

LONDON ROAD & ST PETER'S CONSERVATION AREA

REPORT OF CONSULTATION

CONTENTS

Section	Page
1. Introduction	1
2. Methodology	1
3. Summary of responses	2
4. Main issues and commentary	3
5. Conclusions	6
6. Recommendations	6

APPENDICES

1. Leaflet and questionnaire
2. Copy of exhibition panels
3. Detailed questionnaire analysis
4. Additions and corrections

QuBE, Building 14, Michael Young Centre, Purbeck Road, Cambridge, CB2 8PF

† 01223 275710, f 01223 275711, e enquiries@qube.org.uk, w www.qube.org.uk

January 2006

1. INTRODUCTION

QuBE Planning Ltd were appointed by the Borough of Oadby and Wigston to carry out an appraisal of the Oadby London Road and St Peter's Conservation Area, to produce development control guidelines and then to subject both draft documents to a period of public consultation.

This report describes the public consultation undertaken, summarises the representations received and sets out a response to the principal areas of concern to allow the Borough Council to decide whether to amend the documents prior to final approval and publication.

2. METHODOLOGY

The public consultation comprised:

- A full colour leaflet summarising the conservation area appraisal and development control guidelines was prepared and together with a short questionnaire was issued to some 428 properties in the conservation area and immediately outside the current boundary from the 25 September 2006. The consultation period finished on 13 November 2006.
- A copy of the leaflet and questionnaire can be found in Appendix 1.
- A copy of the leaflet and questionnaire was also distributed to key stakeholders including Ward Councillors, Civic Societies, the Government Office for the East Midlands, Leicestershire County Council, and the East Midlands Regional Assembly.
- A public exhibition was staged in St Peter's Centre in Wigston Road, Oadby on Tuesday 17 October 2006 between 1.00pm and 7.00pm. Staff from the Borough Council were available to deal with comments and questions.
- A copy of the exhibition panels can be found in Appendix 2.
- Copies of the documents and an online response form were available on the Borough Council's website.
- A press release was issued and coverage appeared in the Leicester Mercury and the Borough Council's 'Letterbox' publication.

3. SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

Level of response

A total of 26 questionnaires were returned, but it is not possible to accurately state a percentage response rate as the final number of circulated questionnaires is unknown.

Letters were received from 3 people including the Oadby Civic Society and Leicestershire County Council.

The exhibition was attended by 27 people from the Conservation Area and 2 from outside.

Overall comments

The majority of people who completed a questionnaire supported the Conservation Area Appraisal and the Development Control Guidelines. Of those completing a questionnaire:

- 85% thought the Conservation Area Appraisal accurately described the character and qualities of the area.
- 85% supported the inclusion of Nos. 17 & 17a King Street and Nos. 2-8 (evens) Albion Street.
- 81% supported the removal from the Conservation Area of Nos. 30a & 30b Brooksby Drive and the small car parking area adjacent to No.65a London Road.
- At least 85% people supported all of the Development Control Guidelines.

A detailed breakdown of the questionnaire responses and a summary of the comments made can be found as Appendix 3.

4. MAIN ISSUES AND COMMENTARY

As anticipated, a number of issues have been raised by people responding to the questionnaire. Some of these were points of accuracy, for example drawing the Conservation Area boundary through a private garden or wrongly labelling a property on the map. These comments have been collated and can be found in Appendix 4 and it is recommended that the Appraisal is modified to incorporate the changes prior to final publication.

This table sets out the principal comments and gives a response and a recommendation for consideration by the Borough Council. Where similar comments have been made under more than one section of the questionnaire the responses are dealt with under the most appropriate heading to avoid duplication.

Comment	Response	Recommendation
CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL		
Accuracy of the appraisal in describing the character and qualities of the area		
Oadby Royal British Legion – we do not consider our Concert Room (erected in 2000) to be a negative building nor our car park classed as 'poor floorscape'	The recent extension to the British Legion's building is not unfortunately of the same quality as the original building and its form and position means that it is highly visible from Wigston Road. The adjacent car park is unscreened from the road and the parked cars detract from the setting of the traditional building.	No change.
Adkinson Funeral Parlour is not a negative building. It used to be the Old Oadby Cinema, built prior to 1940.	The building may be older than it appears, but its current appearance is not in keeping with the character of the Conservation Area, and in its current form, it is therefore a negative building.	No change
Factual Errors or omissions		
See Appendix 4	See Appendix 4	See Appendix 4
Proposed inclusions		
23 people supported the inclusion of Nos. 17 & 17a King Street and Nos. 2-8 (evens) Albion Street; 3 had no view.	Nos. 17 & 17a were incorrectly addressed as No.11 in the consultation documents – this will be amended (see Appendix 4)	No change
Proposed Exclusions		
19 people supported the exclusion of Nos. 30a & 30b Brooksby Drive and the small car parking area adjacent to No.65a London Road; 3 had no view.	None required.	No change
1 person did not support the	The area in question is a car	No change

exclusion of the small car parking area adjacent to No.65a London Road because 'these small spaces are very useful'.	park, and has little amenity or aesthetic value.	
Enhancement opportunities identified in Appraisal		
Replacement of less attractive buildings in the area with appropriately designed replacements – generally supported; some concern over use of new buildings and costs involved.	No public funds would be involved and the uses would be controlled by the Local Plan and the DC Guidelines.	No change
Better landscaping / screening of the unattractive parking areas – generally supported; some concerns over safety	Proposals should be carefully designed in accordance with Section 9 of the DC Guidelines.	No change
Replacement of handrail in front of Nos.67-89 (odds) London Street – has already been replaced.	See Appendix 4	See Appendix 4
Possible additional enhancement opportunities		
Resurfacing, general maintenance and improving boundary treatments of Lawyers Lane.	The enhancement of Lawyers Lane would enhance the appearance of the Conservation Area.	Section 9 will be amended.
Better maintenance of 'island' at the top of Church Street.	The area was tidy at the time of survey.	No change, but refer to highway authority
Replacement of PVCu doors and windows.	Shire grants are available for certain types of building projects; see para. 9.5 of the Appraisal document.	No change
More appropriate, traditional style street lighting throughout area, but particularly along Lawyers Lane.	The replacement of the current streetlights with a more appropriate style would enhance the appearance and character of the area and improve the safety of Lawyers Lane which currently has inadequate lighting.	Section 9 will be amended.
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL GUIDANCE		
The following were suggested for inclusion in the Guidance:		
Specific car parking for residents of Albion Street.	Residents parking schemes are outside the scope of the Conservation Area Appraisal and DC Guidelines.	No change, but refer to appropriate authority.
Restriction of take-aways and restaurants.	Already included within the DC Guidelines and Local Plan.	No change
Restriction of traffic, parked cars and large lorries.	Not a matter for the DC Guidelines.	No change, but refer to Highway Authority.
Cleaning of Albion Street and restriction of cars parking on the pavement.	Not a matter for the DC Guidelines	No change, but refer to appropriate authority

Summary of letters received

A number of letters were received during the consultation period and these are summarised below:

Comment	Response	Recommendation
Oadby Civic Society		
Para 6.3 – properties on the northern side of Leicester (London) Road – consider these to be an integral and significant part of this area of Oadby and believe they retain their character as a whole group.	It is not considered that these properties are of sufficient interest to warrant inclusion.	No change
Para. 6.39 – Old smithy forge stone wall is on the west side of the junction with Church Street, not east	Accepted.	Amend para. 6.39
Para. 6.41 – Nos. 15-17 London Road are to the east of the open space, not west.	Accepted.	Amend para 6.41
Para. 8.1 – Additions – refers to No.11 King Street being included. No.11 is a modern property. Should this para. refer to the property to the north of No.7 King Street mentioned in para. 6.55?	Agreed.	Amend Section 8
Agree with Nos. 2-8 Albion Street being included and Nos. 30a & 30b Brooksby Drive being removed. Support removal of car parking adjoining No.65a as long as this refers to that at the rear accessed through Alexandra Court and NOT the forecourt area to the front which forms part of the 'setting' for the property.	The car parking area referred to is indeed that to the rear accessed through Alexandra Court.	No change
Leicestershire County Council		
Para. 9.2 – Would need to ensure that removal of the New Inn car park would not result in demand for additional on-street parking and adversely affect the appearance of the conservation area. Suggest that loss of any other parking in area be treated with same caution.	The potential enhancement of this car parking area should not result in any loss of parking. If the site were redeveloped, the displaced parking would have to be considered as part of the planning application and the County Council would be consulted.	No change.
Mr Ron Pitches, 73 London Road		
Pedestrianisation of the centre of Oadby would contribute most to the conservation of the village. The speed, volume and noise of motor traffic and the hazards which the traffic creates mars Oadby's small town/village impression. Two particular examples at New Street's junction with London Road and	Outside the scope of the Conservation Area Appraisal.	No change, but refer to Highway Authority.

Leicester Road's junction with Church Street were cited.		
Junctions and signposting need to be amended to the roads south west and north east of Oadby to provide through traffic with alternative routes.	Outside the scope of the Conservation Area Appraisal	No change, but refer to Highway Authority
Creation of heritage trail linking the listed buildings	This could be investigated, but is outside the scope of the Conservation Area Appraisal.	No change.
Vehicle parking, loading and unloading, storage facilities for goods, etc. all spoil the setting of some listed (and other) buildings' settings. This needs to be better managed.	Outside the direct control of the Conservation Area Appraisal.	No change, but refer to Highway Authority
Untidiness of sites bordering Conservation Area has a negative effect on the area itself, e.g. the area accessible from the Morlands via its entrance opposite to the children's play area.	Development affecting the setting of the Conservation Area is controlled by the DC Guidance, although general untidiness is outside the control of the Conservation Area Appraisal.	No change

5. CONCLUSIONS

1. There was a reasonable level of interest in the Conservation Area Appraisal and Development Control Guidelines and both were generally well supported in the responses received.
2. The Conservation Area Appraisal is generally considered to accurately reflect the character and qualities of the area.
3. There is strong support from local residents for including Nos. 17 & 17a King Street and Nos. 2-8 (evens) Albion Street and for excluding Nos. 30a & 30b Brooksby Drive and the small area of car parking adjacent to No.65a London Road.
4. The Development Control Guidelines are generally well supported by both local residents and the Civic Society.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Conservation Area boundary should be extended to include Nos. 17 & 17a King Street and Nos. 2-8 (evens) Albion Street.
2. The Conservation Area boundary should be amended to exclude Nos. 30a & 30b Brooksby Drive and the small area of car parking adjacent to No.65a London Road.
3. The draft Conservation Area Appraisal should be amended in line with the recommendations in Appendix 4 prior to final publication.

APPENDIX 1

Note: Due to the file size of Appendix 1 it has not been included in the low resolution version of the Report of Consultation. To view Appendix 1 please download the high resolution version of the document available on the Borough Council's website. Alternatively a hard copy of the Report of Consultation can be viewed at local libraries and the Oadby and Wigston Council Offices.

APPENIDX 2

Note: Due to the file size of Appendix 2 it has not been included in the low resolution version of the Report of Consultation. To view Appendix 1 please download the high resolution version of the document available on the Borough Council's website. Alternatively a hard copy of the Report of Consultation can be viewed at local libraries and the Oadby and Wigston Council Offices.

DETAILED QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSIS

Total questionnaires returned – 23. Responses were not given to every question

This table summarises the comments made on the questionnaires.

QUESTION	YES	NO	NO VIEW
THE CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL GENERALLY			
Do you think the <i>London Road</i> Conservation Area Appraisal accurately describes the character and qualities of the area?	✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓ ✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓ ✓✓✓	✓	✓✓✓
If not, please let us know what changes you think should be made <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We do not consider our Concert Room, erected in 2000, is a negative building. King Street is a busy narrow road used by a Rental lorry Co. How can this be allowed, the noise, pollution from constant use by freeway. Also lorry parking behind Newman. Articulated lorries driving through London Rd. – unacceptable noise. 			
If you think there are any factual errors or omissions please describe briefly <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Our Car Park is not classed as "Poor Floorscape". Atkinson Funeral Parlour is not a negative building. It used to be the Old Oadby Cinema, built prior to 1940. The handrail of London Road has already been replaced (and it does look a heck of a lot better than the old one. You have overlooked the volume of lorries even customers driving up and down King St. Access to London Rd to dire, visibility nil when cars parked opposite and outside antique shop. Also raised pavement railings obscure visibility. 			
CHANGES TO THE CONSERVATION AREA BOUNDARY			
Do you support the inclusion of Nos. 11 King Street and Nos. 2-8 (evens) Albion Street?	✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓ ✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓ ✓✓		✓✓✓✓✓
If not, please give reason <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The house in King Street is no 17 & 17A No. 11 is part of The Mews complex built in 1995- the front garden is derelict and overgrown with self set trees, looks a mess. 			
Do you support exclusion from the Conservation Area Nos. 30a and 30b Brooksby Drive and the small car parking area adjacent to No. 65a London Road?	✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓ ✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓ ✓	✓	✓✓✓✓✓
If not, please give reason <ul style="list-style-type: none"> These open spaces can be very useful 			
ENHANCEMENT OPPORTUNITIES			

Please could you provide us with your comments on the suggested enhancement opportunities in the London Road and St Peter's Conservation Area:

1. The replacement of some of the less attractive buildings in the area (see map within leaflet) with appropriately designed replacements which reflect the character of the surrounding buildings.

- **Agree.**
- **Not enforceable.**
- **It is a shame that so many restaurants/takeaways have been allowed in this area please no more – not in keeping.**
- **Who will pay for this great expense? I think some areas are far more urgent for change than others (Oadby tyre services & other buildings next to funeral directors are eye sores). Would have been an idea to tell legion their plans were bad before they invested in buildings.**
- **Have concern about removal of old school house as my dining room lounge (patio window) looks on to it. What would you replace it with?**
- **Red brick cottage starter homes?**
- **Agree, especially those associated with vehicle repairs etc.**
- **I personally think all things put forward will greatly improve the areas in which we live.**
- **The recent extension to the British legion is inappropriate. The open space adjacent to the British Legion (Former Farmyard) is an eyesore, as are the old Adkinson workshops, next to former cinema.**
- **Great idea – but does that mean encouraging the owners of the buildings to let them go derelict/out of use first, so that they can justify tearing them down? That wouldn't be good. Some of the buildings are in fine conditions, just ugly.**
- **Desirable.**

2. The better landscaping/screening, of the unattractive parking areas to enhance the streetscape.

- **Agree.**
- **Yes.**
- **Currently – because of the Cantonese/Italian restaurants on Leics Rd. we have cars parked all along our road/pavement and nowhere for residents to park. So anything would help.**
- **Tree screening should be added.**
- **Definitely, this would improve the appearance of the area no end.**
- **Changing lorry access via Albion Street to factory area of junction e.g. Access through their car park off A6 Albion street too narrow.**
- **Make sure that you don't make places too dark for winter time. Would need security lights in and around building to make people feel safe and secure.**
- **Brick paving/slabbing with garden/water features.**
- **Some public car parking provided by the council would be beneficial in the area.**
- **Agree, and the facilities should be formalised – e.g. At the New Inn car park (existing access and use by the public ins unclear).**
- **Any such screening, welcome as it would be, would need to take into account, any possible increase in criminal activity.**
- **Great idea, but who is going to pay for it in capital costs and also maintenance? OWBC is not known for its large budget.**
- **Much needed.**
- **Long overdue along London Rd and New Lane, a shambles.**

3. The utilitarian handrail that runs along the front of Nos. 67-89 (odds) London Street contrasts unfavourably with the traditional properties behind. Its replacement with a

more appropriate traditional style of black painted railing is suggested.

- **Agree.**
- **Yes.**
- **Would look much nicer than the present one.**
- **Already improved.**
- **That sounds like a change that has been long needed.**
- **Agree with above.**
- **I accept suggestion.**
- **This has been done, hasn't it?**
- **Black railing already in place and looks very good.**
- **Why was this handrail only replaced approximately 5 years ago? Who chose or suggested the Utilitarian pattern anyway! "Cost?" "Did you?"**
- **Not the most important of projects.**
- **This has only recently been replaced – as has the tarmac. Unfavourable contrast does not justify spending money twice in so short a time.**
- **The handrail was replaced 2-3 years ago and attractive flowers added – are further proposal under consideration?**
- **Black railing already in place.**
- **Don't think the existing is bad enough to warrant expensive replacement**
- **I can't believe this question is on here. The handrail was replaced over a year ago. This inclusion has only created confusion as I thought you were suggesting getting rid of the existing (new) one, which got me angry as I thought of the public's wasted money.**
- **New and very attractive railings already in place!**
- **Hasn't that just been done? But it makes driving onto King Street a very hazardous business.**

Are there any other aspects of the area which need to be improved?

If so, describe briefly:

- **It is fascinating to read that you regard the Bridleway Length of Lawyers Lane as a 'Good Vista'. It is certainly NOT a good vista because our excellently rated County Highways Authority firmly refuses to maintain their grass verges, which would become overgrown were it not for the residents, including ourselves, who cut back vegetation from time to time. The verges look a mess and the situation is certainly inconsistent with the comment in the second paragraph of your letter dated 28th September 2006; Ref. RS/P333/iii which states: "that the qualities and character of the Conservation Area can be preserved and enhanced". I have spent much time in trying to persuade the County Council that they are wrong to do nothing but their attitude is that so long as the Bridleway is sufficiently clear of vegetation to allow pedestrians and horse riders to use it then they have complied with the law. That, in my view, is a minimalist approach. It does not prevent them from occasionally cutting back vegetation – say twice a year. Anyway I leave these comments with you. I have to say that the Borough Council, before losing the Highway Agency, maintained the verges and when this duty became the responsibility of the County Council, their Highway Solicitor had the cheek to suggest to me that the Borough had been acting 'Ultra Vires', Cnc. Lamb has ruffled a few feathers at County Hall over this and after much pushing I have even got Cnc. Griffiths to say something.**

Also, in line with Conservation Area enhancement, do you think that a Council approach could be made to Davies Builders to extend the blue metal fencing around the corner into the Lawyers Lane Bridleway to the end of their land ownership? Many residents have had a go at them and all they have done is to construct a tatty piece of wooden fencing. It's a classic example of spoiling the ship for a ha'porth od tar. The horrible bit of

- wood resembling a palette should also be removed.
- More appropriate traditional style street lighting.
- More flowers such as hanging displays on lampposts (incidentally the beautiful summer ones have already been removed but were still in full bloom – such a shame). What about displays on posts or winter pansies/ivy.
- The old school house should have the original building date not the refurbishment date. The 2 chestnut trees in front of the church obscure the clock and church too much.
- Who is responsible for the upkeep of the 'island' at the top of Church Street? It is rarely mown, the grass is full of stones and the ragged appearance is unsightly.
- CCTV – Take control of chicken Alley, it is dangerous area for youths and drugs. Every year a new batch of youths hang out, and every year the problem will go on. Either block the alley off, or control it. Use all your power to make this area beautiful and save because it is the best part of old Oadby.
- The woodland walkway opposite New Street, it looks totally neglected.
- Too many large lorries use the narrow London/Leicester Rd. Can weight restriction be applied so that they use the A6 and race corner island?
- If the railings contrast enough to be replaced what about PVC doors and windows of some houses 67-89 (odds) London Road. Are grants available to help with/pay for cost of replacing these with doors/windows more in keeping?
- Extend metal railing along washbrook to replace broken wooden fencing at entrance to Lawyers Lane (next to indicating "good vista").
- Improvement to the surface of Lawyers Lane where it meets Milton Garden. It is dangerous, particularly at night.
- We need Leicester City Council-like signs which advertise the conservation area at its popular boundaries. Most people don't even know OWB has conservation areas! That would be a good first step to getting the people of the borough more interested in conservation areas and what they are about.
- Stop lorry parking on New Lane and behind Morwoods.

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL GUIDANCE This sets out policies to ensure that the character of the Conservation Areas is protected. How important are the following issues to you?	IMPORTANT	NOT IMPORTANT	NO VIEW
<i>Demolition</i> Protecting key buildings in the area from demolition and ensuring that applicants provide detailed justifications for the demolition of any building?	✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓ ✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓ ✓✓✓✓	✓	✓✓
<i>The design of new buildings</i> Applying strict criteria to control the design of new buildings in the area so that they respect the character and appearance of the Conservation Area?	✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓ ✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓ ✓✓✓✓✓✓		✓
<i>Alterations and extensions</i> Applying strict design criteria to control the quality of alterations and extensions to buildings in the area and as a rule, restricting extensions to the rear or least important elevations of buildings?	✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓ ✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓ ✓✓✓✓✓✓		✓
<i>Change of Use</i> Applying criteria to control the change	✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓ ✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓	✓✓	✓✓

of use of existing retail premises to new retail or commercial uses?	✓✓✓		
<i>Shopfronts, signage, blinds and security measures (The Lanes)</i> Applying policies to guide the alteration, restoration and replacement of shopfronts	✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓ ✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓ ✓✓✓	✓	✓✓✓
<i>Car Parking</i> Ensuring that car parking areas are appropriately landscaped?	✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓ ✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓ ✓✓✓✓		✓✓✓
<i>Works to Listed buildings</i> Applying strict criteria when determining the acceptability of works to Listed Buildings?	✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓ ✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓ ✓✓✓✓✓		✓✓
<i>Significant Local Buildings</i> Seeking to protect important local buildings from inappropriate alteration?	✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓ ✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓ ✓✓✓✓	✓	✓✓
<i>Proposals affecting the setting of the Conservation Area</i> Ensuring that important views and vistas in the Conservation Area are not affected by developments within or outside the area?	✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓ ✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓ ✓✓✓✓	✓	✓✓

Do you think that there are any other matters that should be covered by the Development Control Guidance?
If so, please summarise

- **Yes, Remove the bench in Chicken Alley, it is loitering ground for hoodies and is very ugly to walk past especially when they have finished, rubbish and litter everywhere. Also very important install CCTV and take control of the alley. We are all fed up; it is constantly for drugs and trading. There is no point in making this a beautiful area if you allow this ugliness to go on. Protect the people who live in this area and who care or they will move out and you will be left with rubbish.**
- **Specific car parking for resident of Albion Street**
- **There appears to be too many "Take Aways and Restaurants", 4 within ½ mile.**
- **All schemes & plans to enhance the area will be futile while there is so much traffic around and narrow streets are packed with parked cars and increasingly larger juggernauts use the road unceasingly**
- **Cleaning of Albion Street, Car Parking on pavement in Albion Street**
- **I think it is important that the owners of listed and significant buildings to a high standard, and to improving and enhancing them where the opportunities arise. However, I don't think this has been done. There seems to be a feeling of "them vs. us" in terms of property owners and the local government planning dept. Why is this so? Perhaps because the planners have made it frustratingly difficult to do anything by the official channels, continuously adding in unnecessary and ridiculous bureaucracy and red tape that makes owners, their agents and architects weep. Other local authorities have much better reputations in this regard than OWBC (OWBC is actually notorious to deal with in some circles). It makes many of us wonder if the officials are just trying to justify their jobs and aggrandise themselves rather than actually approaching their tasks in a reasonable, business-like fashion. The emphasis should be on property owners and planners working together for mutually beneficial results, rather than against each other which unfortunately seems to be happening here.**
- **King Street supposedly residential, but is home to thriving rental vehicle business, in conflict with environment especially as it is not one way street, it**

should be one way, reducing the volume of passing vehicles by half.

The following information would be helpful:

Which street do you live in?

- **Lawyers Lane (Bridleway Section)**
- **London Road x 6**
- **Leicester Road x 2**
- **Church Street**
- **40 Brocks Hill Drive/Milton Gardens**
- **Albion Street x 2**
- **Alexandra Court, London Road**
- **4a Wigston Road**
- **18 Honeywell Close**
- **Hermitage Court, Honeywell Close**
- **The Morwoods**
- **Wigston Road**
- **Seagrave Drive, Oadby**
- **Garden Close**
- **Brooksby Close**
- **Milton Gardens x2**
- **King Street**
- **49 Wigston Road**

APPENDIX 4

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS

During the course of the consultation a number of additional pieces of information and errors were identified and this table summarises these and the proposed changes to the final document.

Comment	Response	Recommendation
The handrail outside Nos. 67-89 (odds) London Road has already been replaced.	The handrail has been replaced since the initial survey was undertaken.	Remove negative railing/fence from map and amend Section 9 of the Appraisal document.
The King Street properties to be included are Nos. 17 & 17a and not No.11 as stated in the consultation documents.	Agreed.	Amend Section 8.0 of the Appraisal document.
Improvement of Lawyers Lane should be added as an enhancement opportunity.	Agreed.	ADD: 9.3 The better landscaping and resurfacing of the north-south leg of Lawyers Lane would improve the untidy appearance of this stretch of otherwise pleasantly tree-lined path.
The installation of more appropriate, traditional style street lighting could be added as an enhancement opportunity.	Agreed.	ADD: 9.4 If the opportunity to replace the street-lighting in the Conservation Area arises, the Borough Council and County Council will work together to ensure an appropriate style is chosen.
Para. 6.39 – Old smithy forge stone wall on west side of junction with Church Street, not east.	Agreed.	6.39 Beginning....whilst a stone wall that stood alongside the old smithy forge (demolished 1924) runs to the west of the Church Street junction.
Para. 6.41 – Nos. 15-17 are to the east of the open space, not the west.	Agreed.	6.41 Beyond....To the east of this space is Nos. 15 & 17 which form....