

6 HERITAGE

6.1 INTRODUCTION

6.1.1 This chapter of the ES assesses the likely significant effects of the development on the environment in respect of Heritage.

6.1.2 This chapter has been prepared by Gail Stoten BA (Hons), who is Executive Director for Heritage for Pegasus Group, a Member of the Institute for Archaeologists and a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries of London.

6.2 ASSESSMENT APPROACH

Methodology

Study Area and Scope

6.2.1 For digital datasets, information was sourced for a 1km study area measured from the boundaries of the Site. With regards to the assessment of setting, reference was also made to a Zone of Theoretical Visibility for the Proposed Development.

Data Collection

6.2.2 The following key sources have been consulted as part of this assessment:

- The National Heritage List for England for information on designated heritage assets;
- The Oxfordshire and Northamptonshire Historic Environment Record (HER) for information on the recorded heritage resource and previous archaeological works;
- Historic mapping for the Site and wider study area;
- The Oxfordshire History Centre online catalogue;
- Aerial photographs and data available via the Northamptonshire National Mapping Programme;
- Portable Antiquities Scheme data;
- The results of a geophysical survey of the Site (Headland Archaeology, July 2022);
- The results of a trial trench evaluation of the Site (Cotswold Archaeology, September 2023); and
- Online resources including Ordnance Survey Open Source data; geological data available from the British Geological Survey and Cranfield University's Soilscales Viewer; Google Earth satellite imagery; and LiDAR data from the Environment Agency.

6.2.3 Historic cartographic sources and aerial photographs were reviewed for the Site, and beyond this where professional judgement deemed necessary. The Site has been surveyed as part of the Northamptonshire National Mapping Programme, with aerial photographs cropmark transcriptions being available online.

6.2.4 Digital terrain model LiDAR data, at 1m resolution, is freely available from the Environment Agency. This was processed using ArcGIS software. Multiple hill-shade and shaded-relief models were created, principally via adjustment of the following variables: azimuth, height, and 'z-factor' or exaggeration. The models created were coloured using pre-defined ramps and classified attribute data. The DTM shaded relief model, with

azimuths graduated by 45° intervals from 0-360°, is provided in Appendix 3 of the Heritage Assessment.

6.2.5 Heritage assets in the wider area were assessed as deemed appropriate.

Site Visit

6.2.6 A Site visit was undertaken by the Executive Director of Heritage at Pegasus Group on 29th November 2021, during which the Site and its surrounds were assessed. Selected heritage assets were assessed from publicly accessible areas.

6.2.7 The visibility on this day was clear. Surrounding vegetation was not fully in leaf at the time of the Site visit and thus a clear indication as to potential intervisibility between the Site and the surrounding areas could be established.

Significance Criteria

6.2.8 Significance in heritage terms and in EIA terms are used in different contexts and have different meaning which could result in a confusion or conflation of Heritage Significance which is the interest of a heritage asset to this and future generations and EIA Significance which is used in terms of significance of the effect a proposed development will have upon an identified receptor. To avoid confusion the term significance in a heritage context will be replaced by the terms 'heritage value' or 'heritage interest' which have the same meaning as heritage significance.

6.2.9 The assessment has been carried out using guidance documentation cited above and below, and professional judgement.

6.2.10 The basis of the setting assessment has been undertaken using the Historic England Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets ('GPA3', 2017) which sets out a 5-step process of the identification of setting and the assessment of its contribution to significance and the potential impacts of a development upon this.

6.2.11 The following tabular methodology is adapted from the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments for Cultural World Heritage Properties (2011). This process is intended to be an aide to assessment. Professional judgement is used where appropriate to ensure a true reflection of the impact is considered on the heritage resource.

6.2.12 The heritage significance of assets has been described using the forms of heritage interest which are described in the NPPF and Historic England's Statements of Significance.

6.2.13 Paragraph 200 of the NPPF recognises that heritage assets with the highest level of significance comprise Scheduled Monuments, Registered Battlefields, Grade I and Grade II* Listed Buildings and Grade I and Grade II* Registered Parks and Gardens.

6.2.14 It is also considered, based on professional judgement, that some Conservation Areas are designated heritage assets of the highest significance, particularly where they contain other designated heritage assets of the highest significance. Footnote 68 of the NPPF recognises that non-designated heritage assets with archaeological interest may be of equivalent significance to a Scheduled Monument, and in such cases, are to be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets.

6.2.15 **Table 6.1** summarises factors for assessing the heritage significance of heritage assets:

Table 6.1: Value of Assets

Heritage Value	Criteria
High	Remains of inscribed international importance, such as World Heritage Sites. Grade I and II* Listed Buildings. Grade I and II* Registered Parks and Gardens. Scheduled Monuments. Registered Battlefields. Some Conservation Areas. Non-designated archaeological assets demonstrably of Schedulable quality.
Medium	Grade II Listed Buildings. Some Conservation Areas. Grade II Registered Parks and Gardens. Sites of moderate archaeological significant as identified through consultation.
Low	Locally Listed buildings identified on a local list. Non-designated buildings, monuments or sites or landscapes of local importance. Locally important historic or archaeological assets, assets with a local value for education or cultural appreciation. Parks and gardens of local interest.
Not significant	Assets identified as being of no historic, artistic, archaeological or architectural interest. Assets whose interests are too compromised by poor preservation or survival to justify inclusion in a higher category.

6.2.16 Once a level of heritage value has been assigned, the magnitude of impact resulting from the Development will be assessed. Potential impacts are defined as a change which affects the heritage value of an asset. These impacts are considered in terms of being direct, indirect or cumulative, and can result from the construction or operation phases, and can be temporary, long-term or permanent.

6.2.17 The magnitude of an impact can be judged on a five-point scale (**Table 6.2**). The impact score is arrived at without reference to the heritage significance of the asset, and the impact is assessed without taking into account any subsequent mitigation proposals. Mitigation embedded into the Development as part of the deign process will be considered within this assessment of impact.

Table 6.2: Magnitude of Impact

Magnitude of Impact	Description of Impact
High	Change such that the heritage value of the asset is totally altered or destroyed. Comprehensive change to setting affecting significance, resulting in changes to the ability to understand and appreciate the resource and its historical context or setting.
Medium	Change such that the significance of the asset is affected. Changes such that the setting is noticeably different, affecting significance resulting in moderate changes to significance and in our ability to understand and appreciate the resource and its historical context or setting.
Low	Change such that the significance of the asset is slightly affected. Changes to the setting that have a slight impact on significance resulting in changes in our ability to understand and appreciate the resource and its historical context or setting.
Negligible	Changes to the asset that hardly affect significance. Changes to the setting of an asset that have little effect on significance and no real change in our ability to understand and appreciate the asset and its historical context or setting.
No change	The development results in no change or such a negligible level of change that it does not affect the significance of the asset. Changes to the setting do not affect the significance of the asset or our appreciation of it.

6.2.18 The assessment of effects will be undertaken in two stages. The magnitude of impact will be cross-referenced with the heritage significance of the asset to categorise the effect that is likely to result from the Development, as shown in **Table 6.3**.

6.2.19 Following this stage, further consideration of mitigation is carried out, and the mitigation is assessed as to whether this would reduce the significance of the effect. Once further mitigation is applied, the asset will be re-assessed, allowing the residual significance of effect to be determined.

Table 6.3: Significance of Effect

Magnitude of Change	Sensitivity of Receptor			
		High	Medium	Low
High		Major	Major	Moderate
Medium		Major	Moderate	Minor to Moderate
Low		Moderate	Minor to Moderate	Minor
Negligible		Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

6.2.20 A significant effect in EIA terms is considered to be major adverse. Moderate adverse effects can be considered significant or not significant in EIA terms. The distinction is made by applying professional judgement to the matrix process, allowing a true reflection of the effect to be considered, rather than a level of effect which has been artificially inflated due to the constraints of the EIA process.

6.2.21 The NPPF does not provide a definition of what constitutes substantial or less than substantial harm. The ES is required to conform to the EIA Regulations and report on the significance of effect. This does not make a judgement on whether substantial or less than substantial harm will be caused. A major adverse effect does not necessarily equate to substantial harm, conversely, a minor adverse effect on an asset may cause a higher level of harm, given the relative sensitivity to change of each heritage asset. Professional judgement has been used to equate the results of the ES process with the requirements of the NPPF.

Scoping Criteria

6.2.22 A Scoping Opinion has not been determined with the Local Planning Authority and the chapter has therefore been written based on professional judgement. Accordingly, the heritage assessment considers the following potential effects:

- Construction Phase – archaeology, specifically ridge and furrow earthworks; and
- Construction Phase – non-designated Huscote Farm.

6.2.23 Grade II listed Seale's Farm and non-designated Overthorpe Hall have also been assessed but it has been concluded that these assets are not sensitive to the Proposed Development at either Construction or Operational Phase.

6.3 LEGISLATIVE AND POLICY FRAMEWORK

Legislative Context

6.3.1 Legislation relating to the Historic Environment is primarily set out within the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which provides statutory protection for Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas.

6.3.2 Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that:

“In considering whether to grant planning permission [or permission in principle] for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State, shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses”.

6.3.3 In the 2014 Court of Appeal judgement in relation to the Barnwell Manor case, Sullivan LJ held that:

“Parliament in enacting section 66(1) did intend that the desirability of preserving the settings of listed buildings should not simply be given careful consideration by the decision-maker for the purpose of deciding whether there would be some harm, but should be given “considerable importance and weight when the decision-maker carries out the balancing exercise.”

6.3.4 A judgement in the Court of Appeal (‘Mordue’) has clarified that, with regards to the setting of Listed Buildings, where the principles of the NPPF are applied (in particular paragraph 134 of the 2012 draft of the NPPF, the requirements of which are now given in paragraph 196 of the revised NPPF, see below), this is in keeping with the requirements of the 1990 Act.

National Planning Policy**National Planning Policy Framework**

6.3.5 The revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (September 2023) sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. The NPPF needs to be read as a whole and is intended to promote the concept of delivering sustainable development.

6.3.6 Paragraph 194 states that in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum, the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary.

6.3.7 Paragraph 195 states that local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and using any necessary expertise. They should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

6.3.8 Paragraph 197 states that, in determining planning applications, local authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets by putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation; and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

6.3.9 Paragraphs 199 and 200 state that 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. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to total loss, substantial harm, or less than substantial harm to its significance. 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. This paragraph also discusses how substantial harm to different assets should be considered.

6.3.10 Paragraph 201 deals with circumstances where a proposed development would lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset.

6.3.11 Paragraph 202 deals with circumstances where a development proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, confirming that this harm should be weighed against public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

6.3.12 Paragraph 203 deals with circumstances where a development proposal would affect the significance of a non-designated heritage asset, requiring a balanced judgement, having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

6.3.13 With regard to decision making, Paragraph 38 confirms that local planning authorities should approach it in a positive and creative way, looking for solutions rather

than problems and seeking to approve applications for sustainable development where possible.

Planning Practice Guidance

6.3.14 The then Department for Communities and Local Government (now the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government (DLUHC) launched the planning practice web-based resource in March 2014. This introduced the national Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) which comprised a full and consolidated review of planning practice guidance documents to be read alongside the NPPF.

6.3.15 The PPG has a section on the subject of the 'Historic Environment' which at paragraph 007 (ID: 18a-007-20190723 revision date 23.07.2019) confirms that consideration of 'significance' in decision taking and states:

"Heritage assets may be affected by direct physical change or by change in their setting. Being able to properly assess the nature, extent and importance of the significance of a heritage asset, and the contribution of its setting, is very important to understanding the potential impact and acceptability of development proposals."

6.3.16 In terms of assessment of substantial harm, paragraph 018 (ID: 18a-017-20190723 revision date 23.07.2019) confirms that whether a proposal causes substantial harm will be a judgement for the individual decision taker having regard to the individual circumstances and the policy set out within the NPPF. It goes on to state:

"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. The harm may arise from works to the asset or from development within its setting."

While the impact of total destruction is obvious, partial destruction is likely to have a considerable impact but, depending on the circumstances, it may still be less than substantial harm or conceivably not harmful at all, for example, when removing later inappropriate additions to historic buildings which harm their significance. Similarly, works that are moderate or minor in scale are likely to cause less than substantial harm or no harm at all. However, even minor works have the potential to cause substantial harm."

Local Planning Policy

6.3.17 The Site is located within Cherwell District Council, therefore planning applications within are currently considered against the policy and guidance set out within the Cherwell Local Plan.

Cherwell Local Plan

6.3.18 The Cherwell Local Plan was adopted in July 2015. It contains Policy ESD 15 'The Character of the Built and Historic Environment' which reads:

“Successful design is founded upon an understanding and respect for an area’s unique built, natural and cultural context. New development will be expected to complement and enhance the character of its context through sensitive siting, layout and high quality design. All new development will be required to meet high design standards. Where development is in the vicinity of any of the District’s distinctive natural or historic assets, delivering high quality design that complements the asset will be essential.

New development proposals should:

...

- Conserve, sustain and enhance designated and non designated ‘heritage assets’ (as defined in the NPPF) including buildings, features, archaeology, conservation areas and their settings, and ensure new development is sensitively sited and integrated in accordance with advice in the NPPF and NPPG. Proposals for development that affect non-designated heritage assets will be considered taking account of the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset as set out in the NPPF and NPPG. Regeneration proposals that make sensitive use of heritage assets, particularly where these bring redundant or under used buildings or areas, especially any on English Heritage’s At Risk Register, into appropriate use will be encouraged.
- Include information on heritage assets sufficient to assess the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. Where archaeological potential is identified this should include an appropriate desk based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

....

The Council will provide more detailed design and historic environment policies in the Local Plan Part 2.

The design of all new development will need to be informed by an analysis of the context, together with an explanation and justification of the principles that have informed the design rationale. This should be demonstrated in the Design and Access Statement that accompanies the planning application. The Council expects all the issues within this policy to be positively addressed through the explanation and justification in the Design & Access Statement. Further guidance can be found on the Council’s website.

The Council will require design to be addressed in the pre-application process on major developments and in connection with all heritage sites. For major sites/strategic sites and complex developments, Design Codes will need to be prepared in conjunction with the Council and local

stakeholders to ensure appropriate character and high quality design is delivered throughout. Design Codes will usually be prepared between outline and reserved matters stage to set out design principles for the development of the site. The level of prescription will vary according to the nature of the site.”

6.4 BASELINE CONDITIONS

Archaeology

6.4.1 The archaeological potential of the Site was initially considered in the Desk-Based Assessment element of the Heritage Desk-Based Assessment given at **Appendix 6.1**.

6.4.2 The archaeological significance of the Site has since been evaluated through a geophysical survey (see **Appendix 6.2**) and trial trench evaluation (see **Appendix 6.3**).

6.4.3 No clear evidence for prehistoric or Roman activity was identified within the Site, with artefactual material of those periods being limited to two sherds of pottery recovered from a later feature and topsoil, respectively.

6.4.4 Investigated features otherwise comprised furrows, field boundary ditches and a probable pond or extraction pit, all of medieval to early modern date.

6.4.5 Collectively, the results of the evaluation suggested that the Site has been in agricultural use since at least the medieval period, and no evidence was encountered for earlier occupation within the Site.

Built Heritage – Within the Site

Huscote Farm

6.4.6 Huscote Farm is located partially within in the central northern part of the Site. It is not identified as a heritage asset by the HER. Historic mapping demonstrates that the farm was extant by the late 19th century and its U-shaped layout is still legible from the surviving buildings. The farm has been abandoned and its buildings are dilapidated. The buildings of the Farm are described in detail in the Heritage Assessment given at **Appendix 6.1**.

6.4.7 Huscote Farm is a farmstead dating from the Victorian period which comprises a former farmhouse and agricultural buildings that have been much altered, are dilapidated, and in varying states of disrepair. The historic layout of the complex is still legible despite modern additions.

6.4.8 The complex derives minimal historic interest from the age and form of its earliest buildings, as well as the intactness of the late 19th-century layout, although it is no longer a working farm. There is a general lack of notable historic fixtures and fittings within the farmhouse and farm buildings.

6.4.9 The complex derives minimal architectural interest from the earliest fabric of the farmhouse and brick ranges. Some quality detailing is in evidence, such as the dentil brickwork of the north range and the prominent brick chimney stacks of the farmhouse; however, the buildings (especially the agricultural ranges) are generally utilitarian in their construction. It is also clear that the earliest buildings have been substantially remodelled, and elements rebuilt or replaced. The dilapidation and disrepair of the complex detracts from its aesthetic value.

6.4.10 The immediate agricultural surrounds make a small contribution to its significance since they form the landholdings that historically served the farmstead and they illustrate its historic rural setting, especially in views on the private trackway approach from the west.

6.4.11 Overall, Huscote Farm is considered to be of **Low Value**.

Built Heritage - Setting

6.4.12 With regards to potential impacts through changes in setting, two assets were considered to be potentially sensitive. These comprised:

- Grade II Listed Seale's Farm (NHLE 1294004); and
- Overthorpe Hall.

Seale's Farm

6.4.13 Seale's Farm comprises a house reported to be of late 17th-century origin and associated farm buildings.

6.4.14 The Grade II listing of the Seale's Farm highlights that it is a heritage asset of less than the highest significance as defined by the NPPF, and a heritage asset of **Medium Value**. Most of the farm buildings appear to be curtilage listed by virtue of their age (they pre-date 1948) and their association with the house historically and at the time of listing.

6.4.15 The heritage significance of the listed house and its curtilage listed structures is principally embodied in their physical fabric.

6.4.16 The asset derives historic interest from its general form, appearance, and layout, being a good example of a farmstead of probable 17th-century origin that has been expanded and adapted. The house is reported to retain early fixtures and fittings which will augment this historic interest by illustrating the historic use of its spaces.

6.4.17 The architectural interest of the listed building is principally embodied in its earliest fabric, including its masonry core and historic fixings such as doors, as well as the fabric of its curtilage listed farm buildings.

6.4.18 The setting of Seale's Farm also contributes to the significance of the asset, although the significance derived from the setting is less than that from its historic fabric. The principal elements of the physical surrounds and experience of the asset (its 'setting') which are considered to contribute to its heritage significance comprise:

- Its garden, which illustrates the historic domestic function of the listed building;
- The associated farm complex, which illustrates the historic farmstead context of the listed building;
- The trackway to the west and north, which forms the main approach to the listed building, although the historic experience has been eroded by the altered alignment of the trackway; and
- The surrounding agricultural land which can be most readily experienced in conjunction with the listed building in views towards and from the asset and which is known to have been in common ownership and use.

6.4.19 The Site is located c. 50m south-west of Seale's Farm at its nearest point.

6.4.20 It is possible that the elements of the Site nearest the farm historically formed part of its landholdings, although this is not confirmed by any known sources. Moreover,

the earliest Ordnance Survey mapping appears to illustrate the north-western part of the Site as forming the landholdings of Huscote Farm. Any historic functional association between the Site and Seale's Farm has been severed.

6.4.21 There is no clear or designed intervisibility between the listed farmhouse and the Site. A dense pocket of woodland at the north-east corner of the Site and the local topography foreshorten views. There are anticipated to be some filtered glimpses of the northern edge of the Site from the trackway approach to Seale's Farm; however, this follows a different alignment than the historic trackway (which was located further to the east and directly north of the farm), therefore it does not reflect the historic experience of the asset.

6.4.22 Ultimately, the Site is not visible in any key views of the asset and does not form part of the immediate agricultural land which can be readily perceived in conjunction with the farm and thereby illustrates its historic agricultural setting.

6.4.23 For these reasons, the Site makes no contribution to the significance of Seale's Farm through setting.

Overthorpe Hall

6.4.24 Overthorpe Hall is not a designated heritage asset, although it is identified on the Northamptonshire HER. At its centre is a neo-Renaissance, or Jacobethan, style country residence of masonry construction. Its main, south-west facade has an irregular arrangement that is characterised by stone mullion and transom windows, bow windows, crenelated parapets, gables and dormers, robust chimney stacks, and simply moulded string courses and hoodmoulds.

6.4.25 Overthorpe Hall is considered to equate to a non-designated heritage asset. It is of **Low Value**. Its significance is principally embodied in its physical fabric and especially the south-west elevation.

6.4.26 The historic interest of the building is derived from those physical elements which give legibility to its historic function as a late Victorian country house, including neo-Renaissance style facades and any historic fixtures, fittings, or internal subdivision. This historic interest has been undermined by conversion of the building from a private residence to a school which has necessitated substantial changes to its form, layout, and character.

6.4.27 The architectural and artistic interest of the building is principally embodied in its designed facades which are characterised by high-quality architectural detailing, including Renaissance balustrades, crenelated parapets, and moulded stringcourses and hoodmoulds. There are reported to be decorative fixtures and fittings internally, including fireplaces and a main staircase, which augment this interest.

6.4.28 The hall has the potential to possess a degree of archaeological interest by virtue of its siting on an earlier residence, or lodge. It is possible that elements of the earlier building were retained and integrated into the late 19th-century hall, therefore there could be concealed fabric or remains that yield information about the earlier origins, form, and appearance of the residence.

6.4.29 The setting of Overthorpe Hall also contributes to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset, although the significance derived from the setting is less than that from its historic fabric. The principal elements of the physical surrounds and experience of the asset (its 'setting') which are considered to contribute to its heritage significance comprise:

- The remnants of its immediate gardens which illustrate its historic function as a private country residence and may predate the late 19th-century remodelling;
- Surviving elements of the ancillary complex to the north-east;
- The driveway to the south-east which forms the designed approach to the building; and
- Remnants of its wider informal grounds and parkland.

6.4.30 The Site is located c. 250m north-west of Overthorpe Hall at its nearest point. There is no known evidence of an association in terms of landownership or functional use, although based on proximity and the possible historic agricultural function of the complex to the north-east of the hall, it is possible that elements of the Site were once in shared ownership.

6.4.31 On the other hand, there is no evidence that the wider grounds or parkland of Overthorpe Hall ever extended into the Site. Historic mapping illustrates that trees belts were planted along the western and northern bounds of the parkland, thereby creating clear separation between the parkland and the agricultural land beyond (the Site).

6.4.32 These tree belts and the topography of the grounds screen intervisibility between the Site and the hall. Moreover, the hall is orientated so that designed views are directed away from the Site.

6.4.33 The Site therefore makes no contribution to the significance of Overthorpe Hall through setting.

6.5 LIKELY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

Construction Phase

Introduction

6.5.1 During the construction phase, the development will be established, resulting in the change of character of the Site, below ground disturbance and, initially, noise and movement associated with the construction activities.

Archaeology

6.5.2 The proposed development would result in the loss of the ridge and furrow earthworks present within the Site. When considered as a whole asset, comprising all such earthworks within the Township, the magnitude of impact is considered to be permanent **Medium Adverse**, with a **Minor to Moderate Significance of Effect**. This is not considered to be significant in EIA terms.

Built Heritage

6.5.3 Huscote Farmhouse will be demolished as part of the proposed development whereas the historic agricultural ranges to the north (which are located outside the Site) will be preserved. The setting of the remaining structures will be altered, through the change in character of associated agricultural land.

6.5.4 This will result in the loss of only one element of the complex. It must be recognised that the complex is unsuitable for modern use as a farmstead (hence its abandonment) and there are viability issues associated with the repair and reuse of the farmhouse, especially given its severe disrepair. The demolition of the farmhouse, which

is derelict and unattractive, will therefore facilitate the retention and adaptation of the agricultural buildings.

6.5.5 Overall, the impact on the complex as a whole is considered to be permanent **Medium Adverse**, taking into account the demolition of the farmhouse and the change in setting, of **Minor to Moderate Significance of Effect**. This is not considered to be significance in EIA terms.

6.5.6 With regards to the other built heritage assets in the vicinity, as set out in the Heritage Assessment given at **Appendix 6.1**, no harm to their heritage significance is anticipated through the construction of the proposed development.

Operational Phase

6.5.7 No impacts to heritage assets are anticipated from the operational phase of the development.

6.6 MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENT

6.6.1 Proposed mitigation measures comprise a topographic earthwork survey for the ridge and furrow earthworks and building recording for Huscote Farm. Such works will provide a record of the assets, and the information gained will reduce the impact, although as such remains cannot be directly replaced, a residual lower impact will remain.

Table 6.4: Mitigation

Ref	Measure to avoid, reduce or manage any adverse effects and/or to deliver beneficial effects	How measure would be secured		
		By Design	By S.106	By Condition
1	Earthwork Survey of ridge and furrow			x
2	Building Recording at Huscote Farm			x

6.7 CUMULATIVE AND IN COMBINATION EFFECTS

6.7.1 No schemes have been identified that, when considered in combination with the Proposed Development, would give rise to likely significant cumulative heritage effects. This includes the planning application for a mixed-use development, including a 240-bed hotel, 4 storey office building, roadside services, coffee shop drive-through and petrol filling station with ancillary retail store, on land immediately west of the Site (LPA ref. 21/02467/F).

6.8 RESIDUAL EFFECTS

6.8.1 Following mitigation of earthwork survey, the residual impact on the ridge and furrow earthworks will be permanent **Low Adverse** magnitude of **Minor Significance of Effect**. This will not be significant in EIA terms.

6.8.2 Following the building recording, the residual effect on Huscote Farm will be permanent **Minor Adverse**, of **Minor Significance of Effect**. This will not be significant in EIA terms.

6.9 SUMMARY

Introduction

6.9.1 An assessment has been made of potential impacts to heritage assets, including archaeological remains and built heritage assets.

Baseline Conditions

6.9.2 Heritage assets considered to be potentially sensitive to development within the Site comprised ridge and furrow earthworks (low value), buildings at Huscote Farm (low value), the Grade II Listed Seale's Farm (medium value) and the non-designated Overthorpe Grange (low value).

Cumulative and In-combination Effects

6.9.3 No cumulative effects have been identified.

Mitigation and Enhancement

6.9.4 Proposed mitigation measures comprise a topographic earthwork survey for the ridge and furrow earthworks and building recording for Huscote Farm. Such works will provide a record of the assets, and the information gained will reduce the impact, although as such remains cannot be directly replaced, a residual lower impact will remain.

Residual Effects

6.9.5 Following mitigation of earthwork survey, the residual impact on the ridge and furrow earthworks will be permanent **Low Adverse** magnitude of **Minor Significance of Effect**. This will not be significant in EIA terms.

6.9.6 Following the building recording, the residual effect on Huscote Farm will be permanent **Low Adverse**, of **Minor Significance of Effect**. This will not be significant.

Conclusion

6.9.7 No residual effects considered significant in EIA terms have been identified.

6.9.8 Table 6.5 contains a summary of the likely effects of the Development.

Table 6.5: Summary of Effects, Mitigation and Residual Effects

Receptor/ Receiving Environment	Description of Effect	Nature of Effect *	Sensitivity Value **	Magnitude of Effect **	Geographical Importance ***	Significance of Effects ****	Mitigation/ Enhancement Measures	Residual Effects ****
Construction								
Ridge and Furrow Earthworks	Partial removal of earthworks	Permanent Direct	Low	Medium	Local	Minor to Moderate Adverse	Topographic recording	Minor
Huscote Farm	Demolition of Farmhouse and changes to setting	Permanent Direct	Low	Medium	Local	Minor to Moderate Adverse	Building Recording	Minor

Notes:

* Enter either: Permanent or Temporary / Direct or Indirect

** Only enter a value where a sensitivity v magnitude effects has been used – otherwise 'Not Applicable'

*** Enter either: International, European, United Kingdom, Regional, County, Borough/District or Local

**** Enter either: Major / Moderate / Minor / Negligible AND state whether Beneficial or Adverse (unless negligible)