

### Castle Donington conservation area: Character appraisal and boundary review

#### Summary of public consultation responses

Consultee	Consultee's response	NWLDC officer comments
<p>Manager Millhouse Business Centre</p>	<p>Telephone conversation 5 February. Supported the removal of their land from the conservation area – “absolutely fine with that”.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Resident 16 Mount Pleasant</p>	<p>Email 5 February. Objected to the removal of their property from the conservation area. Houses on Mount Pleasant “have retained their original character”. Designation “adds value to my property” and ensures that “neighbours cannot make any big or ugly alterations”.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted.</b> The Council should consider whether properties on Mount Pleasant contribute to an area of special interest. We should not consider other matters such as property values or the effect that removal would have upon permitted development rights.</p> <p>Generally the conservation area boundary reflects the extent of the village c.1840. The conservation area is dominated by buildings erected before c.1884. In contrast properties on Mount Pleasant were erected after c.1884. The boundary review describes them as “standard post-byelaw houses that do not contribute to the significance of the conservation area”.</p>

<p>Resident 3 Apiary Gate</p>	<p>Online consultation response 6 February. Advised that the character appraisal should contain “more detail on individual properties”.</p> <p>Asked “who pays” for the enhancement opportunities; for instance regarding the redevelopment of the church hall “the church will never pay nor the council”.</p> <p>Advised that the draft boundary review “seems reasonable”.</p> <p>Emails 7 and 13 February. Advised that “more should be done to control the commercial properties of Borough Street and Market Street”. Noted the “new façade” at 35 Borough Street. Noted “the studding you can see through [the] windows” at 1 Market Street. Noted “overflowing bins”.</p>	<p><b>Partly accepted.</b> The revised document notes that Ryder (1997) contains a detailed gazetteer of historic buildings in the conservation area. See paragraph 3.2. Otherwise Historic England (2019) advises that a character appraisal should describe the “general identity and character of the conservation area”.</p> <p>Noted. The NPPF advises that “local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within conservation areas ... to enhance or better reveal their significance” (paragraph 206).</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. The character appraisal notes the negative contribution made by 35 Borough Street and 1 Market Street. See paragraphs 5.20 and 5.42. The local planning authority cannot control internal alterations to unlisted buildings, regardless of whether those alterations are visible from the street. Generally trade waste bins do not affect the character of the ‘Borough Street and Market Place’ character zone.</p>
-----------------------------------	---	---

<p>Cllr Tony Saffell Castle Ward</p>	<p>Email 11 February. Generally agreed “with the issues you have raised” and hoped that the character appraisal and the Shop Fronts &amp; Advertisements SPD “will give more control over what is allowed to happen in our conservation area”.</p> <p>5.37: “Mention of ‘Manor House’ as a character zone is confusing for locals because our manor house was always Donington Hall.”</p> <p>6.13: “Gritstone kerbs are actually locally quarried sandstone and were the only kerbs we had [until] LCC decided that they should be replaced. Initially in Borough Street they installed Scottish (grey) granite; subsequently they have replaced further sandstone kerbs with Chinese (purple) granite.”</p> <p>6.13: “The pedestrian safety railing was installed in the early 1950s because in those days lorries had inferior braking systems; I remember quite a few embedded in the front of the Cross Keys PH.”</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p><b>Accepted.</b> The revised document refers to the ‘Hotel’ character zone. See paragraphs 5.39ff and 9.2.</p> <p><b>Partly accepted.</b> References to gritstone have been replaced with sandstone; see paragraphs 6.13ff and 9.11. The revised document refers to Leicestershire County Council’s work on Borough Street; see footnote 27. Cllr Saffell has accepted that some granite kerbs – e.g. those on the west side of Bondgate – are authentic.</p> <p><b>Accepted.</b> The revised document proposes that the railing should be removed as part of the traffic management scheme; see paragraph 9.11.</p>
--	---	---

<p>Cllr Tony Saffell Castle Ward (continued)</p>	<p>6.15: York stone flags outside the church gate “were replaced by LCC about 20 years ago. This area has been paved with York stone for as long as anyone can prove – at least 250 years” (i.e. since c.1770).</p> <p>8.16ff: The surgery development “was masterminded and run by Leicestershire County Council – the RDC had little choice but to rubber stamp the plans. The flat roof section was added in 2008.”</p>	<p><b>Partly accepted.</b> The revised document refers to Leicestershire County Council’s work; see footnote 27. It is unlikely that the area has been paved with stone since c.1770 as the entrance to the churchyard was not erected until the early nineteenth century.</p> <p><b>Partly accepted.</b> Leicestershire County Council was not the applicant in 1972. The surgery was extended c.2008. See footnote 12.</p>
<p>Castle Donington Parish Council Planning Committee</p>	<p>Meeting 13 February 2020. The committee resolved to accept the character appraisal and boundary review but recommended that Pinfold Gardens should “remain within the conservation area boundary as its open aspect has a significant impact on character”.</p> <p>Members also recommended a minor alteration to the conservation area boundary on Eastway to reflect boundaries that appear on the ground.</p>	<p><b>Accepted.</b> The boundary review has been amended to omit references to Pinfold Gardens. The land has been added to the ‘Bondgate North’ character zone. See paragraph 5.13.</p> <p><b>Accepted.</b> See paragraph 6 of the boundary review.</p>

<p>Castle Donington Parish Council Planning Committee (continued)</p>	<p>Members noted that the tennis club is now a bowls club (character appraisal paragraph 4.1; boundary review paragraph 4).</p> <p>Members noted the traditional spelling of 'Spital' and noted that Spital Park retains this spelling<sup>1</sup>.</p>	<p><b>Partly accepted.</b> The character appraisal refers correctly to the tennis club's historic development. The boundary review has been amended to take account of the committee's advice. See paragraph 3.</p> <p><b>Accepted.</b> See footnote 24.</p>
<p>Castle Donington Local History Society</p>	<p>Drop-in session 5 March. Objected to the removal of the Millhouse Business Centre from the conservation area.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted.</b> Officers advise that the Millhouse Business Centre should be removed from the conservation area for the reasons set out in paragraph 1 of the boundary review.</p>
<p>Resident 54 Borough Street</p>	<p>Telephone conversation 17 March. Objected to the inclusion of part of her property within the 'Hollow' development opportunity area.</p>	<p><b>Accepted.</b> Maps 5 and 11 have been amended to reflect the resident's objection.</p>

---

<sup>1</sup> The road appears as 'Spital' on the 1963 Ordnance Survey map but it appears as 'Spittal' on the 1972 map.

<p>Historic Environment Planning Adviser Historic England</p>	<p>Letter 17 March. Advised generally that we should provide “greater analysis of the archaeological importance [of] the proposed conservation area and its buffer”. Advised generally that we should provide “a more robust analysis of the designated assets and the historic development of the settlement”. Identified five “key areas of concern”:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Recommended (a) that Hillside Orchard should be “retained within the conservation area”. The sloping site “is largely free of development” and “makes a strong positive contribution to the understanding of the castle’s strategic position”. Recommended (b) that the archaeological alert area, “which currently only replicates the scheduled monument”, should be “enlarged to cover the known extent of the planned medieval settlement”.</li> <li>2. Advised that “the discussion of Castle Donington before enclosure is not sufficiently detailed to underpin the character appraisal”. Advised that “the discussion needs to better reflect the known development of the medieval settlement, emphasising the development of the castle and its planned settlement”.</li> </ol>	<p>Noted.</p> <p><b>Accepted.</b> The boundary review has been amended to omit references to Hillside Orchard. The land has been added to the ‘Castle’ character zone. See paragraph 5.26.</p> <p><b>Partly accepted.</b> Map 3 indicates an archaeological alert area (AAA) that generally reflects the extent of the village c.1840. Map 3 has been amended to clarify the extent of the AAA and the scheduled monument.</p> <p><b>Partly accepted.</b> The revised document contains additional paragraphs describing the extent of the castle and the suggested “medieval defensive enclosure” surrounding Borough Street. Ryder (1997) describes the evidence for the enclosure as “largely illusory”. See paragraphs 3.6 and 3.14.</p>
---	---	--

<p>Historic Environment Planning Adviser Historic England (continued)</p>	<p>3. Advised (a) that the Hollow represents “the line of the outer defences of the castle”. Advised that the line of the road “is important to the understanding of ... the castle” and that buried remains “that contribute to the significance of the scheduled monument ... will be present”.</p> <p>Advised (b) that “any development in this area [would] need to be carefully considered and supported by a heritage assessment”.</p> <p>4. Advised (a) that our analysis of the ‘Castle Hill and Moat’ character zone should emphasise “that much of the area is a scheduled monument” and hence that “works within this area ... are likely to require scheduled monument consent”.</p> <p>Advised (b) that “any development in this area [would] need to be carefully considered and supported by a heritage assessment”.</p>	<p><b>Accepted.</b> Officers have identified an opportunity to enhance character through the replacement of 3 to 10 The Hollow. The revised document contains an additional paragraph advising that the land is “within the extent of the castle” and “development should conserve [its] buried remains”. See paragraph 8.13.</p> <p>Noted. The Council’s validation requirements (2011) specify that a heritage statement would be required.</p> <p><b>Accepted.</b> See paragraph 5.25.</p> <p>Noted. The Council’s validation requirements (2011) specify that a heritage statement would be required.</p>
---	---	---

<p>Historic Environment Planning Adviser Historic England (continued)</p>	<p>5. Advised (a) that the draft appraisal contains “no analysis of views” and hence “the views and landmarks identified in the document do not have an evidence base”. Advised that an analysis should consider “the topographic aspects of the settlement”.</p> <p>Advised (b) that an analysis should consider (i) “views along Borough Street to Castle Hill, (ii) “the curvature of the Hollow” and (iii) “the views along the outer streets of the historic core [that] may represent the ... boundary of the medieval planned settlement”.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted.</b> Paragraph 7.1ff reflects evidence gathered from site inspections and meetings with key stakeholders.</p> <p><b>Partly accepted.</b> The revised document contains an addition paragraph describing ‘terminating features’ that contribute positively or negatively to character. See paragraph 7.4. The “view along Borough Street to Castle Hill” is in fact a view toward the ‘Hollow’ opportunity area. The view does not contribute positively to character.</p>
---	---	--