

## 10.0 Historic Environment

### 10.1 Introduction

- 10.1.1 Orion Heritage is instructed by Hallam Land to undertake this chapter of the ES Addendum in order to provide additional information on the historic environment, which has been gathered since the submission of the 2021 ES Chapter and to consider historic environment matters in relation to the changes to the Proposed Development. This chapter should be read in conjunction with the Historic Environment chapter 10 of the 2021 ES which remains extant unless superseded by the content of this addendum chapter.
- 10.1.2 Additional consultation responses from the LPA's archaeological advisor have since been received during the planning process and an archaeological desk-based assessment (**Appendix 10.7**) for the site's northern area, which was not part of the 2014 site boundary, was completed in November 2022 and updated in July 2025. A geophysical survey (**Appendix 10.2**) was carried out across the entirety of the site's northern area in April 2022 and pre-determination archaeological trial trenching evaluation (**Appendix 10.8**) was carried out within two distinct areas in the site's northern area in September/October 2023. A Heritage Statement was originally produced in October 2022, and an updated version was provided in December 2023 (**Appendix 10.6**), based on consultation responses received from Cherwell District Council's Conservation Officer on 26.05.2022, 17.07.2023 and 09.10.2023. The figures accompanying this ES Addendum are at (**Appendix 10.9**). Figure 1 shows the known areas of archaeological activity within the site. Figure 2 shows the evaluation and mitigation areas which have been agreed with the LPA's archaeological advisor, based on previously carried out work within the 2014 site boundary. Figure 3 shows those areas within the site's northern area which have been subject to trial trenching evaluation in September/October 2023.
- 10.1.3 The additional archaeological investigations carried out within the site's northern area and listed above merit further consideration in this addendum.

## **10.2 Assessment Methodology**

10.2.1 The assessment methodology reported within the 2021 ES remains up to date. A revised assessment methodology is not required, and therefore the methodology outlined in the 2021 ES should be referred to.

### ***Data sources***

10.2.2 Since the production of the 2021 ES an archaeological desk-based assessment for the site's northern area (**Appendix 10.7**), a geophysical survey update (**Appendix 10.2**) and a pre-determination archaeological trial trenching evaluation (**Appendix 10.8**) were carried out. The geophysical survey extended across the site's northern area, which is a later addition to the original 2014 site boundary previously surveyed (and submitted). It was carried out by Magnitude Surveys in April 2022. The archaeological trial trenching evaluation was carried out by Oxford Archaeology in September/October 2023 in two areas within the site's northern area. The trenches were located in two areas proposed for a solar farm and residential dwellings. A Heritage Statement was originally produced in March 2023, and an updated version was provided in December 2023 (**Appendix 10.6**) to address the Conservation Officer's comments. All figures for this ES Addendum will be at (**Appendix 10.9**).

### ***Assessment approach***

10.2.3 There are no material changes to the assessment approach. However, the NPPF has been updated since the 2021 ES, and this has resulted in changes to paragraph numbering within Chapter 16 'Conserving and enhancing the historic environment' (see section 10.3 below). The policies relevant to this assessment in the Cherwell District Local Plan remain unchanged, as does all Historic England guidance.

### ***Significance criteria***

10.2.4 Significance criteria set out in the 2021 ES remain extant.

## 10.3 Relevant Policy

### ***National Planning Policy Framework***

- 10.3.1 The revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2024) sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how they are expected to be applied. Since the 2021 ES the paragraph numbering within Chapter 16 'Conserving and enhancing the historic environment' has changed.
- 10.3.2 Section 16 of the NPPF recognises that intelligently managed change may sometimes be necessary if heritage assets are to be maintained for the long term.
- 10.3.3 Paragraph 207 states that planning decisions should be based on the significance of the heritage asset, and that the level of detail supplied by an applicant should be proportionate to the importance of the asset and should be no more than sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal upon the significance of that asset.
- 10.3.4 Paragraph 216 requires the decision-maker to take into account the effect on the significance of non-designated heritage assets and to take a balanced judgement having regard to the scale of harm or loss and the significance of the asset(s) potentially affected.
- 10.3.5 Annex 2 of the NPPF has the following heritage related definitions:
- *Historic Environment*: all aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and places through time, including all surviving physical remains of past human activity, whether visible, buried or submerged, and landscaped and planted or managed flora.
  - *Heritage Assets* are defined 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. It includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).
  - *Archaeological Interest* is defined as: There will be archaeological interest in a heritage asset if it holds, or potentially holds, evidence of past human activity worthy of expert investigation at some point.
  - *Designated Heritage Assets* comprise: A World Heritage Site, Scheduled Monument, Listed Building, Protected Wreck Site, Registered Parks and Garden, Registered Battlefield or Conservation Areas designated under the relevant legislation.

- *Significance* is defined as: The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. The interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting. For World Heritage Sites, the cultural value described within each site's Statement of Outstanding Universal Value forms part of its significance.
- *Setting* is defined as: The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.

10.3.6 Heritage assets that have not been designated as a listed building, scheduled monument, registered park and garden, protected wreck, battlefield or conservation area are referred to as non-designated heritage assets.

#### ***Planning Practice Guidance***

10.3.7 The NPPF is supported by the National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG).

10.3.8 Paragraph 18a-001 makes a clear statement that any decisions relating to Listed Buildings and their settings and Conservation Areas must address the statutory considerations of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as well as satisfying the relevant policies within the National Planning Policy Framework and the Local Plan.

10.3.9 Paragraph 18a-009 outlines that the assessment of the impact of a proposed development on the setting of a heritage asset needs to take into account and be proportionate to the significance of the asset being considered.

10.3.10 The NPPG outlines that although the extent and importance of setting is often expressed in visual terms, it can also be influenced by other factors such as noise, dust and vibration. Historic relationships between places can also be an important factor stressing ties between places that may have limited or no intervisibility with each other. This may be historic as well as aesthetic connections that contribute or enhance the significance of one or more of the heritage assets.

10.3.11 Paragraph 18a-013 concludes:

*"The contribution that setting makes to the significance of the heritage asset does not depend on there being public rights or an ability to access or experience that*

*setting. The contribution may vary over time. 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. They may also need to consider the fact that developments which materially detract from the asset's significance may also damage its economic viability now, or in the future, thereby threatening its on-going conservation."*

- 10.3.12 The key test in NPPF Paragraphs 212-215 is whether a proposed development will result in substantial harm or less than substantial harm. However, substantial harm is not defined in the NPPF. Paragraph 18a-018 of the NPPG provides additional guidance on substantial harm. It states:

*"What matters in assessing if a proposal causes substantial harm is the impact on the significance of the heritage asset. As the National Planning Policy Framework makes clear, significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting. Whether a proposal causes substantial harm will be a judgment for the decision taker, having regard to the circumstances of the case and the policy in the National Planning Policy Framework. In general terms, substantial harm is a high test, so it may not arise in many cases. For example, in determining whether works to a listed building constitute substantial harm, an important consideration would be 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 significance rather than the scale of the development that is to be assessed."*

- 10.3.13 Paragraph 215 of the NPPF outlines that where a proposed development results in less than substantial harm to the significance of a heritage asset, the harm arising should be weighed against the public benefits accruing from the proposed development. Paragraph 18a-020 of the NPPG outlines what is meant by public benefits (note that the reference to the NPPF paragraph 8 has been corrected to reflect the updated NPPF in July 2018):

*"Public benefits may follow from many developments and could be anything that delivers economic, social or environmental objectives as described in the National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraph 8). Public benefits should flow from the proposed development. They should be of a nature or scale to be of benefit to the public at large and should not just be a private benefit. However, benefits do not always have to be visible or accessible to the public in order to be genuine public benefits."*

***Emerging Local Plan***

*Cherwell Local Plan Review 2042*

10.3.14 Cherwell District Council (CDC) is preparing a new Local Plan. The consultation (Regulation 19) on the draft of the Cherwell Local Plan Review 2042 was held between 19<sup>th</sup> December 2024 and 25<sup>th</sup> February 2025. The Submission Local Plan was approved by CDC Executive on 1 July 2025 and by Full Council on 21 July 2025 and was submitted to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government for independent examination, on 31 July 2025. Officers prepared a Schedule of Proposed Changes and Minor Modifications which they consider would improve and update the draft plan in view of the representations received and updated evidence. These will be submitted for consideration by the Inspector at the examination and if appropriate may form the basis for future Main Modifications to the Submission Local Plan as recommended by the Inspector in order to make the plan sound and/or legally compliant. As such, at this time, only limited weight can be attributed to the emerging Local Plan as a material planning consideration.

## 10.4 Baseline Conditions

- 10.4.1 The baseline conditions assessed in 2021 have been reviewed. They remain largely the same, with the exception of the following information which has since become available.
- 10.4.2 Consultation with the LPA's archaeological advisor in February 2022 confirmed that an archaeological desk-based assessment (DBA) for the site's northern area, which was not included in the original 2014 site boundary, would be required (**Appendix 10.7**). The assessment identified a moderate potential for prehistoric, and Roman finds and features and low potential for all other periods. No designated archaeological assets were found to be susceptible to harm from the proposed development.
- 10.4.3 The consultation also confirmed that the archaeological desk-based assessment should be informed by a geophysical survey of the site's northern area. The survey was carried out in April 2022 (**Appendix 10.2**). The survey did not detect any anomalies indicative of significant archaeological activity. Evidence of agricultural practices, both modern and historical, were identified across the survey area in the form of ridge and furrow cultivation, mapped and unmapped field boundaries and modern ploughing trends. Several linear and curvilinear anomalies were identified which likely have natural or agricultural origins; however, an archaeological origin cannot currently be ruled out.
- 10.4.4 Subsequent consultation with the LPA's archaeological advisor in June 2022 resulted in the requirement for a 2% pre-determination trial trenching evaluation of two areas within the site's northern area. Those comprised an area proposed for residential dwellings and a second, larger area proposed for a solar farm. The evaluation was carried out by Oxford Archaeology in September/October 2023. The results were limited to evidence of a 19<sup>th</sup> century post-enclosure field system defined with single-phase boundary ditches. There was no evidence of any earlier agricultural activity and the absence of any significant quantity of earlier artefactual material was interpreted as a strong suggestion that settlement or activity other than arable or pasture agricultural was absent within the evaluation boundary. The evaluation report forms (**Appendix 10.8**) of this assessment. The recorded remains are considered to be of **negligible** value.
- 10.4.5 There are no listed buildings located within the site. The listed buildings in the village of Bucknell, to the north of the site, were scoped out of the 2021 ES and will therefore not be discussed further here.
- 10.4.6 The existing information regarding those designated and non-designated built heritage assets discussed in the 2021 ES remains accurate and will therefore not be repeated here.

- 10.4.7 In response to Cherwell District Council’s Conservation Officer’s consultation responses dated 26.05.2022, 17.07.2023 and 09.10.2023 an updated Heritage Statement (**Appendix 10.6**) was produced in December 2023. The assessment concluded that the proposals will preserve the significance of all designated heritage assets assessed, with any potential harmful impacts arising from change within the settings of the assets being adequately mitigated, as shown in the Development Framework Plan. It was also concluded that the minor levels of harm identified to the non-designated heritage assets of Hawkwell Farm and Lord’s Farm should be subject to a balanced judgement in respect of the scheme as per paragraph 216 of the NPPF (2024). The updated Heritage Statement included an assessment of the walled garden associated with the Grade II listed Manor House (NHLE1046889). The walled garden is considered to be curtilage listed and is located immediately adjacent to the site’s northern boundary.
- 10.4.8 Regarding the curtilage listed walled garden it was concluded that there is the potential to enhance the garden’s significance by retaining openness and harnessing it as a feature on the edge of the proposed country park. It was further concluded that there is scope at the reserved matters stage to provide interpretation of the walled garden within the community park and on public rights of way, enhancing the experience of the walled garden and thus bringing it to the attention of a wider range of people. The walled garden is of **medium** value. The Development Framework Plan shows a large community park in that area located closest to the walled garden as such the proposed development is anticipated to result in a **negligible** magnitude of impact on the asset. A **negligible** significance of impacts was identified. This is not significant in EIA terms.

## 10.5 Potential Effects

### *Construction stage*

- 10.5.1 The potential effects reported within the 2021 ES remain as reported therein, however, additional information is now available.
- 10.5.2 Based on the trial trenching evaluation results, no archaeological resource is present within the evaluated areas within the site's northern area which would be susceptible to impacts during the development process. The recorded remains are considered to be of **negligible** value. Proposed groundworks associated with the development are anticipated to result in a **low adverse** magnitude of impact on the archaeological interest present within that part of the site proposed for the installation of a solar farm. A **negligible** significance of impacts for the archaeological remains which were identified to be of **negligible** value was identified. This is not significant in EIA terms. Proposed groundworks associated with the development are anticipated to result in a **high adverse** magnitude of impact on the archaeological interest present within that part of the site's northern area which is proposed for residential dwellings. A **negligible** significance of impacts for the archaeological remains which were identified to be of **negligible** value was identified. This is not significant in EIA terms.
- 10.5.3 For the remainder of the site's northern area, which as to date not been subject to a trial trenching evaluation, based on the geophysical results, it is considered unlikely that any archaeological remains are present which would be susceptible to impacts during the development process. The anomalies recorded as part of the geophysical survey are considered to be of **negligible** value. As the majority of the area is proposed as green infrastructure, proposed groundworks associated with the development are anticipated to result in a **negligible** magnitude of impact on the archaeological interest present within that part of the site's northern area. A **negligible** significance of impacts for the archaeological remains which were identified to be of **negligible** value were identified. This is not significant in EIA terms. As such, no further archaeological investigations are suggested for the archaeological remains of negligible value in those parts of the site's northern area which are proposed as green infrastructure. For the area proposed as a burial ground an archaeological evaluation will be carried out, secured by a condition attached to planning consent. This would constitute a **low adverse** magnitude of impact on remains of **negligible** sensitivity, resulting in a **negligible** significance of impacts. This is not significant in EIA terms.
- 10.5.4 There will be no construction effects on the walled garden associated with the Manor House.

***Post-completion stage***

- 10.5.5 The existing information in the 2021 ES remains accurate. It is anticipated that there will be no post-completion stage effects on archaeological assets as all impacts would occur and be mitigated during the construction phase.
- 10.5.6 It is anticipated that there will be no post-completion stage effects on the curtilage listed garden associated with the Manor House, providing that a degree of openness is retained around the asset, to ensure legibility within the landscape is maintained.

## 10.6 Mitigation Measures

### *Construction stage*

- 10.6.1 The proposed mitigation measures reported within the 2021 ES remain as reported therein and it is anticipated that no mitigation measures are required within the site's northern area, as the archaeological remains recorded therein are considered to be of negligible value.
- 10.6.2 No mitigation measures are considered necessary to mitigate the impacts to the setting of the walled garden adjacent to the site's northern boundary during construction activity.

### *Post-completion stage*

- 10.6.3 It is anticipated that there will be no post-completion stage impacts on archaeology, as impacts would occur during the construction phase as assessed above.
- 10.6.4 Providing that a degree of openness is retained around the walled garden associated with the Manor House to ensure legibility within the landscape is maintained, it is anticipated that there will be no post-completion stage effects on the asset. There is scope at the reserved matters stage to interpret the walled garden within the country park and on public rights of way, enhancing the experience of the asset and bringing it to the attention of a wider range of people. This would constitute a **low beneficial** magnitude of impact, resulting in a **minor beneficial** significance of impact.

## 10.7 Residual Effects

### **Construction stage**

10.7.1 The residual effects reported within the 2021 ES remain as reported therein.

10.7.2 No residual construction effects to built heritage have been identified.

### **Post-completion stage**

10.7.3 The residual effects reported within the 2021 ES remain as reported therein. For the site's northern area, no residual post-completion stage effects on archaeology have been identified.

10.7.4 The overall residual significance of impact on the walled garden associated with the Manor House remains **negligible**.

### **Summary of effects**

**Table 10.7.1: Summary of effects**

Potential effect	Significance (pre-mitigation)	Mitigation measure	Significance of residual effect
<b>Construction stage</b>			
Removal of non-designated archaeological assets in the site's northern area	<b>Negligible</b>	none	<b>Negligible</b>
Indirect impact on setting of walled garden associated with Manor House	<b>None</b>	none	<b>None</b>
<b>Post-completion stage</b>			
Indirect impact on setting of walled garden associated with Manor House	<b>Negligible</b>	Provide a degree of openness around the walled garden to ensure legibility within the landscape is maintained	<b>Negligible</b>

10.7.5 In all other respects the 2021 table of effects remains extant.

## **10.8 Cumulative Effects**

- 10.8.1 No changes to cumulative effects have been identified and hence no change to the assessment in the 2021 ES is reported.