

## 9.0 CULTURAL HERITAGE AND ARCHAEOLOGY

### Introduction

- 9.1 This Chapter of the ES has been prepared by Cotswold Archaeology and addresses the potential effects of the Proposed Development on cultural heritage and archaeology. It identifies the location, type and value of cultural heritage assets and their setting and reports on the predicted impacts of the Proposed Development on this resource and the likely significance of effect. No significant effects have been identified.
- 9.2 Heritage assets are defined within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) as ‘A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest’ (NPPF, Annex 2, Glossary). Heritage assets include those that are designated under legislation (such as Listed Buildings and Scheduled Monuments) as well as those that are non-designated. Non-designated heritage assets are assets that are considered to have a degree of local interest, usually recognised by Local Planning Authorities (LPA).
- 9.3 The chapter is supported by the following Appendices:
- **Appendix 9.1:** Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment
  - **Appendix 9.2:** Heritage Settings Assessment

### Legislation and Policy

#### **Legislative Background**

#### **Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990**

- 9.4 The Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990<sup>i</sup> (herein referred to as ‘the Act’) sets out the principal statutory provisions which must be considered in the determination of any application affecting either Listed Buildings or Conservation Areas.
- 9.5 Section 66 of the Act states that in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a Listed Building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. By virtue of Section 1(5) of the Act, a Listed Building includes any object or structure within its curtilage.

## **Planning Policy Context**

### **National Planning Policy Framework**

- 9.6 The NPPF<sup>ii</sup> sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these should be applied to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. While the requirement for an EIA falls under separate legislation, the planning decision still takes account of national guidance.
- 9.7 Section 2 of the NPPF sets out the objectives for achieving sustainable development, including an environmental objective which aims to contribute to protecting and enhancing our built and historic environment (paragraph 8, part c). Section 16 of the NPPF deals specifically with the historic environment. Where changes are proposed, the NPPF sets out a clear framework to ensure that heritage assets are conserved, and where appropriate enhanced, in a manner that is consistent with their value.

### **Cherwell Local Plan (2011 – 2031)**

- 9.8 The Site is located in the local authority of Cherwell District Council. The Local Plan, 'The Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031'<sup>iii</sup>, was adopted in September 2020. Policy ESD 15 relates to the historic environment.

## **Other Guidance**

### **Planning Practice Guidance**

- 9.9 The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)<sup>iv</sup> provides further advice and expands on the guidance and policy outlined in the NPPF.
- 9.10 The value of heritage assets and its importance in decision taking is explored in Paragraph 009<sup>v</sup> of the PPG which states that heritage assets may be affected by direct physical change or by change in their setting. Being able to properly assess the nature, extent and value of a heritage asset, and the contribution of its setting, is very important to understanding the potential impact and acceptability of development proposals.
- 9.11 The setting of the heritage asset is also of importance and a thorough assessment of the impact on setting needs to take into account, and be proportionate to, the value of the heritage asset under consideration. The degree to which the proposed changes enhance or detract from that value must also be considered. The extent and importance of setting is often expressed by reference to visual considerations. Although views of or from an asset will play an important part, the way in which an asset is experienced in its setting is also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise,

dust and vibration from other land uses in the vicinity, and by our understanding of the historic relationship between places.

9.12 Paragraph 013 of the PPG recognises that the contribution that setting makes to the value of the heritage asset does not depend on there being public right of way or the ability to experience that setting. When assessing any application for development which may affect the setting of a heritage asset, local planning authorities may need to consider the implications of cumulative change.

9.13 Paragraph 018 of the PPG discusses how to assess if there is substantial harm. It states that what matters in assessing if a proposal causes substantial harm is the impact on the value of the heritage asset. Ultimately, whether a proposal causes substantial harm will be a judgement for the decision taker. However, it acknowledges that substantial harm is a high test so may not arise in many cases. A key consideration when assessing whether there is an adverse impact on a Listed Building is whether the adverse impact seriously affects a key element of its special architectural or historic interest. It is the degree of harm to the asset's value rather than the scale of the development that is to be assessed.

### **Historic England Good Practice Advice Notes**

9.14 Historic England (HE) has published a series of Good Practice Advice (GPA) and Advice Notes (HEAN) of which those of most relevance to this assessment are:

- GPA2 - Managing Significance in Decision-taking<sup>vi</sup>;
- GPA3 - The Setting of Heritage Assets<sup>vii</sup>;
- HEAN 12 - Statements of Heritage Significance: Analysing Significance in Heritage Assets<sup>viii</sup>;  
and
- HEAN 17 - Planning and Archaeology<sup>ix</sup>.

9.15 These are discussed further within **Appendix 9.1** and **Appendix 9.2**.

### **Chartered Institute for Archaeologists Standards**

9.16 Cotswold Archaeology is a Registered Organisation with the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists. This assessment follows relevant elements of key heritage industry guidance, namely:

- Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Code of Conduct<sup>x</sup> ; and
- Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-based Assessment<sup>xi</sup>.

## Assessment Methodology and Significance Criteria

### Consultation

9.17 The data requirements and assessment methodology have been agreed following consultation with the Archaeological Advisor to Cherwell District Council, via emails between 18th July – 11th September 2023. The Scoping Response (dated 29th September 2023) reflected these discussions. Consultation to date is summarised in **Table 9.1** below.

**Table 9.1: Consultation summary table**

<b>Consultee or organisation approached</b>	<b>Date and nature of consultation</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Summary of response</b>
Richard Oram, Lead Archaeologist, Oxfordshire County Archaeological Services	22nd June 2023 – request for comment on Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for the Desk-Based Assessment (DBA)	Email	18th July 2023 – Mr Oram advised on the specific scope of the Desk-Based Assessment
Richard Oram, Lead Archaeologist, Oxfordshire County Archaeological Services	21st August 2023 – request for comment on the DBA results and the requirement for any further archaeological information to inform the planning application	Email	23rd August 2023 – Response from Victoria Green, Planning Archaeologist, Oxfordshire County Archaeological Services, confirmed the DBA was acceptable and that a staged programme of archaeological investigation is likely to be required.
Victoria Green, Planning Archaeologist, Oxfordshire County Archaeological Services	29th August 2023 – request for comment on the specification of the potential pre-determination archaeological requirements	Email	11th September 2023 – Ms Green confirmed that no further archaeological investigations would be required prior to determination of the application. A staged programme of archaeological works will be requested via a condition of planning permission.

### Assessment Methods

#### **Sources of Data**

9.18 The following sources of information have been reviewed as part of the DBA (**Appendix 9.1**) and form the basis of this assessment:

- Oxfordshire Historic Environment Record (HER) for information on non-designated heritage assets;
- Historic England's 'Archives and Monuments Information England' (AMIE) database;
- Historic England's archive of historic aerial photographs held at their Swindon offices;
- National Heritage List for England (NHLE) for information on designated heritage assets;
- Historic sources held by the Oxfordshire Archives;
- Lidar data;

- Geological records from the British Geological Society;
- Ordnance Survey historic mapping data;
- Site inspection and study area walkover.

## Study Area

9.19 The Study Area for the collation of information on heritage assets was defined by a 1km buffer from the Site boundary (see **Appendix 9.1**, Fig. 1), agreed with the Local Planning Authority’s archaeological advisor as part of a WSI. This distance has been judged as appropriate to provide the context of, and potential for, surviving archaeological remains on the Site given the nature of the Proposed Development and its location. It was also considered an appropriate area within which to consider the potential changes to the settings of heritage assets (see **Appendix 9.2**). Within this Study Area, detailed data was collated in relation to all designated and non-designated archaeological assets. All known heritage assets were identified using the data sources listed above. Only those identified as being potentially impacted are discussed further below. All assets identified within the Study Area, irrespective of whether they would be affected by the Proposed Development, are listed in **Appendix 9.1** and **Appendix 9.2**.

## Significance Criteria

9.20 The methodology for determining the significance of an effect on a heritage asset differs slightly from the methodology described in Chapter 2: Approach to EIA.

9.21 The heritage value (referred to as ‘significance’ in the NPPF, but the term is not used within this ES to avoid confusion with ‘significance of effect’) of a heritage asset is derived from its heritage interest which may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. This is more broadly referred to as the sensitivity of a receptor in Chapter 2: Approach to EIA. Each heritage asset is assessed on an individual basis and takes into account regional variations and individual qualities. The heritage value of an asset is defined by the sum of its heritage interests. Taking these criteria into account, each identified heritage asset can be assigned a level of heritage value in accordance with a four-point scale as set out in **Table 9.2**.

**Table 9.2: Criteria for determining the heritage value of heritage assets**

Heritage Value	Criteria
High	Assets of inscribed international importance, such as World Heritage Sites; Grade I and II* Listed Buildings; Grade I and II* registered historic parks and gardens; Registered battlefields; Scheduled monuments; and Non-designated archaeological assets of schedulable quality and importance.
Medium	Grade II Listed Buildings; Grade II listed registered historic parks and gardens; Conservation Areas;

	Locally Listed Buildings included within a Conservation Area; and Non-designated heritage assets of a regional resource value.
Low	Non-designated heritage assets of a local resource value as identified through consultation; Locally Listed Buildings; and Non-designated heritage assets whose heritage values are compromised by poor preservation or damaged so that too little remains to justify inclusion into a higher grade.
Negligible	Assets on national or regional databases that have very little archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic value.

9.22 Having identified the value of the heritage asset, the next stage in the assessment is to identify the magnitude (level and degree) of impact to an asset arising from the development. Impacts may arise during construction or operation and can be temporary or permanent. Impacts can occur to the physical fabric of the asset or affect its setting.

9.23 The magnitude of impact is assigned with reference to a four-point scale as set out in **Table 9.3**. In respect of cultural heritage, an assessment of the level and degree of impact is made in consideration of any scheme design mitigation (embedded mitigation). Where there is no change from the baseline it is classed as No Impact.

**Table 9.3: Criteria for Determining the Magnitude of Impact on Heritage Assets**

Magnitude of Impact	Criteria
High	Change such that the value of the asset is totally altered or destroyed. Comprehensive change to setting affecting value, resulting in a serious loss in our ability to understand and appreciate the asset.
Medium	Change such that the value of the asset is affected. Noticeably different change to setting affecting value, resulting in erosion in our ability to understand and appreciate the asset.
Low	Change such that the value of the asset is slightly affected. Slight change to setting affecting value resulting in a change in our ability to understand and appreciate the asset.
Negligible	Changes to the asset that hardly affect value. Minimal change to the setting of an asset that have little effect on value resulting in no real change in our ability to understand and appreciate the asset.

9.24 The classification of an effect, having taken into consideration any embedded mitigation, is determined by cross-referencing between the heritage value of the asset (**Table 9.2**) and the magnitude of impact (**Table 9.3**). The resultant significance of the effect (**Table 9.4**) can be adverse or beneficial.

**Table 9.4: Criteria for Determining the Significance of Effect**

Heritage Value	Magnitude of Impact			
	High	Medium	Low	Negligible
High	<b>Major</b>	<b>Major/Moderate</b>	<b>Moderate/Minor</b>	Negligible
Medium	<b>Major/Moderate</b>	<b>Moderate</b>	Minor	Negligible
Low	<b>Moderate/Minor</b>	Minor	Minor/Negligible	Negligible
Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

- 9.25 Major or Moderate effects are considered to be significant (bold in **Table 9.4**). Negligible and Minor effects are considered to be not significant. Where the matrix allows for more than one outcome, professional judgement is used to determine the significance of effect.
- 9.26 An assessment of the predicted significance of effect is made both prior to the implementation of additional mitigation and after the implementation of mitigation to identify residual effects. This first highlights where mitigation may be appropriate and then demonstrates the effectiveness of mitigation and provides the framework for the assessment of significance which takes mitigation measures into consideration.

### **Assessment of harm to designated heritage assets (in the context of the NPPF)**

- 9.27 Within the NPPF, impacts affecting the value of heritage assets are considered in terms of 'harm'. There is a requirement to determine whether the level of harm amounts to 'substantial harm' or 'less than substantial harm'. There is no direct correlation between the significance of effect as reported in this ES and the level of harm caused to heritage value. Notwithstanding this:
- A Major (Significant) effect on a heritage asset (including total loss of value) would typically form the basis by which to determine that the level of harm to the value of a designated asset would be substantial;
  - A Moderate (Significant) effect is unlikely to meet the test of substantial harm and would therefore typically form the basis by which to determine that the level of harm to the value of a designated asset would be less than substantial;
  - A Minor or Negligible (not significant) effect would typically amount to less than substantial harm to the value of a designated asset; and
  - A change that amounts to No Harm on the value of a designated asset.

- 9.28 In all cases, the determination of the level of harm to the value of a designated heritage asset arising from construction or operation of the Proposed Development has been led by professional judgement.

## **Baseline Conditions**

- 9.29 Heritage assets recorded within the Study Area are described in detail within **Appendix 9.1** and **Appendix 9.2**. Designated heritage assets within the Site or Study Area are identified within the following baseline using an alphabetical asset reference (e.g. Asset A), assigned within **Appendix 9.2**. Non-designated heritage assets are identified within the following baseline using a numerical asset reference (e.g. Asset 1), assigned below.

### **Designated heritage assets**

9.30 There are no designated heritage assets within the Site. Designated heritage assets within the Study Area are depicted in **Appendix 9.2** (Fig. 2) and comprise:

- Grade II Listed Stratfield Farmhouse (**Asset A**)
- Grade II Listed Frieze Farmhouse (**Asset B**)
- Oxford Canal Conservation Area (**Asset C**)

9.31 All three of these designated heritage assets are of Medium value. There are no other designated heritage assets within the Study Area and no other designated heritage assets are considered to be potentially sensitive to the Proposed Development. The reasons for this are discussed further within **Appendix 9.2** (Section 3).

### **Non-designated heritage assets**

9.32 Recorded and potential non-designated heritage assets are discussed in detail within **Appendix 9.1**. Those that are potentially sensitive to impacts due to the construction or operation of the Proposed Development are discussed below and comprise:

- Ridge and furrow earthworks (Asset 1)
- Historic landscape character (Asset 2)
- Potential buried archaeological remains (Asset 3)

9.33 Ridge and furrow earthworks (Asset 1) occur in the southern part of the Site. These are discussed further in **Appendix 9.1**, paragraph 4.9 onwards (and Fig. 5). They comprise a heritage asset of Low value.

9.34 The Historic Landscape Character (Asset 2) of the Site is defined as 'reorganised enclosure'. This is discussed further in **Appendix 9.1**, paragraph 3.61. The historic landscape type occurs widely across the local area, and accounts for over 25% of Oxfordshire as a county<sup>xii</sup>. It comprises a heritage asset of Negligible value.

9.35 There is the potential for currently unrecorded archaeological remains (Asset 3) to occur within the Site. This is discussed further in **Appendix 9.1**, paragraph 4.5 onwards. Specifically, there is the potential for prehistoric and Romano-British remains to occur, similar to those recorded elsewhere within the Study Area. These potential remains could comprise a heritage asset of up to Medium value.

9.36 The heritage assets identified above have been assigned a value, in accordance with the methodology outlined in paragraph 9.19 onwards. These values are summarised in **Table 9.5** below.



**Table 9.5: Value of identified heritage assets**

<b>Asset Ref</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Value</b>
<b>A</b>	Grade II Listed Stratfield Farmhouse	Medium
<b>B</b>	Grade II Listed Frieze Farmhouse	Medium
<b>C</b>	Oxford Canal Conservation Area	Medium
<b>1</b>	Ridge and furrow earthworks	Low
<b>2</b>	Historic Landscape Character	Negligible
<b>3</b>	Potential archaeological remains	Medium

## Potential Effects

### **The Nature of Potential Physical Effects**

9.37 The physical impacts expected for the Proposed Development would primarily result from groundworks associated with construction. Such groundworks might include:

- pre-construction impacts associated with ground investigation works;
- ground reduction works;
- construction groundworks, including excavation of building foundations,
- service trenches and stripping for roads/car parks;
- excavation of new site drainage channels (including soakaways); and
- landscaping and planting.

9.38 The groundworks required for the construction of the Proposed Development could result in the disturbance to, or loss of, any buried archaeological features that may be present within their footprint, resulting in the total or partial loss of the value of these assets. Any potential earthwork features within the Site would also be removed. The extent of the impact would be dependent on the type and depth of the proposed excavations, and on the level of survival of archaeological deposits. Any adverse effects on buried archaeological remains or earthwork features would be permanent and irreversible in nature.

### **The Nature of Potential Non-Physical Effects**

9.39 The Proposed Development will also result in changes to the setting of nearby heritage assets that could harm their value. These potential effects upon the setting of heritage assets could occur during the construction and operational phases of the Proposed Development. These potential effects have been considered in accordance with the guidance from Historic England (see **Appendix 9.2**).

## **Identified Potential Effects (Prior to Mitigation)**

### **Construction**

#### Designated heritage assets

9.40 Construction of the Proposed Development will occur over a period of 2 years, beginning in August 2024 and ending in July 2026 (see Chapter 4). While this will involve an increase in traffic on existing roads and noise levels, it is not anticipated that this will adversely affect the setting of the Listed Buildings within the Study Area (Asset A and Asset B) or the Oxford Canal Conservation Area (Asset C). The construction of the Proposed Development will result in a minimal temporary change to the setting of the assets, resulting in no real change in the ability to understand and appreciate the assets. This is discussed further within **Appendix 9.2**. The Construction of the Proposed Development would therefore have a Negligible impact on the value of the designated heritage assets (of Medium value) within the Study Area. The significance of effect would be **Negligible**, which is **not significant**.

#### *Non-designated heritage assets*

9.41 The ridge and furrow earthworks (Asset 1) within the Site would be removed as part of the Construction of the Proposed Development. This constitutes a High magnitude of impact upon this heritage asset (of Low value). The significance of effect would be Moderate/Minor Adverse. However, as the fragmentary remains of historic agricultural activity, detached from other areas of surviving ridge and furrow in the vicinity, the earthworks are considered to only just meet the threshold of the Low value category. The significance of effect would therefore be **Minor Adverse**, which is **not significant**.

9.42 The character of the historic landscape (reorganised enclosure) within the Site (Asset 2) would be lost. However, there are over 70,000ha<sup>xiii</sup> of this landscape type within Oxfordshire, so the degree of loss to the heritage asset as a whole is limited. The impact would be Negligible on the value of this heritage asset (of Negligible value). The significance of effect would therefore be **Negligible**, which is **not significant**.

9.43 The disturbance of any potential archaeological remains (Asset 3) would constitute a High magnitude of impact on a potential heritage asset of Medium value. The significance of effect would be **Major/Moderate Adverse**. Mitigation measures are discussed below.

## Operation

### Designated heritage assets

9.44 Operation of the Proposed Development would result in a Negligible impact to the value of the designated heritage assets (Asset A, Asset B, and Asset C). None of the important attributes of the setting of these designated heritage assets will be altered by the Proposed Development. This is discussed further within **Appendix 9.2**. The significance of effect would therefore be **Negligible**, which is **not significant**.

### Non-designated heritage assets

9.45 Impacts to archaeological heritage assets are confined to the Construction Stage, which would result in their total loss. As such, there would be no further impacts upon archaeological assets (e.g. Asset 1 and Asset 3) during the Operation of the Proposed Development. No impacts would occur, and the residual significance of effect would therefore be **No Effect**.

9.46 The character of the historic landscape within the Site (Asset 2) would be lost. As per the construction stage of the Proposed Development, the impact is Negligible. The significance of effect would therefore be **Negligible**, which is **not significant**.

## Mitigation Measures and Residual Effects

### **Mitigation**

9.47 In relation to the potential physical effects of the Proposed Development upon potential buried archaeological remains, a staged programme of archaeological works prior to construction activities will be secured via condition. These works will be undertaken in accordance with a brief issued by the archaeological advisors to the Local Planning Authority. This approach has been agreed with the Local Planning Authority's archaeological advisors (see **Table 9.1**), who have also confirmed that no further pre-determination archaeological investigations are required to inform the determination of the application.

9.48 The Proposed Development is not considered to harm the value of any designated heritage assets through changes to their setting (see **Appendix 9.2**). As such, no specific mitigation measures are proposed in relation to the non-physical effects of the Proposed Development upon the heritage resource.

## **Residual Effects**

### **Construction**

#### **Designated heritage assets**

9.49 It is not anticipated that Construction of the Proposed Development will adversely affect the setting of the Listed Buildings within the Study Area (Asset A and Asset B) or the Oxford Canal Conservation Area (Asset C). The construction of the Proposed Development will result in a minimal temporary change to the setting of the assets, resulting in no real change in the ability to understand and appreciate the assets. This is discussed further within **Appendix 9.2**. The construction of the Proposed Development would therefore have a Negligible impact on the value of the designated heritage assets (all of Medium value) within the Study Area. No mitigation measures are required and therefore the **Negligible** effect remains unchanged.

#### **Non-designated heritage assets**

9.50 The ridge and furrow earthworks (Asset 1) within the Site would be removed as part of the construction of the Proposed Development. No mitigation measures are required and the conclusions remain unchanged to those presented in the 'Identified Potential Effects (Prior to Mitigation)' section above.

9.51 The character of the historic landscape (reorganised enclosure) within the Site (Asset 2) would be lost. No mitigation measures are required and the conclusions remain unchanged to those presented in the 'Identified Potential Effects (Prior to Mitigation)' section above.

9.52 The disturbance and loss of any potential archaeological remains (Asset 3) would constitute a High magnitude of impact on their value. However, the recording of archaeological remains delivers a recognised public benefit through the knowledge gained that would not be available from any other source<sup>xiv</sup>, and needs to be weighed against the adverse impact. Whilst the mitigation measures would ensure the archaeological value of the remains was captured, as the heritage asset would be lost in the process, an adverse effect remains. It is considered that subject to an appropriate level of archaeological investigation and recording (see Mitigation above), to be agreed with the archaeological advisor to the Local Planning Authority, the residual effect is reduced to **Minor Adverse**, which is **not significant**.

## Operation

### **Designated heritage assets**

9.53 Operation of the Proposed Development would result in a Negligible impact to the value of the designated heritage assets (Asset A, Asset B, and Asset C). The residual significance of effect is therefore **Negligible**, which is **not significant**.

### **Non-designated heritage assets**

9.54 Impacts to archaeological heritage assets are confined to the Construction Stage, which would result in their total loss. As such, there would be no further impacts upon archaeological assets (e.g. Asset 1 and Asset 3) during the Operation of the Proposed Development. No impacts would occur, and the residual significance of effect is therefore **No Effect**.

9.55 The character of the historic landscape within the Site (Asset 2) would be lost. The impact is Negligible. The residual significance of effect is therefore **Negligible**, which is **not significant**.

## Cumulative Effects

9.56 The potential cumulative effects of the Proposed Development have been considered in relation to the schemes identified at Table 2.6 (see Chapter 2). No cumulative effects have been identified.

9.57 It is possible that archaeological remains associated with the deposits identified during investigations at Site 4 extend into the Site. Should this occur, it is possible that the value of the archaeological assets would be cumulatively impacted. However, there is presently no evidence to suggest that such remains extend into the Site and, furthermore, mitigation measures would ensure the archaeological value of such remains would be realised. Therefore, no specific cumulative effect has been identified.

9.58 No instances of harm to the designated heritage assets identified above have been identified by the Heritage Assessments undertaken for the identified cumulative schemes. For instance, the heritage assessment<sup>xv</sup> for Site 4 identified no harm through changes to the setting of nearby designated heritage assets, whilst the Heritage Assessment<sup>xvi</sup> for Site 6, which surrounds Stratfield Farmhouse (Asset A), concluded that the scheme could be achieved without significant impacts on nearby heritage assets or their settings. Therefore, no cumulative effects have been identified through changes to the setting of designated heritage assets.

## Conclusions

9.59 There is the potential for significant effects upon archaeological features located within the Site from construction groundworks. Potential archaeological assets (Asset 3) could be impacted during the Construction Phase, which would result in significant effects. The significant effects would result from permanent physical impacts to the archaeological resource. However, suitable mitigation measures have been proposed to ensure the archaeological value of such remains is realised (and preserved by record), such that the residual significance of effect upon the recorded archaeological remains would be Minor Adverse.

9.60 A number of heritage assets have been identified within the Study Area that could be sensitive to changes to their setting as a result of the Proposed Development, including Listed Buildings and the Oxford Canal Conservation Area. The value of these assets will not be impacted by the Proposed Development either physically or by changes within their setting. Therefore, Negligible effects have been identified as a result of changes to the setting of these heritage assets as a result of the Proposed Development.

**Table 9.6: Summary of residual effects**

Receptor	Sensitivity/value	Magnitude	Nature/Level of Effect	Mitigation	Residual Effect
<b>Construction Phase</b>					
Asset A	Medium	Negligible	Short-term, temporary, direct	N/A	Negligible
Asset B	Medium	Negligible	Short-term, temporary, direct	N/A	Negligible
Asset C	Medium	Negligible	Short-term, temporary, direct	N/A	Negligible
Asset 1	Low	High	Long term, direct, permanent	N/A	Minor Adverse, not significant
Asset 2	Low	Negligible	Short-term, temporary, direct	N/A	Negligible
Asset 3	Medium	High	Long term, direct, permanent	Archaeological investigation and recording	Minor Adverse, not significant
<b>Operational Phase</b>					
Asset A	Medium	Negligible	Long term, direct, permanent	N/A	Negligible
Asset B	Medium	Negligible	Long term, direct, permanent	N/A	Negligible
Asset C	Medium	Negligible	Long term, direct, permanent	N/A	Negligible
Asset 1	Low	No Impact	N/A	N/A	None
Asset 2	Low	Negligible	Long term, direct, permanent	N/A	Negligible
Asset 3	Medium	No Impact	N/A	N/A	None
<b>Cumulative Effects</b>					
None					

## References

---

- <sup>i</sup> HMSO 1990, *Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990*
- <sup>ii</sup> Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities 2023 *National Planning Policy Framework*
- <sup>iii</sup> Cherwell District Council 2015, *The Cherwell Local Plan 2011 – 2031*
- <sup>iv</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/planning-practice-guidance>
- <sup>v</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/conserving-and-enhancing-the-historic-environment>
- <sup>vi</sup> Historic England 2015, *Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: 2*
- <sup>vii</sup> Historic England 2017, *The Setting of Heritage Assets: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition)*
- <sup>viii</sup> Historic England 2019, *Statement of Heritage Significance: Analysing Significance in Heritage Assets Historic England Advice Note 12*
- <sup>ix</sup> Historic England 2022, *Planning and Archaeology: Historic England Advice Note 17 (HEAN 17)*
- <sup>x</sup> Chartered Institute for Archaeologists 2014, *Code of Conduct*
- <sup>xi</sup> Chartered Institute for Archaeologists 2014, *Standard and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment*
- <sup>xii</sup> Oxfordshire County Council 2014, *Oxfordshire Historic Landscape Characterisation Project: Full Report*, 164
- <sup>xiii</sup> Oxfordshire County Council 2014, *Oxfordshire Historic Landscape Characterisation Project: Full Report*, 164
- <sup>xiv</sup> Historic England 2022, *Planning and Archaeology: Historic England Advice Note 17 (HEAN 17)*, 10
- <sup>xv</sup> CSA Environmental 2022, *Land at Gosford East of Kidlington, Oxfordshire: Heritage Assessment*
- <sup>xvi</sup> Asset Heritage Consulting 2022, *Heritage Statement In respect of Proposed Development: Land at Stratfield Farm, Kidlington, Oxfordshire*