



Historic England

Mr Victor Grayson
Kirklees Council
Planning, Investment and Regeneration Service
PO Box B93, Civic Centre, Off Market Street
Huddersfield
West Yorkshire
HD1 2JR

Direct Dial: 01904 601988

Our ref: P00990015

10 May 2021

Dear Mr Grayson

**T&CP (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015
& Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Regulations 1990**

**VICTORIA TOWER, LUMB LANE, CASTLE HILL, ALMONDBURY,
HUDDERSFIELD, HD4 6TA
Application No. 2018/93591**

Thank you for your letter of 29 April 2021 regarding further information on the above application for planning permission. On the basis of this information, we offer the following advice to assist your authority in determining the application.

Historic England Advice

We have received Amended information (consisting of a revised Heritage Statement (UrbanGlow and One17 Architects, March 2021)) concerning the application for the proposal to develop a cafe/restaurant with bedrooms, interpretation facilities and associated parking and servicing at the nationally important Scheduled Monument of 'Castle Hill: slight univallate hillfort, small multivallate hillfort, motte and bailey castle and deserted village', NHLE 1009846.

It was our advice and recommendation in our letter to your authority on 15th October 2020 that the Heritage Statement provided in support of the application was lacking in detail and should be revised.

The main areas of concern with the original document were:

- The application and Heritage Statement did not include any clear reference to the archaeological component of the development proposal, stating:
"All of the archaeological elements of the project should be gathered into the revised Heritage Statement, and this should include the assessment of the past work, identification of source of soil for the bund (the soil should be



37 TANNER ROW YORK YO1 6WP

Telephone 01904 601948
HistoricEngland.org.uk



archaeologically sterile), and an agreed Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for all works associated with the build”

- The comments on setting were insufficiently clear. We stated that: “The photo visualisations submitted are all useful additions, but although there is reference to the Atkins Setting Study, there is no assessment of setting or the contribution that setting makes to the significance of the designated heritage assets. The Heritage Statement should be updated in accordance with the current proposal in order to properly comply with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), para 189.”
- We were concerned that the public benefits of the scheme were unclear, stating that: “...we are concerned over the current lack of clarity regarding these potential benefits and how they can be secured. The public benefits are fundamental to the proposals. A Section 106 Agreement might resolve much of the detail, but the core elements need to be clearly defined so that they can be properly considered in determining the application.”

The planning application has now been determined, and an approval is forthcoming. However, it is also the case that the works will require Scheduled Monument Consent from the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) before they can commence on site. It is essential therefore that all supporting information is accurate, provides an agreed baseline of information and is fit for purpose. We have reviewed the revised document and provide the following comments.

To take each of the items in turn.

- 1) The Archaeological component:** There is still no reference in the revised document to the archaeological component of the development proposal.

The document needs to draw together the known elements of the archaeological significance and potential of the application site and provide consideration of what the possible impact might be for the wider scheme.

In this respect there are 5 archaeological elements to consider:

- 1.1) The footprint of the building
- 1.2) The connection to services; how those services are to be detected, whether they are fit for purpose, and therefore whether additional service provision is required
- 1.3) The modifications to the car park
- 1.4) The creation of the passing places on the access road, and



- 1.5) The use of archaeologically sterile soil to create the bund around the building

Some of the items above will be defined by planning conditions, but the Heritage Statement should include an assessment of the archaeological component of the application site because it is part of the significance, and therefore needs to be assessed. This will then be part of the baseline of information necessary for the planning conditions, the forthcoming 106 Agreement and any subsequent Scheduled Monument Consent application.

- 2) **Setting:** The additional visualisations and views from new locations around Castle Hill (viewpoints 1 to 16) are a welcome and useful addition and provide a more comprehensive illustration of the impact and visibility of the scheme. However, the Heritage Statement has not been updated in accordance with the NPPF or the published guidance on Setting.

Because the revised Heritage Statement has resubmitted and book-ended the original Heritage Statement, the original errors and omissions remain:

2.1) There is still no statement on the setting of Castle Hill, what it is or how the setting contributes to the significance of the site. Understanding setting and the contribution it makes to significance is an essential part of the NPPF assessment.

2.2) p.27, 12.0 Long distance views: The Atkins CMP does not say what the following text suggests. This is a misleading section of the Statement and needs to be corrected immediately.

- 3) **Public Benefit:** The public benefit aspect of the proposal remains unclear, and unsubstantiated. The new conclusion to the Heritage Statement repeats the assertions from the previous document, but now includes statements on the economic benefits of the scheme outweighing the harm (p43). However there is no business plan or business model to judge this against, and no indication as to whether the business and interpretation scheme remains valid post-Covid.

It may be the case that the Section 106 Agreement can resolve much of the detail concerning public benefit, but addressing the key elements at this stage and providing the baseline information will inform the 106 Agreement and make its formulation more straightforward.

- 4) **General points:** The revised Heritage Statement needs a thorough and close edit. Because the revision is the resubmission of the earlier document with a





Historic England

new introduction and conclusion, the errors of the first Heritage Statement remain, eg p20, para 8.0 still refers to a building with a curved roof, which is no longer the case. Because this error remains it then confuses later comment on p27 2) as it is not clear which roof and which design scheme is being referred to.

4.1) the reference to English Heritage should be removed. There was never any suggestion that English Heritage could or would be involved in the operational aspect of this site.

Please contact me should you wish to discuss any of the above.

Yours sincerely

Keith Emerick

Keith Emerick

Ancient Monuments Inspector

E-mail: Keith.Emerick@HistoricEngland.org.uk



37 TANNER ROW YORK YO1 6WP

Telephone 01904 601948
HistoricEngland.org.uk



Historic England is subject to both the Freedom of Information Act (2000) and Environmental Information Regulations (2004). Any Information held by the organisation can be requested for release under this legislation.