LAND AT CLUMP FARM, HINCKLEY ROAD, LEICESTERSHIRE LE9 7TJ:

ARCHAEOLOGICAL MANAGEMENT PLAN

PCA Report Number: R18365

September 2026

PRE-CONSTRUCT ARCHAEOLOGY LTD

DOCUMENT VERIFICATION

Land at Clump Farm, Hinckley Road, Leicestershire LE9 7TJ: Archaeological Management Plan V.2

Quality Control

Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd	
Project Number	K10061
Report Number	R18365

	Name	Date
Text Prepared by:	Joe France	11/03/2026
Graphics Prepared by:	Joanna Nastaszyc	11/03/2026
Graphics Approved by	Mark Roughley	11/03/2026
Project Manager Sign-off:	Rebecca Nichols	11/03/2026

Revision No.	Date	Checked	Approved
3	23/10/2026	Joe France	Rebecca Nichols

Pre-Construct Archaeology Limited
Newark Regional Office
16 London Road
Newark
Notts.
NG24 1TW

Land at Clump Farm, Hinckley Road, Leicestershire LE9 7TJ: Archaeological Management Plan V.3

Local Planning Authority:	**Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council**
Central National Grid Reference:	**SK 48105 00021**
Planning Reference:	**21/01242/FUL**
Site Code:	**CFPL25**
Written and Researched by:	**Joe France**
Project Manager:	**Joe France**
Commissioning Client:	**Lighthouse Development Consulting *on behalf of* Clump Farm Solar Limited**
Contractor:	**Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd**
	Newark Office
	16 London Road
	Newark
	Nottinghamshire
	NG24 1TW
Telephone:	**01636 370410 / 07596 886014**
Email:	**rnichols@pre-construct.com**
Web:	**www.pre-construct.com**

© Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd

October 2026

The material contained herein is and remains the sole property of Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd and is not for publication to third parties without prior consent. Whilst every effort has been made to provide detailed and accurate information, Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd cannot be held responsible for errors or inaccuracies contained herein.

PCA: R18365

CONTENTS

1 Introduction 4

2 Aims 5

3 Site Description 6

4 Site Specific Archaeological and Historical Background 6

5 Summary Description of Development 10

6 Archaeological Management Plan 13

7 Bibliography 19

FIGURES

Figure 1: Site Location 20

Figure 2: Site Plan showing Proposed Archaeological Stand-off Areas 21

Figure 3: Detailed Site Plan showing Fencing and Road Layout with the Archaeological Standoff Areas 22

Figure 4: Excavated Evaluation Trenches with Proposed Archaeological Stand-off Areas 23

Figure 5: Area 1 Detailed Plan of Trench 18 Overlain on the Geophysical Survey Results 24

Figure 6: Area 2 Detailed Plan of Trenches 46 and 70 Overlain on the Geophysical Survey Results 25

Figure 7: Area 3 Detailed Plan of Trenches 29-32, 34 and 35 Overlain on the Geophysical Survey Results 26

Figure 8: Area 3 Detailed Plan of Brick Clamps and Quarries Overlain on the Geophysical Survey Results 27

Figure 9: Area 3 Detailed Plan of Trenches 109 and 110 Overlain on the Geophysical Survey Results 28

Figure 10: Areas 3 and 4 Detailed Plan of Structural Remains Overlain on the Geophysical Survey Results 29

Figure 11: Area 4 Detailed Plan of Trenches 122 and 130 Overlain on the Geophysical Survey Results 30

Figure 12: Area 4 Detailed Plan of Trenches 129 and 140 Overlain on the Geophysical Survey Results 31

Figure 13: Area 4 Detailed Plan of Trenches 138, 139, 145-147 and 150 Overlain on the Geophysical Survey Results 32

Figure 14: Area 4 Detailed Plan of Trenches 154 and 155 Overlain on the Geophysical Survey Result 33

Figure 15: Areas 4 and 5 Detailed Plan of Trenches 164 and 173 Overlain on the Geophysical Survey Results 34

Figure 16: Area 5 Detailed Plan of Trenches 172, 186 and 188 Overlain on the Geophysical Survey Results 35

1 Introduction

1.1 General Background

1.1.1 Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd (PCA) has been instructed by Lighthouse Development Consulting on behalf of Clump Farm Solar Limited to produce an Archaeological Management Plan (AMP), designed to outline an appropriate scheme of mitigation through design to allow for the preservation in situ of the archaeological remains previously identified within the development area, in advance of construction works for a new solar farm at land at Clump Farm, Hinckley Road, Thurlaston, Leicestershire (21/01242/FUL) (Figures 1 & 2).

1.1.2 The AMP provides a summary of the archaeological work undertaken on the project to date and presents the management strategy to safeguard the archaeological resource from any inadvertent adverse physical impact deriving from the ground works associated with the construction phase of the development, its management during its operation, and its decommission, and takes into consideration the guidance outlined within the *Archaeology and Solar Farms Good Practise Guide Advice for developers, archaeological advisors, consultants and contractors* (CIfA 2026).

1.1.3 A Desk-Based Assessment (Cotswold Archaeology 2021) was initially submitted as a part of the initial application alongside the results of a Geophysical Survey (Magnitude 2021). This was followed by a targeted Archaeological Evaluation (PCA 2026) followed (Figure 3), which identified a late the post medieval remains of Tooley Hall, its park and gardens, associated brick manufacturing, and small number of 1st-2nd century Romano-British features which broadly aligned with the results of the geophysical survey.

1.1.4 Due to the extent of the archaeological resource identified within the development area, and its local significance, it has been recognised that the impacts upon the buried archaeological remains recorded within the development area would require further mitigation to offset any potential impact caused by the development.

1.1.5 It has been proposed that the archaeological resource will be chiefly mitigated through design to allow for preservation in situ during the setup, operation, and decommissioning activities associated with the development, and that those measures will be outlined in an Archaeological Management Plan, in line with condition 11 of planning application 21/01242/FUL.

1.2 Planning background

1.2.1 On 9th February 2022, Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council granted full planning permission with conditions for the construction of a Solar farm for the generation of up to 40 MW of AC electrical energy, including access tracks, solar panels, transformer cabins and a substation, enclosed within a 2m perimeter 'deer' fence and associated landscaping (21/01242/FUL).

1.2.2 This management plan has been informed by the results of an earlier archaeological evaluation undertaken in connection with condition 10 of the development (PCA 2026) and have been designed to satisfy the anticipated requirements of the local planning authority and have been designed in response to part two of planning condition 11 of application 21/01242/FUL:

1.2.3 *Part 1 - Prior to commencement of any development, a detailed site plan including Archaeological Exclusion Zones will be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Following the approval and completion of the archaeological evaluation referred to in Condition 10, and prior to the commencement of development, a final detailed site layout plan with full details of the final locations, design and materials to be used for the panel arrays, inverters, customer switchgear, substations, CCTV cameras, fencing, foundations and cabling will be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Should the archaeological evaluation identify any significant archaeological deposits, the final detailed site layout plan will define archaeological exclusion zones within which below and above ground development will be excluded and/or provide sufficient design mitigation will be provided including but not limited to the use of above ground cables, concrete shoes or other means to avoid any impact on archaeological deposits if required. The final detailed site layout plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with the County Council's Lead Archaeologist. Subsequently the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.*

1.2.4 *Part 2 - If there are archaeological areas to be preserved in situ, a management plan will be produced for any archaeological areas to be preserved in situ, setting out the methodology to secure the ongoing protection of these areas both during construction, operation and decommissioning of the solar farm.*

2 Aims

2.1.1 The purpose of this AMP is to provide a baseline of archaeological work to date and to outline a methodology to:

- safeguard the archaeological resource from any inadvertent adverse physical impact deriving from the ground works associated with the construction phase of the development; its management during its operation, and its decommission;
- and to provide an outline methodology to determine the character and extent of any archaeologically significant remains should preservation in situ proves unfeasible;

2.1.2 To ensure that this document remains relevant, adequate and effective as the works progress the AMP will be reviewed and updated:

- Following any change in scope of work that has an impact on archaeological requirements;

- and as instructed by the Project Manager or the Senior Planning Archaeologist (Heritage) for Hinkley and Bosworth Borough Council.

2.1.3 By adhering to these aims, archaeological remains will be preserved or recorded in a manner proportionate to their significance in compliance with the local and national planning policy specified in conditions 10 and 11 of the planning consent.

3 Site Description

3.1.1 The Site, on land at Clump Farm, lies c. 2km to the northeast of Earl Shilton in Leicestershire, on the north side of Hinckley Road (A47) in the Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council (**Figure 1**).

3.1.2 The Site comprises three arable fields bounded by woodland and agricultural fields to the south, east, and west and the A47 to the south, and occupies a relatively flat parcel of land. Its north-western limits comprise fields situated on low lying ground at c. 105m above Ordnance Datum (aOD) with the south-eastern limits at c. 92m aOD. The Site forms part of the Leicestershire Vales, which is characterised by large, relatively open clay vales dispersed with a range of river valleys, the nearest of which to the Site is the Soar Valley c. 6km to the south-east.

3.1.3 The solid geology underlying the Site is variable. In the north of the Site the solid geology is Edwalton Member mudstone, in the centre of the Site are interbedded Cotgrave Member sandstones and in the south of the Site is mudstone of the Gunthorpe Member. Superficial deposits of mid Pleistocene Diamicton are shown in two areas in the north of the Site (British Geological Survey 2025).

3.1.4 The Cranfield Soil and Agrifood Institute identify the soils of the site as Soilscape 18: slowly permeable seasonally wet slightly acid but base-rich loamy and clayey soils (http://www.landis.org.uk/soilscapes).

4 Site Specific Archaeological and Historical Background

4.1 Summary (Figures 5 – 16)

4.1.1 The following describes the archaeological sequence as determined by the relative dates of the finds, as well as by comparison with the known historic map sequence and histories of the landscape and its features.

4.1.2 A total of ninety-three archaeologically significant cut features (including twenty-nine masonry/ foundation/ wall features) and fifty-one standalone deposits were excavated during the evaluation. A small number of Roman features were present within Area 4, whilst the majority of the features across the Site were post-medieval or modern in date and attributable to the former site of Tooley Hall, its associated gardens and parkland, and agricultural activity.

4.1.3 It has been recognized that the archaeological features identified within the development area have the potential to address many of the research themes and objectives outlined in the East Midlands Heritage: An Updated Research Agenda and Strategy for the Historic Environment of the East Midlands (Interactive Digital Platform available at: www.researchframeworks.org/emherf),

4.2 Prehistoric

4.2.1 No definitive prehistoric features were found during the evaluation; the only artefact with a possible prehistoric date was a fragment of a possible fired clay object which featured two angled surfaces potentially forming part of a prehistoric loom weight, kiln bar, or a kiln pedestal. This was recovered from within ditch [40] (trench 122), from which later 1-2nd century pottery was also recovered, suggesting it may have been residual or indicative of a continued tradition into the early Roman period.

4.3 Roman

4.3.1 The only features that could be reliably regarded as Roman were a linear feature [121] (trench 139), [93] (trench 138), [344] (trench 145), and [91] (trench 146), which ran broadly parallel the alignment of the post-medieval boundary recorded within trenches 139, 145, and 146.

4.3.2 It is likely that this ditch was part of a co-axial field system with perpendicular ditches, aligning roughly E-W present within trenches 138, 145, 146 and 155. Environmental samples from these features contained spelt, oats, and barley seeds in variable quantities, which were indicative of agricultural processing. The highest quantities of charred grains from ditch [144] within trench 155 suggest proximity to cereal processing activities.

4.3.3 A probable ring ditch, comprising of [130] and [100] identified within trench 146 was also identified, with environmental samples showing similar charred grains in smaller quantities.

4.3.4 Small quantities of Roman pottery of a largely 1-2nd century date were recovered sporadically from these features.

4.3.5 Finds of probable Roman-dated Swithland slate tiles were identified within several features or deposits within trenches 88 and 89 suggest the presence of a Roman structure having been present within or close to the site. This is further corroborated by 1st-2nd century pottery recovered from ditches [40] and [66] (trench 122) alongside CBM (including a fragment of box-flue tile) and a fragment of tegula from a robbed-out post-medieval wall [175].

Paleochannel

4.3.6 A notable deposit of silty clay within a shallow hollow or depression was seen within Trenches 145, 146, and 147, potentially representing a NW-SE aligned paleochannel. Two of the fills of this feature, containing a possible iron knife as well as horse and cattle bones, as well as two sherds of 1st-century Samian ware.

4.3.7 As no continuation of the feature was recorded to the NW or SE, it has been suggested it may have formed through seasonal drainage runoff during the Roman period.

Medieval

4.3.8 No features of medieval date were recorded within the site. However, several shallow, parallel linear features were recorded in trenches 30, 31, 129, and 164, which likely represented agricultural furrows. The site was located within the wider bounds of Hereswode Forest during the medieval period, which was in part subject to agricultural activities, but is recorded as becoming a part of the Tooley deer-hunting park in the late thirteenth century.

4.3.9 No features clearly associated with the medieval Deer Park were identified; however, boundary ditch [117], whilst most likely to be post-medieval in date, may be associated with an internal division in the deer park.

Post-Medieval

Boundary Ditches

4.3.10 The most archaeologically prominent former boundary ditch was located within Area 4, which was clearly defined on the geophysical survey and which was aligned broadly N-S, and which was depicted on the 1851 Tooley Tithe Map, and on later 19th and 20th century OS maps. A section of the ditch was recorded within trench 139 (as [117]) and recorded in plan within trenches 138, 146, and 154.

4.3.11 A similar agricultural boundary confirmed within T186/ 188/ 173 within Area 5. Similarly, the boundary ditch encountered within trench 18 was depicted on the 1980 OS map.

4.3.12 The geophysical survey identified several linear features, mostly on a roughly NW-SE alignment within Areas 3 and 4, but these were largely proven to represent geological anomalies, or even the result of modern ploughing. The only exception to this was the NE-SW-aligned ditch excavated in trenches 109 [294] and 110 [218], which contained no datable finds.

Brick Clamps and Clay Pits

4.3.13 Centrally within Area 3 was a large group of substantial, deep, subcircular pits (sample excavated within trench 100 and recorded in plan in trenches 90,91, 99, 101, 102, 103, 104). These were interpreted as clay extraction pits, and were likely associated with the brick clamps identified within Trenches 102 & 104.

4.3.14 The clamps were recorded in plan and were typical of post-medieval rural brick making, and likely relate to the provision of bricks for the reconstruction of Tooley Hall c1800. Deposits within trench 122, overlaying the base of the clamp, appeared to represent the dismantling of the brick piles following firing.

Footprint of Tooley Hall

4.3.15 The structural elements present within the north of Area 3 and North-west of Area 4 corresponded with the geophysical survey of the location of the former Tooley Hall and its associated gardens as depicted on the 1851 Tooley Tithe Map. However, the buildings appear much more expensive than those shown on the map. On this map within the Site, the hall buildings are shown as comprising a single sub-rectangular building approximately 30m in width, with narrow 'ranges' extending north. However, the archaeological evaluation identified further structural remains.

4.3.16 The HER entry for the hall records that in *1778, when it was advertised for sale, it had cellars, coach houses, stabling, a walled garden, etc. The house was rebuilt c.1800. By c.1840 it had become a farmhouse…*which appears to be corroborated by the archaeological evidence.

Pre-1800 remains

4.3.17 Deposits within trench 89 contained pottery of an early 17th-century date, as well as a crotal bell and iron key, all dating from the 15th to 17th centuries, which would suggest that the deposit was associated with the demolition of the original Tooley Hall before rebuilding in the early 19th century. A set of similar deposits was present within trench 80 and 96 which represent levelling/ terracing to the south and west of the new structure. Within trench 81 to the west of the known location of the 19th-century hall were several partly demolished and robbed-out walls sealed by a similar consolidation.

4.3.18 Trench 121 exposed two parallel robber trenches from which pottery dating 1600-1800 was recovered. Trench 123 contained a robbed-out wall aligned perpendicular to those in trench 121. A continuation south-east of the wall, as shown on the geophysical survey, was tested with Trench 124, and whilst no wall was present, two similar potential robber trenches were recorded.

4.3.19 The plan of the pre-1800 hall that the ground truthing of the geophysical survey revealed was of a central rectangular building, with an enclosed area extending to its east likely forming a walled garden.

19th century

4.3.20 Due to the active trackway existing between Areas 3 and 4, it was not possible to locate more than one trench within the location of the post-1800 Tooley Hall; trench 88 showed a continuation of the consolidation deposit associated with the demolition of the earlier hall, and the lower walls of basements associated with the post-1800 structure.

4.3.21 Trench 130 was deliberately located to determine the nature of a squared feature identified on the previous geophysical survey (ASWYAS 2021), and which is recorded in the HER as being a possible Roman enclosure or mausoleum. Excavation revealed a deposit of post-medieval made ground containing 18-19th century bottle glass consistent with the levelling deposits elsewhere before the construction of the new Hall in c1800. This was truncated by a robbed-out post-medieval wall, suggesting the structure to be an ancillary building associated with the new hall buildings, possibly a wall demarcating the southeastern boundary of the wooded landscaping shown on the tithe map.

Trackway

4.3.22 Trench 29 contained two shallow, parallel linear features [28] & [30] which correspond with a landscaped trackway or woodland ride to the west of Tooley Hall, as shown on the 1851 tithe map.

5 Summary Description of Development

5.1.1 The following description of the solar scheme is based on the Design and Access Statement (Clump Farm Solar 2021) submitted on 6th October 2021 in support of the planning application, and the updated site plan outlining the areas of archaeological mitigation (Figures 2 & 3). Subsequent publication of revised proposals and specifications for the development, together with updated plans and drawings, may necessitate revisions to this AMP.

5.1.2 This solar park will briefly comprise the following elements:

- 85,000 (approximately) photovoltaic panels mounted on a stainless-steel frame fixed to the ground;
- Substations, inverters and transformers housed in metal containers;
- Metal storage containers (up to three);
- perimeter fencing with cctv;
- access track

5.1.3 The site will be used for 40 years from the date of first exportation of electricity from the site. At the end of the operational lifespan of the proposed development all equipment, underground connections and all associated development and materials would be removed.

5.1.4 The layout takes into account the existing tree and hedgerow vegetation and their root zone. Fence posts, table legs and other apparatus are all are offset from the vegetation to avoid harm. Access tracks have been aligned to limit harm to tree roots.

5.1.5 The construction phase would be about 28 weeks, with the most intense activity occurring during weeks 3 to 20. To minimise disruption construction (and subsequently

decommissioning) would be carried out in accordance with a Construction Management Plan, which would meet the highest industry standards. The CMP would also include measures to avoid environmental harm, notably to biodiversity (including hedgerow and individual trees), the water environment and heritage; and to ensure safe passage across the site for those wishing to use the footpath.

Solar Panels

5.1.6 The panels would be mounted on a stainless steel, non-reflective framework, with table 'legs' of non-corrosive metal driven into the ground to a depth of between 1m and 1.5m.

5.1.7 The layout and framework or 'tables' are illustrated within figure 2. The mounted panels would be arranged in straight rows across the site with the panels angled at 20 degrees and facing southwards.

5.1.8 It would be possible for sheep to graze around and beneath the panels, although it is not currently the intention of the farmer / landowner to do so. The areas of archaeological sensitivity will be managed as rough grassland and seeded with Tussock Grass in anticipation of agricultural use being re-introduced following decommissioning. This will be sown with low-impact machinery/equipment, designed to avoid impacting the sub-soil, and in turn will avoid the compression or truncation of the subsurface archaeological remains.

Fencing

5.1.9 The site would be enclosed by security fencing ('deer fencing' other than the gates), of approximately 2m in height (with 2.1m wooden posts – metal posts at the gates). Cameras would be situated at the periphery of the site alongside the boundary fence and mounted on 3.51m poles. Fences would be positioned 10m inside the hedgerows that form the boundary to the fields with no part of the installation closer than 5m to the perimeter fence. The fence line will following the southern permitter of the northern archaeological standoff area (Figure 03) to avoid any truncation to know archaeological features and deposits, and its route through the northwestern portion of the standoff area takes into the consideration the results of both the geophysical survey and trenches 27 and 28 which indicate a low potential for further buried remains.

Cable Infrastructure

5.1.10 Cables would run along the supporting framework joining 'strings' of solar panels. Cables would join the strings to inverters, which are required to convert the DC electricity produced by the PV panels to AC electricity. Inverters would be installed positioned under the panels.

5.1.11 The inverters would be joined by cables that would feed from beneath the panels into the ground and, subsequently, to a transformer in a metal cabin. They would sit on a plinth constructed of compacted material with a sand and geotextile layer. The transformer cabins would similarly sit on a concrete plinth up to 1.5m deep.

5.1.12 A high voltage cable would run from the substation to connect to the National Grid at

Enderby.

Access Tracks

5.1.13 The access tracks would be approximately 3.5m wide and constructed of compacted gravel over a geotextile layer. Where the track crosses through the archaeological mitigation areas, a non-intrusive construction technique will be employed. The NW-SE orientated track will be built upon the existing trackway, and the NE-SW aligned track will be constructed using non-intrusive techniques in line with the following strategy:

- The topsoil and vegetation are left in place. No stripping, levelling or excavation takes place.
- The grass will be cut short beforehand with low-impact equipment.
- A geogrid (Lotrak 30/30S) system will be rolled out by hand on the existing surface, overlapped and fixed with surface weights or with the road stone itself. No ground will be pins used. The need for a separation geotextile beneath is to be confirmed.
- The ACW/attending archaeologist inspects the laid geogrid before any road stone is placed.
- Stone is delivered only along the finished track. It is end-tipped onto the completed section and pushed forward onto the geogrid by a low-ground-pressure tracked machine standing on placed stone. No plant runs on the geogrid or on bare ground at any time.
- Stone is placed to the full design thickness (up to 0.3 m) in one advance before anything travels on it. A static compaction method or with low-vibration equipment will be used to consolidate the material.
- Whilst it is anticipated that any ground disturbance will be no greater than approximately 50mm, which should not impact the buried archaeological features, the ACW/attending archaeologist will observe the construction of the road and may stop it if rutting, or disturbance is seen.
- Each completed section will be inspected by a suitably qualified and experienced individual before it is opened to traffic. Settlement pins will be installed if the designer requires or archaeologist requires them.

5.1.14 Whilst it is perceived that this will have no impact on the buried archaeological remains this will be required to be monitored by the ACW to consider whether any archaeological involvement would be required at the time, which would be undertaken in consultation with the Senior Planning Archaeologist (Heritage) for Hinkley and Bosworth Borough Council.

6 Archaeological Management Plan

6.1.1 The following strategy has been informed by the results of an earlier archaeological evaluation undertaken in connection with condition 10 of the development (PCA 2026) and have been designed to satisfy the anticipated requirements of the local planning authority and in response to part two of planning condition 11 of application 21/01242/FUL. It presents the management strategy to safeguard the archaeological resource from any inadvertent adverse physical impact deriving from the ground works associated with the construction phase of the development, its management during its operation, and its decommission.

6.1.2 The AMP has been developed to act as an overarching Archaeological Project Design to guide the archaeological mitigation required for the Scheme.

6.1.3 It is anticipated that should further archaeological intervention be required that they would be developed and implemented through task-specific Written Schemes of Investigation (WSI) or archaeological method statements, which will be produced by an Archaeological Contractor on behalf of an appointed Archaeological Clerk of Works, and approved by the Senior Planning Archaeologist (Heritage) for Hinkley and Bosworth Borough Council

6.2 Archaeological Clerk of Works

6.2.1 Clump Farm Solar Limited will need to instruct an Archaeological Clerk of Works (ACW) who will be responsible on behalf of Clump Farm Solar Limited for the implementation of the AMP throughout the life of the solar installation.

6.2.2 The ACW will be required to be a professionally accredited archaeologist with demonstrable experience managing archaeological projects, and a good knowledge of relevant legislation and policy.

6.2.3 They will be responsible for monitoring, or contracting professional archaeologists to monitor those phases of construction work in line with the procedure set out in this document to allow for the preservation in situ and record of the archaeological resource. Should the areas identified for preservation in situ prove unfeasible (Figures 1 & 2), the ACW will also be required to prepare supplementary archaeological method statements in consultation with the local planning authority to ensure that suitable archaeological intervention is undertaken.

6.2.4 It will be necessary for the ACW to liaise with all relevant bodies and individuals, including the main site contractor, sub-contractors, project delivery team, and the Senior Planning Archaeologist (Heritage) for Hinkley and Bosworth Borough Council, to identify items in the archaeological works where formal consents, authorisation or permission is required from others such as the local Planning Authority and land owner.

6.3 Construction Phase

6.3.1 Several areas of archaeological significance have been identified within the development area (Figures 2 & 3) which will be preserved in situ and record. Prior to the commencement of any intrusive ground works, the ACW will produce clear written guidelines to be included in the sites principal Method Statement issued for the use of all construction contractors, outlining the need to avoid unnecessary damage to the known areas of archaeological sensitivity within the site. All contractors will be informed of the archaeological constraints before entering site.

6.3.2 The written guidelines will contain details of arrangements for calling upon professional archaeological support in the event that buried archaeological remains of potential archaeological interest (such as building remains, human remains, artefacts, etc) are discovered outside of those that are being preserved in situ. The guidance will also make clear the legal responsibilities placed upon those who disturb artefacts or human remains, and that should artefacts be located during the course of construction that are deemed by their material content or context to be treasure, as defined by the Treasure Act 1996, that all necessary measures to comply with the requirements of the Act and any project specific requirements will be implemented.

6.3.3 The ACW will also provide input into toolbox talks for site inductions where appropriate.

Area of Archaeological Stand Off / Preservation In-Situ

6.3.4 Three key areas containing significant archaeological features have been identified within the site which will be preserved in situ (Figures 2 & 3). It has been recognised that due to the shallow depth of the archaeological resource within the eastern and southern most stand-off areas, that these archaeological remains may be impacted even through non-intrusive development, and that a strategy of preservation in-situ would be preferable to preservation by record.

6.3.5 The proposed development layout incorporates a standoff zone around these areas wherein no solar arrays, or supporting infrastructure will be installed in order to ensure there will be no impact of the remains resulting from the development. The ACW will ensure that this area will be cordoned off using non-intrusive Heras style panels to prevent the movement of plant, or the storage of materials within the area prior to the commencement of any groundworks on the site. All contractors will be informed of the archaeological constraints before entering site prior to the commencement of any groundworks on the site.

6.3.6 The integrity of the Heras fencing will be monitored and any damage to a fence will be repaired or the fence replaced. A similar non instructive barrier will be maintained on the conclusion of construction works for the lifetime of the scheme to ensure it is clear where this area is and to prevent any accidental impacts. However, the efficacy of this strategy should be reviewed by the ACW in consultation with the Senior Planning Archaeologist (Heritage) for Hinkley and Bosworth Borough Council, to consider whether any alternative is required during the sites use, and if archaeological involvement would be required at the time of its installation.

6.3.7 Where the access tracks cross through the northernmost archaeological mitigation area, a non-intrusive construction technique will be employed (**see section 5.1.13**). Whilst it is perceived that this will have no impact on the buried archaeological remains this will be required to be monitored by the ACW to consider whether any archaeological involvement would be required at the time, which would be undertaken in consultation with the Senior Planning Archaeologist (Heritage) for Hinkley and Bosworth Borough Council. The NW-SE orientated track will be built upon the existing trackway, and the NE-SW aligned track will be laid directly on the existing ground surface and will comprise up to 0.3m of compacted clean stone placed upon biaxial geogrid Lotrak 30/30s.

6.3.8 A banksman will control every vehicle entry and exit at the zone boundary. Only vehicles on the designer's permitted list may enter, up to the stated ground-pressure or axle-load limit which will be confirmed by the project designer and included in all relevant induction processes. Heavy goods vehicles will be excluded unless the designer and archaeologist agree otherwise. All vehicles will stay on the track and will not turn or reverse off the track. Similarly, parking, stockpiling or refuelling will not be permitted within the zone, and this will be outlined within the site induction.

6.3.9 If a track section ruts or deforms, traffic on that section stops and the ACW and designer are informed before it is repaired.

6.3.10 The site would be enclosed by security fencing (‘deer fencing’ other than the gates), of approximately 2m in height (with 2.1m wooden posts – metal posts at the gates). The fence line will following the southern permitter of the northern archaeological standoff area (Figure 03) to avoid any truncation to know archaeological features and deposits, and its route through the northwestern portion of the standoff area takes into the consideration the results of both the geophysical survey and trenches 27 and 28 which indicate a low potential for further buried remains

6.3.11 The management of any grassland areas which fall within the archaeology exclusions zones should be undertaken with low-impact machinery/equipment, designed to avoid impacting the sub-soil, and in turn will avoid the compression or truncation of the subsurface archaeological remains. It is anticipated that any ground disturbance will be no greater than approximately 50mm, which should not impact the buried archaeological features.

Preservation through record - Archaeological Watching Brief or Strip, Map and Record during development

6.3.12 Whilst it is proposed that the archaeological remains identified within the site will preserved in situ (mitigated by design), should the areas identified for preservation in situ prove unfeasible (Figures 1 & 2), the ACW will also be required to prepare supplementary archaeological method statements in consultation with the local planning authority to ensure that suitable archaeological intervention is undertaken.

6.3.13 This may take the form of an Archaeological Watching Brief within and around the impacted area, which would aim to ensure that any buried features disturbed by ground-breaking works can be identified and recorded as appropriate. A formal methodology for the Archaeological Watching Brief will be set out in a Written Scheme of Investigation, produced by the ACW, or approved archaeological contractor in consultation with the Senior Planning Archaeologist (Heritage). Site attendance will be agreed between Clump Farm Solar Limited and the ACW in accordance with the project programme. This will be approved by the Senior Planning Archaeologist (Heritage) Planning Archaeologist for Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council.

6.3.14 Similarly, if buried archaeological remains of potential archaeological interest (such as building remains, human remains, artefacts, etc) are discovered outside of those areas those areas highlighted for preservation in-situ, and should preservation in situ prove unfeasible, the ACW will be required to prepare supplementary archaeological method statements in consultation with the local planning authority to allow for an adequate programme of archaeological intervention to take place.

6.3.15 The programme of archaeological works will be carried out according to the *Standard for archaeological monitoring and recording* (CIfA 2023a) and *Universal guidance for archaeological monitoring and recording* (CIfA 2023b), *Universal Guidance for archaeological excavation (revised)* (Cifa 2023c). The archaeological contractor must adhere to the CIfA *Code of conduct: professional ethics in archaeology* (2025) and to project management advice set out in *Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment: The Project Managers' Guide* (Historic England 2015).

6.3.16 CIfA (2023a) defines archaeological monitoring and recording (archaeological observation) as:

6.3.17 *… a formal programme of observation, investigation and recording conducted during works carried out for non-archaeological reasons, where there is a possibility that archaeological deposits may be disturbed or destroyed.*

6.3.18 *This will be within a specified area or site on land, in an inter-tidal zone or under water. This definition and Standard do not cover chance observations, which should lead to an appropriate archaeological project being designed and implemented, nor do they apply to monitoring for preservation of remains in situ.*

6.3.19 If larger or more significant discoveries are made (those requiring an extended period of time to excavate and record, and again where preservation in situ proves unfeasible) the archaeological contractor will immediately inform the ACW and Senior Planning Archaeologist (Heritage) Planning Archaeologist for Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council.

6.3.20 The ACW will be responsible for keeping the Senior Planning Archaeologist (Heritage) Planning Archaeologist for Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council informed of the timetable and progress of the archaeological works and will be immediately informed of any significant discoveries. The Senior Planning Archaeologist (Heritage) Planning Archaeologist for Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council will be afforded reasonable access to the site to monitor the works.

6.3.21 The final results of any archaeological intervention will be presented to the Senior Planning Archaeologist (Heritage) Planning Archaeologist for Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council in the form of a written report post-construction. This report will clearly and accurately incorporate information obtained from the programme of archaeological work, together with references to primary and secondary documentary sources (where appropriate).

6.3.22 The report will contain a full site plan showing the location of all recorded features etc., as well as detailed drawings and a comprehensive photographic record.

6.4 Management During Operation

Groundworks

6.4.1 No ground works within the areas of known archaeological remains (Figures. 2 & 3) will take place without prior the notification of the ACW and the Senior Planning Archaeologist (Heritage) Planning Archaeologist for Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council, and a strategy of archaeological mitigation is established, and an approved Written Scheme of Investigation has been produced. Any works agreed upon must be carried out in accordance with the approved programme.

Landscape Management

6.4.2 The management of any grassland areas which fall within the archaeology exclusions zones should be undertaken with low-impact machinery/equipment, designed to avoid impacting the sub-soil, and in turn will avoid the compression or truncation of the subsurface archaeological re-mains.

6.4.3 It is anticipated that any ground disturbance will be no greater than approximately 50mm, which should not impact the buried archaeological features. This impact will however require to be monitored by the ACW and any variation to the perceived impact depth will be revised in with the Senior Planning Archaeologist (Heritage) Planning Archaeologist for Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council.

6.4.4 It is considered that seasonal and non-intrusive movement of machinery is comparable to the level of impact of agricultural machinery. It is anticipated that grass land areas will be subject to topping and mowing at regular intervals during development, which will become more infrequent following the establishment of the grasslands. Within the archaeological exclusion areas, this process should avoid periods when ground conditions are likely to be wet and most prone to the effects of vehicle rutting. Such measures will avoid truncation to buried archaeological deposits through rutting. Contractors will be informed of the archaeological constraints before entering site.

6.4.5 The grassland may be subject to light intermittent grazing by sheep, but it is not anticipated that this should cause any impact on the buried archaeological resource.

Movement across site

6.4.6 Once operational, the solar farm would require infrequent visits for the purposes of equipment maintenance or cleaning of the site on an as required basis. As such, the operational access will be associated with a low number of trips, with the largest maintenance vehicle anticipated to be or 4x4 vehicle type

6.4.7 It is advised that maintenance requiring plant should avoid being undertaken during periods when ground conditions are likely to be wet and most prone to the effects of vehicle rutting.

6.4.8 However, if this unavoidable then track/bog matting will be employed to allow for vehicular access in the archaeologically sensitive areas. Such measures will avoid truncation to buried archaeological deposits through rutting. Contractors will be informed of the archaeological constraints before entering site.

6.5 Decommission

6.5.1 It is anticipated that the decommissioning of the development may entail the movement of plant and intrusive ground works within or directly adjacent to the areas of archaeological potential (Figures 2 & 3), and that the land will revert to agricultural use thereafter.

6.5.2 Whilst it is not anticipated that restoration of the site to agricultural use will require particularly intrusive restoration methods within the place within the areas of archaeological sensitivity (figures 2 and 3), the impact of these works should be reviewed by the ACW and the Senior Planning Archaeologist (Heritage) for Hinkley and Bosworth Borough Council, to consider whether any archaeological involvement would be required at the time.

No ground works should take place within the areas of archaeological sensitivity (figures 2 and 3) without the notification of the planning officer, and a strategy of archaeological mitigation is established and a Written scheme of investigation submitted to, and approved by, the local planning authority. Any works agreed must be carried out in accordance with the approved programme.

7 Bibliography

CIfA, 2023a. *Standard for Archaeological Monitoring and Recording. Reading: Chartered Institute for Archaeologists.*

CIfA, 2023b. *Universal Guidance for Archaeological Monitoring and Recording. Reading: Chartered Institute for Archaeologists.*

CIfA, 2023c, *Universal Guidance for archaeological excavation (revised). Chartered Institute for Archaeologists*

CIfA, 2025, *Code of Conduct, Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Reading*

CIfA, 2025, *Archaeology and Solar Farms Good Practise Guide Advice for developers, archaeological advisors, consultants and contractors*

Clump Farm Solar Limited, 2021, *Planning Statement Incorporating: Design and Access Statement, Statement of Community Involvement Proposed Development of Land At Clump Farm, Peckleton Parish for a Solar Farm - Capacity 40mw Ac*

Cooper, N. (ed.), 2006, *The Archaeology of the East Midlands: An Archaeological Resource Assessment and Research Agenda for the East Midlands. Leicester Archaeology Monograph No. 13. University of Leicester*

Cotswold Archaeology, 2021. *Land at Clump Farm, Thurlaston, Leicestershire: Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment*

Knight, D, Vyner, B & Allen, C. 2012. *East Midlands Heritage. An Updated Research Agenda and Strategy for the Historic Environment of the East Midlands. University of Nottingham & York Archaeological Trust*

Historic England, 2015, *Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment*

Magnitude Survey, 2021, *Geophysical Survey Clump Farm Solar*

Pre-Construct Archaeology, 2025, *Land at Clump Farm, Hinckley Road, Leicestershire LE9 7TJ: Written Scheme of Investigation for an Archaeological Evaluation*

Pre-Construct Archaeology, 2026, *Land at Clump Farm, Hinckley Road, Leicestershire LE9 7TJ: An Archaeological Evaluation*

The British Geological Survey Map (BGS) – http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html



Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database right 2026
© Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd 2026
10/03/2026 JN

Figure 1
Site Location
1:2,000,000, 1:250,000, 1:25,000 at A4

P:\PROJECT DATA\Out of London\Leicestershire\Land at Clump Farm, Peckleton Hinckley Rd\CAD\AMP\Fig 03_Detailed Site Plan showing Mitigation Areas_REV.dwg



0 250m

Proposed Plan reproduced from a drawing by SUNNERG Energy & Facility Management
Ordnance Survey © Crown copyright 2025. All rights reserved. License number 100022432
© Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd 2026
11/03/2026 JN

Figure 2
Site Plan showing Proposed Archaeological Stand-off Areas
1:5,000 at A3

P:\PROJECT DATA\Out of London\Leicestershire\Land at Clump Farm, Peckleton Hinckley Rd\CAD\AMP\Fig 02_Detailed Site Plan showing Mitigation Areas_REV4.dwg



0 250m

Proposed Plan reproduced from a drawing by SUNNERG Energy & Facility Management
Ordnance Survey © Crown copyright 2026. All rights reserved. License number 100022432
© Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd 2026
20/10/2026 JN / MR

Figure 3
Detailed Site Plan showing Fencing and Road Layout within the Archaeological Stand-off Areas
1:5,000 at A3

P:\PROJECT DATA\Out of London\Leicestershire\Land at Clump Farm, Peckleton Hinckley Rd\CAD\AMP\Fig 04_Detailed Site Plan_REV.dwg



Ordnance Survey © Crown copyright 2025. All rights reserved. License number 100022432
© Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd 2026
11/03/2026 JN

Figure 4
Excavated Evaluation Trenches with Proposed Archaeological Stand-off Areas
1:5,000 at A3

P:\PROJECT DATA\Out of London\Leicestershire\Land at Clump Farm, Peckleton Hinckley Rd\CAD\AMP\Fig 05_Area 1 Tr 18.dwg



Basemap reproduced from a drawing by ASWYAS

© Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd 2026

10/03/2026 JN

Figure 5
Area 1 Detailed Plan of Trench 18 Overlain on the Geophysical Survey Results
1:500 at A4

P:\PROJECT DATA\Out of London\Leicestershire\Land at Clump Farm, Peckleton Hinckley Rd\CAD\AMP\Fig 06_Area 2 Tr 46_70.dwg





0 25m

Basemap reproduced from a drawing by ASWYAS

© Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd 2026

10/03/2026 JN

Figure 6
Area 2 Detailed Plan of Trenches 46 and 70 Overlain on the Geophysical Survey Results
1:500 at A3

P:\PROJECT DATA\Out of London\Leicestershire\Land at Clump Farm, Peckleton Hinckley Rd\CAD\AMP\Fig 07_Area 3 Tr 29-32_34-35_REV.dwg



Basemap reproduced from a drawing by ASWYAS

© Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd 2026

10/03/2026 JN

Figure 7
Area 3 Detailed Plan of Trenches 29-32, 34 and 35 Overlain on the Geophysical Survey Results
1:500 at A3

P:\PROJECT DATA\Out of London\Leicestershire\Land at Clump Farm, Peckleton Hinckley Rd\CAD\AMP\Fig 08_Area 3 Brick Clamps and Quarry_REV.dwg

Trench 84

Trench 92

Trench 105

N

Trench 91

Quarry Pit [336]

Trench 90

Quarry Pit [338]

Trench 98

Trench 101

Quarry Pit [334]

Pit [292]

Trench 102

Layer [289]

Layer [271]

Layer [272]

Brick Clamp

Layer [270]

Layer [273]

Layer [290]

Layer [276]

Layer [277]

Trench 104

Quarry Pit [325]

Trench 99

Quarry Pit [332]

Trench 103

Quarry Pit [330]

Quarry Pit [328]

447800/299685

447970/299685

Trench 100

Quarry Pit [32]

Proposed Archaeological stand-off Areas
Negative Trench (PCA 2025)
Evaluation Trench (PCA 2025)
Post-medieval
Modern
Undated
Masonry
Excavated Slot

Interpretation

FERROUS	AGRICULTURAL	ARCHAEOLOGY?
SERVICE PIPE	FORMER FIELD BOUNDARY	ARCHAEOLOGY
MAGNETIC DISTURBANCE	GEOLOGY	CROPMARKS
FIELD DRAIN	UNCERTAIN	

0 25m

Basemap reproduced from a drawing by ASWYAS

© Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd 2026

10/03/2026 JN

Figure 8
Area 3 Detailed Plan of Brick Clamps and Quarries Overlain on the Geophysical Survey Results
1:500 at A3

P:\PROJECT DATA\Out of London\Leicestershire\Land at Clump Farm, Peckleton Hinckley Rd\CAD\AMP\Fig 09_Area 3 Tr 107_109_111_112_REV.dwg



Basemap reproduced from a drawing by ASWYAS

© Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd 2026

10/03/2026 JN

Figure 9
Area 3 Detailed Plan of Trenches 109 and 110 Overlain on the Geophysical Survey Results
1:500 at A3

P:\PROJECT DATA\Out of London\Leicestershire\Land at Clump Farm, Peckleton Hinckley Rd\CAD\AMP\Fig 10_Area 3 Structural Remains_REV.dwg

Interpretation

FERROUS	AGRICULTURAL	ARCHAEOLOGY?
SERVICE PIPE	FORMER FIELD BOUNDARY	ARCHAEOLOGY
MAGNETIC DISTURBANCE	GEOLOGY	CROPMARKS
FIELD DRAIN	UNCERTAIN	

Proposed Archaeological stand-off Areas
Negative Trench (PCA 2025)
Evaluation Trench (PCA 2025)

Post-medieval
Modern
Undated
Field Drain
Excavated Slot

Area 3

Area 4

Trench 81
Culvert [296]
Layer [308]
Layer [309]
Wall [343]
Wall [303]
Wall [302]

Wall [53]
Wall [43]
Layer [65]
Layer [55]
Wall [44]
Wall [45]
Cut [56]
Layer [59]
Cut [60]
Layer [58]
Layer [48]
Layer [49]
Trench 88
Layer [47]

Trench 121
Masonry [167]
Culvert [166]
Ditch [165]
Ditch [162]
Ditch [175]
Masonry [172]
Ditch [171]
Ditch [160]
Treethrow[157]

Trench 123
Layer [199]
Wall [184]
Pit [185]
Wall [197]

N

Layer [270]
Trench 80
Cut [263]
Culvert [264]
447880/299935

Trench 124
Layer [181]
Ditch [178]
Ditch [182]
448040/299935

Wall [226]
Trench 89
Cut [239]
Ditch [227]
Ditch [233]
Layer [257]
Cut [223]
Layer [230]
Layer [256]
Cut [254]
Layer [222]
Layer [221]

Trench 87

Trench 79
Ditch [215]

Cut [250]
Wall [246]
Cut [261]
Ditch [248]
Cut [245]
Cut [258]
Trench 95

Trench 96
Layer [208]
Layer [209]
Cut [210]
Wall [211]
Layer [208]

0
25m

Basemap reproduced from a drawing by ASWYAS
© Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd 2026
10/03/2026 JN

Figure 10
Areas 3 and 4 Detailed Plan of Structural Remains Overlain on the Geophysical Survey Results
1:500 at A3

P:\PROJECT DATA\Out of London\Leicestershire\Land at Clump Farm, Peckleton Hinckley Rd\CAD\AMP\Fig 11_Area 4 Tr 122_130_REV.dwg



Basemap reproduced from a drawing by ASWYAS

© Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd 2026

10/03/2026 JN

Figure 11
Area 4 Detailed Plan of Trenches 122 and 130 Overlain on the Geophysical Survey Results
1:500 at A4

P:\PROJECT DATA\Out of London\Leicestershire\Land at Clump Farm, Peckleton Hinckley Rd\CAD\AMP\Fig 12_Area 4 Tr 129_140_REV.dwg



Basemap reproduced from a drawing by ASWYAS

© Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd 2026

10/03/2026 JN

Figure 12
Area 4 Detailed Plan of Trenches 129 and 140 Overlain on the Geophysical Survey Results
1:500 at A4

P:\PROJECT DATA\Out of London\Leicestershire\Land at Clump Farm, Peckleton Hinckley Rd\CAD\AMP\Fig 13_Area 4 Tr 138_139_145_146_150_REV.dwg



Basemap reproduced from a drawing by ASWYAS

© Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd 2026

11/03/2026 JN

Figure 13
Area 4 Detailed Plan of Trenches 138, 139, 145-147 and 150 Overlain on the Geophysical Survey Results
1:500 at A3



Basemap reproduced from a drawing by ASWYAS

© Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd 2026

11/03/2026 JN

Figure 14

Area 4 Detailed Plan of Trenches 154 and 155 Overlain on the Geophysical Survey Results

1:500 at A4

P:\PROJECT DATA\Out of London\Leicestershire\Land at Clump Farm, Peckleton Hinckley Rd\CAD\AMP\Fig 15_Area 4 and 5 Tr 164_173.dwg



Basemap reproduced from a drawing by ASWYAS

© Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd 2026

10/03/2026 JN

Figure 15
Areas 4 and 5 Detailed Plan of Trenches 164 and 173 Overlain on the Geophysical Survey Results
1:500 at A4



Basemap reproduced from a drawing by ASWYAS

© Pre-Construct Archaeology Ltd 2026

10/03/2026 JN

Figure 16
Area 5 Detailed Plan of Trenches 172, 186 and 188 Overlain on the Geophysical Survey Results
1:500 at A4

PRE-CONSTRUCT ARCHAEOLOGY 30 years

PCA CAMBRIDGE
THE GRANARY, RECTORY FARM
BREWERY ROAD, PAMPISFORD
CAMBRIDGESHIRE CB22 3EN
t: 01223 845 522
e: cambridge@pre-construct.com

PCA DURHAM
THE ROPE WORKS, BROADWOOD VIEW
CHESTER-LE-STREET
DURHAM DH3 3AF
t: 0191 377 1111
e: durham@pre-construct.com

PCA LONDON
UNIT 54, BROCKLEY CROSS BUSINESS CENTRE
96 ENDWELL ROAD, BROCKLEY
LONDON SE4 2PD
t: 020 7732 3925
e: london@pre-construct.com

PCA NEWARK
16 LONDON ROAD
NEWARK
NOTTINGHAMSHIRE NG24 1TW
t: 01636 370410
e: newark@pre-construct.com

PCA NORWICH
QUARRY WORKS, DEREHAM ROAD
HONINGHAM
NORWICH NR9 5AP
T: 01223 845522
e: cambridge@pre-construct.com

PCA WARWICK
2 PLESTOWES BARN
HAREWAY LANE, BARFORD
WARWICKSHIRE CV35 8DD
t: 01926 485490
e: warwick@pre-construct.com

PCA WINCHESTER
5 RED DEER COURT, ELM ROAD
WINCHESTER
HAMPSHIRE SO22 5LX
t: 01962 849 549
e: winchester@pre-construct.com

REGISTERED ORGANISATION CIfA