

Application number(s):	22/01682/F
Application site:	Land North Of Manor Farm Noke
Proposal:	Development of a ground mounted solar farm incorporating the installation of solar PV panels, associated infrastructure and access, as well as landscape planting and designated ecological enhancement areas.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>	Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Setting of a Listed Buildings and conservation area
<input type="checkbox"/>	Grade I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Grade II*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Grade II

Policies

Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 (2015)

- Policy ESD15** New development proposals should: Conserve, sustain and enhance designated and non-designated 'heritage assets' including buildings, features, archaeology, conservation areas and their settings, and ensure new development is sensitively sited and integrated, furthermore development should respect the traditional pattern of the form, scale and massing of buildings

Cherwell Local Plan 1996 Saved Policies

- C18** Works to a listed building should preserve the building, its setting and any features of special architectural or historic interest. Alterations or extensions to a listed building should be minor and sympathetic.
- C23** Presumption in favour of retaining positive features within a Conservation Area.
- C28** The layout, design and materials proposed within a new development should respect the existing local character. 'control will be exercised over all new development to ensure that standards of layout, design and external appearance are sympathetic to the character of the urban or rural context of that development.

NPPF – Chapter 16

- Paragraph 199.** When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.
- Paragraph 200.** Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:
- grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;
 - assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly Exceptional.

Paragraph 201. Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:

- a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and
- b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and
- c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and
- d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.

Paragraph 202. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

Paragraph 203. The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

Other Relevant Policies and guidance

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Section 16. In considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works the local planning authority 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.

Section 72. With respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

Significance (50 words)

The site is surrounded by a number of listed buildings, an Ancient Monument, conservation area and potential archaeological sites.

The significance of the area relates to the setting of these designated heritage assets. It is the area that served as agricultural land feeding the local people and then producing greater crop yields and feeding the country. It is this inter-relationship that gives the site its significance. The designated and non-designated heritage assets have mainly over the last 70 years lost this direct connection with the surrounding land as farming has altered and farm increased in size dramatically. The farms that surround this site and had some direct connection no longer do as they are mainly now private dwellings. However, the surrounding land, including this site, does help tell those assets story and help to explain the development of the villages and farms.

Appraisal (250 words)

The site itself sits by the River Ray and sits to the north of Manor Farm, north east of Islip Roman Villa and south west of Logg Farm and east of Islip Conservation Area.

Due to the way the land lies there will be some impact on the setting of all the aforementioned designated heritage assets. However, the impact will be less than substantial in all cases and mainly relating to distant views. Therefore, the harm must be balanced by the public benefit of providing green energy to the Grid.

In this case there harm is so minimal that the proposal will be an appropriate location from a

Level of harm

No Harm

Less than Substantial Harm

Substantial Harm

Public Benefit (NPPG)

Yes

No

Comments

In this case the harm is so minimal that the proposal is an appropriate location for this proposal from a heritage perspective.

Recommendation

No objections

Objections

Engage in preapp

Suggested Conditions

Conservation Officer: Rosie Burton

Date: 27/06/2022