

6. Built Heritage and Archaeology

Introduction

- 6.1 This Chapter reports the outcome of the assessment of likely significant environmental effects arising from the Proposed Scheme in relation to Built Heritage and Archaeology.
- 6.2 The Chapter describes the technical consultation that has been undertaken during the EIA, the scope of the assessment and assessment methodology, and a summary of the baseline information that has informed the assessment.
- 6.3 In line with **Chapter 2: Approach to EIA**, the assessment reports on the likely significant environmental effects, the further mitigation measures required to prevent, reduce or offset any significant adverse effects, or further enhance beneficial effects. The conclusions are provided both in terms of the residual effects and whether these are considered significant. The assessment of effects takes into consideration both primary and tertiary mitigation (see **Chapter 2: Approach to EIA** for further details) and is informed by the EIA Scoping process (**Appendix 2.1** and **2.2**) and iterative scoping process where applicable.
- 6.4 This Chapter, and its associated **Appendices 6.1 – 6.3**, is intended to be read as part of the wider ES with particular reference to the introductory Chapters of this ES (**Chapters 1 – 5**), as well as **Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual**.
- 6.5 In addition, this Chapter should be read in conjunction with **Chapter 8: Assessment of Cumulative Effects**.

Summary of Consultation

- 6.6 **Table 6.1** provides an overview of the consultation that has been undertaken to inform the Proposed Scheme and EIA, including the consideration of likely significant effects and the methodology for assessment.

Table 6.1: Summary of consultation

Body / organisation	Contact	Date and form of consultation	Summary
OCC	Planning Archaeologist	Email and advice letter, 24 th and 27 th January 2022	Consultation regarding requirements for the application, including the need for an Archaeology and Heritage Assessment, Geophysical Survey and Evaluation.
OCC	Planning Archaeologist	Email, 16 th September 2022	Sign-off of Geophysical survey report.
OCC	Planning Archaeologist	Email, 26 th September 2022	Sign off of written scheme of investigation (WSI) for the undertaking of the archaeological evaluation.

Body / organisation	Contact	Date and form of consultation	Summary
OCC	Planning Archaeologist	Site visit during archaeological evaluation, 20 th October 2022	Sign-off of blank trenches and walkover.
OCC	Planning Archaeologist	Email, 8 th November 2022	Confirmation of sign-off of archaeological evaluation.
OCC	Planning Archaeologist	Pending	Sign-off of Archaeological Evaluation Report
OCC	Planning Archaeologist	Pending	Mitigation advice letter – Condition

Scope of the Assessment

6.7 An EIA Scoping Report was submitted to CDC on 2nd November 2022, as presented as **Appendix 2.1**. The EIA Scoping Opinion was received on 7th December 2022 (**Appendix 2.2**). This section provides update on the scope of the assessment presented within this Chapter following submission of the EIA Scoping Report.

Effects Not Considered to be Significant

6.8 The following effect was not considered significant as part of the EIA Scoping Report (**Appendix 2.1**) and is not considered further in this Chapter:

- Change to setting of Drayton Conservation Area.

6.9 Following the EIA Scoping Process, the following additional effect is now not considered significant and the evidence to support this determination is outlined below.

Changes to setting of designated heritage assets within Hanwell Conservation Area

6.10 The assessment included within the Archaeological and Heritage Assessment (**Appendix 6.1**) establishes that the Site does not form part of the setting of the Grade I Listed Church of St Peter or of the Grade II* Listed Hanwell Castle, neither enhancing nor detracting their significance, and that the Proposed Scheme will not result in any harm to the significance of these assets. Views of the surrounding landscape (including the Site) from these assets are blocked/screened by vegetation, topography and modern built form, and there are no other discernible (non-visual) historical or landscape associations between any of these assets and the Site (Image EDP A1.4 to A1.5 and A1.8 to A1.12 of **Appendix 6.1** and Photoviewpoints EDP 3, 4, 6 and 7 of **Appendix 7.3**). The Site was considered to only be a part of the setting of the Hanwell Conservation Area, this being the only designated heritage asset scoped in to this Chapter.

6.11 While acknowledging that the contribution of setting to the significance of a heritage asset is most often expressed by reference to views, with the emphasis on the contribution of the visual experience of the setting of a heritage asset to its significance, this assessment has nonetheless acknowledged that the way in which an asset is experienced (i.e. its setting) can also be affected by environmental factors including noise, vibration and odour. However, there is sufficient intervenient distance, topography and vegetation from the Proposed

Scheme so as to prevent any direct or indirect impacts on any heritage assets. Therefore, consideration of the potential effects of traffic, noise, vibration, air quality and odour on the heritage assets in the following paragraphs has been scoped out of this assessment.

Effects Considered Likely to be Significant

6.12 The following effects (**Table 6.2**) were considered likely to be significant at the EIA Scoping stage and have been assessed and reported within this Chapter:

Table 6.2: Effects considered likely to be significant

Likely significant effect	Receptors	Applicable development stage
Change to setting of Designated Heritage Assets	Hanwell Conservation Area	Construction ^a and Operation
Physical impacts on archaeological remains	Non-designated below ground heritage assets within the site	Construction

Assessment Methodology

Legislative Framework, Policy and Guidance

6.13 The following legislation and policy has informed the assessment of effects within this Chapter and is detailed further in **Appendix 6.1**:

- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990¹;
- Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979²;
- Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance published by English Heritage 2008³;
- The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021)⁴; and
- The saved policies of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996⁵ and the Cherwell Local Plan 2011 – 2031⁶.

6.14 The following guidance has informed the assessment of effects within this Chapter and is detailed further in **Appendix 6.1**:

- The baseline review of archaeological and heritage issues was completed in line with the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists' Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-based Assessment (CIfA 2020)⁷;
- The identification and assessment of potential 'setting' effects, heritage receptors, was undertaken with regard to Historic England's Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets (Second Edition) (HE 2017)⁸; and

^a Whilst not explicitly scoped in as part of the EIA Scoping process, this has been scoped in subsequently, on review.

- The assessment of the significance of heritage assets references Historic England’s Historic England Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment: (HE 2015)⁹.

Defining the Study Area

6.15 As a result of baseline analysis, together with an understanding of the nature and scale of the Proposed Scheme, and the likely extent and distribution of effects on heritage assets, the assessment defines a 1km study area measured from the boundaries of the Site which was used for the assessment of the designated heritage assets, as well as to inform the assessment of the archaeological potential (as agreed with the Archaeological Advisor to OCC).

Establishing the Baseline

6.16 A series of baseline studies have been completed to inform the preparation of this Chapter. These were undertaken in accordance with the relevant guidance set out above, as well as the body of ‘Standard and Guidance’ produced by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA).

6.17 **Table 6.3** summarises all studies / surveys / analysis / evaluations undertaken to inform the assessment presented within this Chapter.

Table 6.3: Background studies / surveys / evaluations / analysis

Study / survey / analysis / evaluation	Overview	Date of completion
Archaeological and Heritage Assessment (Appendix 6.1)	This assessment presents the baseline of historic environment information for the Site and its environs (as required by the NPPF, 2021), and in accordance with the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists’ Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-based Assessment (CIfA 2020)). With recourse to desk-based sources of historic environment data (inclusive of the Oxfordshire Historic Environment Record (HER)), and a site walkover, it defines the Site’s potential to contain potentially significant archaeological remains utilising a 1km radius study area. It identified any designated heritage assets within a 1km study area, described their setting and its contribution to their heritage value, and whether and to what degree the Site also contributes in order to inform the operational assessment of the Proposed Scheme.	July 2022

Study / survey / analysis / evaluation	Overview	Date of completion
Archaeological Geophysical Survey (Appendix 6.2)	An Archaeological Geophysical Survey, comprising detailed gradiometer survey (magnetometry), was undertaken at the request of the Archaeological Advisor to OCC to determine the presence and extent of magnetic anomalies of possible archaeological origin.	May 2022
Archaeological Evaluation Report (Appendix 6.3)	Following discussion with the Archaeological Advisor to OCC informed by the results of the Archaeological Geophysical Survey undertaken in 2022 (AOC 2022 ¹⁰), a trial trench evaluation was carried out. This followed a methodology and scope agreed with the Archaeological Advisor to OCC, set out and agreed through the submission of a WSI/Method Statement (MOLA 2022 ¹¹).	Evaluation undertaken in October/November 2022, with Report completed in January/February 2023

Assessment Process

- 6.18 In line with industry standard best-practice guidance (as set out above), the assessment first identifies the heritage significance of relevant assets through a proportionate narrative analysis, and thereafter assesses the impact of the Proposed Scheme on that significance. Impacts are not harmful unless they adversely affect a heritage asset’s significance.
- 6.19 Having established the significance of heritage assets, and those that are sensitive to change resulting from the Proposed Scheme, **Tables 6.4** to **6.6** set out the criteria that is then employed in attributing ‘sensitivity’ to archaeological and heritage assets, identifying the magnitude of any changes to them (i.e. the impact) and assessing the significance of the resulting effects.
- 6.20 The sensitivity of the heritage assets identified is assessed on the basis of **Table 6.4**. The magnitude and significance of potential effects on archaeological remains and built heritage resources, arising from the implementation of the Proposed Scheme, will be identified and appropriately assessed, based on **Tables 6.5** and **6.6**.
- 6.21 The significance of effect is assessed with reference to the receptor’s (i.e., the heritage asset’s) sensitivity and the magnitude of impact.
- 6.22 The attribution of the sensitivity of a heritage asset is a question of professional judgement derived from an assessment of its heritage significance. The sensitivity of the receptor (heritage asset) is defined by its importance in terms of national, regional or local statutory or non-statutory protection and grading of the asset. The non-statutory criteria used by the Secretary of State for scheduled monuments provide relevant criteria to assist this process, as do the HE Listing Selection Guides and the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) Principles of Selection for Listing Buildings document¹². **Table 6.4** below sets out the criteria for assessing sensitivity.

Reporting of the Environmental Effect and Significance Criteria

6.23 The assessment of likely significant environmental effects as a result of the Proposed Scheme has taken into account the construction and operational stages. The following sections define the approach adopted within the assessment for the determination of sensitivity (or value / importance), magnitude of change / impact, the level of effect and significance.

Determining Sensitivity of Receptor

6.24 The sensitivity of affected receptors has been considered on a scale of **high, medium, low or negligible** (Table 6.4).

Table 6.4: Sensitivity of Receptor

Receptor	Sensitivity of Receptor				
	Very High ^b	High	Medium	Low	Negligible
World Heritage Site					
Scheduled Monument					
Grade I or II* Listed Building					
Grade I or II* Registered Park or Garden					
Other nationally important built heritage/archaeological asset					
Grade II Listed Building					
Grade II Registered Park or Garden					
Conservation Area					
Other built heritage/archaeological asset of regional or county importance					
Locally important built heritage/archaeological asset with cultural or educational value					
Heritage site or feature with very limited value or interest					

^b Given that no World Heritage Sites are present in the vicinity of the Site, this sensitivity criteria of 'very high' is not used in this assessment.

Determining the Magnitude of Change

- 6.25 The magnitude of change has been considered as the change experienced from the current baseline conditions at the sensitive receptor and has been considered on a scale of **large, medium, small** or **negligible**.
- 6.26 The classification of the magnitude of change to heritage assets is rigorous and based on consistent criteria. This will take account of such factors as the physical scale and type of disturbance to them and whether features or evidence would be lost that are fundamental to their heritage interest and therefore significance. The magnitude of change is assessed using the criteria in **Table 6.5**.

Table 6.5: Magnitude of Change

Magnitude of change	Description
Large	Change to the significance of a built heritage/archaeological asset so that it is completely altered or destroyed.
Medium	Change to the significance of a built heritage/archaeological asset so that it is significantly modified.
Small	Change to the significance of a built heritage/archaeological asset so that it is noticeably different.
Negligible	Change to the significance of a built heritage/archaeological asset that hardly affects it.

- 6.27 Following the evaluation of sensitivity for specific archaeology and cultural heritage receptors and the magnitude of impact, the significance of effect is assessed using the criteria shown in **Table 6.6**.

Determining the Level of Effect

- 6.28 The level of effect has been informed by the magnitude of change due to the Proposed Scheme and the evaluation of the sensitivity of the affected receptor. The level of effect has been determined using professional judgement and **Table 6.6** has been a tool which has assisted with this process.
- 6.29 Whilst **Table 6.6** provides ranges, the level of effect is confirmed as a single level and not a range, informed by professional judgement. For each effect, it has been concluded whether the effect is '*beneficial*' or '*adverse*'.

Table 6.6: Matrix to support determining the level of effect

		Sensitivity (or value / importance)			
		High	Medium	Low	Negligible
Magnitude of change	Large	Major	Moderate to Major	Minor to Moderate	Negligible
	Medium	Moderate to Major	Moderate	Minor	Negligible
	Small	Minor to Moderate	Minor	Negligible to Minor	Negligible
	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

6.30 The following terms have been used to define the level of the effects identified and these can be ‘beneficial’ or ‘adverse’:

- **Major effect:** where the Proposed Scheme is likely to cause a considerable change from the baseline conditions and the receptor has limited adaptability, tolerance or recoverability or is of the highest sensitivity;
- **Moderate effect:** where the Proposed Scheme is likely to cause either a considerable change from the baseline conditions at a receptor which has a degree of adaptability, tolerance or recoverability or a less than considerable change at a receptor that has limited adaptability, tolerance or recoverability;
- **Minor effect:** where the Proposed Scheme is likely to cause a small, but noticeable change from the baseline conditions on a receptor which has limited adaptability, tolerance or recoverability or is of the highest sensitivity; or where the Proposed Scheme is likely to cause a considerable change from the baseline conditions at a receptor which can adapt, is tolerant of the change or/and can recover from the change; and
- **Negligible:** where the Proposed Scheme is unlikely to cause a noticeable change at a receptor, despite its level of sensitivity or there is a considerable change at a receptor which is not considered sensitive to a change.

6.31 The duration of the effect has been assessed as either ‘short-term’, ‘medium-term’ or ‘long-term’. Short-term is considered to be up to 1 year, medium-term is considered to be between 1 and 10 years and long-term is considered to be greater than 10 years.

6.32 The assessment matrix defined in **Table 6.6** is not intended to be ‘prescriptive’, but rather it allows for the employment of professional judgement to determine the most appropriate level of effect for each heritage asset that is identified.

6.33 Effects have been categorised with regard to their nature (adverse, beneficial or neutral) and their permanence (permanent, temporary or reversible). For all forms of heritage asset (receptor); including archaeological sites and remains, historic buildings, places and areas; and historic landscapes; the sensitivity of the receptor is combined with the predicted magnitude of change to heritage significance to arrive at the significance of effect.

Determining Significance of effect

- 6.34 For each residual effect, a statement has been made as to whether the level of effect is ‘**Significant**’ or ‘**Not Significant**’. This determination has been based on professional judgement and/or relevant guidance/legislation where applicable.
- 6.35 With reference to the matrix in **Table 6.6**, those effects defined as major are deemed ‘significant’. Judgment is also to be applied to whether a moderate effect might be reported as a significant effect in certain high impact cases, on a case-by-case basis.
- 6.36 Significance of effect has only been concluded for residual effects (i.e. following the identification of secondary mitigation).

Baseline Conditions

- 6.37 A detailed description of the baseline situation at, and around, the Site is set out in **Appendix 6.1**. Provided below is a summary of the baseline assessment with regard to cultural heritage.

Designated heritage assets

- 6.38 There are no designated heritage assets within the Site. Within the study area there are two conservation areas and ten listed buildings, as follows:
- Hanwell Conservation Area (HCA) approximately 100m north of the Site;
 - Drayton Conservation Area approximately 860m south of the Site;
 - Grade I Listed Church of St Peter (NHLE ref. 1216364) approximately 320m northeast of the Site;
 - Grade II* Listed Hanwell Castle (NHLE ref. 1287674) approximately 380m northeast of the Site;
 - Grade II Listed Chest Tomb dated 1676 to Mrs Elizabeth Hidd approximately 15m south west of porch, Church of St Peter (NHLE ref. 1216365) approximately 300m northeast of the Site;
 - Grade II Listed Group of 5 chest tombs between 10 to 18m south of chancel of Church of St Peter (NHLE ref. 1216366) approximately 320m northeast of the Site;
 - Grade II Listed Group of 4 17th century headstones approximately 10m south east of south aisle, Church of St Peter (NHLE ref. 1287672) approximately 320m northeast of the Site;
 - Grade II Listed Right Gatepier approximately 50m west of Hanwell Castle (NHLE ref. 1216370) approximately 360m northeast of the Site;
 - Grade II Listed Left Gatepier approximately 50m west of Hanwell Castle (NHLE ref. 1216369) c.360m northeast of the Site;
 - Grade II Listed 6 Main Street (NHLE ref. 1216368) approximately 410m northeast of the Site;

- Grade II Listed Heath Farmhouse (NHLE ref. 1287673) approximately 500m northeast of the Site; and
 - Grade II Listed Spring Farmhouse (NHLE ref. 1216367) approximately 550m northeast of the Site.
- 6.39 There are no other types of designated heritage assets within the Site or the study area, such as registered parks and gardens, battlefields or scheduled monuments.
- 6.40 As described in the *'Effects Not Considered to be Significant'* section above, the assessment included within **Appendix 6.1** refined this analysis, establishing the Proposed Scheme could only result in harm to the significance of the HCA.
- 6.41 As such, the HCA is the only built heritage asset assessed in respect of the consideration of the potential effects of the Proposed Scheme and further details of this asset are summarised below.

Hanwell Conservation Area (HCA)

- 6.42 A comprehensive assessment of the HCA and the contribution of the Site to its significance and setting is set out in **Appendix 6.1**, Section 5.
- 6.43 The HCA is considered to be a receptor of medium sensitivity.
- 6.44 The assessment set out in **Appendix 6.1** established that the Site is considered to make a limited positive contribution to the significance of the HCA through, firstly, historical and current functional links; and, secondly, a 'passive' contribution through being an area of undeveloped farmland that contributes to the broader and rural setting to the south of the HCA.
- 6.45 The assessment within the Archaeological and Heritage Assessment (**Appendix 6.1**, Section 5) established that the contribution of the Site to the setting of the HCA is limited to the small positive contribution to the agricultural character of views outwards from the southern edge of the HCA. The long-distance views discussed above include elements of the topography, agricultural land, glimpses of built form and vegetation. The existence of varied views, even if mostly contained within the village lanes, across the HCA makes a positive contribution to its significance as it allows observation of its diversity, as well as all the elements that contribute to its special character.

Non-Designated heritage assets

- 6.46 A detailed description of the baseline situation at, and around, the Site is set out in **Appendix 6.1**, Section 4. Provided below is a summary of the baseline assessment with regard to archaeology.
- 6.47 The Oxfordshire Historic Environment Record (OHER) records no previous known archaeological investigation within the Site prior to the Archaeological Geophysical Survey (**Appendix 6.2**) having been undertaken in May 2022. The Survey revealed several possible archaeological features comprising: a rectilinear feature located to the west of the aforementioned main concentration as well as two elongated "U"-shaped features that vaguely resemble either funerary or tentative banjo enclosures; a number of linear trends of uncertain origin; a former field boundary; broad trends of ridge and furrow cultivation

running east-west throughout the Site and possibly also running north–south in the northwest of the Site; and modern ploughing.

- 6.48 The OHER documents a single record within the Site, comprising the projected route of a prehistoric trackway and the later Roman Portway Road crossing adjacent and along the Site’s eastern boundary (MOX4831).
- 6.49 The archaeological evaluation undertaken to inform the Archaeological Evaluation Report (**Appendix 6.3**) involved the excavation of 79 evaluation trenches across the Site. Archaeological remains were found in 13 of the trenches, 3 in Parcel A and 10 in Parcel B.
- 6.50 Findings included a series of enclosures dating to the late Iron Age in Parcel B which corroborate the results of the Archaeological Geophysical Survey (**Appendix 6.2**). A sample of the features in this area were excavated to ascertain their character and dating. Notable finds included a piece of Post-Medieval pot in the east of Parcel A, in addition to pottery, animal bones and cremated human bone in north/west of Parcel B. These finds were dated from the early/mid to late Iron Age. Shards of glass were also found, although these was ascertained to be Modern.
- 6.51 Some of the features (e.g., pits, post-holes, ditches and gullies) were preserved in-situ due to the quantity and quality of the remains, and others (e.g. the majority of the cremated human remains) were not excavated at the request of the OCC Archaeologist.
- 6.52 The results of the investigations indicate that the archaeological remains present within the Site are considered to be of no more than low to medium sensitivity.

Future Baseline

Designated heritage assets

- 6.53 In terms of the HCA, no changes are predicted in consideration of a future baseline scenario where the Site remains as agricultural land.

Non-designated heritage assets

- 6.54 With regards to the archaeological remains within the Site, given the use of the land for arable cultivation, it is conceivable that modern ploughing will further damage underlying remains. However, this effect is, in the short to medium term, unlikely to be more than negligible.

Primary and Tertiary Mitigation

- 6.55 The hierarchical approach towards mitigation (prevent, reduce, offset) has been to avoid, where possible, any effects through the overall design of the Proposed Scheme, the disposition of its elements (prevent), and, subsequently through careful siting of the different elements of the proposals and its required infrastructure (reduce).
- 6.56 Primary mitigation provides a form of preventative mitigation and has been considered as an integral part of the overall design and locational strategy for the Proposed Scheme. It is not an ‘add-on’ measure to ameliorate significant environmental effects, but part of the positive and pro-active approach whereby mitigation has been assessed and considered at all stages of the project to prevent or reduce the occurrence of potentially significant environmental effects.

6.57 Potential adverse effects on cultural receptors have been identified at the design stage and as a consequence, mitigation measures have been considered and incorporated into the submitted landscape strategy designed to eliminate, reduce or offset any adverse effects, as far as possible, in the context of the form of the Proposed Scheme. This was achieved by:

- Designated heritage assets:
 - The restriction of residential building heights up to 2.5 storeys across Parcel A with designed ground level alterations to even out any possible dips and bumps and create a uniform roofscape; this will limit the visibility of any built form from any possibly affected views from the HCA towards the south;
 - Planting of structure/shrubs and specimen trees and the reinforcing of the northern Site boundary with additional planting, in order to strengthen the sense of enclosure and screen and filter views of new built form in the Site from the southern edges of the HCA; and
 - The use of Parcel B as an open green space and wildlife area, which will somewhat maintain the historic character and appearance of this part of the site and, thus, of the only horizon view mentioned by the Hanwell Conservation Area Appraisal that includes the Site.
- Non-designated heritage assets:
 - Design and careful siting of built units avoiding the areas where archaeological remains were found as much as possible in order to limit the effects of construction on archaeological remains.

Assessment of Effects, Secondary Mitigation and Residual Effects

Construction Stage

Change to the setting of Designated Heritage Assets

6.58 The assessment has identified that there is no potential for any impact during the construction stage on the HCA. It is expected that any setting effects during the construction stage will either be short-lived because of the temporary and dispersed nature of the activity, or lower magnitude versions of effects which will be captured and assessed in respect of the operational Proposed Scheme.

6.59 Given that the effects of the Proposed Scheme are at their greatest once operational, the Proposed Scheme during construction is not predicted to result in any significant effects on any built heritage receptors in terms of change to their settings. Effects that may arise during the construction stage are likely or expected to be short term, temporary and more discrete.

6.60 The sensitivity of the HCA is considered to be low to medium. The magnitude of change is considered to be negligible. Therefore, there is likely to be a negligible effect on the HCA.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

6.61 No secondary mitigation or enhancement is required/has been identified.

Residual Effect

6.62 There will be a negligible residual effect on the HCA given that no impacts or effects are identified through the construction stage of the Proposed Scheme.

Significance

6.63 There are no residual effects on the HCA, these are then considered to be **Not Significant**.

Physical impacts on archaeological remains

6.64 The baseline assessments (**Appendices 6.1 – 6.3**) have demonstrated that non-designated below ground heritage assets are present within the Site.

6.65 One area of archaeological interest (in Parcel B), comprising late Iron Age enclosures was recorded during the Archaeological Evaluation Report (**Appendix 6.3**). These enclosures included pottery, animal bones and cremated human bone which have the potential to be disturbed, damaged or destroyed during the construction of the SuDS attenuation pond and associated drainage swales of the Proposed Scheme.

6.66 The sensitivity of the archaeological remains within the Site is considered to be low to medium. The magnitude of change is considered to be large. Therefore, there is likely to be a direct, permanent, long-term, adverse effect which is considered to be Moderate, to Moderate to Major.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

6.67 Targeted areas of archaeological excavation will be undertaken at two discrete areas of archaeological interest identified by the Archaeological Evaluation Report (**Appendix 6.3**) which comprise late Iron Age enclosures. These works will be carried out under WSIs (to be secured by condition) that conform to recognised standards and guidance and which will be prepared in consultation with and approved by the OCC Archaeologist.

6.68 The measures will mitigate the effects of the Proposed Scheme by preserving the remains through record and will be set out in a WSI to be agreed with the OCC Archaeologist and secured through a Condition.

Residual Effect

6.69 The sensitivity of archaeological remains identified within the Site is considered to be low. The magnitude of change, following secondary mitigation, comprising a targeted programme of archaeological investigation and recording implemented pre-construction as a condition of planning permission, is considered to be negligible. Therefore, there is likely to be a direct, permanent, long-term, adverse residual effect on archaeological remains within the site, which is considered to be Negligible.

Significance

6.70 The residual effect on the archaeological remains within the Site is considered to be **Not Significant**.

Operational Stage

Change to the setting of Designated Heritage Assets

6.71 The Proposed Scheme would change the character of Site, from agricultural to residential and hence cause a change to a small part of the setting of the HCA. This change in character of a small part of the setting of the HCA would be somewhat mitigated by the proposed

landscape scheme which includes a comprehensive green infrastructure plan effectively screening and offsetting the Proposed Scheme and retaining open land undeveloped in closest proximity to the HCA. However, it is a change to the rural character of part of the setting of the HCA nonetheless, and as such, is assessed in terms of the NPPF at the level of less than substantial harm (Paragraph 202) at the lowest end of the scale, since the main contributors to the character and appearance of the HCA itself will remain unchanged.

- 6.72 The changes expected to the views of the HCA and arising from the Proposed Scheme are expected to be negligible considering the only part of the Site included within the horizon views (Parcel B) will be left undeveloped as part of the green infrastructure, and hence will remain mostly unchanged. No other mentioned view will change or be blocked as these are focused within the centre/core of Hanwell, and do not include or extend towards the Site. None of these views will be affected, changed, or blocked by the Proposed Scheme considering its location outside of the HCA as well as the presence of built form and vegetation in between it and the Site which prevents any intervisibility (**Appendix 6.1**, Images EDP A1.11 to A1.17).
- 6.73 The sensitivity of the HCA is considered to be medium. The magnitude of change through the operation of the Proposed Scheme is considered to be negligible to minor. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, permanent, long-term, adverse effect which is considered to be Minor.

Secondary Mitigation or Enhancement

- 6.74 No secondary mitigation or enhancement is required/has been identified.

Residual Effect

- 6.75 In the absence of secondary mitigation, the effects remain as that stated above.
- 6.76 The sensitivity of the HCA is considered to be medium. The magnitude of change through the operation of the proposed scheme is considered to be negligible to small. Therefore, there is likely to be an indirect, permanent, long-term, adverse residual effect which is considered to be Minor.

Significance

- 6.77 This effect is considered to be **Not Significant**.

Limitations and Assumptions

- 6.78 To ensure transparency within the EIA process, the following limitations and assumptions have been identified.
- 6.79 Specific assumptions and limitations of the assessment can be found in the supporting **Appendices 6.1 – 6.3**. In summary, there are no assumptions or limitations that will overtly affect the quality or robustness of the assessment.
- 6.80 The analysis of potential buried archaeological remains includes an inherent degree of predictive modelling, as is an industry accepted approach, but is informed by primary data gathered through a geophysical survey and the analysis of available data (i.e., Historic Environment Record, LiDAR, aerial photography and historic cartography, etc.).

Summary

- 6.81 **Table 6.7** provides a summary of the effects, receptors, residual effects and conclusions of significance considered within this Chapter.
- 6.82 The table only provides a summary of the residual effects identified within the assessment and details of all primary, secondary and tertiary mitigation that has been taken into account is set out in detail within the Chapter and summarised within the Environmental Management Plan included within **Volume 3: Environmental Management Plan**.

Table 6.7: Summary of residual and significant effects

Effect	Receptor	Residual effect	Is the effect significant?
Construction Stage			
Change to the setting of designated heritage assets	Hanwell Conservation Area	Negligible	No
Physical impacts on archaeological remains	Non-designated below ground heritage assets within the Site	Negligible	No
Operational Stage			
Change to the setting of designated heritage assets	Hanwell Conservation Area	Minor adverse	No

References

- ¹ Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 Act of UK Parliament
- ² His Majesty's Stationery Office (HMSO) 1979. Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act
- ³ Historic England (HE), 2008. *Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment*
- ⁴ Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG), 2021. The National Planning Policy Framework. London.
- ⁵ Cherwell District Council (CDC). Cherwell Local Plan 1996
- ⁶ Cherwell District Council (CDC). Cherwell Local Plan 2011 – 2031
- ⁷ Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA), 2020. *Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-based Assessment*. Reading.
- ⁸ Historic England (HE), 2017. *Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets* (Second Edition). London.
- ⁹ Historic England (HE), 2015. Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2. London.
- ¹⁰ AOC. 2022. *Land East of Warwick Road, Banbury, Archaeological Geophysical Survey*
- ¹¹ MOLA 2022. *Land East of Warwick Road, Banbury: Written Scheme of investigation for an archaeological evaluation*.
- ¹² Department of Digital, Culture, Media & Sport. 2018. Principles of selection for listed buildings