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Executive Summary

This archaeological desk-based assessment considers c.55.41 hectares of development land (the study site) proposed for an extension to Magna Park, Lutterworth, Leicestershire. It was commissioned in association with a planning application for the DHL Supply Chain (Figure 1).

The assessment provides a description of heritage assets potentially affected by the development of the study site and addresses the information requirements of Government’s National Planning Policy Framework (particularly para 128).

The assessment has established that there are no designated heritage assets within the study site. The Scheduled Monument of Bittesby Deserted Medieval Village is located in close proximity to the corridor of proposed planting. However development within the study site will not directly effect any designated heritage assets. A separate Built Heritage Assessment has been prepared to accompany the application (CgMs 2015 ref: RU/JCG18281) and this should be consulted for a detailed assessment of the potential sensitivity of built heritage assets within the wider study area.

The proposed built development on the study site lies c.340m from the Scheduled Monument, but the application extends close (c.10m) to the Scheduled Monument’s eastern boundary. The study site is presently intervisible with the northern part of the Scheduled Monument. The study site currently makes a neutral contribution to the significance of the Scheduled Monument, comprising part of the peripheral rural landscape setting.

Geophysical and fieldwalking surveys have been commissioned in support of the current application and a wider study area (shown in Figures 1 of the Geophysical Survey report (Appendix 1) and Fieldwalking Survey report (Appendix 2)) that includes the area of a further planning application by IDI Gazeley that is still to be prepared and submitted. The reason for including the results of the wider area is to provide all the information needed to understand the possible impact of the DHL facility on the Scheduled Monument and any below-ground archaeology.

The results of the geophysical and fieldwalking surveys have shown that the proposed development area contains no evidence for substantial archaeological remains associated with the Scheduled Monument. Six areas of geophysical anomalies or groups of anomalies have been identified within the application area. These will require investigation by trial trenching in advance of determination of the application. Based upon the evidence available at present these anomalies are likely to be of local and/or regional importance. They will be significant for their evidential values and will not prohibit or constrain development, but are likely to require mitigation through preservation by record in advance of development.
Geophysical anomalies interpreted as multi-phase Roman and Medieval enclosures (supported by the results of the fieldwalking) have been identified located predominantly on the ridge between the Scheduled Monument and the application area. The Medieval components are clearly connected to the Monument by trackways. These newly discovered geophysical anomalies, located on the ridge and extending to the eastern boundary of the Monument clearly comprise part of the historic setting of the Scheduled Monument and contribute to its significance. An accurate determination of their significance in their own right will depend upon intrusive investigation, which will establish their date, complexity and state of preservation. As buried features however, they lack the illustrative historical and aesthetic values of the earthwork features within the Scheduled Monument. The setting of these features comprises the ridge on which they are cut, which creates a natural 'bowl' with the Scheduled Monument located in the bottom. It is the topographic setting that contributes to the understanding of the Monument. The anomalies themselves are imperceptible in the landscape. The significance of the anomalies on the ridge is vested in their evidential value and the contribution that they make to the significance of the Scheduled Monument. There will be no direct impact on these anomalies.

A separate Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment has been prepared in support of the application and this should be consulted for a consideration of the effect of changes to the views from the Scheduled Monument. The proposed development involves construction within 85m of the newly discovered anomalies on the ridge between the Scheduled Monument and the application area. The magnitude of development impact upon the setting of the Scheduled Monument is assessed as Moderate, because of the proximity to the non-designated assets that demonstrably make a positive contribution to its setting. The proposed development will not impact upon the key values (aesthetic, illustrative historical and evidential) that contribute to the significance of the Monument and therefore the proposed development clearly does not constitute ‘substantial harm’ (NPPF para 134).

This document updates the draft desk-based assessment provided to the Local Planning Authority and Historic England (formerly English Heritage) in advance of a pre-application meeting at Harborough Council offices on Monday 9th March. It has been updated in line with changes to the application boundary and also further to receipt of the reports on the geophysical survey and fieldwalking surveys completed on a larger, future application area to the west of the study site.
1.0 **INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF STUDY**

1.1 This archaeological desk-based assessment of land at Magna Park, Lutterworth, Leicestershire has been researched and prepared by CgMs Consulting on behalf of IDI Gazeley.

1.2 The site, also referred to as the study site, is located to the west of Lutterworth and comprises approximately 55.41 hectares of land centred at National Grid Reference SP 5076 8550 (Fig 1). The study site is an irregularly shaped plot of land, bordered by Mere Road and Magna Park to the south-east, Watling Street (A5) to the south-west and field boundaries and outlying fields to the north-west and north-east.

1.3 This assessment has been prepared with regard to Government’s National Planning Policy Framework, to identify and provide a description of the significance of heritage assets within the study site and the likely effects of future development. This study concentrates on identifying any archaeological interest in the site and assessing the potential impact of development on the archaeological significance of identified assets.

1.4 The assessment comprises an examination of evidence in the Leicestershire and Rutland Historic Environment Record, Warwickshire Historic Environment Record, Leicestershire and Rutland Archives and online resources. Information regarding Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens and Registered Battlefields was obtained from Historic England’s *National Heritage List for England*. A separate Built Heritage assessment (CgMs 2015; report number RU/JCG18281) has been prepared and this should be consulted for an assessment of potential development impacts upon Built Heritage assets. Information on Conservation Areas was sought from Harborough District Council and Rugby Borough Council. The assessment incorporates published and unpublished material and charts historic land-use through a map regression exercise. Site inspections were undertaken on 14th and 18th July 2014. Assessment of the setting of the Scheduled Monument has been undertaken in accordance with the guidance provided by Conservation Principles (English Heritage 2008) and Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 - The Setting of Heritage Assets (English Heritage 2015).
2.0 PLANNING BACKGROUND AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN FRAMEWORK

2.1 In considering any planning application for development, the local planning authority will be guided by the policy framework set by government planning policy, by current Development Plan policy and by other material considerations.

National Planning Policy Framework

2.2 In March 2012, the Government published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which replaces national policy relating to heritage and archaeology (Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment).

2.2.1 Section 12 of the NPPF, entitled *Conserving and enhancing the historic environment* provides guidance for planning authorities, property owners, developers and others on the conservation and investigation of heritage assets. Overall, the objectives of Section 12 of the NPPF can be summarised as seeking the:

- Delivery of sustainable development
- Understanding the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits brought by the conservation of the historic environment, and
- Conservation of England’s heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.

2.2.2 Section 12 of the NPPF recognises that intelligently managed change may sometimes be necessary if heritage assets are to be maintained for the long term. Paragraph 128 states that planning decisions should be based on the significance of the heritage asset, and that the level of detail supplied by an applicant should be proportionate to the importance of the asset and should be no more than sufficient to review the potential impact of the proposal upon the significance of that asset.

2.2.3 Heritage Assets are defined in Annex 2 of the NPPF as: *a building, monument, site, place, area or landscape positively identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest*. They include designated heritage assets (as defined in the NPPF) and assets identified by the local planning authority during the process of decision-making or through the plan-making process.

2.2.4 Annex 2 also defines Archaeological Interest as a *heritage asset which holds or potentially could hold, evidence of past human activity worthy of expert investigation at some point*. Heritage assets with archaeological interest are the primary source of evidence about the substance and evolution of places, and of the people and cultures that made them.
2.2.5 A **Designated Heritage Asset** comprises a World Heritage Site, Scheduled Monument, Listed Building, Protected Wreck Site, Registered Park and Garden, Registered Battlefield or Conservation Area.

2.2.6 **Significance** is defined as: *The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. This interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting.*

2.2.7 In short, government policy provides a framework which:
- Protects nationally important designated Heritage Assets (which include World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Listed Buildings, Protected Wreck Sites, Registered Parks and Gardens, Registered Battlefields or Conservation Areas)
- Protects the settings of such designations
- In appropriate circumstances seeks adequate information (from desk based assessment and field evaluation where necessary) to enable informed decisions
- Provides for the excavation and investigation of sites not significant enough to merit *in-situ* preservation.

2.2.8 The NPPF requires that when considering the effect of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation (paragraph 132). Paragraph 133 provides a test for assessing harm in relation to designated heritage assets: “Where the application will lead to substantial harm or total loss of significance, local planning authorities should refuse consent”. Paragraph 134 notes that ‘where development will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against ...the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use should be weighed against the loss’.

2.2.9 The effects of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should also be taken into account in determining the application, although a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset (paragraph 135).

**Core Strategy**

2.3 The Harborough Local Development Framework Core Strategy was adopted on 14th November 2011. The strategic objectives of the Core Strategy include two relevant to the historic environment:
1.65: To protect and enhance the District’s distinctive rural landscape, settlement pattern, historic assets, natural environment and biodiversity;
1.66: To safeguard and enhance the character and built heritage of the District’s settlements and ensure that residential amenity is protected;

2.4 The approach to the District’s historic environment and individual heritage assets is further addressed in Core Strategy Policy CS11:

Policy CS11: Promoting Design and Built Heritage
In recognition of the importance of good design and the built heritage of the District, the highest standards of design in new development will be sought to create attractive places for people to live, work and visit. This will be achieved in the following way:

a) Development should be inspired by, respect and enhance local character, building materials and distinctiveness of the area in which it would be situated. Proposals which are rich in architectural detail, individual, yet sympathetic to the local vernacular will be particularly supported. In areas with particularly high heritage value (such as Conservation Areas), new development should be sympathetic to those characteristics that make these places special.
b) All development should respect the context in which it is taking place and respond to the unique characteristics of the individual site and the wider local environment beyond the site’s boundaries to ensure that it is integrated as far as possible into the existing built form of the District. New development should be directed away from undeveloped areas of land which are important to the form and character of a settlement or locality.
c) Development should be well planned to:
   i) Incorporate safe and inclusive design, suitable for all to access;
   ii) Make the most of local built and natural assets;
   iii) Be of a scale, density and design that would not cause damage to the qualities, character and amenity of the areas in which they are situated;
   iv) Ensure that the amenities of existing and future neighbouring occupiers are safeguarded;
   v) Reflect the landscape or streetscape in which it is situated and include an appropriate landscaping scheme where needed;
   vi) Enable adaptation, allowing for mixed uses with the potential to change use where appropriate;
   vii) Enable adaptation, ensuring suitability for today’s users and capability for alteration to suit users in a future changing climate;
   viii) Where appropriate, encourage travel by a variety of modes of transport;
   ix) Minimise waste and encourage re-use and recycling wherever possible.
d) Heritage assets within the District, and their setting, will be protected, conserved and enhanced, ensuring that residents and visitors can appreciate and enjoy them through:
   i) Supporting proposals for the statutory listing of buildings where it can be demonstrated that the buildings meet the criteria for designation;
   ii) Realising and actively seeking opportunities within the planning process to secure the viable and sustainable future of heritage assets at risk of neglect or loss, especially where this supports tourism or business development, providing such development is consistent with the significance of the heritage asset;
   iii) Ensuring development in existing Conservation Areas is consistent with the special character as described in the Statement or Appraisal for that Area, keep these Areas under review and work with local communities to appraise other areas of special architectural or historic interest in the towns, suburbs
and villages of the District to inform potential designation of additional Conservation Areas;

iv) Safeguarding Scheduled Monuments and non-scheduled nationally important archaeological remains, and other areas of archaeological potential or importance and areas of historic landscape;

v) Encouraging improved access to buildings and places of heritage for local people and visitors;

vi) Identifying heritage assets of local importance;

vii) Promoting and managing Foxton Locks and the Grand Union Canal as a tourism attraction and key strategic Green Infrastructure corridor in line with the Conservation Plan and Heritage Partnership Agreement.

Planning Policy Guidance

2.5 In March 2014, the Government published Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) website. The PPG is intended to be read alongside the NPPF and relevant guidance set out below.

2.6 Paragraph 003 states the conservation of heritage assets should be in a manner appropriate to their significance and is a core planning principle. Heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and effective conservation delivers wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits. Where the complete or partial loss of a heritage asset is justified, the aim is to capture and record the evidence of the asset’s significance which is to be lost, interpret its contribution and make that information publicly available.

2.7 For decision-taking, Paragraph 009 identifies why ‘significance’ is important in decision-taking. Being able to properly assess the nature, extent and importance of a heritage asset, and the contribution of its setting, is very important to understanding the potential impact and acceptability of development proposals. Paragraph 015 states the vast majority of heritage assets are in private hands. Thus, sustaining heritage assets in the long term often requires an incentive for their active conservation. Any use is required to be viable, not only for the owner, but also the future conservation of the asset. If, from a conservation point of view, there is no difference between viable uses, then the choice of use is a decision for the owner.

2.8 Paragraph 017 identifies how to assess if there is substantial harm. Whether a proposal causes substantial harm will be a judgement for the decision taker, having regard to the circumstances of the case and the policy in National Planning Policy Framework.
Local Plan

2.9 The new Local Plan for Harborough District Council is currently undergoing consultation and is intended for submission to the Secretary of State in September 2016.

2.10 Therefore in considering the archaeological and heritage implications of the proposed planning application for development, the local planning authority will be guided by the policy framework set by government policy, and Policy CS11 of the LDF Core Strategy document.

Relevant Guidance

Conservation Principles (English Heritage 2008)

2.11 Conservation Principles outlines Historic England’s approach to the sustainable management of the historic environment. While primarily intended to ensure consistency in Historic England’s own advice and guidance through the planning process, the document is commended to local authorities to ensure that all decisions about change affecting the historic environment are informed and sustainable.

2.12 This document was published in line with the philosophy of PPS5, yet remains relevant with that of the current policy regime in the emphasis placed upon the importance of understanding significance as a means to properly assess the effects of change to heritage assets. The guidance describes a range of heritage values which enable the significance of assets to be established systematically, with the four main 'heritage values' being: evidential, historical, aesthetic and communal. The Principles emphasise that ‘considered change offers the potential to enhance and add value to places...it is the means by which each generation aspires to enrich the historic environment’ (paragraph 25).

Good Practice Advice 3 – The Setting of Heritage Assets (English Heritage 2015)

2.13 Historic England has provided guidance on the management of change within the setting of heritage assets and seeks to provide definition of the aspects of ‘setting’, as well as a possible approach to allow councils and applicants to assess the impact of developments upon the settings of heritage assets.

2.14 Setting is defined in NPPF and the Good Practice Advice Note 3 as ‘the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve.’ Setting is also described as being a separate term.
to curtilage, character and context. While it is largely a visual term, setting, and thus the way in which an asset is experienced, can also be affected by noise, vibration, odour and other factors. 'Setting is not a heritage asset, nor a heritage designation… Its importance lies in what it contributes to the significance of the heritage asset' [para. 9].

2.15 It provides guidance on practical and proportionate decision making with regards to the management of proposed developments and the setting of heritage assets. It is stated that the ‘protection of the setting of heritage assets need not prevent change’ (Para. 11) and that decisions relating to such issues need to be based on the nature, extent and level of the significance of a heritage asset, further weighing up the potential enhancement or harm of the asset’s significance associated with the proposals.

2.16 **Impact Assessment Methodology**

2.16.1 The assessment of direct harm or loss to heritage assets has followed the approach described in NPPF (Para. 128) and the Good Practice Advice Note 3 (Step 1). This requires applicants ‘to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting… Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation’ (NPPF para 128). The current report provides a desk-based assessment of the site’s archaeological potential, based on a consideration of available archaeological and historical information for the site and a c.1km radius search area around the site boundary. It also takes into account the results of the geophysical and fieldwalking surveys undertaken within the application area and c. 120 ha to the west of the site (future Outline application area).

2.16.2 The assessment of indirect harm takes account of the potential impacts of the development on the settings of designated heritage assets (Scheduled Monuments, Registered Battlefields and Registered Historic Parks & Gardens) in the surrounding area. Assets, including heritage assets potentially sensitive to development within the site were agreed between Nicholas Pearson Associates and Landscape Partnership (acting for the Local Planning Authority).

2.16.3 The setting of heritage assets is defined in the NPPF as ‘the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surrounding evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative
contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.’ (NPPF Annex 2).

2.16.4 Historic England has also published further guidance concerning the assessment of effects on the setting of heritage assets (English Heritage, 2015; Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 – The Setting of Heritage Assets). This guidance proposes a five stage approach to assessment: (1) identifying the assets affected and their settings; (2) assessing whether, how and to what degree these settings make a contribution to the significance of the heritage asset(s); (3) assessing the effect of the proposed development on the significance of the asset(s); (4) maximising enhancement and minimising harm; and (5) making and documenting the decision and monitoring outcomes.

2.16.5 The methodology adopted for the purposes of the current assessment has regard to the 2015 English Heritage guidance above, and consists of a staged process as follows:

Step 1: The baseline heritage assets and their settings located within the study area are identified and their heritage significance considered;

Step 2: The contribution which setting makes to the heritage significance of the asset(s) (i.e. the sensitivity of the asset to effects as a result of changes within its setting) is then determined. Regard is had at this stage, and where relevant, to the factors identified in the 2015 guidance – summarised in Table 1 below.

Step 3: The magnitude of the impact of the proposed development on the heritage significance of each asset is identified. Where the potential impact is on the setting of the heritage asset, only that part of the heritage significance derived from its setting can be affected and assessment of the magnitude of impact is weighted proportionately. Regard is had at this stage, and where relevant, to the factors identified in the 2015 guidance – summarised in Table 2 below. The criteria used in this assessment to establish the sensitivity of an asset to impacts on its setting, and to assign a value to the magnitude of the impact are set out in Tables 3 and 4 below.

2.16.6 Steps 4 and 5 will be undertaken during consultation and review with the local planning authority once the application has been submitted.
**Table 1:** Attributes of a setting that may contribute to significance  
(non-exhaustive check-list in English Heritage 2015 guidance 'Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3')

| The asset’s physical surroundings | • Topography  
| | • Other heritage assets (including buildings, structures, landscapes, areas or archaeological remains)  
| | • Definition, scale and ‘grain’ of surrounding streetscape, landscape and spaces  
| | • Formal design  
| | • Historic materials and surfaces  
| | • Land use  
| | • Green space, trees and vegetation  
| | • Openness, enclosure and boundaries  
| | • Functional relationships and communications  
| | • History and degree of change over time  
| | • Integrity  
| | • Issues such as soil chemistry and hydrology  

| Experience of the asset | • Surrounding landscape or townscape character  
| | • Views from, towards, through, across and including the asset  
| | • Visual dominance, prominence or role as focal point  
| | • Intentional intervisibility with other historic and natural features  
| | • Noise, vibration and other pollutants or nuisances  
| | • Tranquillity, remoteness, ‘wildness’  
| | • Sense of enclosure, seclusion, intimacy or privacy  
| | • Dynamism and activity  
| | • Accessibility, permeability and patterns of movement  
| | • Degree of interpretation or promotion to the public  
| | • The rarity of comparable survivals of setting  
| | • The asset’s associative attributes  
| | • Associative relationships between heritage assets  
| | • Cultural associations  
| | • Celebrated artistic representations  
| | • Traditions |
### Table 2: Attributes of development which may be relevant to assessing implications for significance

*(non-exhaustive check-list in English Heritage 2015 guidance ‘Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3’: only a limited subset of the attributes are likely to be particularly important in terms of any particular development)*

| Location and siting of development | • Proximity to asset  
|• Extent  
|• Position in relation to landform  
|• Degree to which location will physically or visually isolate asset  
|• Position in relation to key views |
| Form and Appearance | • Prominence, dominance or conspicuousness |
|• Competition with or distraction from the asset |
|• Dimensions, scale and massing |
|• Proportions |
|• Visual permeability (extent to which it can be seen through) |
|• Materials (texture, colour, reflectiveness, etc) |
|• Architectural style or design |
|• Introduction of movement or activity |
|• Diurnal or seasonal change |
| Other effects of the development | • Change to built surroundings and spaces |
|• Change to skyline |
|• Noise, odour, vibration, dust etc |
|• Lighting effects and 'light spill' |
|• Change to general character (e.g. suburbanising or industrialising) |
|• Changes to public access, use or amenity |
|• Changes to land use, land cover, tree cover |
|• Changes to archaeological context, soil chemistry, or hydrology |
|• Changes to communications/accessibility/permeability |
| Permanence of development | • Anticipated lifetime/temporariness |
|• Recurrence |
|• Reversibility |
| Longer term or consequential effects of development | • Changes to ownership arrangements |
|• Economic and social viability |
|• Communal use and social viability |
### Table 3: Criteria for assessment of sensitivity of an asset to impacts on its setting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensitivity to impacts</th>
<th>Typical Characteristics may include:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>• A visually prominent asset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Situated in a well-preserved historic landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Well known in the locality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Promoted as a visitor attraction with signposts and information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>• Recognisable as a heritage asset by the average visitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In a setting only partially modified by later land use, and can still be readily appreciated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mentioned in non-specialist publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>• Recognised as a heritage asset only by a trained observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In a setting substantially altered from its original condition, but still can be understood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGLIGIBLE</td>
<td>• Imperceptible as a heritage asset</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4: Criteria for assessing the magnitude of impact on the significance of heritage assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magnitude of Impact</th>
<th>Typical Characteristics may include:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>• Total loss or major alteration of the asset, or change in its setting leading to the total loss or major reduction in the significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The relationship between the asset and its setting is no longer readily appreciable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>• Partial loss or alteration of the asset, or change in its setting leading to the partial loss or reduction in the significance of the asset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Setting characteristics can still be appreciated, but with the introduction of new, unrelated elements that distract from and compete with the relevant setting elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>• Slight change from pre-development conditions to the asset, or change in its setting leading to the slight loss or reduction in the significance of the asset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Setting characteristics can still be appreciated, the changes do not conflict with the character of the heritage asset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGLIGIBLE</td>
<td>• No change, or very slight change to the asset, or change in its setting resulting in no reduction in the significance of the asset</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.16.7 These criteria have been applied to the circumstances of the application site and the results are set out below.
3.0 GEOLOGY AND TOPOGRAPHY

3.1 Geology

3.1.1 The British Geological Survey (BGS) 1:50,000 records the geology within the site as Mudstone belonging to the Penarth Group Formation. Superficial deposits are recorded as Diamicton from the Oadby Member Formation. (http://maps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyviewer_google/googleviewer.html).

3.2 Topography

3.2.1 The study site lies within the Leicestershire Vales Natural England Character Area. The Character Area (NCA) consists of ‘an open landscape of gentle clay ridges and valleys (with)...an overall visual uniformity to the landscape and settlement pattern.’ (http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/9965009?category=587130; see Figure 5).

3.2.2 The ground levels of the study site rise from the north-western boundary which lies at c.110m AOD towards the south-eastern boundary, which lies just above 125m AOD.
4.0 ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND, INCLUDING ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

4.1 Timescales used in this report are as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palaeolithic</td>
<td>450,000 BC</td>
<td>10,000 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesolithic</td>
<td>10,000 BC</td>
<td>4,000 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>4,000 BC</td>
<td>1,800 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
<td>1,800 BC</td>
<td>600 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td>600 BC</td>
<td>AD 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>AD 43</td>
<td>410 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxon/Early Medieval</td>
<td>AD 410</td>
<td>1066 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>AD 1066</td>
<td>1485 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Medieval</td>
<td>AD 1485</td>
<td>1800 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>AD 1800</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Introduction

4.2.1 This chapter reviews existing archaeological evidence for the site and the archaeological / historical background of the general area, based on a consideration of evidence in the Leicestershire and Rutland Historic Environment Record and Warwickshire Historic Environment Record for the study site and a surrounding search area of approximately 1km surrounding the study site boundary for non-designated heritage assets and c.1.5km for the designated heritage assets. Assets, including heritage assets potentially sensitive to development within the site were agreed between Nicholas Pearson Associates and Landscape Partnership (acting for the Local Planning Authority).

4.2.2 A gazetteer of archaeological Monuments and Designated Heritage Assets is provided in Appendix 1 and the locations of HER entries within the search area are shown on Figures 2, 3, 4 and 5.

4.2.3 This document updates the draft desk-based assessment provided to the Local Planning Authority and Historic England in advance of a pre-application meeting at Harborough Council offices on Monday 9th March 2015. It has been updated in line with changes to the application boundary and also further to receipt of the reports on the geophysical survey and fieldwalking completed on a much larger, future application area to the west. It has therefore been prepared in accordance with the
NPPF, to consider the potential for as yet undiscovered archaeological assets on the site – but the results of the combined geophysical and fieldwalking surveys, covering c.189.5 ha (including the application area) allow a very confident assessment of the actual archaeological resource within the site and the wider study area.

4.3 Designated Heritage Assets

4.3.1 Data obtained from Historic England and the Local Authority confirms that there are no designated heritage assets (Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Battlefields, Registered Parks and Gardens or Conservation Areas) within the study site.

4.3.2 This document takes into consideration all of the below ground designated heritage assets which have been identified as potentially sensitive to the proposed development within the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Environmental Statement, Chapter 2, Landscape and Visual).

4.3.3 There are two Scheduled Monuments within the 1.5km search area. Bittesby Deserted Medieval Village (Reference 1012563) is located c.340m north-west from the proposed warehouse, but the application boundary extends close (c.10m) to the Scheduled Monument’s eastern boundary. The northern extent of the Monument is partially intervisible with the study site. The other Scheduled Monument is the ‘moat, fishponds and shifted village earthworks of Ullesthorpe (Reference 1010300), located 1.3km north-west from the main body of the proposed development, but 660m north of the area of proposed planting. This Monument is screened from the site by the local topography and has therefore been scoped out of this report and the Environment Statement.

4.3.4 There are eight Listed Buildings within the search area, two located within the historic core of Willey, c.460m south-west of the study site, five within the core of Ullesthorpe village, c.1km north-east of the site and one within Claybrooke Parva, c.1.4km north-west of the site. The Conservation Area of Ullesthorpe is approximately 1.5m north-west of the location of the proposed development on the study site. A detailed assessment of Built Heritage assets within the wider study area has been undertaken within a separate report (CgMs 2015; report number RU/JCG18281).

4.3.5 The designated heritage assets are included within the Gazetteer in Appendix 1 and their locations are shown in Figure 2.
4.4 **Non-Designated Heritage Assets and other archaeological monuments**

4.4.1 Heritage assets are defined (NPPF Annex 2: Glossary) as ‘A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. Heritage asset includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing)’.

4.4.2 Prior to the current application there were two single heritage assets identified within the proposed development area; the polygon showing the mapped extents of Bitteswell Airfield (MLE 15959) and Watling Street Roman Road (MLE1388). The Airfield extends into the area of the site to the east of Mere Lane. There was also one record, relating to the discovery of over 300 sherds of Roman pottery and c.20 fragments of Roman tile, including tegulae and imbrices (roof tile) recovered during fieldwalking (MLE21337 and ELE8535) c.50m north-west of the development site boundary.

4.4.3 The results of the geophysical and fieldwalking undertaken in support of the current application and a future wider application area (see Figure 10) has established that there are six areas containing anomalies of archaeological interest within the application area (ref. A1 to A6). These are tabulated below and should be considered to be non-designated heritage assets. In addition to these three further areas containing anomalies of archaeological interest have been identified in the zone between the current application area and the Scheduled Monument of Bittesby village, these too should also be assessed as non-designated heritage assets and are also included in the table (ref. A7 to A9).

**Table 5:** Non-designated heritage assets identified by the geophysical and fieldwalking survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archaeological asset reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Concordance with geophysical survey report and HER</th>
<th>Likely date</th>
<th>Likely importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Linear anomalies in relatively close proximity to Roman pottery findspots</td>
<td>Anomaly 92</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anomaly</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Linear anomaly. Same feature as A3. No clear dating but association with possible ring gully and flint</td>
<td>Anomaly 98</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Two linear anomalies, one of which is the same as A2. No clear dating but association with possible ring gully and flint</td>
<td>Anomaly 98</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Two parallel linear anomalies likely to be a trackway</td>
<td>Anomaly 1</td>
<td>Post-Medieval / Modern</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>Two parallel linear anomalies likely to be a trackway</td>
<td>Anomaly 76</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>Local to regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>Linear anomaly</td>
<td>Anomaly 73</td>
<td>Unclear, possibly Prehistoric</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>Anomalies interpreted as enclosures and trackways</td>
<td>Anomalies 83, 84 and 85</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>Anomalies interpreted as enclosures including ladder-type settlement. Also HER MLE 21337 and ELE 8535</td>
<td>Anomalies 78, 79, 80, 81, and 82</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>Anomalies interpreted as enclosure. Associated with trackway A5</td>
<td>Anomaly 76</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.4 The HER sites or finds within the search area which are relevant to appraisal of the archaeological potential of the site are discussed below.

4.4.5 A gazetteer of the HER records is included as Appendix 1. The locations of monument and buildings recorded in the HER are shown in Figure 4.
4.5 Previous Archaeological Investigations

4.5.1 Geophysical and fieldwalking surveys were undertaken by ArchaeoPhysica and MoLA Northants in November 2014 to April 2015 across c. 186.5 ha in support of the current application and a future planning application.

4.5.2 The geophysical survey was carried out across the current application area apart from the centre of the northern field (c.1.3 ha) which was too waterlogged and soft to be traversed practically and safely and the land to the east of Mere Lane (c.3 ha) – which is unsuitable for survey.

4.5.3 The fieldwalking within the current application area recovered a Mesolithic flint core, a flint waste blade and four flint flakes (undated due to their poor quality), two sherds of Roman pottery and twenty-three sherds of Medieval pottery. Approximately fifty sherds of Post-Medieval pottery and over 100 pieces of tile and brick were also recovered, likely to represent manuring scatters (Appendix 3).

4.5.4 The results of the surveys that are relevant to an assessment of the site’s archaeological potential are summarised in the Table 5.

4.5.5 There has been relatively little archaeological investigation within the surrounding area prior to the fieldwork commissioned in support of the current and future planning applications. Fieldwalking of approximately 5ha of land, c.40m north-west of the study site revealed c.300 sherds of Roman pottery (ELE8535) and desk-based assessment, walkover survey and geophysical survey undertaken c.200m north-west of the study site, recorded the western edge of Bittesby Deserted Medieval Village (ELE4713 and ELE5263).

4.5.6 The Magna Park Lutterworth site was not archaeologically investigated because the site had previously been used as an airfield.

4.5.7 The locations of HER Event records are shown in Figure 3.

4.6 Prehistoric

4.6.1 One linear anomaly, interpreted as a ditch likely to be associated with a ringditch, has been given two Archaeological Asset numbers (A2 and A3) in Table 5 above. It has two numbers because it crosses the proposed development footprint in two places and where it crosses the south-eastern tip of the application area it may be associated with an additional linear anomaly. The dating of these features is not secure, but the lack of other obvious dating evidence, the alignment of the main ditch (which is not
4.6.2 A further linear anomaly has been given Archaeological Asset number A6. The proposed planting corridors at the north-western extent of the application area cross this feature in two places. Again the dating of this feature is not secure, but it does not align with current field boundaries, nor is it obviously related to the Roman and Medieval activity identified to the south. A flint core was recovered in relatively close proximity to the feature and there is no other strong dating evidence. For these reasons it has been assessed as potentially Prehistoric in date.

4.6.3 The fieldwalking survey undertaken in support of the current application recovered a burnt flint core, likely to be Mesolithic in date, a flint blade from the line of the proposed planting corridor, a flint flake possibly associated with a ring ditch in the southern tip of the site and three undated flint flakes from the proposed building footprint. Very little Prehistoric material was recovered from the wider survey area (to be the subject of a future planning application). This accords with the picture from the wider search area, where the only previous evidence followed fieldwalking west of the Scheduled area of Bittesby Deserted Medieval Village, c.200m north-west of the study site (ELE4713). This work recovered a flint core and flake, possibly dating from the Palaeolithic (MLE16462), an early Mesolithic flint tool and approximately 31 worked flints broadly dating from the Neolithic/Bronze Age (MLE17111).

4.6.4 The application area contains three linear anomalies likely to be Prehistoric in date. It has a negligible potential for hitherto unknown significant Prehistoric evidence.

4.7 Roman

4.7.1 The route of a major Roman road, Watling Street (MLE1288 and MWA420) is the only feature recorded in the HER which is of Roman date. The road, followed by the modern A5, is located along the south-western boundary of the study site. An undated skeleton was revealed along the western side of the A5 (Watling Street) in the 1950s, approximately 570m north-west of the study site (MLE1225).

4.7.2 Two linear anomalies (Archaeological Asset A1), identified during the geophysical survey of the proposed development area, have been assessed as likely to be of Roman date. This is based on their alignment, at right angles to the A5, and the recovery of Roman pottery in relatively close proximity.

4.7.3 The absence of further geophysical anomalies suggestive of Roman activity, from the current application area, combined with the fact that only one sherd of Roman pottery
was recovered from the fieldwalking (Appendix 3) within the site strongly suggests that there was little or no significant activity within the site in the Roman period.

4.7.4 Geophysical anomalies interpreted as multi-phase Roman enclosures (A8) were identified predominantly along the ridge located between the study site and the Scheduled Monument to the west. Whilst it is difficult to unpick these features from potentially overlying Medieval activity, the long, ladder-type settlement arrangement is likely to be late Iron Age or Roman in date on morphological grounds. The bulk of the Roman pottery recovered from the fieldwalking undertaken in support of the current application area and a future planning application is from this area. In addition to this over 300 sherds of Roman pottery and c.20 fragments of Roman tile, including tegulae and imbrices (roof tile) were recovered during fieldwalking (MLE21337 and ELE8535) c.50 m west of the site. On the basis of the available evidence it is therefore likely that there is a Roman settlement and associated enclosures located just off the top (to the north-west) of the ridge, above the Scheduled Monument.

4.7.5 The HER data includes a further four records, in addition to that referenced above, of Roman activity in the surrounding search area of the study site.

4.7.6 A possible Roman villa (MLE1230) was reported to have been found by workmen during construction of the Midlands railway line in c.1838, c.140m south-west of the study site. It is recorded that tessellated pavement and the remains of a bath house were also found in association with the villa (MLE1230). A geophysical survey, magnetometry and resistance, of the Scheduled Area has been commissioned and the results of this should be available in mid-summer 2015. It is hoped that this will establish the presence/absence of this structure.

4.7.7 During the levelling of the railway embankment in 1979, c.140m south-west of the study site, the stream course was altered and c.8 sherds of Roman pottery were found (MLE1230). Approximately 7 sherds of Roman pottery were also found in this area in 1982 and 2001 (MLE1230) and 18 sherds of Roman pottery were recovered during fieldwalking c.280m south-west of the study site by Lutterworth Fieldwork Group (MLE16461). These pottery sherds may be associated with the putative Roman villa.

4.7.8 Metal detecting of land south-east of Manor Farm, c.300m north of the study site, revealed an early Roman trumpet brooch and a possible lead alloy stylus (MLE20939). Given that this part of the search area appears to have been extensively and systematically metal detected in 2005, the fact that only two Roman artefacts were recovered suggests that this part of the search area actually has little potential to contain significant settlement remains.
4.7.9 The study site contains the Roman Road of Watling Street, one Archaeological Asset, A1, comprising two ditches likely to be Roman in date and two sherds of Roman pottery, identified during the fieldwalking survey undertaken in association with the current application. The potential for further, hitherto unknown significant activity of this date is negligible.

4.8 **Saxon**

4.8.1 None of the geophysical anomalies from within the site, nor the wider survey area, appear to be indicative, on morphological grounds, of Saxon features. No Saxon evidence was recovered during the fieldwalking.

4.8.2 Data obtained from the HER contains four records relating to Saxon sites or finds from the search area.

4.8.3 The deserted settlement of Bittesby, c.340m west of the proposed warehouse on the study site, is recorded in Domesday Survey (1086) as 'Bichesbie' (MLE1226). This name consists of 'Byttel' and 'Oscan' which combines a Saxon personal name with a Viking word for habitation, suggesting that the Medieval settlement may have been renamed from an existing Saxon settlement (MLE1226).

4.8.4 A loomweight was found next to the footpath along the railway embankment to the north of the Deserted Medieval Village of Bittesby (MLE6250), c.280m north-west of the study site. The embankment was presumably constructed from material acquired from outside the study site. It is therefore possible that the loomweight may have been brought onto site during the construction works, or it may have been revealed during the topsoil stripping of the area of the embankment.

4.8.5 A middle Saxon coin and an early to middle Saxon plate brooch were recovered during metal detecting south-east of Manor Farm, c.550m north-east of the study site (MLE20938). It has been suggested that these finds may represent a Saxon site, however, they were found c.400m apart and may simply represent casual losses.

4.8.6 The settlement of Willey, c.400m south-west of the study site (MWA9579) is also recorded in Domesday Survey (1086), which suggests that the village was settled during the Late Saxon period and is contemporary with Bittesby settlement.

4.8.7 The paucity of evidence for Saxon activity identified during the geophysics and fieldwalking and its distance from the historic cores of surrounding settlements suggests that the site has a negligible potential for significant evidence of Saxon date.
4.9 **Medieval**

4.9.1 Only one Archaeological Asset (A5) of Medieval date was identified within the application area from the geophysical survey and fieldwalking survey results. This is a trackway, which appears to connect an enclosure (Archaeological Asset A9) to the north-eastern boundary of the Scheduled Monument of Bittesby Village.

4.9.2 With the exception of the evidence of furrows, of no archaeological interest, likely to date from the Medieval period and later there is no further evidence for Medieval activity within the application area.

4.9.3 Geophysical anomalies interpreted as Medieval enclosures and trackways (Archaeological Asset A7) were identified extending from the south-eastern boundary of the Scheduled Monument, up the slope and onto the ridge. To the north, as stated above, trackway A5 leads to a further Medieval enclosure A9.

4.9.4 The HER includes five records of Medieval activity from the surrounding search area.

4.9.5 HER MLE1226 refers to the Deserted Medieval Village (DMV) of Bittesby, located c.340m north-west of the proposed warehouse on the study site. The eastern extent, c. 2.3 ha of the DMV is designated as a Scheduled Monument.

4.9.6 The history of Bittesby settlement is well documented in the Desk-Based Assessment of Land adjacent to Bittesby House (Archaeological Services and Consultancy, 2008). However, to summarise, Bittesby is referred to in Domesday Survey (1086) and is thought to have had a population of c.50 (ASC 2008; 10). By 1279, it is recorded that 25 families lived in the village (MLE1226; Hopkins 1950, 93). Subsequent depopulation of the settlement is recorded in 1488 and 1494 and in 1517, the Earl of Shrewsbury evicted 60 people, effectively ‘killing off’ the settlement (ASC 2008; 10). By 1536, the only remaining family were the Salisbury family in the village (MLE1226). Hoskins notes that a fine dating from 1572 records that Bittesby consisted of 40 acres of arable, 60 acres of meadow and 1000 acres of pasture land (1950; 93). This information suggests that the desertion of the settlement may have been due to the eviction of the populace by the Lord of the Manor, in order to create extensive areas of sheep pasture, presumably to capitalise on the increasing profitability of the wool trade in the 16th century.

4.9.7 The Reverend Aulay Macaulay, 1791, neatly summarises William Burton’s (1622) account of the historical development of Bittesby. Much of both accounts is taken up with a description of the transfer of ownership of the land and is therefore not relevant to this assessment. Of interest however is Macaulay’s statement that ‘The lordship, which Burton tells us was anciently called Bittelusby, and which in the endowment of
the vicarage in 1260 is spelt Budesby, contains only one house. The whole lordship is now almost entirely occupied by one person, and the greatest part of the land has long since been converted into pastures for cattle and sheep, and, to use Burton’s words. “it is a most fertile and fruitful soil”. Bittesby is remarkable for having been the manor of John Talbot, the first and famous earl of Shrewsbury, who distinguished himself so much in France in the reign of Henry VI.’ He later proceeds to explain that ‘Bittesby lordship seems to have been converted into sheep pastures before Burton’s time. It now remains chiefly in that fate, and many people are confident, that if the plough were admitted there, the curiosity of the Antiquary might be richly gratified.’

4.9.8 In c.1840, the embankment for the railway line was constructed through the earthworks of the Deserted Medieval Village (DMV) of Bittesby, splitting the settlement in two. The DMV originally encompassed an area of approximately 10 hectares (indicated by the mapped area of HER entry MLE1226).

4.9.9 In c.2005, the topsoil and subsoil of approximately 4ha of the western part of the settlement, c.550m north-west of the study site, was stripped as part of a program to improve the agricultural value of the land. Imported waste material was subsequently deposited onto the southern third of this area to raise the land, preventing intermittent flooding and improving yields (ASC 2008).

4.9.10 It is also recorded that the Lutterworth Fieldwalking Group recovered 249 sherds of pottery, spanning the entire Medieval period, from the across the stripped surface of the Deserted Medieval Village (ASC 2008; 10).

4.9.11 Earthwork remains of the shrunken settlement at the northern end of Willey village are visible on aerial photographs, c.350m south-west of the study site (MWA6473). These earthworks represent the shifting location of the Medieval village of Willey, now recorded approximately 400m south-west of the study site (MWA9579) and centred around the Church of St Leonard, originally built in the Medieval period (MWA1677).

4.9.12 The study site lay within the open field system (ridge and furrow) associated with the settlement of Bittesby, identified during the geophysical survey (Figure 6 and Appendix 2). However, no upstanding earthworks of ridge and furrow are extant within the study site, confirming that the former field systems have been ploughed out. No evidence of Medieval settlement was revealed during the geophysical survey. A trackway (A5) leading from the north-eastern corner of the Scheduled Monument to Medieval Enclosure (A9) is the only Medieval feature identified within the application area. The site has a negligible potential for hitherto unknown significant activity of this date.
4.10 Post-Medieval & Modern (including map regression)

4.10.1 The trackway (Archaeological Asset A4) revealed during the geophysical survey is likely to date to the Post-Medieval/Modern period. It does not obviously relate to any earlier features and the finds found in closest proximity are Post-Medieval in date.

4.10.2 The fieldwalking recovered over 100 sherds of pottery and a considerable amount of brick and tile dating from this period across the site but in no discernible pattern.

4.10.3 Data obtained from the HER contains five records relating to Post-Medieval or Modern period monuments from the search area.

4.10.4 Bitteswell Airfield, a former training airfield which opened in 1941 and closed in 1987, is located partly within the south-eastern boundary of the site (MLE15959). This land was re-developed to accommodate distribution sheds at Magna Park in the 1990s.

4.10.5 The Midlands Counties Leicester to Rugby railway line (MLE16079) originally ran along a north-south aligned embankment, c.500m west of the study site. The railway was initially built to supply Leicester with coal from the Nottinghamshire coalfield and opened in 1840. A railway underpass, presumably built in c.1840, is also located c.530m north-west of the site (MLE21154). The railway line closed in 1961. Sections of the embankment were demolished in the late 1970s and 1980s.

4.10.6 The remaining records of Post-Medieval/Modern activity in the search area relate to the remains of 17th to 19th century farm buildings/structures (MWA8852 and 8893) and an underground Monitoring Post (MLE16029). These records have a well-defined extent and nature that add little to the understanding of the study site’s archaeological potential and are therefore not discussed in any detail.

4.11 Historic Landscape Characterisation

4.11.1 Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) project (2010) ‘maps and describes the present day landscape of Leicestershire and Rutland and records significant changes that can be observed through the study of historic mapping and aerial photography’. The Historic Landscape Characterisation mapping for the study site is shown in Figure 5.

4.11.2 The majority of the study site is recorded as Fields and Enclosed Land: Planned Enclosure (HLE11676). These fields were deliberately laid out during the 18th and 19th centuries and often originally contained open-field or strip cultivation (ridge and furrow) dating from the early Medieval period (2010; 87). However, there is no extant
evidence for ridge and furrow on the study site and the original Medieval landscape no longer survives.

4.11.3 The areas of proposed plantation lie within ‘Fields and Enclosed Land: Very Large Post-War Fields’ (HLE11675), a small area within the north-eastern part of the site is recorded as ‘Woodland: Other Plantation’ (HLE11678) and the area east of Mere lane is recorded as ‘Industrial: Post-1880s Industrial Complex’ (HLE11677).

4.12 **Historic Map Regression**

4.12.1 The first map to show the DHL application site in detail is the Tithe Map of Bittesby, 1844 (Wigston Magna Reference Ti/36/1; Figure 7) and shows the main body of the study site lying within thirteen enclosed fields. The area proposed for planting lies within four enclosed fields and along the parish boundary. Bittesby House is marked to the south-west of the study site and consists of a farmhouse (shown in pink), with farm buildings to the north-east of the main building. Paths leading from Claybrooke and Ashby Parva towards Bittesby House are shown on this map. One of these paths corresponds to anomaly 2 identified during the geophysical survey (Appendix 2).

4.12.2 There were no changes to the site layout between 1844 and the First Edition Ordnance Survey map, 1886 (Figure 8), other than removal of one internal field boundary and the construction of a building, later known as Bittesby Cottages, immediately adjacent to the north-western boundary of the study site.

4.12.3 There are no further changes to the study site until the mid 20th century, when maps show Bitteswell Airfield (later Bitteswell Aerodrome) partially constructed within the site and Mere Lane forming part of the south-eastern boundary of the site (1955; Figure 9). Within the north-east of the site, a sewage farm, consisting of two buildings and a circular tank are shown on the map and within the south-west of the site, a Lodge has been constructed along Watling Street.

4.12.4 In the 1960s, the area east of Mere Lane contained tracks and a small woodland associated with the Airfield. By the early 1990s, Bitteswell Aerodrome was converted to Magna Park Lutterworth. The area east of Mere Lane was changed to a pond and filter beds and the sewage park was renovated into a balancing pond and nature area. GoogleEarth maps from 1999 show the application site in its current layout which lies within eight fields (the proposed planting is located within three additional fields), part of Watling Street and roads/land east of Mere Lane. The internal field boundaries of the study site were probably removed in the late 20th century.
4.12.5 The results of the geophysical and fieldwalking revealed possible features relating to Post-Medieval farming evidence and a typical assemblage of Post-Medieval/Modern pottery, brick and tile. The study site has remained farmland though the Post-Medieval and Modern periods. The study site’s potential for Post-Medieval or Modern period agricultural remains, of negligible significance, is considered to be moderate and for significant remains is negligible.

4.13 **Assessment of Significance**

4.13.1 Paragraph 128 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should be based on the significance of the heritage asset, and that the level of detail supplied by an applicant should be proportionate to the importance of the asset and should be no more than sufficient to review the potential impact of the proposal upon the significance of that asset.

*Bittesby Deserted Medieval Village (Scheduled Monument 1012563; HER 1226)*

4.13.2 Bittesby Deserted Medieval Village is located c. 340m from the proposed built development, but a narrow section of the application area extends close (c. 10m) to the Scheduled Monument boundary to allow for planting to effectively screen the asset from the built development. The scheduling of the Monument recognises its national importance. There will be no direct impacts upon the asset.

4.13.3 The Scheduled area of the Deserted Medieval Village (DMV) of Bittesby comprises approximately 2.3ha of earthwork remains, including hollow ways, ditches and house platforms, which are clearly visible on aerial photographs and partially visible on the ground. Currently the site is used as pasture land for grazing sheep. It is not particularly well managed, signposted or maintained and therefore, the earthworks are difficult to interpret.

4.13.4 The significance of the Scheduled Monument is predominantly derived from its archaeological interest (evidential value), which lies in the physical earthworks and the below-ground remains and the information that the settlement site contains regarding date and methods of construction and potential to preserve earlier land surfaces, artefacts, environmental evidence and other features. The upstanding earthworks have an aesthetic value and also an illustrative historical value. The communal value of the monument lies in the meaning of the place for people who relate or experience it.

4.13.5 There is detailed documentary evidence of the DMV’s history, ownership and depopulation, its representation of the social organisation of Medieval communities
and its relationship with surrounding Medieval settlement. The corpus of historical knowledge of the development of the Scheduled Monument is a significant contributor to its significance. The significance of the monument is also partially derived from its communal and aesthetic value.

4.13.6 The non-designated remains of Bittesby Medieval village, which are located to the west of the embankment also contribute to its significance and form part of the monument’s setting. Those remains did not warrant inclusion within the Scheduled area because they no longer exist as upstanding/earthwork features. Therefore whilst they contribute to the setting and significance of the Scheduled Monument, their own significance is vested in their evidential value. They contribute to the understanding of the Monument, but have not been assessed as being of national importance (following DCMS criteria Scheduled Monuments & nationally important but non-scheduled monuments; Annex 1: Principles of Selection for Scheduled Monuments 2013). These remains have an enhanced significance for their group value, but do not score highly for rarity or survival/condition.

4.13.7 The newly discovered geophysical anomalies, located on the north-western side of the ridge between the proposed building footprint and the Bittesby Scheduled Monument, and extending to the eastern boundary of the Monument, clearly comprise part of the historic setting of the Scheduled Monument and contribute to its significance. An accurate determination of their significance in their own right will depend upon intrusive investigation, which will establish their date, complexity and state of preservation. As buried features however, they lack the illustrative historical and aesthetic values of the earthwork features within the Scheduled Monument. As such these newly discovered features are directly analogous to those remains to the west of the embankment. It is therefore concluded that these features will not be assessed as suitable for Scheduling. Paragraph 139 of NPPF, which establishes that non-designated but nationally important heritage assets should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets, does not therefore apply to these anomalies.

4.13.8 The setting of these features comprises the ridge on which they are cut, which creates a natural ’bowl’ with the Scheduled Monument located in the bottom. It is the topographic setting that contributes to the understanding of the Monument. The anomalies themselves are imperceptible in the landscape. The significance of the anomalies on the ridge is vested in their evidential value and the contribution that they make to the significance of the Scheduled Monument.

4.13.9 Looking east from the Monument, upslope, the view is of large modern enclosed fields. Nothing of the original Medieval landscape survives as positive/upstanding features.
An informed understanding of the setting is only obtained from visiting the site with the geophysical survey information and maps of the Medieval fields and ridge and furrow. With this information the significance of the landform is apparent and the focus of activity on the ridge overlooking the Monument. The experience of visiting the Monument is however, dominated by the railway embankment, the construction of which resulted in substantial harm to the physical remains of the Monument and irrevocably impacted its setting. Bittesby DMV originally covered an area of c.10 ha. The effect of the construction of the embankment was to divorce the easternmost 2.3 ha of the settlement from the remainder. Only the area to the east of the railway line is Scheduled, reflecting the preservation of the earthworks, which have been ploughed out across the remainder of the asset (prior to recent unauthorised stripping of an extensive area as part of agricultural improvement works).

4.13.10 The embankment dominates the experience of visiting the monument, especially in views to the west and at all times it is a significant intrusion. The choice of settlement location was to utilise the lowland location and proximity to the river within a natural, sheltered bowl. It is likely that the ridge was utilised more for stock management purposes in the Medieval period, although this is to be confirmed by intrusive investigation. Bittesby village was not sited to enjoy expansive views. It bears many similarities to the setting of Ullesthorpe shifted Medieval earthworks to the north, which are also Scheduled. The north-south aligned (although meandering) river corridor is the crucial link between the Medieval settlements of Willey, Bittesby and Ullesthorpe and was clearly an important factor in the settlement locations and provided a connection between them or a ‘corridor of local movement’ in contrast to the regional corridor/transport link provided by Watling Street, now the A5.

4.13.11 It is clear from the mapping of the ridge and furrow within the site (Figure 6) and also the evidence from the geophysical survey that Bittesby DMV was initially located within a typical Medieval landscape with strip fields of ridge and furrow agriculture. It was not set out in relation to specific views – but its landscape context would have made a substantial contribution to its significance whilst it survived. The consequences of enclosure, modern agricultural practice and in this specific instance the substantial harm from the construction of the railway has left only one fifth (c.2.3 ha) of the original asset with a state of preservation warranting recognition for its national importance. Its significance is vested in its earthwork features and the corpus of historical documents detailing the site’s development. The setting that makes any positive contribution to its significance falls to the west of the current application boundary, on the north-western extent of the ridge. The current agricultural surroundings make a neutral contribution as they do not aid or detract from an understanding of the values that comprise its heritage significance.
4.13.12 The Landscape and Visual Impact assessment prepared in support of the application contains verified montages showing existing views from the Monument and should be consulted for a detailed description of current views. In summary a wind turbine is visible to the north-east from the Monument (Plate 5) and Magna Park Lutterworth is visible to the east from the northern boundary of the Monument (Plate 6). The embankment screens views from the monument to the west and prevents inclusive views of the Monument from the east. Views to the south from the Scheduled Monument are screened by mature trees and the local topography (Plate 7). Views to the east are screened by mature trees and topography which rises steeply to the east (Plate 8). To the north, views comprise the immediately surrounding fields and the wind turbine (Plates 5 and 9). When stood on the ridge on the public footpath, which runs immediately to the west of the newly discovered geophysical anomalies, there are views of each of the buildings comprising the western extent of Magna Park, Lutterworth.

4.13.13 There is a permissive access agreement to the Scheduled Monument, although access to it is not easy. There are no signposts to it outside of the site, nor from the embankment and once on site there is a single laminated sign at the north-western corner of the Monument, providing limited historical information and confirming access agreements. Once on site there is significant noise from the A5 which can be heard from all areas of the Scheduled Monument and visual intrusion from the wind turbine and railway embankment. The monument is currently grazed pasture and is little visited.

4.13.14 Built Heritage Assets which may be affected by the development proposals will be dealt with in a separate report (CgMs 2015; report no. RU/JCG18281).

4.13.15 The results of the geophysical survey and fieldwalking within the study site in support of the application have allowed the identification of six areas of hitherto unknown non-designated heritage assets. These are tabulated in Table 5 and comprise probable Prehistoric, Roman, Medieval and Post-Medieval/Modern ditches and trackways (Figure 10). The significance of these features will be vested in their evidential values and their potential to provide information about the evolution of the wider landscape surrounding the Scheduled Monument (with reference to the pre-Medieval activity) and potentially about the landscape broadly contemporary with the Monument (with reference to the Medieval features). Overall however, the results of the recent surveys confirm that the current application area contains very few assets of archaeological interest and there is no evidence to suggest that it contains any remains likely to prohibit or constrain development.
4.13.16 The land to the east of Mere Lane has been largely previously developed and as a consequence is likely to retain little or no potential to contain archaeological deposits. This area is unsuitable for geophysical or fieldwalking surveys.
5.0 SITE CONDITIONS, THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT & IMPACT ON HERITAGE ASSETS

5.1 Site Conditions

5.1.1 Site visits were made on 14th and 18th July 2014 and 22nd April 2015 (Plates 1-9). The whole site was accessible and comprises part of eight enclosed fields planted with crop, a balancing pond/nature area, an area of scrub land and roads around filter beds and ponds east of Mere Lane and c.3.7ha of proposed planting located within enclosed fields.

5.1.2 The site has been ploughed and no earthwork features are likely to survive. No archaeological features or finds were noted during the site visit.

5.1.3 The north-western boundary of the study site consists of part of an enclosed field beyond mature trees and hedgerow. The topography in this area of the site rises steeply towards a ridge line. The mature trees and local topography provides partial screening of views of the Scheduled Monument to the west and complete screening of the Listed Buildings to the south-west and north-west.

5.1.4 Mature trees and hedgerows also form the northern and south-eastern boundaries of the site, providing screening in these directions. Magna Park Lutterworth is visible to the east of the study site, especially within the area east of Mere Lane and a wind turbine is visible to the north of the site. The south-west boundary of the site is formed by the A5. Matues trees beyond the A5 to the south-west screen the proposed development from the Listed Buildings within Willey.

5.2 The Proposed Development

5.2.1 The study site is being proposed as an extension to Magna Park Lutterworth, Leicestershire. An illustrative Masterplan will be provided with the full Planning Application. A description of the development is provided below.

'Demolition of the Emmanuel and Lodge cottages and the construction of a 100,844 sq m warehouse distribution facility with ancillary B1 office space, gatehouse, associated vehicle fuelling and washing facilities, HGV, car and cycle facilities, fencing and security infrastructure, structural landscaping and associated highway layout within and around the site, including alterations to existing vehicular and pedestrian access, creation of a new access to Bittesby Farm and Bittesby Barn Buildings, creation of a new A5/Mere Lane roundabout and partial dualling of the A5 and development of public transport infrastructure including bus stop and lay-by, together with drainage and water management infrastructure including attenuation ponds and water treatment facility, waste management facilities, rooftop solar...
5.3 **Impact on Heritage Assets**

5.3.1 There are no designated assets within the study site and development within the site will have no direct impact upon any designated heritage asset. The Scheduled Monument of Bittesby Deserted Medieval Village is statutorily protected under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act of 1979, but that statutory protection does not extend to its setting.

5.3.2 NPPF para 132 states that 'When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional. Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.'

5.3.3 NPPF para 133 proceeds to explain that local planning authorities should refuse consent for development that would lead to substantial harm or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset unless that loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh the harm or loss.

5.3.4 NPPF para 134 states ‘Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.’

5.3.5 NPPF para 135 states ‘The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that effect directly or indirectly non designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.’

5.3.6 The National Planning Practice Guidance (Paragraph: 017 Reference ID: 18a-017-20140306) provides the following guidance on substantial harm:
In general terms, substantial harm is a high test, so it may not arise in many cases. For example, in determining whether works to a listed building constitute substantial harm, an important consideration would be whether the adverse impact seriously affects a key element of its special architectural or historic interest. It is the degree of harm to the asset’s significance rather than the scale of the development that is to be assessed. The harm may arise from works to the asset or from development within its setting.

While the impact of total destruction is obvious, partial destruction is likely to have a considerable impact but, depending on the circumstances, it may still be less than substantial harm or conceivably not harmful at all, for example, when removing later inappropriate additions to historic buildings which harm their significance. Similarly, works that are moderate or minor in scale are likely to cause less than substantial harm or no harm at all. However, even minor works have the potential to cause substantial harm.

5.3.7 Many of the legal decisions concerning the ‘substantial harm’ test relate to Built Heritage rather than strictly archaeological assets. However Bedford Borough Council v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and NUON UK Ltd [2012] (‘Nuon’) focused on setting issues. Mr Justice Jay stated (para 24) ‘What the inspector was saying was that for harm to be substantial, the impact on significance was required to be serious such that very much, if not all, of the significance was drained away.’

5.3.8 Mr Justice Jay proceeded to state (in para 25) ‘that plainly in the context of physical harm, this would apply in the case of demolition or destruction, being a case of total loss. It would also apply to a case of serious damage to the structure of the building. In the context of non-physical or indirect harm, the yardstick was effectively the same. One was looking for an impact which would have such a serious impact on the significance of the asset that its significance was either vitiated altogether or very much reduced.’

5.3.9 Consideration of the impact on the surrounding Built Heritage Assets is dealt with in separate report (CgMS 2015; report no. RU/JCG18281/2).

**Bittesby Medieval Settlement**

5.3.10 The Scheduled Monument is approximately 340m west of the proposed building footprint. Proposed planting will extend c.10m from the eastern boundary of the Monument. The proposed development is an extension to the existing Magna Park, Lutterworth, which occupies higher ground to the east and is partially intervisible with
the northern extent of the Monument. The remainder of the Monument is effectively screened by existing planting.

5.3.11 The impact of the construction of the proposed warehouse will be to introduce built development to the west of Mere Lane, which will make the facility more prominent in views east from the Monument than the existing Magna Park. The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment prepared in support of the application contains verified montages showing the change within the current views from the Monument. This visual intrusion will be mitigated by the proposed planting, once it matures. This assessment is concerned chiefly with the potential for setting impacts that impact upon the significance of heritage assets. Not all changes within the setting of heritage assets, designated or non-designated, will impact upon their heritage significance.

5.3.12 The significance of the Monument is established in Section 4.13 above, including an assessment of how the newly discovered geophysical anomalies occupying the ridge between the building footprint and the Scheduled Monument contribute to that significance. The geophysical survey and fieldwalking surveys within the application boundary have established that the site contains 6 areas of hitherto unknown non-designated assets. These assets are not of a significance that will prohibit or constrain development. These assets will be evaluated through trial trenching in advance of determination of the planning application and it is likely that there will be a requirement for a limited conditioned scheme to preserve some of these assets by record in advance of development.

5.3.13 The proposed development area does not contain substantial remains that contribute to the significance of the Scheduled Monument. As such although the construction of the warehouse will increase the amount of modern development intervisible with the Monument, the development will not remove assets that contribute positively to its significance. The modern, enclosed fields that comprise the site currently make a neutral contribution to the heritage significance of the monument. Once the planting matures the development proposals will have only a very limited impact on the aesthetic value of the Scheduled Monument as the distribution sheds will not increase the visual intrusion of development significantly from the extant position.

5.3.14 The key elements that comprise the significance of the Scheduled Monument, its aesthetic and illustrative historical values derive from its upstanding earthworks and its state of preservation. It is also important for the historical records that relate to it. These values and its evidential value will not be impacted by the proposed development. The setting that makes a positive contribution to its significance is the ridge between the Monument and the application area. This too will not be physically
implied by the proposed development. The features that occupy the ridge are significant for their evidential value and their contribution to the significance of the Scheduled Monument. These values will not be impacted by the proposed development.

5.3.15 The proposed development will involve construction within 75m at its closest point of the newly discovered geophysical anomalies on the ridge. These are buried features, whose setting does not make a major contribution to their significance. However, the ridge into which they are cut and their association with the Scheduled Monument extends the setting of the Monument that makes a positive contribution to its significance close (within 75m) to the application area. The existing Magna Park facility is c. 500m to the east of these assets and is prominent in views to the east.

5.3.16 The construction phase will introduce noise, dust, vibration and visual intrusions through cranes etc into views from the Monument itself. The intervening topography, distance from the Monument (c. 340 m) and planting will limit the impacts upon visitors to the Monument and will involve only a low magnitude of change during the construction phase, which will lessen to negligible once the planting matures and the cranes and construction impacts have finished.

5.3.17 The proximity of the proposed building footprint to the newly discovered geophysical anomalies increases the potential for setting impacts upon the Monument, because these anomalies demonstrably contribute to its significance. The features themselves are not discernible being buried, but an informed observer with the survey reports can determine how these enclosures relate to the existing landform and positively contribute to an understanding of the monument. The observer would naturally look west towards the Monument, to which the anomalies are associated and existing views east contribute nothing positive towards their significance. The construction of a warehouse facility within 75m of these assets however would involve a medium magnitude of change – introducing new, unrelated elements that distract from an appreciation of the asset and compete with the setting of the Monument.

5.3.18 The current warehouses at Magna Park are obviously modern in character, but the lack of detailing prevents them becoming overly conspicuous. The Gazeley graded cladding of what are very large structures also lessens their visual intrusion.

5.3.19 There will be a conditioned requirement to ensure that the proposed development does not have an adverse impact on the state of preservation of deposits within the Scheduled Monument. The proposed development will not involve significant change to run off rates into the river, nor will it create significant changes to soil chemistry.
5.3.20 There will also be no impact on the historical value of the Scheduled Monument. Nor will the development impact on the associative values or connections between Bittesby Medieval settlement and the surrounding settlements of Ullesthorpe and Willey. There may be a positive impact on the communal value of the monument due to the increased use and understanding of the area by the people who work at Magna Park Lutterworth.

5.3.21 This assessment therefore considers the magnitude of impact on the setting of the Scheduled Monument to be moderate. In no sense will the proposed development remove all significance from the Monument, nor will it adversely impact upon key elements of its special interest. There will be no physical impacts upon the Monument, nor will development remove substantial assets which make significant contributions to its significance. The magnitude of impact is moderate, because of the increased modern development in close proximity to non-designated assets that contribute to its significance and setting. This change in proximity to those assets in no way constitutes ‘substantial harm’ (NPPF para 132 and 134).

**Watling Street Roman Road**

5.3.22 The Roman Road Watling Street (HER 1388) partly lies within the study site. The modern surface of the A5 overlies the historic road surface of the Roman road. The construction of the A5 will have either built up the ground level over the original road surface or truncated the archaeological deposits. Therefore, the proposed development will be not impact upon the Roman Road of Watling Street and this feature will be scoped out of the Environment Statement.

**Bitteswell Airfield**

5.3.23 The HER polygon of the modern airfield at Bitteswell (HER 15959) is located partially within the study site, east of Mere Lane. This polygon represents the mapped extent of the airfield, rather than an area significant archaeology associated with the former use of the land. Any archaeological evidence of the airfield that is located within the site will have already been destroyed during the construction of Magna Park Lutterworth and its associated water purification area. The proposed development will not cause any impact on Bitteswell Airfield. This Airfield will be scoped out of the Environmental Statement due to this reason.
6.0 CONCLUSIONS

6.1 This archaeological desk-based assessment draws together the available archaeological, historic, topographic, land-use, geophysical survey and fieldwalking survey information in order to clarify the heritage significance and archaeological potential for land proposed for an extension to Magna Park Lutterworth, Leicestershire on behalf of IDI Gazeley.

6.2 It addresses the information requirements set out in Government’s National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, para 128).

6.3 The assessment has established that there are no designated heritage assets within the study site. The Scheduled Monuments of Bittesby Deserted Medieval Village and moat, fishponds and shifted village earthworks of Ullesthorpe and eight Listed Buildings are located within a 1.5km surrounding search area. Development within the study site will not directly effect any designated heritage assets. A separate Built Heritage Assessment has been prepared to accompany the application (CgMs 2015; ref RU/JCG18281/2) and this should be consulted for a detailed assessment of the potential sensitivity of built heritage assets within the wider study area.

6.4 The study site is currently intervisible with the northern extent of the Scheduled Monument of Bittesby Deserted Medieval Village. The study site comprises part of the peripheral rural landscape setting of the Scheduled Monument but this setting makes no positive contribution to the significance of the Scheduled Monument. There are no substantial archaeological remains associated with the Scheduled Monument within the study site and it does not retain significant components of Medieval landscape. A separate Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment has been prepared in support of the application and this should be consulted for a consideration of the effect of changes to the view from the Scheduled Monument.

6.5 This assessment has assessed the magnitude of the proposed development impact on the setting of the Scheduled Monument to be moderate. In no sense will the proposed development remove all significance from the Monument, nor will it adversely impact upon key elements of its special interest. There will be no physical impacts upon the Monument itself, nor will development remove substantial assets making significant contributions to its significance. The magnitude of impact is moderate, because of the increased modern development in close proximity to non-designated assets that contribute to its significance and setting. This change in proximity to those assets in no way constitutes ‘substantial harm’ (NPPF para 132 and 134).
6.5 There will be a requirement to investigate the six areas of geophysical anomalies or groups of anomalies that have been identified within the application area through trial trenching in advance of determination of the application. Based upon the evidence available at present these anomalies are likely to be of local and/or regional importance. They will be significant for their evidential values and will not prohibit or constrain development. There is likely to be a conditioned requirement for limited archaeological works to allow preservation by record of elements within the site in advance of development.
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Plate 6: View east from the northern boundary of the Scheduled Monument of Bittesby DMV
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APPENDIX 1: GAZETTEER OF HER DATA

MONUMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MonUID</th>
<th>SMR No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>MonType</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MWA6473</td>
<td>6473</td>
<td>Shrunken Settlement Earthworks at Willey</td>
<td>SHRUNKEN</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWA8852</td>
<td>8852</td>
<td>Post-medieval farm buildings at Bayhouse Farm, Willey</td>
<td>FARMYARD, FARM BUILDING</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWA8893</td>
<td>8893</td>
<td>Little Orchard, Willey</td>
<td>TIMBER FRAMED HOUSE</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWA9579</td>
<td>9579</td>
<td>Willey Medieval Settlement</td>
<td>SETTLEMENT</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWA1677</td>
<td>1677</td>
<td>Church of St Leonard, Willey</td>
<td>CHURCH, BUILDING</td>
<td>Medieval to Imperial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLE21154</td>
<td></td>
<td>Railway underpass, Bittesby</td>
<td>UNDERPASS</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLE21153</td>
<td></td>
<td>Railway bridge, south of Ullesthorpe</td>
<td>BRIDGE</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLE1226</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deserted settlement at Bittesby</td>
<td>DESERTED SETTLEMENT</td>
<td>Saxon to Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLE15959</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bitteswell Airfield</td>
<td>MILITARY AIRFIELD, AIRFIELD</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLE20938</td>
<td></td>
<td>Possible Anglo-Saxon site south-east of Manor Farm</td>
<td>SITE?</td>
<td>Saxon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLE16079</td>
<td></td>
<td>Midland Counties Railway, Leicester to Rugby branch</td>
<td>RAILWAY</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLE1388</td>
<td></td>
<td>Watling Street Roman Road</td>
<td>ROAD</td>
<td>Roman to Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLE1225</td>
<td></td>
<td>Skeleton, north-west of Willey Crossing on the A5</td>
<td>INHUMATION</td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLE10324</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pottery from Bittesby (dismantled railway line)</td>
<td>FINDSPOT,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLE16029</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cold War monitoring post west of Harrier Parkway</td>
<td>UNDERGROUND MONITORING POST</td>
<td>Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLE1230</td>
<td></td>
<td>Possible Roman villa site, Bittesby</td>
<td>VILLA?, MOSAIC, BATH HOUSE?</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLE16460</td>
<td></td>
<td>Medieval and post-medieval pottery from Bittesby DMV</td>
<td>FINDSPOT,</td>
<td>Medieval to Post-Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLE16461</td>
<td></td>
<td>Roman pottery from Bittesby DMV</td>
<td>FINDSPOT</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLE16462</td>
<td></td>
<td>Palaeolithic flint from Bittesby DMV</td>
<td>FINDSPOT</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLE17111</td>
<td></td>
<td>Flint from Bittesby DMV</td>
<td>FLINT SCATTER</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLE6250</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anglo-Saxon loomweight from north-west of Bittesby</td>
<td>FINDSPOT</td>
<td>Saxon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLE20939</td>
<td></td>
<td>Roman finds from south-east of Manor Farm</td>
<td>FINDSPOT</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DESIGNATED HERITAGE ASSETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Listed Buildings</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>NGR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ListEntry</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1034859</td>
<td>COTTAGE NURSERIES</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>SP 49576 84782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1116337</td>
<td>CHURCH OF ST LEONARD</td>
<td>II*</td>
<td>SP 49664 84802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1211290</td>
<td>HOME FARM HOUSE</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>SP 50361 87426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1209178</td>
<td>CONGREGATIONAL CHAPEL AND RAILINGS TO WEST</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>SP 50643 87472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189599</td>
<td>THE MANSE</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>SP 50515 87534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ListEntry</td>
<td>Scheduled Monuments</td>
<td>NGR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1211322</td>
<td>5 STATION ROAD</td>
<td>II SP 50583 87650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1292776</td>
<td>ULLESTHORPE MILL</td>
<td>II SP 50652 87771</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1292803</td>
<td>CLAYBROOKE HOUSE</td>
<td>II SP 49821 87777</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1012563</td>
<td>Bittesby deserted medieval village</td>
<td>SP 50079 85757</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1010300</td>
<td>Moat, fishponds and shifted village earthworks at Ullethorpe</td>
<td>SP 50139 87370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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