

Residents Meeting with NWBC Heritage & Conservation – 6th February 2025

Jennifer Leadbetter answered residents questions and provided valuable information as to managing properties in a Conservation Area.

She encouraged residents to designate specific properties and elements of the properties for consideration under Article 4, including windows and wrought iron works, to retain the uniqueness of the aesthetic.

She confirmed that all trees within the Conservation Area are protected so residents need to seek advice from NWBC regarding managing their trees.

She noted comments on the Boundary and explained that a full Boundary Review and Assessment has taken place with full, considered, responses. She realised that residents had not seen it and have not seen comments made during the consultation so this will be sent as a follow-up

Follow-up through an email from Jennifer to ATH

Jennifer provided these links:

NWBC Conservation Areas general page:

[Heritage and Conservation | North Warwickshire Borough Council](#)

Historic England:

[Designating and Managing a Conservation Area | Historic England](#)

[Living in a Conservation Area | Historic England](#)

Jennifer attached in the email

- a list of comments including **individual residents comments** from the original 2022 consultation and the responses given to each comment (see below)
- a full Boundary Review that considered a number of additional properties and areas of lands with recommendations or reasons for exclusion (see attached)

Consultation Comments and Responses from Heritage & Conservation, including individual residents
(ATH has removed individual names)

Who	Comment	LUC Response
Resident In Support	Whole-heartedly support the plans to make Caldecote a conservation area. The beautiful estate needs protection to preserve the history and grandeur of the buildings, the grounds and the surrounding area.	Thank you
Resident In Support	Developers are blighting the area by building on the surrounding green spaces e.g. the developer called 'Gladman' planning 760 homes near to the estate. http://www.your-views.co.uk/uploads/images/Weddington/Consultation%20Boards/Consultation%20Boards.pdf	This is a short distance away from Caldecote, but within another local authority area. The conservation area would be a material consideration should it be adopted.
Resident In Support	No comment, but do reconsult if amendments significantly impact the natural environment.	Thank you
Resident In Support	Conservation area designation would be positive for the village. However it seemed to me that a number of the people there were only interested in using the proposal to counter the proposed MIRA development; by, for instance, including land and properties adjacent to this which have no real merit. This doesn't seem right as they are two entirely separate questions, in my opinion.	The comments from all attendees of the workshop about the conservation area boundary will be assessed and considered.
Resident In Support	The setting of Caldecote needs to be protected. There have been two massive development proposals in the area in the past year.	The purpose of a conservation area is not to stop development, but to preserve or enhance the area's special interest. If the conservation area is designated, then any new planning applications within its setting should seek to preserve or enhance the significance of the conservation area.
Resident In Support	Expand the CA to include all of the surrounding fields that give Caldecote its stunningly beautiful setting.	Through the feedback from the conservation area workshop, consideration has been given to suggestions to include field to the north, south, east and west of the proposed boundary. In each case it was found that these fields although attractive, are not of special architectural or historic interest.
Resident In Support	An Article 4 Direction (mentioned at the meeting) should be introduced to stop uPVC windows or other changes happening that would undermine the character and identity of the buildings.	This was one of the preservation and enhancement proposals. Your support for the possible introduction of this additional measure is noted.
Resident In Support	Such a shame that the WHOLE village of Caldecote cannot be included	The comments from all attendees of the workshop about the conservation area boundary will be assessed and considered.
Resident In Support	Would really like to see the church come back to life. A huge task. Perhaps it could be hired for weddings, funerals, christening, Christmas, Easter. Could generate funds for its upkeep.	Agreed. Addressing the uncertain future of the church is one of the preservation and enhancement proposals of the appraisal. A viable use of the church will help to maintain its fabric and its heritage values.

Resident In Support	Confirm rights of way and access routes should be signposted.	Agreed. This was one of the preservation and enhancement proposals of the draft appraisal.
Historic England Comment	The Appraisal follows a format that is fully in line with national guidance. There is a clear articulation of the conservation areas special interest and a succinct and insightful analysis as to how this currently contributes to the areas character and appearance. Both positive aspects of the conservation area and some areas of concern that could lead to negative changes to its condition are carefully itemized and clear prescriptions for management are suggested.	Thank you
Resident Against	It seems to me that the only outcome of such a move is to tie the residents of Caldecote up in more red tape and bureaucracy as they have to fill in yet another planning application to alter a garden gate, fence or put a satellite dish up to name but a few. We already have a planning department who surely already consider the merits of developments and the impact on the village plus we have a tree preservation order saving our trees so why then do we need this extra layer of interference.	The additional planning controls that conservation area designation brings are intended to help preserve or enhance the area's character. The minor alterations you describe are not considered by the planning authority for properties that are not within conservation areas. The conservation area protection to tree would not impact the trees that are already protected by Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs), but would introduce a layer of protection for those trees that are not covered by TPOs and currently have no protection.
Resident Against	It seems you had a pot of money and had to dream up something to spend it on perhaps it would be better spent on the wider community to reduce the amount of people sleeping rough in doorways in our towns, reduce the litter that blows around our streets and provide more services for people finding it hard to make ends meet. To spend money on a conservation area that is not needed or wanted and has very little point seems quite frankly appalling.	North Warwickshire BC obtained Section 106 funding and determined to use some of this funding to assess Caldecote and potentially adopt a new conservation area as part of its statutory duty to consider new conservation area designations from time to time. Section 106 funds can only be used for planning purposes or capital works to the environment. They cannot be allocated to societal issues that are outside of the planning system.
Coal Authority Comment	The Planning team at the Coal Authority has no specific comments to make on this consultation document.	Thank you
Resident In Support	We are in support of the planned change in status but are aware that there may be direct impacts on future improvements we might want to make to the property. It was reassuring to hear that we, the residents, could collectively determine what should be considered most important when assessing future planning, though it would help to understand how this type of information might be collated and maintained and also how far we can influence this?	The conservation area appraisal would be the primary source of information about the special character of Caldecote. However this cannot possibly be comprehensive in its scope and detail, therefore any additional local knowledge or information about heritage assets affected by planning applications can be used in addition to the content of the appraisal.

Resident In Support	Reference this planning application from MIRA: http://planning.northwarks.gov.uk/portal/servlets/ApplicationSearchServlet?PKID=124581 , we feel that their Heritage assessment is very limited and does not consider current non heritage assets along with heritage assets that collectively create the Caldecote area. We feel they need to complete another assessment and address the proposed design of their layout, accordingly, with conservation in mind, so as not to cause harm to the area.	This is outside the scope of the conservation area appraisal and adoption process. However, LUC has forwarded your comment on the North Warwickshire BC's Conservation Officer for their consideration.
Resident In Support	Extend the boundary to include the Riding School at the very end of Caldecote Lane (the site of the ancient mill), also 17 & 18 Weddington Lane and Rookwood (near to Watling Street), which were all part of the Caldecote Estate. We appreciate they are more remotely situated.	Thank you for these suggestions. They have been reviewed and it is concluded that distance from the proposed conservation area and their marginal architectural and historic interest mean their inclusion within the conservation area would dilute its overall special interest. We have recommended that NWBC considers adding Rookwood and the building at the Riding School dated 1817 are added to the local list.
Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council In Support	Given the close proximity of MIRA to Caldecote, HBBC would be concerned if any changes to the final boundary location of the proposed conservation area (and namely the setting) would have any potential to undermine the national designation of MIRA as an Enterprise Zone. MIRA was awarded Enterprise Zone status in August 2011 by the UK government, with many benefits, including removing barriers for growth, alongside business rates discounts, unrivalled locality, simplified planning and access to a large skilled workforce. Therefore, critical to HBBC is that any implications particularly in terms of planning restrictions in close proximity to MIRA are congruent with its aims and that the long term objectives for MIRA would be supported, and as such not undermined by any planning restrictions associated with the proposed Conservation Area's setting. HBBC would seek assurance of this given the boundary of the proposed conservation area is unconfirmed at this stage, especially given the wider Parish does transcend to the A5 trunk road immediately adjacent to MIRA. For your information, the boundary of the MIRA Enterprise Zone immediately abuts the southern extent of the A5 Watling Street, which is the main access for MIRA's facilities	The purposes of the Enterprise Zone are understood. Thank you for setting these out. The potential designation of the new conservation area is a consequence of the Council carrying out its statutory duty to consider new conservation area designations from time to time. Its intention is to preserve or enhance the special character of Caldecote rather than to prevent development per se. We will inform you of the proposed boundary to be considered for adoption.

Caldecote Conservation Area Boundary Review

Proposed Inclusions

Anchor Cottage Farm, Caldecote Lane

Factors in favour of inclusion

- Historically an estate farmhouse like The Beeches and Caldecote Mews.
- Rebuilt around the same time (1880-1900) as the rest of the estate in a domestic revival style and sharing roof tiles, brickwork and half-timbering.
- Relatively unaltered externally
- Protection to trees within the garden curtilage of the house

Factors against inclusion

- Distance from proposed CA. It is in open countryside circa 370m from the edge of the proposed CA. This area has a distinctive character and feel from the core of the settlement and there is very little intervisibility between Anchor Cottage and the rest of the hamlet.
- Inclusion would mean a combination of one or all of the following changes to the boundary, which would dilute the special interest of the conservation area:
 - inclusion of a substantial arable field to the north that is of no special interest and/or
 - inclusion of a long stretch of Caldecote Lane and its verges. Although attractive and part of the historic settlement layout it forms a weak boundary to the proposed CA: a long linear extension of no special interest leading to one building, and/or
 - Inclusion of the icehouse, ice house spinney, the field that contains them and a former paddock to the north (more on this below)
- The insertion of uPVC windows has harmed the traditional character of the building in a prominent manner

Recommendation

Exclude from the conservation area principally due to the distance from the proposed conservation area and the distinctly different character of this area compared to the cluster of buildings within the proposed conservation area. The former farmhouse is of heritage value, and it is suggested that it is considered for local listing.

Signal Leys / Caldecote Riding School

Factors in favour of inclusion

- This site includes farm buildings that were historically part of an estate farm like The Beeches and Caldecote Mews. IN this particular case the buildings were associated with Anchor Cottage Farmhouse.
- The collection of buildings includes a barn with a datestone inscribed 1817(?) and initialled (initials unclear, but presumably relate to the lord of the manor at the time).

Factors against inclusion

- The modern character of the site. The site is a horse riding school and is dominated by a riding arena, while the buildings on the site are a collection of stables, outbuildings and storage units.

These structures are generally all modern builds including prefabricated units. While there is a small collection of traditional brick-built farm buildings these are outnumbered and dominated by later brick extensions and later prefabricated buildings and structures. On balance, the site is not of sufficient historic and architectural interest to include in the conservation area as its character is very much like a working farm or allotment garden: the modern buildings and structures are built for purpose and are temporary in their nature rather than of architectural or historic value.

- Distance from proposed CA. It is in open countryside circa 420m from the edge of the proposed CA. This area has a distinctive character and feel from the core of the settlement and there is very little intervisibility between Signal Leys and the rest of the hamlet.
- Inclusion would mean a combination of one or all of the following changes to the boundary, which would dilute the special interest of the conservation area:
 - inclusion of a substantial arable field to the north that is of no special interest and/or
 - inclusion of a long stretch of Caldecote Lane and its verges. Although attractive and part of the historic settlement layout it forms a weak boundary to the proposed CA: a long linear extension of no special interest leading to one building, and/or
 - Inclusion of the icehouse, ice house spinney, the field that contains them and a former paddock to the north (more on this below)

Recommendation

Exclude from the conservation area principally due to the distance from the proposed conservation area and the lack of architectural or historic interest of the large majority of the buildings, structures and landscape features on the site. The brick building dated 1817 could perhaps be considered for local listing due to its age and associations with the Caldecote Hall estate.

The Ice House and Ice House Spinney

Factors in favour of inclusion

- The ice house was built in the 1820s and served Caldecote Hall as a place to store food and ice.
- Ice house spinney is an attractive clump of mature woodland that was planted as part of the Caldecote Hall estate.

Factors against inclusion

- The ice house is a grade II listed building. Its fabric therefore already has a much higher degree of protection from harm to its significance than conservation area designation would bring. The effects of change within its setting are already a material planning consideration.
- Distance from proposed CA. Ice pit spinney is in open countryside circa 325m from the edge of the proposed CA. This area has a distinctive character and feel from the core of the settlement, as the spinney is an isolated woodland clump surrounded by arable field.
- The landscape and historical value of the spinney could be protected by a Tree Preservation Order

Recommendation

Exclude from the conservation area, as the only built feature, the ice house, is grade II listed and as such conservation area designation would not bring any additional protection to it. The distance between the icehouse and the proposed conservation area means a much larger area of no special

interest would need to be added to the conservation area in order to include the ice house. The landscape and historical value of the spinney could be protected by a Tree Preservation Order

Houses at Weddington Lane / the A5 and Crazy Pit Spinney

This area consists of circa ten detached houses that are all to the west of Weddington Lane and are accessed from it within 250m of its junction with the A5.

Factors in favour of inclusion

- Of the houses, Rookwood was built at some point between 1886 and 1901 as a lodge to Caldecote Hall. It was built as part of the wider 1880-1900 remodelling of the Caldecote Hall estate. In this case the lodge served a new drive that was laid out in the 1880s and linked the Hall directly with Weddington Road a short distance from its junction with Watling Street. The lodge is noticeably similar in its architecture and materials to the other estate buildings, farmhouses, cottages and lodges that were rebuilt c.1880-1900.
- The woodland clump at Crazy Pit Spinney was planted circa 1880-86 (if not earlier) as part of the expansion of the parkland associated with Caldecote Hall. The spinney was at the northernmost edge of the extended park. The woodland is today a key feature of the junction of Weddington Road and the A5 and is visible from the current grounds of the Hall.

Factors against inclusion

- With the exception of Rookwood, all of the houses in this group were erected after 1938 as commuter dwellings, after the Caldecote Hall estate had been sold off in different lots. Although attractive, these houses are suburban in character, have undergone varying degrees of alteration, extension and remodelling and are therefore not considered to be of architectural or historic interest. They are not historically part of the traditional estate village of Caldecote. A number of the houses also have large gateway features at the entrances to their drives from Weddington Road. These features have been added on an ad hoc basis and do not share the same character as the proposed conservation area. These later dwellings and gateways surround the former lodge at Rookwood.
- The woodland at Crazy Pit Spinney is designated as a Tree Preservation Order. This woodland is therefore already subject to a greater level of protection than conservation area designation would offer.
- Distance from proposed CA. This group of houses ranges from circa 210m to 420m away from the proposed conservation area. It has a character that is distinct from the proposed conservation area and its inclusion within the conservation area would require also including two agricultural fields that are not of architectural or historic interest.

Recommendation

Exclude from the conservation area, as this is predominantly a row of altered mid-20th century commuter dwellings that stand alongside woodland that is already protected by a Tree Preservation Order. Rookwood, the former Caldecote estate lodge, should be considered for local listing.

17 and 18 Weddington Lane

Factors in favour of inclusion

- The site was part of the Caldecote Hall estate in the c.1840 tithe, though the cottage on this site was replaced with the current pair of semi-detached houses after 1886, quite possibly as part of the rebuilding of most of the Caldecote Hall estate between 1880 and 1900.

Factors against inclusion

- The architecture of the houses shares only a limited similarity with the other buildings erected between 1880 and 1900 in the proposed conservation area. Although symmetrical with twin central gables, lean-to bay windows and a red clay tile roof, the houses have none of the domestic revival style of the other houses and cottages on the estate nor the Jacobean revival style of the Hall and its stables. Although attractive, 17 and 18 Weddington Road are representative examples of late 19th century semi-detached houses. Alterations such as extensions and uPVC glazing to different designs has diluted their historic character.
- The houses are some 265m away from The Grange and some 490m away from the cluster of cottages at the entrance to Caldecote Lane. These distances mean the houses have little visual connection with the proposed conservation area and are experienced as part of the open countryside around Caldecote rather than as being clearly part of the estate village. As well as being in an area with a distinctive character to the proposed conservation area, the inclusion of these houses would mean either including a long c.490m stretch of Weddington Road and/or one or two substantial arable fields. Neither the road nor the fields are considered to be of special interest and therefore extending the conservation area in either manner would dilute the overall special character and appearance of the conservation area.

Recommendation

Exclude from the conservation area due to the outlying location of the houses and their limited architectural similarity to comparable houses and cottages within the conservation area.

Fields to the east and west of Caldecote Lane and the north and south of Weddington Road

There were several different iterations of the same proposal for different fields, parts of fields or groups of fields to be included in the proposed conservation area, often as a 'buffer' or as an important part of the rural character and setting of Caldecote.

Factors in favour of inclusion

- The fields to the east and west of Caldecote Lane were, for a period of circa 45 years, converted from farmland to parkland by the lord of Caldecote manor so that his newly rebuilt Hall (of 1880) had a commensurately large designed landscape to accompany it. Historical accounts suggest this particular lord of the manor, Captain Townshend, was keen on hunting, riding and fishing and created a landscape for these pursuits by converting arable land in his estate to pasture with clumps, lines and scattered trees planted in them. These works effectively extended the grounds of the Hall to a far greater extent than earlier historic maps suggest.

Factors against inclusion

- The use and management of these fields as parkland ceased more or less with the death of Captain Townshend in the 1920s, as shortly after his death, the Caldecote estate was divided into lots and sold. The majority of the park soon reverted to arable use, and so many of the trees planted in the park were removed in order to restore the fields to their former state. Therefore any historical interest the fields either side of Caldecote Lane may have relates to only a brief period in the overall history of the estate and cannot be readily appreciated or understood today on the ground due to the lack of the majority of the park trees, especially those that were planted in a dispersed fashion. Therefore what architectural or historic interest these fields had has been largely removed. In devising the proposed conservation area boundary, careful consideration has been given to including the extent of the former parkland where the estate character can readily be discerned by the tree cover and the present-day use and appearance of the fields. It is considered that the ground and fields included in the proposed conservation area boundary reflect the extent of the surviving parkland character.
- Conservation area designation brings with it the legal requirement to ensure that the decisionmaker for the planning application for any works within its setting to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character of appearance of the conservation area.¹ In practice, case law has established that 'special attention' does not mean simply balancing any harm to the significance of the conservation

¹ Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 s.72(1): <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/9/section/72> accessed 22.11.2022

area against other public benefits, but rather that it is a consideration that is second only to the adopted Local Plan in weight.² The conservation area's setting therefore inherently receives a level of protection from harmful change once the conservation area is designated, even if the setting itself is of little, negligible or no architectural or historic interest in its own right. It therefore runs contrary to the purpose of conservation area designation to include surrounding land of little, negligible or no architectural or historic interest within a conservation area as this would dilute the overall significance of the conservation area and would create an unhelpful situation whereby 'the setting of the setting' is given special attention in planning decisions. Such a situation would inevitably put the validity of the conservation area boundary, and, potentially the entire designation, into question, particularly if cases reach appeal or judicial review and the Council is asked to justify the extent of the conservation area and its reasons for designation. This is echoed in the national planning policy as follows:

*"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."*³

Suggested Exclusions

Paddock / Land to the southeast of The Grange

Attendees of the workshop clarified that the proposed conservation area boundary extends beyond the extent of the rear garden of the Grange, and include a paddock parcel of land that is not part of the garden. Reviewing this on Google Earth Pro, there is a discernible line where the lawned garden ceases. This lines up with the rear line of the outbuildings. It would appear this would be appropriate as the conservation area boundary, as the land to the southeast of this line does not appear to be garden due to there being four vehicular routes through it, and suggestions that items and vehicles are stacked and stored on this land and are conveyed by vehicles.

Recommendation

Exclude the area as suggested by the workshop attendees. Bring the conservation area boundary in line with the northwest edge of the paddock / storage area that is also the southeast edge of the lawned gardens of The Grange.

The pair of modern agricultural sheds at The Courtyard

Attendees of the workshop queried why two modern agricultural sheds are proposed to be included within the conservation area, while a nearby shed of a larger footprint is excluded. The attendees suggested removing the two sheds from the boundary as they are not of historic or architectural interest.

In preparing the conservation area appraisal, this group of building posed the greatest difficulty in terms of identifying a boundary that was justifiable and can be read on the ground by following physical features as much as possible. The four ranges of traditional farm buildings that form the four sides of The Courtyard stand side by side with three modern working farm buildings made of prefabricated frames with external cladding.

Having reviewed this part of the boundary on Google Earth Pro, it appears that it would be possible to exclude the northernmost shed by having the conservation area boundary follow the line of the boundary wall of the northern range of The Courtyard and its car park. There does not appear to be a satisfactory way of excluding the shed nearest the courtyard, as doing so would bisect tracks and

² Charles Mynors, Nigel Hewitson (2017) Listed Buildings and Other Heritage Assets (fifth Edition) section 16-018

³ MHCLG (2021) National Planning Policy Framework, para. 191

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1005759/NPPF_July_2021.pdf accessed 22.11.2022

spaces between buildings. The present configuration follows a clear and decisive edge that is easier to follow on the ground compared to alternatives.

Recommendation

Adjust the conservation area boundary so it follows the norther and eastern boundary walls to the Courtyard and its car park so that the northernmost agricultural shed and its concrete yard are excluded. The shed and yard are not of special interest and the adjustment would ensure the boundary is clear and decisive on the ground.