

**HINCKLEY & BOSWORTH BOROUGH COUNCIL APPLICATION: 25/00931/FUL
ADDRESS: CLIFFE HILL FARM, LITTLE SHAW LANE, MARKFIELD,
LEICESTERSHIRE**

HERITAGE TECHNICAL NOTE

1. In comments dated 12th February 2026 William Kelly, Senior Planning Archaeologist (Heritage) at Leicestershire County Council, identified an additional historic environment requirement in relation to the above application. This latest requirement is in addition to the recently completed ridge and furrow assessment, and the upcoming trial trench evaluation of the Site, undertaken in response to previous comments issued by Mr Kelly on 29th October 2025.
2. The concerns raised by William Kelly in February 2026 relate to the wider historic landscape and Charnwood Forest. These concerns are framed around *'impacts on the wider Ulverscroft Wooded Valley LCA/Charnwood National Forest landscape'*. These are not designated heritage assets (as defined by NPPF). Mr Kelly suggests from *'a historic perspective the Charnwood Forest represents a regional significance, this could of course be increased in the case of a designation'*. A clarification would be welcomed as to whether Mr Kelly is suggesting a heritage designation, and if so, which type of designation he is referring to. At the current stage, there is no additional heritage designation that requires consideration as part of the above application.
3. Mr Kelly makes reference to Wylde's 1754 Plan of Charnwood Forest, which depicts the Site and suggests it was enclosed at an earlier date than previously suggested (by both Cotswold's Heritage Assessment submitted with the application and the Council's Historic Landscape Characterisation). This is an informative source not previously identified during the previous assessment, and provides further information on the likely date of enclosure of the Site and its surrounds. The existing Heritage Assessment suggested *'the study area was likely enclosed c.1769'* (due to an Enclosure Act for that year), but the 1754 plan suggests it actually occurred before this date. Irrespective of the specific date of enclosure, a number of hedgerows within the Site were identified by the existing Heritage Assessment as historically 'important' hedgerows and potential development effects identified.
4. Whilst additional analysis could discuss the sources cited by Mr Kelly, doing so is not anticipated to alter the conclusions reached in relation to the impacts of the scheme upon the historic environment. Recognition that the historic landscape within the Site was enclosed prior to 1754 – as opposed prior to 1769 as suggested by the existing Heritage Assessment – would not alter the heritage policy tests that apply to the proposed development.
5. Such analysis would likely lead to a reclassification of the Site in terms of its Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) classification – from its current 'Planned Enclosure'

description (which accounted for 24.5% of the HLC study area), to 'Piecemeal Enclosure' (5.7% of the HLC study area) or 'Re-organised Piecemeal Enclosure' (18.1% of the HLC study area), as defined by the Leicestershire Historic Landscape Characterisation Project (Leicestershire County Council 2010). The Project defined the 'Piecemeal Enclosure' HLC type as follows:

This character type may be defined as field systems created out of the medieval open fields by means of informal, presumably verbal, agreements between farmers wishing to consolidate their holdings (Beresford, 1949). This process appears to have been underway in Leicestershire around the late 16th and early 17th centuries. Enclosure within this category will be characterised by small irregular or rectilinear fields with at least two boundaries exhibiting an 's-curve' or 'dog-leg' morphology indicating that they are following boundaries of former strip fields. (Leicestershire County Council 2010, 47)

6. Whilst such a refinement of the HLC classification would undoubtedly be beneficial to the understanding of the local historic environment, the impacts of the above application to historic landscape character would still need to be considered in the context of policies relating to non-designated heritage assets (e.g. paragraph 216 of the NPPF), as has already been presented within the existing assessments. In essence, such analysis would not alter the policy considerations in relation to the historic environment.
7. It is unclear what potential material implications this additional information is perceived to have in relation to assessing the heritage impacts of the proposed development, and indeed which specific heritage assets require additional analysis as part of any new Heritage Statement. In this context, the requirements of paragraph 207 of the NPPF need to be borne in mind, which seek to ensure that where authorities request information from applicants, the *'level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance'*.

Nathan Blick
Principal Heritage Consultant
Cotswold Archaeology
6th March 2026