Chapter 11

CULTURAL HERITAGE

11 Cultural Heritage

Preface

This ES chapter has been revised to take account the completion of a geophysical survey and archaeological trial trenching that has taken place (Appendix 11.4) on the Site. A review of this information has identified the potential for significant effects on archaeological remains of a possible Medium importance as a result of the Development and a mitigation strategy is proposed. A cumulative assessment with the neighbouring Tritax Scheme is also now provided.

There is no change in the significance of other residual effects stated in the 2021 ES.

11.1 Introduction

11.1.1 This chapter of the ES was prepared by RPS Consulting Services Ltd and presents an assessment of the likely significant effects of the Development on archaeology and built heritage. Mitigation measures are identified, where appropriate, to avoid, reduce or offset any likely significant adverse effects identified and/or enhance likely beneficial effects. The nature and significance of the likely residual effects are reported.

11.1.2 The purpose of this chapter is to assess the potential effects of the Development on the archaeological and built heritage assets within and in proximity to the Site. This chapter of the ES sets out the policy context, assessment methodology and baseline conditions of the Site, examines potential effects of the Development, and presents mitigation measures to prevent, reduce or offset (where possible) any likely significant adverse impacts. The likely residual impacts once these mitigation measures have been implemented are presented, and their significance assessed. An assessment of potential cumulative effects arising from nearby committed development schemes is also provided.

11.1.3 The Site is comprised of two parcels of land to the east and west of the A43, which are known respectively as the Eastern Site and Western Site. Given the available information for each Site, the baseline conditions and receptors are considered to be closely aligned. This has been demonstrated by baseline reporting which is summarised later in this chapter when the baseline conditions are specified. As such, the two Sites are not differentiated as part of this chapter in archaeological and built heritage terms and are referred to as one Site. Equally, the impacts and potential effects are also expected to be the same for the Eastern Development, Western Development and Enabling Works, so the Development is assessed and reported as a whole, with differentiation highlighted where required. A worst case scenario is assumed for the purposes of assessing potential impacts on relevant receptors.

11.1.4 The chapter is supported by the following appendices:

- Appendix 11.1: Cultural Heritage Desk Based Assessment;
- Appendix 11.2: Geophysical Survey - Western Site;
- Appendix 11.3: Geophysical Survey - Eastern Site;

- Appendix 11.4: Archaeological Evaluation Trenching; and
- Appendix 11.5: Relevant Planning Policy and Guidance.

Competence

11.1.5 The RPS Heritage and Archaeology team has extensive experience in the provision of cultural heritage assessment for EIA. The authors of the archaeological portions of this chapter have relevant experience of 7 years and 15+ years respectively within Oxfordshire and further rural archaeological sites across southern England. The authors are registered (Member level) with the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA), a peer review system designed to ensure the competency of archaeological practitioners, whilst RPS is a CIfA Registered Archaeological Organisation. The author of the built heritage portions of this Chapter is a Senior Director from the Built Heritage Team with over 7 years' experience and a registered member of the IHBC.

11.2 Legislation, Planning Policy and Guidance

Legislation Context

11.2.1 The following legislation is relevant to the Development:

- Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979, updated 2014[1]; and
- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990[2].

Planning Policy Context

National

11.2.2 The following national planning policy is relevant to the Development:

- National Planning Policy Framework (2023)[3]; and

Local

11.2.3 The following local planning policy is relevant to the Development:

- Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031, Part 1[4];
- Saved polices from Cherwell Local Plan (1996)[5]; and
- Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan 2018-30[6].

Guidance

11.2.4 The following guidance is relevant to the Development:

- Planning Practice Guidance (2014, updated June 2021)[7].
- Historic England Good Practice Advice (GPA) document 1, 2015[8];
- Historic England Good Practice Advice (GPA) document 2, 2015[9];
- Historic England Good Practice Advice (GPA) document 3, 2017[10];
- Historic England Good Practice Advice (GPA) document 4, 2020[11];
- English Heritage Conservation Principles, Policy and Guidance, 2008[12];
- Design Manual for Roads and Highways, 2019[13]; and

- Department for Culture, Media and Sport, (2013). Scheduled Monuments and Nationally Important Non-Scheduled Monuments[14].

11.3 Assessment Methodology

Consultation

11.3.1 Table 11.1 summarises key comments raised by consultees of relevance to this assessment and how it has responded to them.

Table 11.1: Consultation Response Summary

Consultee and Comment	Response
Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) Archaeologist (contact ongoing since 13/05/2021)	
OCC Archaeologist consultation on planning application 21/03267/OUT on 12th October 2021 commented that an Archaeological Desk Based Assessment would be required. It also stated that a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for that DBA had been agreed by OCC. The response also stated that a programme of archaeological evaluation would be required ahead of planning determination.	The DBA WSI was approved by OCC in June 2021. Further to this two WSI documents were submitted for two Geophysical Survey phases at the site. These were intended to form an initial phase of field evaluation. These WSIs were approved by the OCC Archaeologist in May / June 2021. These documents provided an agreed basis on which to proceed with initial desk based reporting and geophysical survey at the Site. The resulting reports were issued to OCC for review and approval.
A subsequent further Written Scheme of Investigation was submitted to OCC for pre-application field evaluation trenching.	The WSI was agreed with OCC and the trenching was monitoring by OCC between November 2022 and January 2023. The resulting trenching report was approved by OCC in June 2023. During the monitoring visit, OCC advised that a localised area of archaeological excavation would be required where Iron Age activity had been identified in the southern part of the Eastern Site. It was anticipated that such work could be secured by planning condition if planning consent were to be granted.
Cherwell District Council (CDC) Scoping Opinion (29/07/2021)	
CDC confirmed that archaeology should be scoped into the proposed EIA process, and that the setting of nearby built heritage assets should also be included.	Effects on built heritage were proposed to be scoped out of the ES in the EIA Scoping Report. However, in response to the EIA Scoping Opinion, built heritage effects are scoped into this ES Chapter.

11.3.2 The OCC Archaeologist was contacted in the first instance on 13th May 2021 in their role as advisors to CDC. The scope of the desk based work, geophysical survey and field

evaluation trenching was agreed with the OCC Archaeologist via production and approval of relevant Written Schemes of Investigation (WSIs).

11.3.3 The subsequent EIA Scoping Opinion received from CDC confirmed that archaeology should be scoped into an EIA process, as well as the setting of nearby built heritage assets.

Study Area and Scope

11.3.4 A study area of 1km from the Site boundary was utilised throughout baseline reporting and this chapter to identify any archaeological and built heritage assets that might be present within the Site or nearby area that would need consideration within this assessment. This area was chosen on the basis of standard industry practice and was agreed with the OCC Archaeologist in July 2021.

Establishing Baseline Conditions

11.3.5 To inform this assessment, an archaeological desk-based assessment (DBA) was prepared initially in June 2021 (see Appendix 11.1). A geophysical survey was also undertaken across each Site (i.e. the Eastern Site and Western Site) between May and August 2021 (see Appendices 11.2 and 11.3). The geophysical survey highlighted below ground anomalies and provided information on the possible presence/absence of archaeological remains. This was supplemented by a field evaluation comprising evaluation trenches between November 2022 and January 2023 (see Appendix 11.4). The trenching suggested that the correlation between the geophysical survey results and the trenching was poor, with the majority of geophysical survey anomalies either not identified within the trenches or shown to be geological or modern in origin. A small concentration of archaeological features matching geophysical survey anomalies was identified in the southern part of the Eastern Site. This included a cluster of waste disposal pits which produced large assemblages of animal bone and early to middle Iron Age pottery. Two ditches formed a possible related small enclosure. A Built Heritage Assessment and associated site-visit was undertaken in August 2021 (see Appendix 11.1).

11.3.6 The archaeological DBA included a review of relevant nationally designated archaeological assets, below ground archaeological findspots, records and previous archaeological work within the study area as agreed with the OCC Archaeologist. This study area allowed the importance of known and likely archaeological assets features to be placed in their local, regional and national contexts. The conclusions of the DBA have since been superseded by the completion of geophysical survey and evaluation trenching at the Site.

11.3.7 Archaeological and built heritage assets are recorded in national and/or local historic environment databases, in this instance the National Monuments Record and the Oxfordshire Historic Environment Record (HER). These data sources have been used in the preparation of this chapter and to inform the approach to mitigation for the Site. In accordance with national and local planning policy, this assessment considers both designated and undesignated heritage assets within the study area, including:

- World Heritage Sites;
- Scheduled Monuments;
- Registered Battlefields;
- Archaeological Remains;

- Designated and Non-designated built heritage assets; and
- Conservation Areas.

11.3.8 The main sources consulted during the compilation of the baseline information are listed below:

- British Geological Survey;
- British Library;
- Oxfordshire County Archaeologist;
- Oxfordshire HER;
- National Heritage List for England;
- The National Archives; and
- Oxfordshire County Record Office.

11.3.9 Future baseline conditions were also assessed in the same manner.

Identifying Likely Significant Effects

11.3.10 No standard EIA methodologies exist for heritage and archaeological assessment. However, assessment methodology has been guided by various published guidance documents including: English Heritage's Conservation Principles, Policy and Guidance, the Historic Environment Good Practice Advice Planning Advice Note 3 and the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Guidance 2020. Although the latter was designed as best-practice for road schemes in particular, it is accepted as best-practice for the assessment of cultural heritage in relation to archaeology, listed buildings and historic landscapes.

11.3.11 The assessment is of a qualitative nature, and the evaluation of significance is ultimately a matter of professional judgement.

11.3.12 The three-stage approach presented below is adopted in order to reach an understanding of the level of any effect that the Development may have on a heritage asset. It is necessary to understand the importance/significance of the asset, the anticipated impact, and the impact magnitude on the asset to assess the overall scale of effect on identified assets and effect significance.

11.3.13 Using a matrix that measures both asset importance (significance in the context of NPPF terminology) and impact magnitude defines an assessment of the level of the potential scale of the effect of the Development on identified assets. This approach, including the matrices themselves, is set out in Tables 11.2 – 11.4.

Construction

11.3.14 This ES chapter considers the nature, scale and significance of the effects to identified and potential archaeological and built heritage assets that would arise during the construction phase, with the effects defined on the basis of any changes compared to the baseline (i.e. the conditions which would exist if the proposals did not go ahead).

11.3.15 The scale of the Development indicates that any buried archaeological remains which may be present within the Site, specifically within construction footprints, would be unlikely to

survive the construction process. There are known archaeological assets within the Site as identified by geophysical survey and evaluation trenching.

11.3.16 With regard to heritage assets outside the Site boundary, anticipated construction effects would most likely be indirect, short term and temporary. Potential effects on the setting of heritage assets include construction noise, dust or vibration, in addition to visual effects. Visual effects may relate to the presence of construction equipment (including any cranes) and hoardings in the short term and these views would change as the construction phase progressed.

11.3.17 Accordingly, this assessment considers the following potential effects:

- Direct effects on buried archaeological remains;
- Direct effects on the settings of nearby archaeological assets;
- Direct effects on standing built heritage assets; and
- Direct effects on the settings of standing built heritage assets.

Completed Development

11.3.18 The assessment identifies effects arising from the operational stage to built heritage assets. This includes permanent changes within the setting of the heritage assets, which may include changes of use, character and visual effects.

11.3.19 It is only during the construction phase that any direct effects on archaeological assets will occur; no direct impacts are anticipated once the Development is complete and occupied. Where relevant, effects on the settings of relevant nearby archaeological assets once the Development is complete and occupied have been considered.

Cumulative Effects

11.3.20 There may be some cumulative impacts on below ground archaeological and built heritage receptors in general terms as a result of the interaction of the Development with other schemes. Therefore, this Chapter has considered the potential for cumulative effects upon the identified archaeological and built heritage receptors. This requires a consideration of potential cumulative physical impacts to relevant receptors, which may comprise for example the removal of the same receptor where present across multiple development sites. A consideration of potential change within the setting of relevant receptors, which may cumulatively degrade the importance of that receptor, is also required. This requires a consideration of the likely significance of the effect identified to each relevant receptor as a result of individual development schemes, which can then be assessed cumulatively. Professional judgement is applied to this consideration in order to understand the potential for cumulative effects.

11.3.21 For the most part, cumulative effects on archaeological receptors are only relevant where there is a clear grouping of archaeological receptors across multiple development schemes which form part of the same wider archaeological monument. These would be cumulatively degraded by the loss of relevant receptors at each scheme. The loss of archaeological receptors at adjacent development schemes that cannot be intrinsically linked to form part of the same wider archaeological monument is not likely to give rise to any cumulative effects. For extant heritage assets, the physical loss of an asset where it is present across multiple development schemes may comprise a cumulative effect. A loss of importance as

a result of cumulative changes within a receptor's setting may also comprise a cumulative effect.

Determining Effect Significance

11.3.22 The methodologies for determining receptor sensitivity, magnitude of impact descriptors and significance criteria are outlined below.

Sensitivity of Receptor

11.3.23 The NPPF refers to the consideration of the 'significance' of heritage assets. However, in the context of EIA, the term 'significance' relates to the established scale of effect as a result of the combination of the importance/sensitivity of the asset and the magnitude of potential impact on that asset. Therefore, to avoid confusion, when referring to the NPPF the term 'importance' or 'sensitivity' (rather than significance) will be used.

11.3.24 Receptors are either known designated or non-designated heritage assets or a perceived potential for currently unknown below ground archaeological heritage assets.

11.3.25 Determination of the importance of a heritage asset is based on existing statutory designations and, for undesignated assets, the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) non-statutory criteria for Scheduling Monuments, Historic England's Conservation Principles, the heritage interests defined by the NPPG and professional judgement. The NPPF and the NPPG introduce criteria for the assessment of the significance (importance) of heritage assets, and these have been factored into this assessment. The criteria outlined by the DCMS include period, rarity, documentation, group value, survival/condition, fragility/vulnerability, diversity and potential, and can be used as a basis for the assessment of the importance of historic remains and archaeological sites. However, the document also states that these criteria "should not be regarded as definitive; but as indicators which contribute to a wider judgment based on the individual circumstances of a case".

11.3.26 The importance or sensitivity of a heritage asset can be defined as Very High, High, Medium, Low, or Negligible. In addition, the below ground nature of archaeological remains necessitates the addition of an Unknown / Uncertain level of importance or sensitivity. The criteria to establish the importance or sensitivity of heritage assets are described in Table 11.2.

Table 11.2: Receptor Sensitivity Descriptors

Value (Sensitivity)	Descriptor
Very High	Structures or monuments of international importance, including World Heritage Sites. Structures and buildings inscribed as of universal importance, such as World Heritage Sites. Other buildings or structures of recognised international importance.
High	Monuments scheduled under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979.

Value (Sensitivity)	Descriptor
	Archaeological sites, historic landscapes, and remains of comparable quality, assessed with reference to the Secretary of State's non-statutory criteria. Undesignated structures of national importance. Grade I and II* listed buildings. Other listed buildings that can be shown to have exceptional qualities in their fabric or historical associations not adequately reflected in the listing grade. Conservation Areas containing buildings of exceptional importance.
Medium	Archaeological sites, historic landscapes and remains which, while not of national importance, score well against most of the Secretary of State's criteria. Conservation Areas - containing buildings that contribute significantly to their historic character. Grade II listed buildings. Historic (unlisted) buildings that can be shown to have exceptional qualities in their fabric or historical associations. Historic Townscape or built-up areas with important historic integrity in their buildings, or built settings (e.g. including street furniture and other structures).
Low	Archaeological sites or historic landscapes that score less well against the Secretary of State's criteria. Locally Listed Buildings. Historic (unlisted) buildings of modest quality in their fabric or historical association. Historic Townscape or built-up areas of limited historic integrity in their buildings, or built settings (e.g. including street furniture and other structures).
Negligible	Areas in which investigative techniques have produced no or only minimal evidence for archaeological remains, or where previous large-scale disturbance or removal of deposits can be demonstrated. Sites or buildings of very limited architectural or historic interest, insufficient to warrant consideration as a non-designated heritage asset.
Unknown / Uncertain	Archaeological sites which have not yet been subject to sufficient evaluative work in order to understand an archaeological potential. Archaeological sites which have been subject to extensive past disturbance which has likely removed any archaeological remains. Historic buildings of unknown character or importance which would require further information to ascertain the potential interest of the building.

Magnitude of Impact

11.3.27 The magnitude of impact is assessed without regard to the importance of the asset. In terms of the judgment of the magnitude of impact this is based on the principle (established in the NPPF paragraphs 189-208) that preservation of the asset and its setting is preferred, and that total physical loss of the asset is the least preferred. Determining the magnitude of

impact is based on an understanding of how, and to what extent, the Development would impact on the buried archaeological assets and the setting of any nearby heritage assets. The magnitude of impact is rated as Major, Moderate, Minor, Negligible or No Change in DMRB methodology. Impacts can be either adverse or beneficial.

11.3.28 Impacts may be comprised of physical impacts, on monuments, boundaries, buildings or buried remains, including destruction, compression, vibration, or drying out (where waterlogged). Setting impacts may arise from a reduction of the appreciation of the resource by visual intrusion, noise and dust for example, or by severance (i.e. removal of the monument or site from its context.

11.3.29 The survival of archaeological remains is often uncertain without archaeological evaluation and in these circumstances the magnitude of impact can only be estimated or stated as unknown. The magnitude of change resulting from the impact may vary depending on the nature of past development or management effects (e.g. extent of truncation and made ground and the various forms of impact).

11.3.30 Impacts can be direct and indirect:

- **Direct impacts**: are defined as an impact caused by an action, which generally occurs at the same time and place as that action. They are generally associated with the construction, operation or maintenance of a facility or activity and are usually obvious or quantifiable; and
- **Indirect impacts**: are defined as changes resulting from direct impacts. These changes can be short or long-term depending on their persistence or duration.

11.3.31 The criteria for assessing the magnitude of impact are set out in Tables 11.3 and 11.4:

Table 11.3: Magnitude of Impact Descriptors for Archaeology

Impact Magnitude	Impact Descriptions
Major	Change to most or all key archaeological materials, such that the resource or its setting is totally altered
Moderate	Changes to many key archaeological materials, such that the resource or its setting is clearly modified.
Minor	Changes to key archaeological materials, such that the asset or its setting is slightly altered.
Negligible	Negligible perceptible impact from changes in use, amenity or access. Negligible perceptible change in the ability to understand and appreciate the resource and its historical context and setting.
No Change	No change to the archaeological monument, feature or asset.

Table 11.4: Criteria for Assessing the Magnitude of Impacts to Built Heritage Assets

Magnitude	Impact Descriptions
Major	Complete loss of a heritage asset or change to key elements of the asset or its setting such that its value is totally altered.

Magnitude	Impact Descriptions
Moderate	Changes to key materials/ fabric such that the heritage asset or its setting is considerably modified.
Minor	Changes to materials/ fabric such that the heritage asset or its setting is slightly different.
Negligible	Negligible change or no material change to material/fabric of a heritage asset or its setting that makes little contribution to its importance.
No Change	Changes to material/fabric of a heritage asset or its setting that make no contribution to its importance.

Assessing Significance

11.3.32 The assessment of effects is a combination of the importance and sensitivity of the heritage asset (Table 11.2) and the magnitude of impact on that asset (Tables 11.3-4). Effects can be adverse or beneficial and temporary or permanent. It should be noted that effects to archaeology largely arise from the construction phase and that, in the case of archaeology, such effects are often permanent and non-reversible. Adverse effects are those that create or amplify existing or new impacts upon the importance/sensitivity of heritage assets or their setting and remove or limit the ability to understand and appreciate the importance of the heritage asset. Beneficial effects are those that mitigate existing impacts and help to restore or enhance the importance/sensitivity of heritage assets or their setting, therefore allowing for greater understanding and appreciation of it.

11.3.33 Table 11.5 presents a matrix that demonstrates how the scale of effect has been assessed.

Table 11.5: Effects Significance Matrix

Receptor Sensitivity	Magnitude of Impact: Major	Moderate	Minor	Negligible	No Change
Very High	Very Large	Large or Very Large	Moderate or Large	Slight	Neutral
High	Large or Very Large	Moderate or Large	Slight or Moderate	Slight	
Medium	Moderate or Large	Moderate	Slight	Neutral or Slight	
Low	Slight or Moderate	Slight	Neutral or Slight	Neutral or Slight	
Negligible	Slight	Neutral or Slight	Neutral or Slight	Neutral	
Unknown / Uncertain	Unknown				

11.3.34 Table 11.6 provides a description of the various effect significance categories.

Table 11.6: Effects Significance Categories

Effect Significance Category	Description
Very Large	**Significant**: Effects at this level are material in the decision-making process.
Large	**Significant**: Effects at this level are considered to be very important considerations and are likely to be material in the decision-making process.
Moderate	**Significant**: Effects at this level can may be important but are not likely to be key decision-making factors.
Slight	**Not Significant**: Effects at this level are not material in the decision-making process.
Neutral	**Not Significant**: No effects or those that are beneath levels of perception, within normal bounds of variation or within the margin of forecasting error.
Unknown	Further work required to understand the potential for significant effects.

11.3.35 Generally, any effects that are identified as Moderate, Large or Very Large Adverse / Beneficial are considered to be '**significant**' effects, whilst those that are identified as Neutral or Slight Adverse / Beneficial are considered to be 'not significant' effects. In those instances where two possible levels of effect are given, professional judgement has been used to determine whether an effect is significant or not.

Mitigation

11.3.36 Mitigation measures are included where relevant in order to mitigate or reduce potential adverse effects where possible. These will be outlined in this chapter once potential significant or non-significant adverse effects have been identified.

Residual Effects

11.3.37 Residual effects are those that are predicted to remain after implementation of mitigation measures. Such effects are outlined later in this chapter after mitigation measures have been identified.

Assumptions and Limitations

11.3.38 The assessment of the scale of effects is based on extensive professional experience gained on other major developments across the south of England.

11.3.39 The assessment assumes the accuracy of the available datasets reviewed in its compilation. The information presented in this ES chapter and the technical appendices provide an indication of below ground archaeological assets present or likely to be present, rather than a definitive list of all assets present.

11.3.40 The current baseline conditions are informed by the Cultural Heritage Desk-Based Assessment (DBA),Geophysical Survey, Evaluation Trenching, and the Built Heritage Assessment.

11.3.41 The principal limitation to the assessment of effects upon below ground heritage assets is the nature of the archaeological resource, which is buried and therefore not visible. This means it can be difficult to accurately predict the presence and likely importance of below ground heritage assets, and the likely impact (and resultant effects) of the Development upon such assets. This limitation has been reduced by the provision of archaeological fieldwork reporting, comprising Geophysical Survey and Evaluation Trenching, which has provided a suitable sample representation of archaeological remains which are likely to be present at the Site. The assessment is based on a worst-case assumption leading to total removal of all archaeological remains across the Site.

11.4 Baseline Conditions

Archaeology

11.4.1 The current baseline conditions are informed by the Cultural Heritage DBA, Geophysical Surveys, and Evaluation Trial Trenching, which are appended as Appendices 11.1-11.4. A summary of the assessments is presented below. The DBA and Geophysical Surveys were previously completed in 2021, however the more recent Trial Trenching results supersede those reports and provides the updated baseline conditions at the Site. The archaeological results are summarised (where relevant) by archaeological periods, as presented in Table 11.7:

Table 11.7: Archaeological Time Periods

Prehistoric	
Palaeolithic	900,000 – 12,000 BC
Mesolithic	12,000 – 4,000 BC
Neolithic	4,000 – 1,800 BC
Bronze Age	1,800 – 600 BC
Iron Age	600 BC – AD 43
Historic	
Roman	AD 43 – 410
Saxon/Early Medieval	AD 410 – 1066
Medieval	AD 1066 – 1485
Post Medieval	AD 1485 – 1799
Modern	AD 1800 – Present

11.4.2 There are no relevant nationally designated archaeological assets within the Site or in close proximity within the study area, as defined by the National Heritage List or Historic England register (accessed online 2023).

11.4.3 The solid geology of the Site is shown by the British Geological Survey (BGS Online 2023) as White Limestone Formation. A small band of head deposits is recorded in the southern part of the Western Site, whilst alluvial deposits are recorded along the southern boundary of the Eastern Site. Geotechnical site investigations have been undertaken historically at the Site as recorded by the BGS, which have identified a sequence of topsoil overlying superficial silt deposits, and in turn the limestone bedrock in the Western Site. The superficial deposits may represent hillwash colluvial deposits, comprising sediment material that has accumulated on lower slopes when washed down from higher ground. The Trial Trenching identified a broadly consistent geological substrate across the Site, comprising bands of light grey limestone and mid red brown sandy clay, encountered at depths between

0.3m and 0.8m. This substrate was covered with subsoil deposits, which in places was interpreted as possible Pleistocene channels filled with redeposited Aeolian material (brickearth). Colluvial deposits were identified in various deposits. All trenches were sealed by topsoil deposits.

11.4.4 A non-designated heritage asset comprising a 19th century milestone is recorded within the southern part of the Site adjacent to the A43 on the Oxfordshire HER, however the HER notes that this is thought to have been lost during construction of the M40 in the later 20th century. In general, the majority of HER records within the study area comprise evidence for cropmarks identified as possible archaeological anomalies. A focus of Medieval village activity is recorded at Baynards Green to the immediate north of the Site.

11.4.5 Evidence for middle to late Iron Age activity was encountered during trial trenching across land to the immediate east of the Site. Four burials were identified, as well as a set of ditches forming a projected routeway. A 2nd to 4th century AD Roman building was recorded during the same work, forming a basic villa, farmhouse, or large barn. Several smaller ancillary buildings were also recorded and considered likely to be contemporary. A number of associated ditches were also recorded in the surrounding trenches. A quarry pit as well as a destruction layer associated with the building contained pottery assemblages dating to the 4th century. The trenching also found two Saxon period sunken feature buildings (SFBs), with a further possible two SFBs also recorded. The features corresponded with several large anomalies seen on preceding geophysical survey.

11.4.6 Historic mapping demonstrated that the Site has likely remained open agricultural land or pasture since at least the 18th century through to the present day. Minor development is shown, comprising localised areas of agricultural buildings and a small extraction pit in the northern part of the Eastern Site.

11.4.7 Two separate phases of Geophysical Survey have been undertaken at the Site. No clear archaeological anomalies were identified other than evidence for modern agricultural activity, although a number of anomalies of possible archaeological origin were identified with no particular focus suggested in the data.

11.4.8 The Evaluation Trial Trenching identified a small concentration of archaeological features matching geophysical survey anomalies in the southern part of the Eastern Site, in trenches 188, 225, 227, and 229-231. This comprised a cluster of waste disposal pits, two ditches which were thought to form a small enclosure, and an associated internal pit. The finds included large assemblages of animal bone and early to middle Iron Age pottery from the waste pits. The pottery included diagnostic vessels likely to have been used in the storage and consumption of food. Fragments of fired clay were also recovered along with worked stone. The animal bone assemblage comprised mainly cattle and sheep / goat. Cut and chop marks of primary and secondary butchery were consistently observed. Small rodent bones were also recovered, indicating that the rubbish pits were not rapidly buried. Overall, the finds were thought to represent evidence for small domestic settlement of Iron Age date.

11.4.9 Beyond these localised finds, a series of isolated undated ditches were recorded in other parts of the Site, in trenches 122, 124, and 165. They do not correspond with any historic field boundaries shown on early mapping and are inferred as pre-dating the 19th century as a result. These could represent evidence for agricultural activity and land division surrounding the Iron Age settlement, or could form part of later phases of agricultural activity of unknown date.

11.4.10 As a result of these works, a localised area of archaeological remains has been identified and characterised as a small area of Iron Age occupation, whilst the remainder of the Site appears to have comprised part of a surrounding rural landscape with no clear centres of either Prehistoric or Historic activity. There is no clear evidence for either Roman or Saxon activity as found on the Site to the immediate east. It is most likely that the importance of the identified remains would be Low, although well-preserved settlement evidence dating to the Iron Age could be considered of Medium importance. It is not anticipated that there would be any archaeological remains present that would preclude development or form a material design consideration.

Built Heritage

11.4.11 The identification of heritage assets potentially affected by the Development were based on the Cherwell District Council Scoping report, as well as the search of the National Heritage List for England (NHLE). The search concluded that the Site does not contain any designated heritage assets. It did identify three designated heritage assets, which fall within the study area. No non-designated heritage assets were identified within the study area.

11.4.12 The designated heritage assets identified, included:

- Barn at SP 5487 2940, Grade II listed (List entry number: 1046400);
- Manor Farmhouse, Grade II listed (List entry number: 1369564); and
- Fewcott Farmhouse, Grade II (List entry number: 1046880).

11.4.13 Following a site visit in August 2021, only the Barn at SP 5487 2940 was considered to have the potential to be affected by the Development for the reasons set out below.

11.4.14 Manor Farmhouse and Fewcott Farmhouse are located in the village of Fewcott, circa 800m from the Site. These assets have no visual, historical or functional connection to the Site and are, furthermore, separated from the Site by agricultural field boundaries and the M40 motorway network.

11.4.15 These assets draw their significance from their historical connection and setting of Fewcott and Ardley. The study area does not contribute to their significance. For these reasons, the two assets were not further assessed as part of the built heritage assessment.

Barn at SP 5487 2940

11.4.16 The Barn is a Grade II listed building, considered to be constructed in the late 18th Century and represents one of the earliest surviving buildings in Baynard's Green. The building is set within its own grounds, surrounded by mature hedgerows and trees. The only available access is via a private road off the B4100/A43 roundabout, which also forms access for the nearby service station. Baynard's Trading Estate lies adjacent to the Barn.

11.4.17 Since its original construction, the Barn was part of Baynard's Green Farm, which has stood relatively isolated within the agricultural hinterland of Bicester. The farm lay near the historical road network, which still exists and now forms the A43 and B4100. The farm saw expansion during the 19th Century, but was partially demolished during the mid-20th Century.

11.4.18 Its immediate setting was changed during the 20th Century with the conversion of the Barn into office use and the development of ancillary buildings. Although altered, the enclosed nature of the plot boundaries continues to facilitate the formation of a self-contained plot

within the landscape, which has persisted since the late 18th Century. Traffic noise from the A43 is clearly audible from the barn's location; however, the wider landscape is not appreciable, as the plot is surrounded by mature vegetation and modern buildings.

11.4.19 In summary, the asset holds architectural interest as a late 18th Century stone barn, however to a lesser extent, due to significant alterations and conversions in the 20th Century. The Site, including the wider open fields, makes no contribution to the importance of the heritage asset.

Future Baseline

11.4.20 The baseline conditions for below ground archaeology at the Site are not likely to change unless the Site is subject to redevelopment.

11.4.21 The Site has remained in farming/agricultural use since historical records began. It is therefore likely that the natural development of the Site without the Development would continue to function in this way. Therefore, conditions for built heritage at the Site are not likely to change.

Summary of Receptors and Sensitivity

11.4.22 Table 11.8 below details the known archaeological assets, and potential archaeological resources identified within the Site from the Historic England National Heritage for England (NHLE) List, the Oxfordshire HER, from the DBA, Geophysical Survey, and Evaluation Trial Trenching. Table 11.9 summarises relevant built heritage receptors.

Table 11.8: Summary of Receptor Sensitivity - Archaeology

Baseline Evidence	Receptor	Comment	Sensitivity (Value)
Geophysical Survey & Trial Trenching	Localised area of early to middle Iron Age activity identified in the southern part of the Eastern Site. This is most likely to comprise low importance remains, however well-preserved Iron Age settlement activity could be considered of medium importance.	Potential for non-designated archaeological asset	Low (Local) to Medium (Regional)
Geophysical Survey & Trial Trenching	Undated isolated ditches recorded across the remainder of the Site, likely to represent rural activity of potential late Prehistoric, Roman, Saxon, Medieval or Post Medieval date. These remains would likely be considered of low importance.	Potential for non-designated archaeological asset	Negligible to Low (Local)

Table 11.9: Summary of Receptor Sensitivity - Built Heritage

Baseline Evidence	Receptor	Comment	Sensitivity (Value)
NHLE & BHS	Barn at SP 5487 2940, Grade II listed (List entry number: 1046400)	Designated asset	Medium (Regional)

11.4.23 No archaeological or built heritage receptors are being introduced as part of the Development.

11.5 Scheme Design and Management

11.5.1 Potential significant archaeological impacts will be offset through appropriate mitigation measures including those set out below as agreed with CDC and the OCC Archaeologist. These mitigation measures would be secured through planning conditions for both planning applications.

11.5.2 Construction works will be carried out in accordance with standard good site practice and adherence to a CEMP, with mitigation measures set out in the Framework CEMP (see Appendix 6.1). Should archaeological remains be identified, control mechanisms will be in place to preserve the archaeological resource by record prior to any significant impacts occurring.

11.5.3 The Development locates built form away from the northern Site boundary; as such the Build Zones are located away from the only built heritage asset in proximity to the Site (Barn at SP 5487 2940) to minimise potential indirect impacts on its setting.

11.6 Construction

Assessment of Effects

Archaeology

11.6.1 Site works involving ground establishment works and construction activities associated within building foundations, will have up to a direct, major magnitude of impact to below ground known and potential resources. This may also include changes to drainage patterns within the Site or immediate area as a result of construction works.

11.6.2 Based on those assumed construction phase activities, the likely impacts are summarised in Table 11.10. All potential impacts are considered direct.

Table 11.10: Assessment of Likely Construction Impacts

Construction Activity	Assessed Magnitude of Impact
Site set-up works, including contractors compound set-up and associated temporary services, levelling work and other preparatory groundworks	Minor
Demolition of extant structures, including grubbing out of existing foundations	Major

Construction Activity	Assessed Magnitude of Impact
Site strip in advance of construction	Major
Construction, including foundation excavation or pile installation, service installation, road construction	Major
Landscaping, including ground reduction or levelling and creation of attenuation tanks and ponds	Minor to Moderate
Compression of buried remains from vehicle movement, construction of spoil tips, bunds or raised landscape areas	Minor

11.6.3 It has been concluded for the purpose of this assessment that the identified below ground heritage assets present within the Site will most likely be of a low to medium sensitivity.

11.6.4 It is considered likely that the effects to below ground heritage assets as a result of construction activities would be adverse in nature, given that such works remove either fully or partially any below ground remains which may be present within the Development footprint. All relevant construction activities have been considered and a worst-case scenario is assumed as part of this assessment of potential effects, comprising the complete loss of archaeological remains during these works. These effects will be limited to the Site and will be permanent and irreversible.

11.6.5 Any effects as a result of construction activities on relevant known designated archaeological assets and non-designated below ground archaeological remains outside of the Site will be negligible (not significant).

11.6.6 An evaluation of the predicted archaeological impacts during construction and the subsequent nature, scale and significance of effects is provided in Table 11.11.

Table 11.11: Evaluation of Predicted Archaeological Impacts During Construction Phase

Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Impact	Scale of Effect
Localised area of early to middle Iron Age activity identified in the southern part of the Eastern Site. This is most likely to comprise low importance remains, however well-preserved Iron Age settlement activity could be considered of medium importance.	Low (Local) to Medium (Regional)	Up to Major Adverse Direct	Up to Moderate or Large Adverse
Undated isolated ditches recorded across the remainder of the site, likely to represent rural activity of potential late Prehistoric, Roman, Saxon, Medieval or Post Medieval date. These remains would likely be considered of low importance.	Negligible to Low (Local)	Up to Major Adverse Direct	Slight or Moderate Adverse

11.6.7 The above effects would be permanent as direct impacts on archaeology cannot be reversed.

11.6.8 A potential significant adverse effect is considered to an identified area of localised Iron Age occupation activity as a result of construction groundworks and/or excavation activities. The potential for this effect to be significant is due to the potential for these remains to be of medium importance / sensitivity. This can be appropriately mitigated by preservation in record, as discussed below.

11.6.9 It would be reasonable to suggest that the adverse effect of Slight or Moderate identified on the undated ditch receptors should be considered as Slight and therefore not significant. This is due to the anticipated low importance of these receptors and that the preservation of these receptors by record or in situ is not considered to be a material factor in the decision-making process per Table 11.6.

Built Heritage

11.6.10 The nature of the construction stage is such that it will introduce temporary changes within parts of the Barn's setting that does not contribute to its importance. These changes would not alter the ability to appreciate or experience the importance of the asset, will be temporary in nature and will have no impact on the built heritage asset.

Table 11.12: Evaluation of Predicted Built Heritage Impacts During Construction Phase

Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Impact	Scale of Effect
Barn at SP 5487 2940, Grade II listed (List entry number: 1046400)	Medium	Low	Negligible

Mitigation, Monitoring and Residual Effects

Archaeology

11.6.11 Environmental assessment should incorporate a hierarchical system of mitigation, beginning with avoidance and prevention of the effect, followed by reduction to lessen the significance of the effect, and finally through to remediation to offset the effect. This may include embedded mitigation within development design proposals, for example to preserve archaeological remains within situ as part of an area of open space. It may also include essential mitigation which will reduce and/or offset significant adverse effects. In the case of archaeological remains, it is an accepted practice that, where preservation in situ is not considered to be necessary, a programme of archaeological evaluation and mitigation works should be undertaken to ensure the preservation by record of those remains prior to any adverse effect. Whilst these mitigation measures do not reduce the adverse effect upon the archaeological resource, they ensure that archaeological resources are not lost without record.

11.6.12 The Archaeological Desk Based Assessment, Geophysical Survey and Evaluation Trial Trenching provide a comprehensive package of evaluation surveys to support a planning application. Based upon the results of these reports, further archaeological work is anticipated. This would comprise a localised area of open area excavation where the focus of Iron Age occupation activity has been identified in the southern part of the Eastern Site.

11.6.13 All archaeological work will be undertaken under the terms of a standard archaeological planning condition in consultation with the local authority's archaeological advisor, in accordance with an approved archaeological WSI.

11.6.14 The location, timing and extent of any archaeological mitigation will be discussed and agreed with CDC and their archaeological advisor at OCC. Any requirement for mitigation will be agreed in advance of commencement of construction activities.

11.6.15 Where archaeological remains will be preserved by record, the analysis and reporting of the results of the archaeological works will occur off site; however, the results will be published in a variety of technical and non- technical formats. The preservation by record of archaeological remains does not reduce the effect upon those remains, as they will still be subject to total loss – this loss remains an adverse residual effect.

11.6.16 There is the potential for significant effects on archaeological remains of a possible Medium importance as a result of the Development. The ability to undertake archaeological fieldwork does not reduce the adverse effect upon the archaeological remains, however it is accepted industry practice to undertake appropriate fieldwork followed by dissemination of the acquired data in instances where preservation in situ is not considered to be necessary. Therefore, the adverse residual effects remain as stated above.

Built Heritage

11.6.17 No specific mitigation measures are considered necessary at construction stage as no impacts are predicted. This outcome rests on the prerequisite of a best practice approach in using construction methods.

11.7 Completed Development

Assessment of Effects

Archaeology

11.7.1 The Development, once completed and occupied, will not have any effect on archaeological remains within the Site as it has been assumed that the construction phase of the Development will have disturbed any remains which may be present as a result of excavation, earthworks and other below ground construction activities, as well as archaeological mitigation. Consequently, no additional direct effects will occur to relevant archaeological assets during the operational phase.

11.7.2 Similar to the construction phase, it is considered that any further impacts on relevant archaeological assets outside of the Site once the Development is completed and operational will be negligible.

11.7.3 Opportunities for public outreach and heritage interpretation works are to be explored as part of a potential package of heritage enhancement measures. This may include programmes designed to inform the new community of the prehistoric and historic heritage at their development. Such measures could also be secured by planning condition. The dissemination of information from archaeological fieldwork to the local community in order to enhance an understanding of the history of the local area would be considered a beneficial residual effect. This does not remove or negate the adverse effect from the loss of the archaeology.

Built Heritage

11.7.4 The completed and operational Development will present a change in character within the Site and is likely to lead to a higher amount of traffic along the B4100 and A43 intersection (see Chapter 8: Transport and Access). However, the Site does not contribute to the ability to appreciate the importance of the Barn due to its self-contained nature and traffic noise from the A43 is already audible at the Barn's location.

11.7.5 The Development will not diminish the ability to appreciate the importance of the Barn and will not obstruct or interfere with any important views of the assets. A summary of these impacts is summarised in Table 11.13.

Table 11.13: Evaluation of Predicted Built Heritage Impacts During Operations Phase

Receptor	Importance	Impact Description	Magnitude of Impact	Scale of Effect
Barn at SP 5487 2940, Grade II listed (List entry number: 1046400	Medium	Changes to setting	No impact	No Impact

Mitigation, Monitoring and Residual Effects

11.7.6 No archaeological or built heritage effects are anticipated at the operational stage and therefore no further mitigation measures are required.

11.8 Cumulative Effects

11.8.1 The implementation of the cumulative schemes would degrade the archaeological resources within the area by removing archaeological remains within the footprint of each development. The impacts of the developments would be mitigated through archaeological investigation, preservation by record, which is considered to do less harm than unmonitored removal, however, would still contribute to the gradual removal and destruction of the resource.

11.8.2 There may be some cumulative effects on archaeological receptors as a result of the interaction of the Development with other cumulative schemes, including the Tritax Scheme adjacent to the east of the Site. These remains can be linked to form a reconstruction of the landscape at a particular point in human history and to understand how that landscape was being exploited by humans at that time. However, the archaeological remains identified within the Site appear localised and do not have any clear links with archaeological remains identified in the nearby area. In particular, there is no evidence of contemporary Roman, or Saxon activity at the Site which could be intrinsically linked to the finds made at the Tritax Scheme site. The Iron Age finds within the Site appear to be isolated and localised. Therefore, it is very unlikely that the enabling and construction works associated with the Development would give rise to any significant cumulative effects when assessed alongside identified cumulative schemes.

11.8.3 Given that the nearby Grade II listed barn is surrounded by mature vegetation and modern buildings and that the surrounding landscape is not appreciable, it is not anticipated that the development of the Site and the adjacent Tritax Scheme would give rise to any cumulative

effects upon this heritage asset. In addition, no cumulative effects are identified from proposed schemes further afield, such as at Heyford Park.

Table 11.14: Summary of Residual Effects

Effect	Receptor (Sensitivity)	Geographic Scale	Temporal Scale	Magnitude of Impact	Mitigation and Monitoring	Residual Effect
Construction						
Enabling works and construction activities including excavations etc.	Localised Iron Age activity identified within the southern part of the Eastern Site (Low to Medium)	Local to Regional	Permanent	Up to Major Adverse	Programme of archaeological works to be secured by planning condition and agreed with OCC Archaeologist.	Up to Moderate or Large Adverse
	Isolated ditches and agricultural landscape features of Prehistoric, Roman, Saxon, Medieval or Post Medieval date (Negligible to Low)	Local				Slight or Moderate Adverse
Construction activities, including increased traffic and noise levels	Barn at SP 5487 2940 (Medium)	Local	Temporary	No impact	None required	None
Completed Development						
Dissemination of archaeological fieldwork results and publication	All archaeological receptors stated above	Negligible, Local, to Regional	Permanent	Up to Major	None. Dissemination of fieldwork and results would be a requirement of archaeological works. This does not negate the loss of the archaeological remains which remains an adverse residual effect as above.	Minor to Moderate Beneficial
Change of setting to designated heritage asset	Barn at SP 5487 2940 (Medium)	Local	Permanent	No impact	None required	None
Cumulative Effects						
No cumulative effects are identified						

References

[1] Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979, (updated 2014). United Kingdom Central Government.

[2] Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990, (1990). United Kingdom Central Government.

[3] Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, (2023). National Planning Policy Framework. September 2023

[4] Cherwell District Council, (2015). Local Plan 2011-31 Part 1.

[5] Cherwell District Council, (1996, saved in 2007). Local Plan 1996 Saved Policies.

[6] Cherwell District Council, (2019). Mid-Cherwell Area Neighbourhood Plan 2018-30.

[7] Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, (2014, lasted updated June 2021). Planning Practice Guidance.

[8] Historic England, (2015). Good Practice Advice Note 1: The Historic Environment in Local Plans.

[9] Historic England, (2015). Good Practice Advice Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment.

[10] Historic England, (2017). Good Practice Advice Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets.

[11] Historic England, (2020). Good Practice Advice Note 4: Enabling Development and Heritage Assets.

[12] English Heritage, (2008). Conservation Principles, Policy and Guidance.

[13] Design Manual for Roads and Highways, (2020).

[14] Department for Culture, Media and Sport, (2013). Scheduled Monuments and Nationally Important Non-Scheduled Monuments.