

From: public.access@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk
Sent: 02 September 2024 12:20
To: Planning Application Comments
Subject: Comments for Planning Application 24/00766/P3CQ

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 02/09/2024 12:19 PM from Battlefields Trust Trust.

Application Summary

Address:	Pretty Oak Farm Upton Lane Stoke Golding Leicestershire
Proposal:	Change of use of agricultural building to 4 bedroom dwelling (C3)
Case Officer:	Matt Jedruch

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	Battlefields Trust Trust
Email:	research@battlefieldstrust.com
Address:	Crown House, 27 Old Gloucester Street, London WC1N 3AX

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Other
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Thank-you for the opportunity to comment on this application. The Battlefields Trust notes the proposed development appears to be adjacent to the registered area of the nationally important battlefield of Bosworth (1485). Whilst the proposed development is not within the registered area it is sufficiently close, in our view, for an assessment to be required of the significance of the battlefield site in respect of this application as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 200. Without this the Trust is uncertain how you as the planning authority will be able to discharge your responsibilities under paragraph 201 of the NPPF and recommends that this application is placed on hold until a suitable statement of significance is provided by the applicant. We note that the Phase One desk study includes visual and cultural designations on pp.56-57, but fails to consider registered battlefields within this assessment. It is unclear why this oversight has occurred.

Once this statement of significance has been provided you should be able to weigh the public benefits of the proposed development with the harm to the heritage, which will be less than substantial given the scale of what is proposed.

We also remain concerned that this application seeks to convert an agricultural building that was constructed at some point between 2013-2019, according to the aerial photo views in the Phase 1 Desk study report, into a dwelling house. We assume the agricultural building was constructed under permitted development rights. If so, we judge the attempt to convert this building after, at most around ten years, as unacceptable as it has the potential to open a route for the construction of agricultural buildings on the battlefield and within its immediate area under permitted development rights before being converted to dwelling houses after a very short period of time. Such practice should be rejected as it will adversely affect the rural character of the registered battlefield.

Kind regards