

**Kegworth: Potential conservation area**

## Summary of public consultation responses

Consultee	Consultee's response	NWLDC officer comments
Incumbent Kegworth Baptist Chapel	Online response 15 November. Supported the proposed conservation area and considered that the boundary would "reflect the area of interest". Pleased that the council had recognised "the contribution of the places of worship to the heritage of the village".	Agreed.
Householder 16 Dragwell	Consultation form received 19 December. Supported the proposed conservation area.	Agreed.
Householder 38 London Road	Online comment 22 December. Supported the proposed conservation area. Advised that the draft appraisal should refer to the impact of a "large influx of students" and "the conversion of large houses in the village to HMOs".	<b>Partly agreed.</b> The rapid appraisal has been revised to indicate the total population – and the student population – of the parish. A detailed character appraisal may assess the positive and negative impacts of the student population upon the special interest of the historic core.

Consultee	Consultee's response	NWLDC officer comments
<p>Householder 24 Market Place</p>	<p>Online comment 10 December. Supported the proposed conservation area and considered the boundary to be appropriate.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>
<p>Householder 31 Nottingham Road</p>	<p>Online comment 17 December. Supported the proposed conservation area. Generally supported the draft boundary and draft appraisal.</p> <p>Recommended that 2 to 6 Church Gate should be "excluded from the conservation order or identified as opportunities for redevelopment", because their demolition would "improve the views of the church".</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p><b>Not agreed.</b> The draft appraisal notes that development of these properties "may affect views of the church spire". 4 &amp; 6 Church Gate is an eighteenth century building. We consider that it is well preserved and contributes positively to the character of the area.</p> <p>We consider that 2 Church Gate does not contribute positively to the character of the area, but generally the draft appraisal does not identify individual buildings of this kind. 2 to 6 Church Gate form part of an area that has special interest generally; for that reason it would not be appropriate to exclude the properties from the proposed boundary.</p>

Consultee	Consultee's response	NWLDC officer comments
Principal Adviser Historic England	Email 23 November. Advised that Historic England only offers advice on "designations of clearly national importance, or where there is a wider strategic dimension". Considered that the council's conservation officer was "ideally placed to provide detailed expert advice on this designation".	Agreed.
Conservation Adviser Victorian Society	<p>Email 23 November. Generally supported the council's "commitment to best managing [its] heritage assets".</p> <p>Emphasised "the significant contribution made ... by Victorian buildings" and considered it "remiss" that the definition of special interest should "exclude such a significant aspect of Kegworth's special architectural and historic interest".</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>Noted. A full character appraisal would describe the Victorian contribution in more detail. Otherwise we consider that the rapid appraisal describes the Victorian contribution to the village in proportion to its significance. The proposed boundary includes two high status Victorian houses ('Alton Lodge' and 'The Wymeshead') and these are described in some detail.</p>
Chair Kegworth Museum	Online comment 19 December. Supported the proposed conservation area. "Fully supported" the draft boundary and draft appraisal.	Agreed.

Consultee	Consultee's response	NWLDC officer comments
<p>Clerk Kegworth Parish Council</p>	<p>Email 21 December. Supported the proposed conservation area as it would help to encourage sympathetic development and maintain “the character of the village centre”.</p> <p>Advised that the proposed boundary should be extended to include land on the east side of Packington Hill, including the site of the Oddfellows PH, as development of the latter may have a “deleterious effect” on surrounding properties.</p> <p>Advised that 13 Dragwell “is worth protecting” and that it “has been empty for some years”.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p><b>Not agreed.</b> The District Council would expect development of the Oddfellows site to reflect local identity and conserve the setting of heritage assets. Local plan policies D1 and HE1 would be relevant. Land on the east side of Packington Hill comprises a mix of post-byelaw and post-WW2 development as well as the Oddfellows site; generally we consider that it does not have special interest.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
<p>Member of the public Station Road</p>	<p>Online response 16 November. Supported the proposed conservation area and considered that the boundary would be “appropriate”. Found the appraisal to be “very good”.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>

Consultee	Consultee's response	NWLDC officer comments
Member of the public Sideley	<p>Online response 26 November. Supported the proposed conservation area.</p> <p>Noted that the bypass would not benefit the village centre unless alterations are made to existing roads. Otherwise "many drivers will find the present route through the village shorter and more convenient than using the bypass".</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
Member of the public	<p>Comment made at parish council meeting 5 December. Advised that the proposed boundary should be extended to include Victorian properties on Derby Road. Advised that these properties present an "entrance" to the historic core of the village.</p>	<p><b>Not agreed.</b> Kegworth's historic core has special qualities of age that would justify its designation as a conservation area. Properties on Derby Road do not share these qualities; we consider that they do not have special architectural or historic interest.</p> <p>Alton Lodge and the Wymeshead are Victorian properties with special historic interest; they have been included in the conservation area.</p>

Consultee	Consultee's response	NWLDC officer comments
Member of the public Sibson Drive	Online comment 9 December. Supported the proposed conservation area and considered that the boundary "looks about right". Felt that it would be "tremendous" if the conservation area could facilitate the regeneration of the village centre.	Agreed.
Member of the public Derby Road	<p>Online comment 21 December. Supported the proposed conservation area. "Fully supported" the draft boundary and draft appraisal.</p> <p>Noted that the bypass would offer "an opportunity to reclaim our major communal spaces from the car".</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
Member of the public Derby Road	Online comment 22 December. Supported the proposed conservation area. Considered the draft boundary to be "very carefully thought out and entirely appropriate". "Welcomed" the draft appraisal and noted the contribution that trees make to the character of the village.	Agreed.

Consultee	Consultee's response	NWLDC officer comments
<p>Member of the public Borough Street</p>	<p>Online comment 22 December. Advised that "consideration of the older buildings in Kegworth is long overdue". Generally supported the draft boundary and draft appraisal.</p> <p>Advised that the proposed boundary should be extended to include properties at the north end of Borough Street, including their own property. Referred to several pre-Victorian properties here.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p><b>Not agreed.</b> The north end of Borough Street contains some pre-Victorian properties and some may be suitable for inclusion on the list of local heritage assets. However, generally the north end of the street comprises a mix of post-byelaw and post-WW2 development; generally it does not have special interest.</p>
<p>Member of the public Melton Mowbray</p>	<p>Telephone call 21 December. Expressed "complete and total opposition" to the proposed conservation area, as it would give the local authority additional controls over works to trees.</p>	<p><b>Not agreed.</b> We consider that additional controls are justified in the interests of conserving the special interest of the area and in the interests of public amenity.</p>