

Our Ref: 17001

Your ref:

21 March 2017



**trigpoint conservation & planning ltd.**  
6 Guildford Way, Loughborough LE11 3SE  
t: 01509 828288 m: 07941 809921  
e-mail: [sb@trigpointcp.co.uk](mailto:sb@trigpointcp.co.uk)  
[www.trigpointcp.co.uk](http://www.trigpointcp.co.uk)

## **Comments by Trigpoint Conservation & Planning Ltd in response to Calverton Preservation and History Society's statement prepared in relation to Matter 15**

1. I have reviewed the comments made by the Calverton Preservation and History Society (CPHS) (Matter 15: Historic Environment) as contained in their statement for Matter 15 in response to GBC report EX/43 – *Assessment of Impact of LPD Development Sites on Scheduled Monuments*.
2. I would not agree that the assessment of Calverton's key ridgeline heritage assets in report EX/43 is flawed, as suggested by paragraph 6 of the CPHS response, and I see no reason to change the assessment of the potential impact of the Main Street, Calverton site (ref. H15) on the scheduled monument at Cockpit Hill.
3. The proposed development site is a relatively flat and featureless parcel of land within an area of Calverton, to the west of George's Lane, that is some distance from the historic settlement core and is characterised by late 20<sup>th</sup> century and early 21<sup>st</sup> century housing development. In this context the development of this site is a logical rounding-off of the built-up settlement.
4. Paragraph 6 of the CPHS response refers to the location of the site of the Iron Age hillforts on visually prominent points along the Calverton ridgeline to the south of the village and paragraph 9 goes on to criticise the EX/43 report for suggesting that the Cockpit Hill site has '*no visual or spatial association with any of the LPD development sites*'. However this brief assessment is expanded on by paragraph 7.21 of the EX/43 report, which concludes that there are no direct visual associations between the Main Street site and the scheduled

trigpoint conservation & planning ltd.  
a recognised historic environment service provider

Registered in England No. 5465626

monument at Cockpit Hill and its development will not encroach into the open rural setting that this monument currently enjoys.

5. Whilst it should be noted that the Cockpit Hill site is described by the County's Historic Environment Record as a Roman camp, compared to the Fox Wood site that does appear to be of Iron Age construction, it is not disputed that this monument was strategically located on the ridgeline and therefore its location does make a contribution to its significance. The monument itself is located within a small copse and the gardens attached to the residential properties at Ramsdale Stables, there are no obvious above-ground earthworks. Consequently the actual scheduled monument has a very limited physical presence in the landscape and its setting (defined in the NPPF as the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced) is also limited.
6. Furthermore, I would not disagree with the comments made by CPHS regarding the importance of the visual, spatial and historic associations between the Cockpit Hill site and the Fox Wood site. However the proposed Main Street development would have no impact on the relationship between these two monuments and consequently it was not considered necessary to refer to this connectivity in the EX/43 report. (It is also interesting to note that the importance of the connectivity between neighbouring monuments was not made in the English Heritage (now Historic England) comments referred to by CPHS.)
7. The CPHS also refers to the importance of the woodland on the ridgeline demarcating the location of the Cockpit Hill monument. This woodland is not part of any landscape designed to enhance or contribute to the significance of the scheduled monument or the ridgeline, and its relationship to Calverton village would still be evident in views from Main Street.
8. The CPHS also refers to comments made by English Heritage in November 2011 in relation to the development of the Dark Lane site within Calverton village and its impact on the Fox Wood scheduled monument. The CPHS response suggests that similar conclusions should be applied to the relationship of the Main Street site with Cockpit Hill site. However as the English Heritage comments were made in respect of a different development site and a different scheduled monument I am not convinced that this can be the case given the difference in the context of these sites.
9. In describing the setting and significance of the Fox Wood monument the English Heritage comments make particular reference to the intervisibility between the historic village running along Main Street, and within the Conservation Area, and the ridgeline

monument and the intervening historic landscape, which all relate to different patterns of historic development. The English Heritage comments then conclude by suggesting that the development of the Dark Lane site would significantly intrude into the open countryside harming the significance of the Conservation Area and the setting of the scheduled monument.

10. This overall analysis does not transfer to the consideration of the Main Street site. The Main Street site is located on the western side of Calverton within an area of modern housing development, outside of the historic settlement core and the Conservation Area, and its development would not significantly intrude into the open countryside. In addition, the intervening landscape between the Main Street site and Cockpit Hill is occupied by a golf course, a man-made landscape of no historic importance. Furthermore, in the return views from the ridgeline towards Calverton village, the Main Street site will not be seen as a particularly prominent development, it will be largely indistinguishable from the existing development along Main Street.
11. For these reasons it is difficult to draw direct parallels between the development of the Dark Lane site and its perceived impact on the scheduled Fox Wood site, and the Conservation Area, and the development of the Main Street site, which is not within the Conservation Area, and its impact on Cockpit Hill. The NPPF also reminds us that elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of a heritage asset, or may be neutral. Given the relationship of the Main Street site to the existing settlement and the scheduled monument and the nature of the intervening landscape, its contribution to the setting of this monument can be considered to be no more than neutral.
12. Therefore notwithstanding the views of the CPHS, and also indirectly of English Heritage, it is my considered opinion that the development of the Main Street site (ref. H15) will not harm the setting of the scheduled monument at Cockpit Hill or its overall significance, as defined by its strategic location on the ridgeline, and I see no reason to change the conclusions set out in para. 7.21 of the GBC report EX/43.

**Stephen Bradwell, MA RTPI IHBC**  
**21 March 2017**