

Dear Sirs,

Thank you for the below questions addressed to Historic England as part of EXQ1.

We note your authority would like a response from Historic England in regard to Q11.0.2, Q11.0.3 and Q11.0.4.

Each question is restated below, along with the interested parties noted the asset is in reference to and our response accordingly.

Q11.0.2

Fields for Farming, Historic England and Nottinghamshire County Council

'Littleborough Roman Town Scheduled Ancient Monument'

Question

The written representation from Fields for Farming (FfF) in respect of Historic Environment [REP1-032] explains that the Scheduled Ancient Monument site presently covering the main Roman settlement is being extended to cover the ribbon developments and other important remains detected during the recent surveys. It is further stated it would include fields to the left of the current road from Littleborough to Sturton.

1. Can FfF provide further details on the stated extension to the Scheduled Ancient Monument and particularly whether this is subject to a formal process. If so, are there any timescales for implementation? Are any areas of the development proposed on the areas referred to?

2. Can Historic England (HE) and NCC provide their understanding of the current position in respect of the comments made by FfF?

In response to part 2 of the question, Historic England can advise that as of 08th January 2026, we have not received an application to review any proposed amendments to the scheduling of 'Segelocum Roman town' (NHLE: 1003669). Thus, we cannot provide a timescale for implementation or specific areas referred to, as we have not received an application to consider. We are not actively reviewing the extent of the scheduling.

In regard to general current position, conversation with the Applicant is ongoing as part of the development of the Statement of Common Ground in regards to appropriate mitigation and detailed design requirements on land parcels considered to retain non-designated archaeological features that contribute to the significance of the Scheduled Monument; extensions of the ribbon road side settlement for example. We envisage that appropriate mitigation and protective measures will be secured through the AMS/oWSI and the CEMP, in consultation with both Historic England and NCC.

Q11.0.3

Nottinghamshire County Council and Historic England

Extent of Harm to North Leverton Windmill (Grade II* listed)

Question

The third bullet point in paragraph 5.1.8 considers that the impacts on the setting of North Leverton Windmill are likely to be at the highest end of 'less than substantial harm' category with regards to the NPPF. The fourth bullet point then states that you consider the impact to North Leverton Windmill, and to a lesser extent Burton Chateau, would fall into the 'substantial harm' category with regards to the NPPF in the lack of evidence to prove otherwise.

1. Can NCC clarify the different extent of harm findings between the two bullet points. Do the different conclusions on harm relate individually to 'setting' and 'financial viability'? If so, what do you consider would be the totality of harm to the significance of this asset as a consequence of the proposed development?

2. Can NCC explain what evidence you require to consider the effect?

3. Can HE provide their position on the effects to this asset noting the different positions between the applicant and other parties?

In response to part 3 of the question above, Historic England present our position in regard to the effect on North Leverton Windmill (NHLE: 1234469).

Firstly, we note and acknowledge the existing set back (by 1 field) of the infrastructure from the windmill. However, in terms of the assessment of the impact to the significance of the windmill via change in its setting, we consider that the applicant has applied a rather reductive approach in only considering the significance derived from the design intent. We consider that North Leverton Windmill not only derives significance from its design intent, but also the kinetic views that are experienced on approach to and from the asset, observable and readily appreciated in both short and long ranging views. Despite modern built form that has subsequently been added to the landscape, the windmill can be understood in its agricultural setting, as it would have been historically.

Historic England suggest development as proposed would result in a moderate level of less than substantial harm to the significance of the highly graded asset as a result of change in its setting. We consider that further detailed visual assessment may be helpful, including further visualisation.

Q11.0.4

Historic England

Church of St Peter and St Paul (Grade II* listed)

Question

Can HE provide further comments on the effects of the proposed development on the Grade II* Listed Church of St Peter and St Paul and, noting the applicant's response to your relevant representation in [REP1-008], whether you consider the ES has appropriately assessed effects to this asset?

Historic England have reviewed the effects to this asset again in light of the applicant's response to our relevant representations. Thank you for the invitation to re-address this issue. We note that in our response to the PEIR as follows:

"With specific reference to the Grade II* listed Church of St Peter and St Paul (NHLE: 1275773) within Sturton le Steeple, the PEIR NTS notes some visible built form in the wider surrounds of the asset, and recognises that it will impact some longer distance views towards the church tower, but suggests that this would not impact the significance of the asset, this would need to be carefully evidenced against our published guidance regarding the setting of Heritage assets. Further to this, Chapter 9 of the PEIR states that views are considered as part of the ZTV, and it is however acknowledged that the setting of an asset does not rely wholly on visibility, therefore further assessment should be considered."

The applicant's response was as follows:

'detailed assessment of potential impacts to the significance of the asset is provided in the Cultural Heritage Technical Baseline (Appendix 9.1, [EN010163/APP/6.3.9]). The key and contributory elements of the asset's setting (both visual and non-visual) are considered in this ES Chapter at paragraph 9.7.14.'

In Appendix 9.1 - Cultural Heritage Technical Baseline, it is acknowledged that 'the prominent church tower is a highly visible feature within the surrounding landscape', and that 'the Proposed Development is anticipated to result in some visible built form in the wider surrounds of the asset, and will impact some longer distance views towards the church tower, with the Scheme appearing in the foreground of longer-range views of the tower'.

The basis of the applicant's assessment is on the basis that 'the significance of this asset is formed primarily by its architectural and historic interest which is best demonstrated by its physical fabric. The setting of the asset also makes a contribution to its significance, although this contribution is much less than that made by its physical fabric'. While we would agree that its built form comprises a large part of its significance, however, we would suggest that's it's setting contributes a lot more significantly than is suggested in this text. The prominent nature of the tower, and the way it is visible both now, despite modern form in the landscape, retains the ability to understand the dominance of church and state in the medieval period.

There is also a clear landscape level relationship and line of sight from the church and The Scheduled Monument comprising the Medieval settlement and open field system immediately south east of Low Farm (NHLE ref. 1017741). This clear relationship demonstrates a clear interrelationship in the medieval landscape that is currently legible and should be protected. It is noted that there is a set back of panels from the Scheduled Monument, however, we suggest the introduction of both panel and BESS in this area, could obscure the intervisibility of the two assets, and this fracture the historical relationship between the two, resulting in harm to significance of both assets. Refinement of detailed design here would reduce the level of harm to both assets and should be carefully considered.

Many of the photos and montages show the tower quite clearly in long ranging views, and the introduction of the panels entirely obscures this view from certain ground level views, which as identified above would present, what we would consider a moderate level of less than substantial harm to the significance of the highly graded asset as a result of change in its setting.

We note the content of Q11.0.1 and suggest that our response above could be consider relevant to this question also.

Please do get back in touch if your authority requires any further clarification or information,

Kind regards,

Inspector of Ancient Monuments

The Foundry

82 Granville Street

Birmingham

B1 2LH