

From: William Kelly <William.Kelly@leics.gov.uk>
Sent: 20 August 2025 16:56
To: Sophie Iliffe
Cc: Planning Folder New; Paul Grundy
Subject: 25/00653/HOU & 25/00654/LBC | Single storey side extension including removal of one wall to create enlarged opening and erection of new single storey swimming pool building | Old Hayes Farm Burroughs Road Ratby

Categories: Shaun

Dear Sophie,

25/00653/HOU & 25/00654/LBC | Single storey side extension including removal of one wall to create enlarged opening and erection of new single storey swimming pool building | Old Hayes Farm Burroughs Road Ratby

Archaeological considerations

Thank you for your consultation on this application, please accept my sincere apologies for not being able to respond sooner. We recommend that you advise the applicant of the following archaeological requirements, for a targeted historic building assessment. We also note that the submitted DBA is still marked as DRAFT and therefore the conclusions reached may not be fully up to date. We would recommend that the final copy of the report should be submitted in place of the draft version.

We would also recommend that you seek the advice of your specialist Historic Building Officer regarding any potential impacts of the development upon the setting and significance of the designated Grade II Listed building Old Hayes Farmhouse (NHLE Ref.: 1074092).

The proposal involves the removal of wall material and a doorway located on the eastern exterior of the Old Hayes Farmhouse, in addition to the construction of a new Pool and Gym building beyond the extent of the moated site to the northeast. The applicant has submitted a Heritage Statement (Heritage Matters; Version: 5) and an archaeological desk-based Assessment (ULAS DBA Ref.: 2023-094) in support of the application, which is welcome. Having reviewed the submitted documents we would however raise our concerns that the significance of the structural elements of the building proposed for removal is not sufficiently understood at this time. In particular we note that, whilst the Heritage Statement concludes that the southernmost elements of the building are earlier in date and likely placed on the same footprint as the original farmhouse/manor house (page 28), the DBA suggests that the east facing wing of the building is likely to be the earliest element and the original location of the medieval hall (page 17). The Heritage Statement appears to have reached its conclusion on the basis of an examination of the building's plan form whilst the DBA appears to have reached its conclusions from an assessment of the historical written sources.

It is likely that the assessment of the historic building phasing would benefit from drawing together all available evidence. The Heritage Statement, for example, does not appear to reference the initial building renovations that took place in the early 1600s, as mentioned on page 17 of the DBA (referencing Nichols; 1811). It is therefore possible that the stone wall incorporated into the later brick elements of the building could relate to this initial phase of early 17th century renovation, rather than representing an original element of the building. In this context we note that a number of internal walls appear to be of a greater width than the external walls and could represent earlier phases of the building. It is also possible that the external elements could be concealing earlier timber elements of the medieval building (as suggested in the DBA – page 17), for which inspection of the internal spaces would be necessary. Whilst the DBA states that 'It is argued that the north-east wing of the extant property is the oldest part of the building and is likely located on, or incorporates the 13th century deer park warden's hall', it is unclear how this conclusion has been reached. A reanalysis of the building's plan form, taking into consideration the historical background provided by the DBA and supplemented by targeted investigation of the building, should provide a clearer understanding of the building's phasing and therefore the significance of the structural elements that would be affected by the

proposals. This would also inform the potential for highly significant historic building foundations to be present within the footprint of the proposed extension structure.

The preservation of historic fabric and the protection of archaeological remains is, of course, a “material consideration” in the determination of planning applications. The proposals include operations that may affect, or have the potential to affect, one or more heritage assets with an archaeological interest (National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Section 16, paragraph 207-208 and Annex 2).

However, the implications of these changes cannot be adequately assessed on the basis of the currently available information. Since the proposals will alter the character and form of the historic buildings, we recommend that a programme of targeted historic building assessment is undertaken, where necessary/appropriate including limited intrusive investigation, to establish the archaeological interest and significance of the affected structure, to enable an informed decision and assist in the preparation of any appropriate mitigation strategy, e.g. historic building investigation and recording, design modifications, etc.

We therefore recommend that the planning authority defer determination of the application and request that the applicant complete the targeted assessment of the proposals as specified above. This will involve closer consideration of the available plan evidence in light of the historical information provided within the DBA, closer inspection of interior elements of the building including non-intrusive opening up (where achievable) and targeted test pitting of external areas to determine the presence of earlier building foundations. Any works taking place within the scheduled monument (including archaeological works) will of course require scheduled monument consent. Closer-up photographs of the northeastern wing could indicate potential historic changes to the structure, we note that there appear to be breaks in the stone/brickwork which could indicate this area of the building has been subject to various phases of alteration. This could also help to indicate where targeted test pitting could be undertaken to evaluate the presence/absence of earlier building foundations. Consideration of information that could support our understanding of the medieval/post-medieval landscape could also be used to indicate the likely orientation of the original manorial building.

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 19, paras. 207-208 & 212-215).

The Historic & Natural Environment Team (HNET), Leicestershire County Council, as advisors to the planning authority, in consultation with the Conservation Officer, 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 investigation is undertaken to the satisfaction of the planning authority, in a cost-effective manner and with minimum disturbance to the historic building. The Specification should comply with this Department’s “Guidelines and Procedures for Archaeological Work in Leicestershire and Rutland” and relevant Institute for Archaeologists “Standards” and “Code of Practice” and should include a suitable indication of arrangements for the implementation of the historic building survey, and the proposed timetable.

Information on suitable 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

William Kelly | Senior Planning Archaeologist (Heritage) | Historic & Natural Environment Team | Planning, Historic & Natural Environment Department | Room 200, County Hall | Glenfield | Leicestershire | LE3 8RA

Leicestershire County Council values are:



Positivity



Trust and
Respect



Flexibility



Openness and
Transparency

This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, any reading, printing, storage, disclosure, copying or any other action taken in respect of this e-mail is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by using the reply function and then permanently delete what you have received. Incoming and outgoing e-mail messages are routinely monitored for compliance with Leicestershire County Council's policy on the use of electronic communications. The contents of e-mails may have to be disclosed for requests under Data Protection or Freedom of Information legislation. Details about how we handle information can be found at

<https://www.leicestershire.gov.uk/data-protection>

The views expressed by the author may not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Leicestershire County Council.

Attachments to e-mail messages may contain viruses that may damage your system. Whilst Leicestershire County Council has taken every reasonable precaution to minimise this risk, we cannot accept any liability for any damage which you sustain as a result of these factors. You are advised to carry out your own virus checks before opening any attachment.