

From: William Kelly <William.Kelly@leics.gov.uk>
Sent: 24 August 2026 11:36:53 UTC+01:00
To: "Emma Baumber2" <Emma.Baumber@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk>
Cc: "PF - Planning" <planningapplications@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk>
Subject: 26/00675/OUT | Land South Of Bosworth Academy Leicester Lane Desford

Dear Emma,

26/00675/OUT | Outline planning application for residential development of approximately 550 dwellings, including provision of a primary healthcare facility and district centre [E Use Class]; sports facilities; public open space; access from Peckleton Lane and Leicester Lane with a connecting road; sustainable drainage; and associated infrastructure. All matters reserved except for access. | Land South Of Bosworth Academy Leicester Lane Desford

Archaeological considerations

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

We would also recommend that you seek the advice of your specialist Conservation Officer regarding any potential impacts of the development upon the setting and significance of the designated Desford Conservation Area (HER Ref.: DLE670).

The Leicestershire and Rutland Historic Environment Record (HER) indicates that the site lies within an area of archaeological interest. While we welcome the submission of an archaeological desk-based Assessment (Orion DBA Ref.: PN4736), we feel that this underplays the overall archaeological potential of the site, particularly the potential for prehistoric and Roman remains to be present. Investigations in 1999 identified an Iron-Age/Roman site with multiple phases, c. 200m to the northwest (HER Ref.: MLE9267). Immediately south of the site three prehistoric flint cores were found in the 1980s (MLE7557) and photographs identified faint cropmarks of two possible enclosures and a linear feature (MLE2734), although it is thought that these could relate to modern drainage. As the application area does not appear to have undergone significant previous ground disturbance, any further archaeological remains that are present within the site are likely to be relatively well preserved and close to the ground surface.

We welcome the submission of a geophysical survey of the site (Magnitude Surveys Ref.: MSSK2219), although the results of this work are largely inconclusive. Geophysical survey does not represent a definitive statement of a site's archaeological potential, as not all types of archaeological deposit are sensitive to detection by this method. Furthermore the disposal of green waste within the current application site has had noticeably negative effects on the results. This is particularly the case within areas 4, 5, and 9 of the survey, areas 2 and 3 also appear to have been affected to a lesser extent. Elsewhere, although the survey has not identified any positive evidence for archaeological activity, it has not established their absence either, indeed the survey has identified a number of linear and curvilinear anomalies for which an archaeological origin has not been ruled out by the surveyor.

Given the scale of the proposals and the limitations of geophysical survey as a means of archaeological evaluation, including in this case the particular issues arising from the presence of green waste across much of the site, it is our recommendation that these results should be supported by a programme of further pre-determination evaluation. In addition to consideration of the viability of fieldwalking across the site, intrusive trial trenching should be undertaken in order to test any geophysical anomalies and provide a suitable sample of any geophysically 'blank' areas. The DBA also notes the presence of a large curvilinear anomaly within the northmost field of the site identified through LiDAR analysis, which could represent an earlier feature such as part of a prehistoric enclosure, this feature should be targeted as part of the trial trenching programme.

In addition to the consideration of archaeological buried remains, the HER has identified the possible presence of ridge and furrow earthwork remains across two fields within the site (areas 2, 5 and the eastern extent of Area 3 of the geophysical survey). The DBA does not include an assessment of these earthworks and the presence/absence of earthworks is not noted within the report, although the DBA confirms that a site visit was undertaken as part of the assessment. We would therefore welcome any clarification on whether the assessment included consideration of these earthworks remains.

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 field evaluation, by appropriate techniques including fieldwalking and 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

William Kelly | Senior Planning Archaeologist (Heritage) | Historic & Natural Environment Team |
Planning, Historic & Natural Environment Department | Room 200, County Hall | Glenfield |
Leicestershire | LE3 8RA
☎ 0116 305 0039 | 📞 07871 733 637 | ✉ William.Kelly@leics.gov.uk

Leicestershire County Council values are:



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.