

From: public.access@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk <public.access@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk>
Sent: 29 October 2025 15:20:34 UTC+00:00
To: "Planning Application Comments" <planningapplicationcomments@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk>
Subject: Consultee Comments for Planning Application 25/00931/FUL
Categories: Yasmin

Consultee comments

Dear Sir/Madam,

A consultee has commented on a Planning Application. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 29/10/2025 3:20 PM from William Kelly (william.kelly@leics.gov.uk) on behalf of LCC Archaeology - Historical And Natural Environment Team.

Application Summary

Reference:	25/00931/FUL
Address:	Cliffe Hill Farm Little Shaw Lane Markfield Leicestershire LE67 9PP
Proposal:	Development of a logistics park for storage and distribution (Class B8), general industry (Class B2), ancillary office space (Class E) and associated infrastructure.
Case Officer:	Emma Baumber

[Click for further information](#)

Comments Details

Dear Emma,

Comments: 25/00931/FUL | Development of a logistics park for storage and distribution (Class B8), general industry (Class B2), ancillary office space (Class E) and associated infrastructure. | Cliffe Hill Farm Little Shaw Lane Markfield

Archaeological considerations

Following appraisal of the above development scheme, we recommend that you advise the applicant of the following archaeological requirements, for pre-determination trial trenching.

Consideration of the submitted Heritage Assessment (Cotswold Archaeology HA Ref.: MK1102_1) and the Leicestershire and Rutland Historic Environment Record (HER) has confirmed that there have been no previous archaeological investigations within the site and very few previous investigations within the study area. The relative absence of archaeological information from the surrounding area is likely to be due to the fact that very little archaeological investigation has previously been undertaken here, as such the potential for, and significance of, any archaeological buried remains present within the site remains unknown at this time.

We welcome the submission of a geophysical survey of the site (Headland Archaeology Report Ref.: 2025-100), although the results of this work are largely inconclusive. Geophysical survey does not represent a definitive statement of the site's archaeological potential, as not all types of archaeological deposit (including prehistoric, Anglo Saxon remains and human burials) are sensitive to detection by this method. Although the survey has not identified any positive evidence for archaeological activity here, it has not established their absence either. Indeed, the report shows a number of anomalies for which an archaeological origin has not been ruled out by the surveyor, which should be tested by trial trenching. Given the scale of the proposed development, the uncertain archaeological potential and the limitations of geophysical survey as a means of archaeological evaluation, it is our recommendation that this should be supported by a programme of pre-determination trial trenching in order to test any anomalies, in addition to any geophysically 'blank' areas.

In addition to consideration of the archaeological buried remains the site also contains extant areas of ridge and furrow earthworks within the southeast of the Site (HER Ref.: MLE28870). The applicant has undertaken a ridge & furrow Assessment (Cotswold Archaeology Report Ref.: MK1189_1) which concludes that the earthworks have been 'significantly eroded over time' and represent isolated remains of a now fragmented medieval to early post-medieval open field system. Given that the earthworks have been identified as a non-designated heritage asset within the Neighbourhood Plan (Map 11) and that the submitted masterplan makes no allowance for preservation of the surviving features, we would therefore recommend that the applicant undertakes a topographic survey of the earthwork remains. The survey should consolidate the available information compiled within the Heritage Assessment and the ridge and furrow Assessment reports. Any remaining uncertainties regarding the earthworks which the recording exercise is not able to adequately clarify may be addressed as part of the trial trenching investigation.

The preservation of archaeological remains is, of course, a "material consideration" in the determination of planning

applications. The proposals include operations that may destroy any buried archaeological remains that are present, but the archaeological implications cannot be adequately assessed on the basis of the currently available information. Since it is possible that archaeological remains may be adversely affected by this proposal, we recommend that the planning authority defer determination of the application and request that the applicant complete an Archaeological Impact Assessment of the proposals.

This will require provision by the applicant for:

1. A topographic survey of the ridge and furrow earthwork remains.
2. A field evaluation, by appropriate techniques including trial trenching, to identify and locate any archaeological remains of significance, and propose suitable treatment to avoid or minimise damage by the development. Further design, civil engineering or archaeological work may then be necessary to achieve this.

This information should be submitted to the planning authority before any decision on the planning application is taken, so that an informed decision can be made, and the application refused or modified in the light of the results as appropriate. Without the information that such an Assessment would provide, it would be difficult in our view for the planning authority to assess the archaeological impact of the proposals.

Should the applicant be unwilling to supply this information as part of the application, it may be appropriate to consider directing the applicant to supply the information under Regulation 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Applications) Regulations 1988, or to refuse the application. These recommendations conform to the advice provided in DCLG National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Section 16, paras. 207 & 208).

Should you be minded to refuse this application on other grounds, the lack of archaeological information should be an additional reason for refusal, to ensure the archaeological potential is given future consideration.

The Historic & Natural Environment Team (HNET), Leicestershire County Council, as advisors to the planning authority, will provide a formal Brief for the work and approve a Specification for the Assessment at the request of the applicant. This will ensure that the necessary programme of archaeological work is undertaken to the satisfaction of the planning authority, in a cost-effective manner and with minimum disturbance to the archaeological resource. The Specification should comply with relevant Chartered Institute for Archaeologists "Standards" and "Code of Practice", and should include a suitable indication of arrangements for the implementation of the archaeological work, and the proposed timetable.

Information on suitable archaeological organisations to carry out this work can be obtained from HNET. Should you have any further queries please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours sincerely,

William

Kind regards