

There are so many omissions from the planning officers briefing that I must draw your attention to these matters:

1. **There is no ambiguity at all about the position of English Heritage regarding the site of the battle of Fulford.** This is taken from their internal document, EH Doc BP2012/3/E dated 2 Feb 2012

*“On the grounds of probability Germany Beck appears to be the most likely location for the battle. Jones' interpretation of the course of the battle is plausible and is the best fit for the surviving evidence.*

*5.2 In relation to the forthcoming Selection Guide, it is clear that the Battle of Fulford is of sufficient historical importance for inclusion in the Register. On the basis of probability, Germany Beck can be identified as the location of the Battle of Fulford and on the basis of Jones' interpretation, a reasonable boundary could be identified focusing on the line of the Germany Beck. It is worth noting that the combination of evidence and reasoning here differs little from that used to determine the location of the registered Battle of Maldon.*

*5.3 Inclusion in the Register is not obligatory. To include Fulford in the Register at this stage would raise the temperature of discussions regarding the detailed planning application. **Following forthcoming development of the site, the site would be very unlikely to merit inclusion in the Register.***

*5.4 Given the planning history of this site, EH is currently considering responding to the request to Register with advice which recognises that Germany Beck is likely to be the location of the Battle, but that, given the planning situation, refrains from adding the site to the Register.”*

So English Heritage recognise that this is the site of the battle but intend to delay reviewing their designation decision until the ‘forthcoming development’ has ruined the site allowing them to say that it does not ‘merit inclusion in the Register’. This is a dereliction of their duty as guardians of our heritage and utterly cynical.

English Heritage and the academic community have addressed the evidence and recognise that Germany Beck is the location of the battle of Fulford.

2. **The Applicant's Heritage Statement (Jan 2012) does not make a single mention let alone engage in any debate about the evidence for the battle of Fulford. You should note the number of times that those advising you are archaeology have failed to engage with the facts.**

- The archaeology and analysis of the heritage landscape is the old work. EH noted in 2004 that it is irrelevant to the discovery of battlefields. Not a single piece of work in the 9 years since then have addressed this deficiency. John Oxley has declined to address the recent evidence and analysis when asked to do so.
- The applicants were asked to, and agreed to, consult me about the work required at a meeting with planning officers prior to submitting the reserved matter. They failed to make any contact or to report their failure to do as instructed.
- John Oxley issued a formal instruction for the applicants to ‘take account of’ the projects detailed in a chapter of the report entitled 'Finding Fulford'. No projects or new work were undertaken by the applicants .
- I wish to place on record that the applicants refused, and CYC officers condoned, the failure to allow discovery of battlefield evidence even when the planning guidance was changed (2008/9) which required such discovery to be mandated. This failure should have been reported to you.

3. **There were serious failures by CYC officers in the application to Dept of Transport who were misinformed about the archaeology related to the stopping up order.**

- The failure to correct this need to be challenged.
4. **I have asked various officers, and finally the Chief exec, for a clear expression of the view of CYC as to whether you recognise Germany Beck as the site of the battle of Fulford.**
    - The CYC will not be able to hide behind some carefully crafted words from John Oxley about the exact extent or similarly ambiguous expressions to provide any cover when the culpability for destroying a national treasure is finally considered.
  5. I am referred to as an interested party. I feel the term is used in a derogatory sense. The High Court has recognised that I am acting in the public interest and CYC should follow suit as my work to save the heritage of Fulford has cost me much and will earn me nothing.

Chas Jones

24 April 2013