

**Objections from owners and occupiers**

Ref	Consultee	Consultee's response	NWLDC officer comments
1732	Householder Old School, Belton	<p>Emails 18 September and 8 October. Acknowledged the property's historic interest but objected to its inclusion on the local list. Described the property as "not in a good state of repair" and advised that they "would hate to be stuck with the existing windows". Asserted that inclusion on the list would be 'very restrictive', incur 'extra costs' and 'devalue my property'.</p> <p>Email 18 September. Offered corrections to the draft list entry.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted.</b> Generally the issues raised by the householder are not relevant to an assessment of the property's architectural and historic interest. Inclusion of the property on the local list would not affect its permitted development rights, nor would it hinder the proper maintenance of the property.</p> <p><b>Accepted.</b> The draft list entry has been amended in accordance with the advice.</p>

Draft list of local heritage assets: Summary of public consultation responses

Objections from owners and occupiers, continued

Ref	Consultee	Consultee's response	NWLDC officer comments
1857	Householder Swepstone Hall	<p>Emails 19 September, 20 September and 10 October. Objected to the inclusion of the property on the local list. Offered evidence that the property has been “significantly altered”. Referred to alterations including a single storey rear extension (11/00842/FUL), replacement windows and the removal of chimneys.</p> <p>Advised that the property was “built in 1861 ... before Sir Arthur Blomfield was engaged by the church”. Requested a “retraction” regarding the above.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted.</b> Officers considered the extension ‘in keeping with the existing dwelling’. The property has been altered, but the alterations are not substantial and the property has retained its character. On this basis the property should be included on the local list.</p> <p><b>Partly accepted.</b> There is documentary evidence that the property was erected between 1866 and 1877 but there is no evidence to confirm Blomfield’s involvement. The discussion document and the draft list entry have been amended accordingly.</p>

Draft list of local heritage assets: Summary of public consultation responses

Objections from owners and occupiers, continued

Ref	Consultee	Consultee's response	NWLDC officer comments
1793	Agent 31 Main Street, Osgathorpe	<p>Emails 21 September and 6 October. Objected to the inclusion of the client's property on the list on the grounds that the property has been substantially altered and extended.</p> <p>The property was extended c.1955. The agent asserted that the extension was "substantial", having "doubled the size of the property". He asserted that the property has been "altered beyond recognition". He referred to the addition of render, the alteration of window openings and the alteration of the front boundary wall.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted.</b> The extensions may be large but they have not "doubled the size of the property" and they remain subservient to the principal building. Officers have been unable to substantiate the agent's assertions about the alteration of the property. While the property has been altered, the alterations are not substantial and the property has retained its character. On this basis the property should be included on the local list.</p>
1526	Agent Belfry Hotel and Gate House, Whitwick	<p>Email 9 October. Advised that his client "would not wish their property to be included on the list at this time".</p> <p>Email 16 October. Advised that a consultant was preparing a 'representation' against the inclusion of the property on the list.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted.</b> No 'representation' has been received and the agent has not substantiated his objection. Officers consider that the property has a degree of historic interest that would warrant its inclusion on the list.</p>

Draft list of local heritage assets: Summary of public consultation responses

Objections from owners and occupiers, continued

Ref	Consultee	Consultee's response	NWLDC officer comments
1167	Solicitor 71 Top Street, Appleby Magna	<p>Letter and enclosure 10 October. Letter objects to the inclusion of their client's property on the local list. Describes renovation "so extensive that [the building] no longer retains a substantial proportion of its original fabric".</p> <p>Enclosure refers to "five different types of bricks" used in "the chapel and extensions" and "three different types of slate on the roof". Describes a front porch (76/0526/P) and a single storey rear extension (80/1043/P), the latter having "involved removal of about 3.5m of the original [external] wall". Refers to other external alterations including new windows.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted.</b> The property has been altered, but the alterations are not substantial and the property has retained its character. On this basis the property should be included on the local list.</p>

Draft list of local heritage assets: Summary of public consultation responses

Objections from owners and occupiers, continued

Ref	Consultee	Consultee's response	NWLDC officer comments
1757	<p>Manager Old Vicarage, Castle Donington</p>	<p>Online form 25 October. Objected to the inclusion of their property on the local list. Asserted that the property "is not a rare example of the type". Asserted that "it does [not] offer group value" and that "it can only be glimpsed from the street".</p> <p>Asserted that the property "had extensive rebuilding" following "a major fire", including "new windows [and] brickwork". Highlighted "ground-to-roof feature windows, which are not sympathetic". Referred to "a number of extensions" including a two-storey side extension (06/00269/FUL). Asserted that the gates and piers "were built by the maintenance team".</p> <p>Email 19 November. Asserted that the list entry "is inviting parties to enter the grounds to see it" and that this raises issues of health, safety and security.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted.</b> Some of the issues raised (including the fact that the property is not generally visible from the street) are not relevant to an assessment of the property's architectural and historic interest. In terms of the perceived risk of trespass, a suitable disclaimer has been added to our website and to each of the four discussion documents.</p> <p>A field assessment did not identify evidence of "extensive rebuilding". Officers considered that the extensions permitted in 2006 were "appropriate" in their scale and proportions. The gates and piers were not "built by the maintenance team" but sensitively relocated with the District Council's permission (97/0999/P). The property has been altered, but the alterations are not substantial and the property has retained its character. On this basis the property should be included on the local list.</p>

Draft list of local heritage assets: Summary of public consultation responses

Objections from owners and occupiers, continued

Ref	Consultee	Consultee's response	NWLDC officer comments
1816	Secretary Wesleyan Reform Chapel Griffydam	Email 2 January 2019. Objected to the inclusion of the property on the local list "if we were unable to obtain planning permission for regular maintenance or if we were to request permission to make improvements and end up having a fight". Referred to planning applications 07/01422/FUL and 13/01011/FUL.	<b>Not accepted.</b> Inclusion of the property on the local list would not affect its permitted development rights, nor would it hinder the proper maintenance of the property. The Local Planning Authority should resist development proposals that would harm the significance of heritage assets; in 2013 the council considered the property to be a "non-designated heritage asset".

Draft list of local heritage assets: Summary of public consultation responses

**Support from owners and occupiers**

Ref	Consultee	Consultee's response	NWLDC officer comments
1762	Householder 51 Barroon, Castle Donington	Email 22 September. Supported the inclusion of their property on the Local List.  Offered corrections to the draft list entry.	Noted.  <b>Accepted.</b> The draft list entry has been amended in accordance with the advice.
1271 1342 1909	Team Manager NWLDC Asset Management	Email 4 October. Supported the inclusion of NWLDC assets on the local list: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• St James Churchyard, Hugglescote</li> <li>• Cemetery, Church Lane, Whitwick</li> <li>• War Memorial, North St, Whitwick</li> </ul>	Noted.
1502	Custodian Ebenezer Baptist Chapel	Email 5 October. Supported the inclusion of their property on the Local List.	Noted.

Draft list of local heritage assets: Summary of public consultation responses

Support from owners and occupiers, continued

Ref	Consultee	Consultee's response	NWLDC officer comments
1854	Householder Old Rectory, Coleorton	Email 9 October. 'Appreciated' the inclusion of their property on the Local List but 'reluctant' to be "prevented from making future alterations to the property".	Noted. The issue raised is not relevant to an assessment of the property's architectural and historic interest. Development of the property would need to accord with policy S3 of the local plan ('countryside') regardless of whether the property was included on the local list.
1813	Householder Top Chapel House, Worthington	Email 10 October. Made no objection to the inclusion of their property on the local list.	Noted.
1172	Custodian Measham Village Hall	Online form 11 October. Made no objection to the inclusion of their property on the local list.  Offered corrections to the draft list entry.	Noted.  <b>Accepted.</b> The draft list entry has been amended in accordance with the advice.

Draft list of local heritage assets: Summary of public consultation responses

Support from owners and occupiers, continued

Ref	Consultee	Consultee's response	NWLDC officer comments
1813	Circuit Treasurer Top Chapel House, Worthington	Email 18 October. Acknowledged that the Sunday school "can be mentioned ... if the converted chapel is included on the listing". Advised against "including the school room ... on a listing" because "it is of no architectural interest". Queried the description of the former chapel as 'Wesleyan'.	Noted. It is proposed to include the Sunday school on the local list in association with the chapel rather than 'in its own right'. Before 1932 the building was a Wesleyan Methodist chapel. In 1932 the Wesleyan Methodists united with two other denominations as the Methodist Church.

Draft list of local heritage assets: Summary of public consultation responses

**General support**

Ref	Consultee	Consultee's response	NWLDC officer comments
	Cllr Terri Eynon Hugglescote & St Mary's	Email 28 September. Described the draft list as "comprehensive"; pleased that it contained "many of my own favourite buildings".	Noted.
	Clerk Kegworth Parish Council	Email 2 October. The Parish Council "has no additions or amendments to make".	Noted.
	East Midlands Region Historic England	Email 27 September. Historic England supports the compilation of local lists generally. Welcomed our 'thematic approach'. Welcomed the focus upon war memorials and recommended that local list entries should be "submitted for consideration as part of the national list".	Noted. Members are invited to support an application to add the war memorials at Measham and Ravenstone to the national heritage list.
1271	Member of the public Castle Street, Whitwick	Online form 26 October. Supported the inclusion of Whitwick Cemetery and lodge on the local list.	Noted.

Draft list of local heritage assets: Summary of public consultation responses

**Corrections to list entries**

Ref	Consultee	Consultee's response	NWLDC officer comments
1174	Custodian Kegworth Baptist Chapel	Online form 21 September. Offered corrections to the draft list entry. Asserted that "the main part of the chapel was built in 1815 and a side extension was built in 1865".	<b>Not accepted.</b> Stell (1986) <i>Inventory of nonconformist chapels</i> says that "only the west wall is recognisably of an early C19 date; the south front is entirely of 1865". Field assessment supports this conclusion.
1000	Team Rector St John's Churchyard, Coleorton	Email 26 September. Offered corrections to the draft list entry.	<b>Accepted.</b> The list entry has been amended in accordance with the advice.
1345	Householder Church Hall, Heather	Email 4 October. Offered corrections to the format of the list entry.	<b>Accepted.</b> The format has been amended in accordance with the advice.
1918	Householder 4 Dennis Street, Hugglescote	Meeting 15 October. Offered corrections to the draft list entry.	<b>Accepted.</b> The list entry has been amended in accordance with the advice.

**Nominations**

Ref	Consultee	Consultee's response	NWLDC officer comments
1666	Friends of Thringstone	Email 22 September. Nominated the former Wesleyan Methodist Chapel in Thringstone for inclusion on the local list. Advised that the chapel was erected in 1872.	<b>Not accepted.</b> The classical style remained popular for nonconformist chapels until about 1870; after that date "gothic was favoured" (Historic England, 2017). The chapel at Thringstone is the earliest use of the gothic style locally but it does not have qualities of age that would justify its inclusion on the local list.
1668	Friends of Thringstone	Email 5 October. Nominated Thringstone House for inclusion on the list of education buildings; described the property as an 'institute'.	<b>Partly accepted.</b> Thringstone House may be suitable for inclusion on the local list. Ordnance Survey maps describe the property as a 'club' and the property should be considered as part of a thematic assessment of recreational buildings.

Draft list of local heritage assets: Summary of public consultation responses

Nominations, continued

Ref	Consultee	Consultee's response	NWLDC officer comments
	Deputy Clerk Ashby Town Council	Letter 23 October. Supported "the inclusion of the assets listed".	Noted.
	Deputy Clerk Ashby Town Council  Ashby Civic Society	<p>Email from the Civic Society 9 October and letter from the Town Council 23 October. Recommended that the local list should be 'extended' to include a list of about 100 "buildings considered to have a positive impact on the streetscape" appended to our appraisal of the Ashby conservation area (2001).</p> <p>The Civic Society was invited to submit further information regarding three buildings on the list (see right) but did not do so.</p>	<p><b>Partly accepted.</b> The majority of buildings on the list do not appear relevant to the four thematic lists under consideration. Three buildings appear relevant as follows:</p> <p><i>Vicarage, Upper Church Street:</i> The vicarage was assessed for inclusion on the list of suburban and small country houses but considered 'not suitable for inclusion'.</p> <p><i>Christadelphian Hall, Union Passage:</i> The hall occupies a terrace of four Edwardian houses. It is not suitable for inclusion on the list of places of worship.</p> <p><i>Teacher's house, Leicester Road:</i> The house is suitable for inclusion on the list of education buildings and this should be pursued when the list is reviewed.</p>