fact this provides the best vista of the village and it was put forward to be included in the 2005 appraisal.	Field at 2 has been reassessed and the conservation area boundary has been amended to include this field.
2	Beeby – To protect the unusual nature of the village	Noted.
3	You should include Coppice Lane in Queniborough as it is an area of natural character.	The proposed boundary to the conservation area includes Coppice Lane up to Queniborough Brook.

Q6 Are you aware of any other areas within these villages that you feel should be considered to be included in the conservation areas?

Answered: 10 Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	60.00%	6
No	40.00%	4
Total		10

	Additional Comments Received	Response of the Head of Planning & Regeneration
1	Beeby - Field 2. The opening photograph of the appraisal and the view of field 1 shown from the South Croxton approach to the village cannot be seen by anyone in a car or walking along the road. The photos have been taken by getting onto the extremely overgrown verge and peering over the hedge. The view the appraisal seems to like can easily be seen however from the public footpath that runs through field 2 (Field to the East of Beeby Manor). In fact this provides the best vista of the village and it was put forward to be included in the 2005 appraisal.	Field at 2 has been reassessed and the conservation area boundary has been amended to include this field.
2	I have only looked at my own village, Queniborough and there are no omissions here.	Correct.
3	As per above for Beeby, I would like to see areas 2,3 and 6 also included	Field at 2 has been reassessed and the conservation area boundary has been amended to include this field. The fields at 3 and 6 do not display distinct

Charnwood Conservation Areas Boundary Review

		historic evidence of past village activity; they do however contribute to the setting of the conservation area.
4	At the back of The Grange in Queniborough near to Barkby Road.	
5	Queniborough - I believe that further investigation of the village setting from the South of village should be surveyed and investigated, there are a number of tracks and footpaths passing through this area, some of which are shown on the 1903 map.	Green areas (and features such as footpaths) that specifically contribute to the special character of the area <i>and</i> have a historic connection to it have been included. Guidance on the designation of conservation areas identifies that green areas should not be included for simply being green spaces. The NPPF emphasises that <i>'When considering the designation of conservation areas, local planning authorities should ensure that an area justifies such status because of its special architectural or historic interest and that the concept of conservation is not devalued through the designation of areas that lack special interest'</i> .
6	Hathern – At the public meeting, a number of locations were highlighted which are not included at present, i.e. Swifts Sock Factory. The Charnwood Borough Councilor representative noted the full list	These areas have all been assessed and, where considered that they meet the criteria, have been included within the conservation area. Specifically, the proposed boundary to the conservation area has been adjusted to include Swifts Sock Factory.
7	The Old Sock Factory, Hathern	The proposed boundary to the conservation area has been adjusted to include the Old Sock Factory.

Q7 If you have any views on a particular part of the proposal then please use the comments box below

Answered: 4 Skipped: 6

	General Responses	Response Of The Head of Planning & Regeneration
1	Thank you for taking the time to host the meeting in Hathern on Thursday 31 st January. Your delivery was very thorough and clear. Much appreciated. At this meeting we discussed a specific property and I thank you for agreeing to remove the garage from within the newly proposed conservation area – instead running the new boundary down the side of the house. The garage is not visible from the road, so does not impact the street scene and therefore should not be included in the conservation remit. For administration purposes please also note that the garage is labelled as '37' on your plans. Also '35 The Green' is listed in two sections of your proposal. Section 5 includes the house (not garage, as detailed above) in the new conservation (sic). Section 4 omits it – however	This land has been reassessed and the conservation area boundary adjusted to exclude the garage.

the properties shown in this section are Green Hill, not The Green. Just to ensure that all those concerned are notified and consulted correctly.	Noted.
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------

General comments received by other means, i.e. Public Presentation Meetings, email etc.

	General Comments	Response Of The Head of Planning & Regeneration
1	<p>Barkby & Barkby Thorpe – To include the small fields north of Beeby Road up to the current limits of the conservation area. These small fields provide the setting of the village from the Beeby Road and are integral to the rural “feel” of the village. Tracks across these fields also provide access to the houses along the brook. These fields which are all down to pasture deserve a degree of protection which the conservation area can provide.</p> <p>Pair of houses to the west of Area 4 should be included.</p>	<p>These fields have been reassessed and the conservation area boundary has been amended to include them.</p> <p>These houses, although of some historic significance are considered geographically too remote from the conservation area.</p>
2	<p>Beeby – Area 2 should be included as this field is of great historical importance in that it includes evidence of the original medieval settlement.</p> <p>Area 6 has the potential to be included since the view from the centre of the village leads the eye naturally out of the village and highlights the compact nature of the village in a valley surrounded by fields.</p> <p>In addition Area 4 should be considered for inclusion because of its close proximity to the village and encouraging any sympathetic development of the site. Anyone approaching from the west would see this site in Beeby first and then beyond that to the village.</p>	<p>Area 2 has been reassessed and the conservation area boundary has been amended to include this field.</p> <p>Areas 4 and 6 do not display distinct historic evidence of past village activity; they do however contribute to the setting of the conservation area.</p>
3	<p>Hathern – A number of buildings/areas for inclusion were suggested by the Hathern Local History Society, these include:</p> <p>Swift’s hosiery factory, Gladstone Street</p> <p>Naws Cottage, Tanners Lane</p> <p>No 51 Loughborough Rd., + The Dewdrop Inn</p>	<p>The proposed boundary to the conservation area has been adjusted to include Swifts Sock Factory.</p> <p>The remainder of the buildings/areas are considered to be either too detached from the</p>

Charnwood Conservation Areas Boundary Review

	<p>Area around The Leys, including the Baptist Chapel, 19 The Leys and a number of properties along Loughborough Road.</p> <p>Nos. 5 to 27 Shepshed Road Properties to the north of the current conservation area, nos. 21, 29 and 31 Derby Road and The Kings Arms</p>	<p>conservation area or the individual buildings have been altered to such an extent that they no longer contain sufficient historic or architectural detail that meets the criteria required for inclusion.</p>
4	<p>Queniborough – Representation received from P&DG Planning Consultants on behalf of the owners of Queniborough Old Hall. Strongly presented objection on the inclusion of the Old Hall and its grounds within the conservation area.</p>	<p>Queniborough Old Hall is a grade II* listed building and it is important that significant listed buildings within the village are included in the conservation area. Including the Hall within the conservation area will not introduce any additional planning controls other than for the protection of trees. The grounds of the Hall contain a significant number of trees and in order to reduce any administrative burden on the landowner it is proposed that a long term tree management plan be agreed to cover future tree works.</p>
5	<p>Thurcaston – Concerns over the omission of Area 3 and 5. The omission of these two areas will lead to the degradation of the character and appearance of the conservation area.</p> <p>Request to review the area to the north of Area 4 around Lanesborough Wood.</p> <p>Request that the village historian be provided with details of the review.</p>	<p>These areas have been reassessed and the conservation area boundary has been amended to include them.</p> <p>This area has been assessed but it is considered that a) the area is too detached from the conservation areas and b) there does not appear to be any features of special architectural or historic quality for inclusion.</p> <p>Noted – action carried out.</p>