

Kelly C (Christine)

From: Hargreaves Philip [Philip.Hargreaves@northlancs.nhs.uk]
Posted At: 22 July 2008 16:17
Conversation: response to Historic Battlefields.
Posted To: hs.shep
Subject: response to Historic Battlefields.

This email has been received from an external party and has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.

Further to your recent consultation document, I have carried out extensive research in to the protection of historic battlefields.

The first piece of work led to me being awarded a master of science with distinction in environmental planning. The second award was for a master of philosophy in battlefield conservation. My work contains much detailed responses to your questions below so I have only provided short answers. You would benefit greatly from reading pieces of work.

I would be happy, if you so wished, to share with you copies of both of these pieces of work, but in specific response to your consultation document I comment as follows:

1. I do agree that a policy for the protection and sustainable management is necessary. My research has concluded though that the policy can be overcome and thwarted unless it carries mandatory protection and not simply words like "have regard to". Space and time do not allow a full answer on this and you may wish to refer to my research for a more in-depth response.
2. I do not necessarily agree with the scope and definition. Whilst it is important to recognise that a battle took place your policy recognises the number of combatants and military forces. I would suggest that if a famous individual, or individuals, or a particular tactic or piece of equipment made that battle significant then that should be included. I also think that some battles influenced and changed the shaping of nations and that may also be a factor worth considering.
3. Here are all my views on the value of a battlefield. Please see Chapter 3 of the thesis.
4. I agree that an inventory should be made but it should be statutory and the planning process should have the powers to protect such sites. The experience in England, for example, still leaves many sites under threat despite the historic battlefield register and the relevant conservation and transport guidance notes.
5. Yes, historic battlefields should be equal and in a sense the same status as gardens and landscapes.
6. The proposed inventory should also prioritise threats since this would influence where conservation efforts are needed most. I would suggest all my answers will be thoroughly supported from a reading of my research.
7. I agree.
8. You need to bear in mind if any significant landscape features played a part in the battle or buildings etc. They may not necessarily be on the battlefield as such but play a significant part to its outcome. The position of a baggage train or brook or stream which influenced the path or routes taken prior to engagement.
9. I totally agree that management plans are required.

10. Best practice should be made available. Historic Scotland, the battlefields trust, would be a good starting point. Draw on the experiences of others.

11. In England I recommended archaeological groups, local battlefield societies, THE CBA, Battlefield Trust,

Regards

Phil Hargreaves

B.A.(Hons) Arch, Dip. Arch, MSc, MPhil,

R.I.B.A.; M.R.T.P.I.

Head of Estates Planning

North Lancashire Teaching Primary Care Trust Derby Road, Wesham PR4 3AL and also at

Moor Lane Mills, Moor Lane, Lancaster LA1 1QD

Direct Dial 01253 306437 (Wesham)

01524 519269 (Lancaster)

Mobile 07717 766 787

Fax 01253 306306 (Wesham)

E Mail philip.hargreaves@northlancs.nhs.uk

www.northlancshealth.nhs.uk

P Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail. Thank you