OXFORDSHIRE
STRATEGIC RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE

DCO Submission

Environmental Statement

Chapter 10: Heritage – Built and Archaeology (tracked)

Document 6.10
Revision A

On behalf of
Oxfordshire Railfreight Limited

Prepared by RPS Consulting UK & Ireland and Marrons
~~March~~October **2026**

PINS REF:	TR050008
Document Reference	6.10
APFP Regulation	5(2)(a)
Author	RPS Consulting UK & Ireland and Marrons
Date	October 2026
Revision	A

Formatted: Font: 11 pt, Font colour: Auto

CONTENTS

10.1 INTRODUCTION

10.2 ASSESSMENT SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

10.3 POLICY CONTEXT

10.4 BASELINE CONDITIONS

10.5 ASSESSMENT OF LIKELY EFFECTS

10.6 ADDITIONAL MITIGATION AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

10.7 CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

10.8 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

FIGURES

FIGURE 10.1: MAP OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL RECEPTORS
FIGURE 10.2: MAP OF BUILT HERITAGE RECEPTORS

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 10.1: ARCHAEOLOGICAL DESK-BASED ASSESSMENT
APPENDIX 10.2: GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY REPORT
APPENDIX 10.3: ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION
APPENDIX 10.4: BUILT HERITAGE STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE
APPENDIX 10.5: ASSESSMENT OF AIRBORNE REMOTE SENSING DATA AND SATELLITE IMAGERY FOR ARCHAEOLOGY
APPENDIX 10.6: HISTORIC LANDSCAPE ASSESSMENT
APPENDIX 10.7: BUILT HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT
APPENDIX 10.8 – ARCHAEOLOGICAL MITIGATION STRATEGY

APPENDIX 10.9 - NOTE ON THE SETTING AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE TURF MAZE AT TROY FARM

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

10.1 INTRODUCTION

10.1.1 This ES Chapter assesses the likely significant environmental effects of the Proposed Development on the historic environment. In particular, it considers the potential effects of known and potential buried archaeological remains within the Application Site and built heritage assets both within the Application Site and in the wider area.

10.1.2 This ES Chapter describes the methods used to assess the effects, the baseline conditions currently existing within the Application Site and in its surroundings. This ES Chapter also provides an assessment of some of the potential direct and indirect effects of the Proposed Development arising from the construction and the operational phase, and the mitigation measures required to prevent, reduce, or offset the effects to minimise the likely residual effects.

10.1.3 This ES Chapter is supported by the following figures and appendices:

- **Figure 10.1 – Map of Archaeological Receptors**
- **Figure 10.2 – Map of Built Heritage Receptors**
- **Appendix 10.1 – Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment**
- **Appendix 10.2 – Geophysical Survey Report**
- **Appendix 10.3 – Archaeological Evaluation**
- **Appendix 10.4 – Built Heritage Statement of Significance**
- **Appendix 10.5 – Assessment of Airborne Remote Sensing Data and Satellite Imagery for Archaeology**
- **Appendix 10.6 – Historic Landscape Assessment**
- **Appendix 10.7 – Built Heritage Impact Assessment**
- **Appendix 10.8 – Archaeological Mitigation Strategy**
- **Appendix 10.9 - Note on the Setting and Significance of the Turf Maze at Troy Farm**

Formatted: Font: Bold

Competency Statement

10.1.4 It has been written by [redacted] BA (Hons) MCIfA FSA AssocIHBC of RPS Consulting and [redacted] BA (Hons) PGDip MA IHBC of Marrons. [redacted] is Senior Director for RPS Consulting. [redacted] has a degree in Archaeology from the University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne (BA Hons), is a Member of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (MCIfA), a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries (FSA) and an Associate Member of the Institute for Historic Building Conservation (IHBC). [redacted] has over 20 years'

experience working in the archaeology sector including fieldwork (geophysics, trial trenching, excavation), research, graphics, and consultancy. As a consultant [redacted] has provided archaeology and heritage advice and project management to clients for a variety of developments including residential, infrastructure, commercial and renewable energy.

10.1.5 [redacted] BA(Hons) PGDip MA IHBC has over thirteen years' experience working in both local authority and private consultancy as a historic buildings specialist. In [redacted] current role as Heritage Partner at Marrons having previously worked at RPS, [redacted] has worked across numerous commercial, residential and infrastructure schemes throughout the UK advising on impacts on built heritage assets and their settings.

10.2 ASSESSMENT SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

10.2.1 Consultation has been undertaken with the Oxfordshire County Council Archaeology team since late 2020 and is ongoing. Several site visits were undertaken with the Lead Archaeologist of Oxfordshire County Council to monitor the ongoing archaeological fieldwork (August 2022 - October 2022). The scope and methodology of the assessment has been informed by consultation responses received from Oxfordshire County Council, Historic England, Cherwell District Council and the Planning Inspectorate Scoping Opinion (July 2021 – Document 6.32).

Table 10.1A: Response to PINS Scoping Opinion

Consultee	PINS Comments	Applicant Response
4.8.2	Study area established should take account of the potential for effects within and outside the redline boundary and co-ordinate with the baseline produced for other disciplines.	The assessment uses a study area of 2km from the boundaries of Application Site. This study area was also supported by the site visit and review of ES Chapter 7 (the Landscape and Visual). The boundary is consistent with that used for ES Chapter 7. Due to the nature of lighting effects, the study area for lighting extends further than the heritage and, landscape and visual study area. Please refer to ES Chapter 8 (Lighting) for further details on the lighting study area.
4.8.3	The Inspectorate considers that given the nature of the application site and its surroundings and the limited information available at this stage about the Proposed Development, an assessment	The Historic Landscape Assessment is included as ES Appendix 10.6.

	of effects on historic landscape character should also be scoped into the assessment where significant effects are likely to occur.	
4.8.4	ES should describe the good practice used to define significance	Included within the methodology section (Section 10.2) of this ES Chapter.
4.8.5	The Inspectorate considers that impacts from changes to surface or groundwater flows on heritage assets as a result of the Proposed Development should also be scoped into the assessment where significant effects are likely to occur.	Included in Section 10.5 of this ES Chapter which states the following in paragraph 10.5.8: *"No waterlogged archaeological receptors or finds or features that would rely on special surface/groundwater conditions were identified during the trial trench evaluation within the Application Site."*
4.8.6	The Scoping Report sets out a table showing the different levels of magnitude that will be applied to determine whether effects are significant or not significant. The Inspectorate considers that the ES should provide a similar table for definitions of sensitivity, to enable a clear understanding of the criteria used to determine significance of effect.	Please refer to Table 10.3 in this ES Chapter.

10.2.2 There has also been a period of consultation with Historic England and the Conservation Officer at Cherwell District Council regarding the treatment of the heritage assets at Ashgrove Farm (within the Application Site), setting impacts on those heritage assets located within the study area identified as being sensitive to the Proposed Development, and potential mitigation measures (April 2022 – October 2022). Ongoing consultation with Cherwell District Council recommenced in April 2025 with an initial meeting with the Conservation Officer to confirm their previously agreed position. Further discussions will be sought. Historic England were also contacted in September 2025 in relation to the forthcoming Stage 2 Consultation and to reiterate the position previously agreed in relation to the mitigation discussed.

10.2.3 The principal focus of discussions with Historic England has been the potential impacts on the Upper Heyford Conservation Area. Their Stage 1 consultation response raised concerns about how the Proposed Development would be experienced in conjunction with the Conservation Area and its proximity. In particular, the view along the runway was raised and the extent to which structures would be visible. As part of subsequent engagement, the treatment of this area has been refined to ensure a more open view is retained at the end of the runway through the approach to the bunding, planting and parameters for the built development.

10.2.4 The Stage 1 Consultation response from Cherwell District Council included a consideration of conservation issues which focused on the Upper Heyford Conservation Area. These have been addressed as part of subsequent joint conversations with the Conservation Officer and Historic England as set out above. Additionally, engagement with the Conservation Officer also included a consideration of the approach to the treatment of Ashgrove Farm including the reuse and restoration of the Barn (Grade II Listed Building) and the wider associated farm complex (non-designated heritage asset). Comments relating to the Stage 2 Consultation are included in Table 10.1B.

Table 10.1B: Consultation and Engagement

Consultee	Date/Time	Comments	Response and Actions
OCC Archaeologist	30th November 2020	Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for Desk-Based Assessment (DBA)sent to County Archaeologist	WSI approved in response dated 1st December 2020 11:56
OCC Archaeologist	8th April 2021	WSI for geophysical survey sent to County Archaeologist	County Archaeologist required amendments
OCC Archaeologist	8th April 2021	County Archaeologist approves updated WSI	
OCC Archaeologist	2nd September 2021	WSI for trial trenching sent to County Archaeologist	
OCC Archaeologist	14th September 2021	Ecological constraints plan sent to County Archaeologist	Acknowledged
Historic England and Cherwell District Council	7th April 2022	Site visit with RPS, Historic England and Cherwell District Council representatives	Potential impacts and mitigation measures noted.
OCC Archaeologist	August 2022 – October 2022	Meetings on site, and via phone call/Teams with RPS representatives to monitor the archaeological trial trenching.	On site monitoring meetings are continuing throughout fieldwork
Historic England	15th September 2022	Meeting to discuss amendments to the proposal to reduce impact on RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area to address their consultation response	Various options prepared and circulated for discussion.
Cherwell District Council	16th September 2022	Meeting to discuss amendments to the proposal to reduce impact on RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area to address their consultation response	Various options prepared and circulated for discussion.
Historic England & Cherwell District Council	27th October 2022	Follow-up meeting to discuss preferred option for landscaping proposals to reduce impact on RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area	Preferred option confirmed.

OCC Archaeologist	3rd March 2025	Email to [redacted] (OCC) to re-open communications between RPS and OCC Archaeology.	[redacted] (OCC) responded to RPS on 5th March confirming she would be advising on this project.
OCC Archaeologist	28th March 2025	Plans showing proposed areas for archaeological mitigation sent to County Archaeologist for comment/approval.	Acknowledged by County Archaeologist and requested copy of detailed plans for the development.
Cherwell District Council	June-July 2025	Email to initiate further consultation to confirm previously agreed position regarding Ashgrove Farm and RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area	Meeting with Conservation Officer confirming current proposals for landscaping in respect of RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area and treatment of Ashgrove Farm were as agreed at the conclusion of earlier discussions.
OCC Archaeologist	28th April 2025	Copy of Illustrative Masterplan sent to County Archaeologist for comment in relation to an archaeological mitigation strategy.	County Archaeologist responded with recommended areas for mitigation.
OCC Archaeologist	31st July 2025	Copy of archaeological mitigation strategy sent to County Archaeologist for approval.	
Historic England	September 2025	Email to advise of forthcoming Stage 2 consultation and to summarise previous position regarding RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area	
Oxfordshire Architectural & Historical Society	1st December 2025	Stage 2 Consultation comments Comments focus on the Grade II listed Barn at Ashgrove Farm within the Site. They consider that the setting of the Grade II Barn would be dominated by the warehouses in a number of directions leading to a complete loss of its rural setting. Note the Barn is in need of remedial works. Elements of the Barn that should be retained are described and concerns about addition of twelve rooflights raised. Highlight importance of existing adjoining stables and workshops in illustrating historic changes in agricultural practices. Identifies other Listed Buildings within the adjacent area but consider	Loss of rural setting of Grade II listed Barn acknowledged with identified level of harm to this asset reflecting the impact of built development within its wider agricultural setting. It is also recognised that the contribution from the retained Ashgrove Farm complex to the significance of the Barn will be maintained which reduces the overall level of impact as it will remain legible as part of a farmstead. The proposed restoration of the Barn has been based on a full condition and structural survey with existing materials reused where viable. Other associated structures of historic and architectural

		landscaping schemes will provide effective mitigation.	interest will also be retained and sensitively converted.
Historic England	3rd November 2025	Stage 2 Consultation comments. Reiterates previous consultation comments regarding sensitivities associated with RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area. Advises some harm to the Conservation Area but agree that harm would be '*lower part of less than substantial'* subject to bund height and tree planting at eastern end of the runway. Requested landscape approach to treatment of eastern end of runway made clear in the DCO submission.	Acknowledged and agreed on level of harm to RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area. The height of strategic mounding at eastern end of the former RAF Upper Heyford runway has been reduced to a 'half-height' to help preserve the historical context of the former runway, with less treatment proposed in this location. Further details about the height of the mounding are shown on the Parameters Plan (Document 2.5) and in ES Chapter 7 (LVIA) within the DCO submission.
Cherwell Conservation Officer	7th November 2025	Joint response of Cherwell District Council and Oxfordshire County Council to the Stage 2 Consultation. Advises significance of Ashgrove Farm heritage assets lies in the fabric and character of the 18th century barn and buildings which contribute to its setting. Considers that landscape surrounding RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area contributes to the character and setting of the Conservation Area. Concludes that they 'are content if no objections are raised by Historic England' in respect of design approach to mitigate impacts on RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area. Notes the approach consistent with earlier consultation discussions. No objection to proposed treatment of the Grade II listed Barn at Ashgrove Farm and welcomes retention of Ashgrove Cottages (non-designated heritage asset). Principle	Acknowledged – Historic England's Stage 2 Consultation response confirms they would agree lower end of less than substantial harm to RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area. Details regarding the development of the Grade II listed Threshing Barn will be considered and granted through the DCO application which includes plans and technical work proportionate to the significance of the Listed Building and scope of the proposals (see Document series 2.14) .Details for the rest of the Central Hub area would be approved at the detailed stage of design through DCO requirements.

		of works to Ashgrove Farm area acceptable in principle.	
OCC Archaeologist	7th November 2025	Joint response of Cherwell District Council and Oxfordshire County Council Stage 2 Consultation. Confirmed archaeological potential of site has been adequately examined to inform the DCO. Archaeological Mitigation Strategy not yet approved, but does address the majority of County Archaeologist's concerns highlighted in previous iterations of the document.	RPS Tetratech have updated the following within the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy: • Figure 13 – zoom out to show trench locations in wider site context • More information on public outreach
OCC Archaeologist	February 2026	County Archaeologist required changes to the Mitigation Strategy methodology, public benefits strategy and to Fig. 13.	Changes actioned and version 5 of the Mitigation Strategy sent to County Archaeologist.
OCC Archaeologist	May 2026	County Archaeologist required that the contractor method statement that will complement the Mitigation Strategy will need to include a list of specialists. Clarification required on sampling percentages in excavation area. Also required confirmation that the archaeologically stripped areas will be subject to metal detecting.	Changes actioned and version 6 of the Mitigation Strategy sent to County Archaeologist on 10th July 2026.
OCC Archaeologist	13th July 2026	County Archaeologist accepts Mitigation Strategy.	

10.2.5 Assessment of likely significant environmental effects on cultural heritage resources within the Application Site has been conducted in line with the latest and most comprehensive guidance provided in the following documents:

- "Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in the UK" prepared by IEMA (now ISEP), IHBC and CIfA;
- "Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) published by the Highways Agency in 2007 (updated 2020);
- Chartered Institute for Archaeologists Standard and Guidance for historic desk-based assessment (updated October 2020).

10.2.6 These documents do not provide a prescriptive approach to assessment but identify principles and good practice that have been applied in the

methodology for this assessment. This ES Chapter refers to the same elements of the Proposed Development as those described and defined in ES Chapter 2 (Proposed Development and Alternatives). The assessment scope and methodology have also been informed by consultation responses from the Local Planning Authority, OCC, Historic England and the Planning Inspectorate.

Study Area

10.2.6 The Application Site is described and defined in ES Chapter 2 (Description of Development and Alternatives).

10.2.7 This assessment uses a study area of 2km from the boundaries of the Application Site to identify heritage assets that may be sensitive to the Proposed Development (**Figure 10.2**). This study area was also supported by the site visit and review of the Landscape and Visual Chapter of the ES (Chapter 7).

Survey and Data Sources

10.2.8 The Main Site has been subject to a series of archaeological investigations comprising a desk-based assessment in February 2021 (RPS Consulting), a geophysical survey in 2021 (Sumo Services Ltd) and evaluation trenching, also in 2021 (Archaeology Warwickshire), details of which can be found at **Appendix 10.1**, **10.2** and **10.3** respectively. An assessment of airborne remote sensing data and satellite imagery has also been undertaken (Air Photo Services 2021, **Appendix 10.5**). It should be noted that since the desk-based assessment (**Appendix 10.1**) was undertaken the Proposed Development, including the Application Site boundaries, have evolved. Furthermore, subsequent geophysical survey work (**Appendix 10.2**) and trial trenching work (**Appendix 10.3**) provide a more detailed understanding of the Application Site's heritage and archaeological potential.

10.2.9 Archaeological geophysical surveys and trial trenching has also been undertaken within the proposed J10 Highways Improvements and proposed Middleton Stoney Relief Road.

10.2.10 A Built Heritage Assessment of Significance (**Appendix 10.4**) has also been prepared to identify built heritage assets sensitive to the Proposed Development and provide an assessment of their significance. A Built Heritage Impact Assessment (**Appendix 10.7**) has been prepared to confirm the baseline set out in the Built Heritage Assessment of Significance and identify

potential impacts based on the current masterplan. The Built Heritage Impact Assessment is also cross-referenced with the assessment and associated technical appendices (including the visualisations) of ES Chapter 7 (Landscape & Visual Impacts) and refers to the proposed bunding strategy adjacent to RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area. The acceptability of this approach was confirmed with Historic England and Cherwell District Council as part of the consultation which took place in 2022 and subsequently re-agreed with Cherwell District Council in July 2025. This approach was also confirmed within the OCC/CDC Stage 2 (statutory) consultation response.

10.2.11 The Environment Agency LiDAR data was accessed in order to assist in identifying any unknown archaeological features within the Application Site and to help confirm the presence of those already recorded. Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) is an airborne mapping technique which employs a laser to measure the distance between an aircraft and the ground. Up to 100,000 measurements per second are recorded, which allows for a highly detailed terrain model to be made of the ground at special resolutions of between 0.25m and 2m.

Significance Criteria

10.2.12 The determination of magnitude of effect is based on the level of effect that the development may have on cultural heritage resources, together with the current state of survival/condition of the receptor, taking into account the nature of past development or management effects. These effects could include temporary or permanent land take or excavation, ground disturbance and compaction.

10.2.13 The assessment in this ES Chapter is qualitative and the evaluation of significance is ultimately a matter of professional judgement. The baseline assessments have been prepared in accordance with current national guidance and policy, and follows the staged assessment set out in Historic England's Good Practice Advice 2 and 3 (GPA2 and GPA3)[1].

10.2.14 Development effects can be characterised as to whether they would be:

- Direct or Indirect;

[1] Historic England (2015) Good Practice Advice Note 2: *Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment*, and Historic England (2017) Good Practice Advice Note 3: *The Setting of Heritage Assets*

- Beneficial or Adverse;
- Short (0-5 years), Medium (6-14 years) or Long Term (15 years plus);
- Reversible or Irreversible; and/or
- Cumulative.

10.2.15 The magnitude of ~~effect~~impact is assessed by taking into consideration the extent/proportion of the site/feature affected, its type, its survival/condition, its fragility/vulnerability and its potential amenity value. In considering the above factors the criteria for assessing magnitude of predicted change on cultural heritage resources are given in Table 10.2 below. Both physical and setting effects are included as harm to significance can result through loss to or development within the setting of a heritage asset.

Table 10.2: Criteria for Appraisal of Magnitude of ~~Effect~~Impact on Heritage Receptors

Magnitude	Definition
High	• Total or substantial loss of the significance of a heritage asset. • Substantial harm to a heritage asset's setting, such that the significance of the asset would be totally lost or substantially reduced (e.g., the significance of a designated asset would be reduced to such a degree that its designation would be questionable; the significance of an undesignated asset would be reduced to such a degree that its categorization as a heritage asset would be questionable).
Moderate	• Partial loss or alteration of the significance of a heritage asset. • Harm to a heritage asset's setting, such that the asset's significance would be materially affected/considerably devalued, but not totally or substantially lost.
Low	• Slight loss of significance of a heritage asset. This could include the removal of fabric that forms part of the heritage asset, but that is not integral to its significance (e.g., the demolition of later extensions/additions of little intrinsic value). • Some harm to the heritage asset's setting, but not to the degree that it would materially compromise the significance of the heritage asset. • Perceivable level of harm, but insubstantial relative to the overall interest of the heritage asset.
Negligible	• A very slight change to a heritage asset. This could include a change to a part of a heritage asset that does not materially contribute to its significance. • Very minor change to a heritage asset's setting such that there is a slight impact not materially affecting the heritage asset's significance.
No Impact	• No change to a heritage asset or its setting.

10.2.16 The sensitivity of a heritage asset depends on factors such as the condition of the asset and its perceived heritage value/importance. The sensitivity of the

heritage asset is also defined by its importance in terms of national, regional or local statutory or non-statutory protection and designations.

10.2.17 The non-statutory criteria used by the Secretary of State for Scheduling Ancient Monuments provide relevant criteria to assist this process, as does the advice contained in Historic England's Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide and the NPPF. Table 10.3 sets out the criteria for assessing sensitivity.

Table 10.3: Criteria for Assessing Sensitivity of Heritage Receptors

Sensitivity	Definition
High	• World Heritage Sites • Scheduled Monuments and archaeological sites of demonstrable schedulable quality and importance • Protected Wreck Sites • Registered Battlefields • Grade I and Grade II* Listed Buildings • Grade I and Grade II* Registered Parks and Gardens
Moderate	• Local Authority designated sites and their settings • Undesignated sites of demonstrable regional importance • Grade II Listed Buildings • Grade II Registered Parks and Gardens • Registered Historic Landscapes • Conservation Areas
Low	• Sites with specific and substantial importance to local interest groups • Sites whose importance is limited by poor preservation and poor survival of contextual associations • Locally Listed Buildings and buildings of some quality in fabric or historic association (i.e., non-designated heritage assets)
No Importance	• Sites with no surviving archaeological or historical component
Unknown	• Importance cannot be ascertained

10.2.18 The sensitivity of the receiving environment, together with the magnitude of effect, defines the significance of the effect on the cultural heritage receptor. The significance of effect has been established with reference to the matrix set out in Table 10.4. The environmental effect outlined below represents the effect on the significance of the heritage assets without mitigation. A significance of effect of 'major' or 'moderate' would be considered to equate to significant impacts highlighted in the context of EIA Regulations.

10.2.19 This process is not quantitative, but relies upon professional judgement at each step, However the factors considered in informing these judgements and in arriving at the various rankings and magnitudes of effect are observable facts (i.e., numbers of assets, special relationships, designations, impacts). This matrix approach is not intended to mechanise judgement on the significance of effect, but to act as a check to ensure that judgements regarding sensitivity, magnitude of impact and significance of effect are reasonable and balanced.

10.2.20 Designated heritage assets such as scheduled monuments and listed buildings are all of high or ~~medium~~moderate sensitivity and so even low levels of predicted magnitude of change to these features can be significant. Assessment of the effect of development on the setting of heritage assets follows the guidance issued by Historic England.

Table 10.4: Criteria for Assessing Significance of Effect

Sensitivity Resource	~~Significance~~Magnitude of ~~Effect~~Impact				
	High	**Moderate**	**Low**	**Negligible**	**None**
High	Major Adverse	Moderate Adverse	Minor Adverse	Negligible	No Impact
~~Medium~~Moderat	Moderate Adverse	Moderate to Minor Adverse	Minor Adverse to Negligible	Negligible	No Impact
Low	Minor Adverse	Minor Adverse to Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	No Impact
No Importance	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	No Impact

10.2.13 The assessment of heritage impacts as set out in planning policy ~~utilises a scale of harm. In relation to designated assets, this scale is~~ can be defined ~~in the NPPF by three categories;~~as positive effects, no effect, harm or total loss. Where there is harm, ~~less than substantial and substantial~~[2], the effect on the asset should be weighed against any public benefits resulting from the proposal[3]. The NPPF also sets out that any harm to non-designated heritage assets ~~requires the decision maker to adopt~~ should be weighed against the benefits of the proposal and a balanced judgement made, having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the asset's significance ~~of the asset~~[4].

~~[2] NPPF (2024), paragraph 212~~
[3] NPPF (2026), Policy HE6
[4] NPPF (~~2024), paragraph 216~~2026), Policy HE7

10.2.14 The National Networks National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPS) sets out the following in terms of harm to heritage assets:

- *"Any harmful impact on the significance of a designated heritage asset should be weighed against the public benefit of development, recognising that the greater the harm to the significance of the heritage asset, the greater the justification that will be needed for any loss."* (paragraph 5.220).
- *"Where the proposed development will lead to substantial harm to, or total loss of, significance of a designated heritage asset, the Secretary of State should refuse consent unless it can be demonstrated that it is necessary to deliver substantial public benefits that outweigh that loss or harm." (paragraph 5.221)*
- *"Where the proposed development 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 securing its optimum viable use." (paragraph 5.222)*

10.2.15 In regards to non-designated assets, those of *"archaeological interest that are demonstrably of equivalent significance to Scheduled Monuments, should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets"* (paragraph 5.208), whereas other non-designated should be considered *"on the basis of clear evidence that the assets have a significance that merit consideration in that process"* (paragraph 5.209).

10.2.16 The detailed assessment of the impacts arising from the Proposed Development undertaken in the Appendices refers to the above tests.

10.2.17 The methodology for this Chapter utilises accepted ES terminology to define impacts to each receptor to allow for consistency in the understanding of environmental effects arising from the Proposed Development. These categories are compatible with the levels of harm and assessment methodology set out in planning policy that underpins decision-making in respect of the historic environment. Substantial harm is understood to be a high test and may not arise in many cases[5], with less than substantial harm a broader spectrum. As such, effects that are significant in EIA terms could still be considered to be less than substantial with regard to the NPS and NPPF.

Limitations and Assumptions

[5] Planning Policy Guidance Paragraph: 018 Reference ID: 18a-018-20190723

10.2.21 Archaeological evaluation of some areas of the Main Site ~~could not be carried out~~had a reduced trial trenching sample due to the presence of ecological constraints relating to Great Crested Newts. The County Archaeologist was kept aware of the constraints throughout the process and a suitable methodology was agreed in order to proceed. The findings of the evaluation remain sound.

10.2.22 In undertaking the built heritage assessment, there are a number of assumptions and limitations to be aware of:

- The site visit was limited to the area of the Application Site, the Upper Heyford Airfield, public rights of way and other public areas; and
- The visualisations referred to ES Chapter 7 (LVIA) are representative static views; they do not reflect the kinetic experience of the Proposed Development within the surrounding area.

10.3 POLICY CONTEXT

10.3.1 In determining the respective effects on heritage receptors from the Proposed Development, relevant policy, standards and guidance in respect of both archaeology and built heritage have been applied; the relevant policies and documents are summarised below. These set out a framework for assessment which is proportionate to their respective significance and ensures a comprehensive and clear approach is followed from the identification of sensitive receptors to establishing the nature of any impact and informing appropriate mitigation measures. This allows for the relevant tests set out in national policy and statutory legislation in respect of heritage assets to determine the Proposed Development to be robustly and accurately informed.

10.3.2 The detailed archaeological and built heritage assessments undertaken in accordance with the relevant policy, standards and guidance which underpin this Chapter are included in the supporting Appendices.

National Planning Policy

The National Networks National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPS)

10.3.3 The NPS sets out the need for, and Government's policies to deliver, development of nationally significant infrastructure projects (NSIPs) on the national road and rail networks in England. It provides planning guidance for

promoters of NSIPs on the road and rail networks, and the basis for the examination by the Examining Authority and decisions by the Secretary of State.

10.3.4 Paragraphs 5.204 – 5.226 of the NPS relate to the Historic Environment. Paragraph 5.210 relates to the Applicant's assessment of the Proposed Development and states:

> *"The applicant should undertake an assessment of any significant heritage impacts of the proposed project and should describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the asset's importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance."*

10.3.5 Paragraph 5.213 outlines the approach to mitigation and states:

> *"Where the loss of the whole or part of a heritage asset's significance is justified, the Secretary of State should require the applicant to record and advance understanding of the significance of the heritage asset before it is lost (wholly or in part). The extent of the requirement should be proportionate to the importance and the impact."*

10.3.6 In terms of decision making, paragraph 5.217 states:

> *"In considering the impact of a proposed development on any heritage assets, the Secretary of State should take into account the particular nature of the significance of the heritage asset, and the value that they hold for this and future generations. This understanding should be used to avoid or minimise conflict between their conservation and any aspect of the proposal."*

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (~~2024~~2026)

10.3.7 Section ~~16~~20: Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment of the NPPF is relevant to the Proposed Development. It provides guidance for planning authorities and others on the consideration of the historic environment in the planning system.

Local Planning Policy

10.3.8 The following local planning policies are relevant to the Proposed Development:

- Policy ESD15: The Character of the built and historic environment (Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031, adopted July 2015);
- Policy C18 Development proposals affecting a Listed Building, Policy C21: Proposals for re-use of a listed building, Policy C23 Retention of features contribution to a character or appearance of a Conservation Area & Policy C25: Development affecting the site or setting of a Scheduled Ancient Monument (Saved Policies in Local Plan 1996, adopted November 1996); and
- Policy PD4: Protection of important views and vistas, Policy PD4: Building and Site Design & Policy PD6: Control of Light Pollution (Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan, made May 2019).

Other Relevant Policy, Standards and Guidance

10.3.9 The following national and local policy and guidance is relevant to the Proposed Development:

- Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment (Historic England, 2015);
- Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets (2nd Edition) (Historic England, 2017);
- Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment (CIfA, 2017, updated 2020);
- Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB, updated 2020)

10.4 BASELINE CONDITIONS

10.4.1 This ES Chapter is supported by the findings of an archaeological desk-based assessment, the results of a geophysical survey, archaeological trench evaluation and a Built Heritage Statement. The archaeological desk-based assessment informed the scope of the surveys for the geophysical survey and trial trench evaluation undertaken to date.

10.4.2 A number of heritage receptors are known within the Application Site and the surrounding study area. Those which could be affected by the Proposed Development are discussed below. A plan showing the location of the archaeological resources in relation to the Application Site is provided in **Figure 10.1** and the built heritage receptors are shown in **Figure 10.2**.

Table 10.5: Criteria for Assessing Significance of Effect

Receptor ID	Description	Sensitivity	In or Out the Application Site
SM1	Scheduled Cold War Structures	High	Out
SM2	Ardley Wood Moated Ringwork	High	Out
SM3	Turf Maze at Troy Farm	High	Out
AR1	Iron Age, Roman and Undated linear features and former field boundaries	Low	In
AR2	Iron Age and Roman ditches	Low	In
AR3	Iron Age and Roman ditches. Roman stone structure	Medium	In
AR4	Post Medieval agricultural structure	Low	In
AR5	Roman enclosures	Low	In
AR6	Iron Age banjo enclosure	Medium	In
AR7	Iron Age enclosure and cremations	Low	In
AR8	Iron Age ditches and Roman settlement including Roman structure	Medium	In
AR9	Early Medieval pit, possible Sunken Featured Building	Medium	In
AR10	Iron Age banjo enclosures	Medium	In
AR11	Iron Age possible banjo enclosure	Medium	In
AR12	Iron Age ditches	Low	In
AR13	Roman cremations and inhumation	Low	In
AR14	Possible Iron Age banjo enclosure	Medium	In
BHR1	Barn approximately 30m north of Ashgrove Farmhouse (Grade II Listed Building)	Medium	In
BHR2	Ashgrove Farm (non-designated heritage asset)	Low	In
BHR3	Trow Pool Water Tower (Grade II Listed Building)	Medium	Out
BHR4	Troy Farmhouse (Grade II Listed Building)	Medium	Out
BHR5	Lodge Farmhouse (Grade II Listed Building)	Medium	Out
BHR6	Middleton Park (Grade II Registered Park and Garden)	Medium	Out
BHR7	Ardley Conservation Area	Medium	Out the Main Site (partially in Application Site due to foul sewer connection)
BHR8	RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area	Medium	Out

10.4.3 There are no designated archaeological assets, such as Scheduled Monuments or Registered Battlefields, located within the Application Site. Scheduled Monuments located in the study area comprise (see Fig 10.1):

- Ardley Wood Moated Ringwork (NHLE 1015554, **SM2**), 400m north-east of the Main Site;
- Cold War Structures at the former Upper Heyford Airbase (NHLE 1021399, **SM1**), 500m west of the Main Site; ~~and~~
- Turf Maze at Troy Farm (NHLE 1468043, **SM3**), 800m west of the Mai Site; and
- Middleton Stoney Castle (NHLE 1015164), 1km south-west of the Main Site.

10.4.4 The significance and settings of the Scheduled Monuments has been discussed in the archaeological desk-based assessment (**Appendix 10.1**) and will not be repeated here. The significance and setting of the Turf Maze at Troy Farm (**SM3**) has been assessed in a separate note (**Appendix 10.9**). The assessment determined that the Proposed Development would have no impact on the setting or significance of this Scheduled Monument. This is as a result of there being no intervisibility or contextual relationship between the two. Therefore, this asset will not be considered further in this ES Chapter.

10.4.5 With regards to Middleton Stoney Castle and the Ardley Wood Moated Ringwork (**SM2**), the desk-based assessment determined that the Proposed Development would have no impact on the setting or significance of these Scheduled Monuments. This is due to the distance between the Application Site and the assets, the lack of intervisibility between them caused by topography and dense vegetation/modern development, and the lack of any known contextual relationship. Consequently, these two assets will not be considered further in this ES Chapter.

10.4.6 The Cold War Structures at Upper Heyford Airbase (**SM1**) includes five areas: the Quick Reaction Alert areas in the north-western part of the airbase, including aircraft shelters, security fencing, watchtower, fuel supply point and hardened crew building; the Northern Bomb Stores and Special Weapons Area in the north-eastern part of the airbase; the Avionics Maintenance Facility, close to the western edge of the airbase; the Hardened Telephone Exchange; and the Battle Command Centre in the southern part of the airbase. The only area of **SM1** with potential to be impacted (to its setting only) by the Proposed Development is the Northern Bomb Store. As a Scheduled Monument this receptor is of national significance and high sensitivity.

10.4.7 A Historic Landscape Assessment (**Appendix 10.6**) has been undertaken to inform this ES Chapter. This assessment concluded that though the Proposed Development would mean the loss of much of the landscape pattern within the

Formatted: English (United States)

Application Site, however as the historic landscape is not unique, the impact would not result in a significant loss.

10.4.8 The archaeological fieldwork has identified fourteen archaeological receptors within the Application Site (see Table 10.5 Receptors above). None of the archaeological receptors evaluated within the Application Site are of sufficient preservation or rarity to be considered of high sensitivity.

Archaeological Receptors on the Main Site

10.4.9 Archaeological Receptor **AR1** (see **Figure. 10.1**) comprises a series of Iron Age and Roman linear ditches, some of which have been shown to be former field boundaries. Other, undated linear features were identified in the trial trenching. This area was almost entirely devoid of finds, these restricted to small very small pottery fragments and an iron object. **AR1** is therefore considered to be a Low sensitivity receptor of local interest.

10.4.10 **AR2** comprises a complex of Iron Age and Roman ditches representing a number of different phases of activity. Iron Age and Roman activity is well represented in the local landscape, and as such **AR2** is considered to be of Low sensitivity and of local importance.

10.4.11 Archaeology Receptor **AR3** is an area of Roman settlement, including the remains of the stone footings for a rectangular Roman building. The building was associated with a large amount of roof tile and finds included pottery fragments, coins, slag, nails and a brooch. The building seems to have been of some status during the Roman period, and the trial trenching indicates potential for the recovery of further remains relating to the structure. Some ditches dating to the Iron Age were also identified in this area. **AR3** is considered to be a Medium sensitivity asset of up to Regional importance.

10.4.12 **AR4** comprises the stone foundation of a Post-Medieval agricultural building. This building is shown on the 1839 Tithe Map, but is not evident on the 1881 Ordnance Survey, suggesting that it was demolished in the intervening period. **AR4** is a Low sensitivity asset of limited archaeological importance.

10.4.13 **AR5** relates to a large triangular enclosure with two sub-square internal enclosures. Roman pottery was recovered from the ditches together with a brooch and the fragments of a fire bar, possibly associated with a kiln. **AR5** is considered to be a Low sensitivity asset of local importance.

Formatted

Formatted: English (United States)

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 cm, Hanging: 1.5 cm

10.4.14 To the north-west of AR5 is an Iron Age banjo enclosure **(AR6)**. Trial trenching of this receptor recorded pottery and animal bone. An internal post-hole, possibly contemporary with the enclosure was also identified. **AR6** is considered to be a Medium sensitivity asset of up to Regional importance.

10.4.15 **AR7** is an ovoid Iron Age enclosure with internal features and a small pit. Associated finds included a think sheet of rivetted copper alloy. Two possible cremations were recorded to the south of the enclosure, which may represent part of a larger Iron Age cemetery. **AR7** is considered to be a Low sensitivity receptor of local interest.

10.4.16 **AR8** comprises a series of Roman ditches associated with the remains of a rubble surface or floor. Remains of fine pottery table wares were recovered, along with coins, brooches and a hair pin, suggesting and elevated status for the inhabitants of what seems to have been a domestic structure. **AR8** is considered to be a Medium sensitivity asset of up to Regional importance.

10.4.17 **AR9** is an isolated ovoid pit with moderately steep edges and an irregular base. No structural features were evident; however, 86 pottery sherds dating to the Early Medieval period were recorded. **AR9** has been interpreted as an Early Medieval Sunken Featured Building (SFB) and is considered to be of Medium sensitivity of up to Regional importance.

10.4.18 **AR11** is located in the north-western part of the Main Site and comprised a number of cut features relating to a possible Iron Age banjo enclosure. **AR11** is a Medium sensitivity asset of up to Regional importance.

10.4.19 **AR12** comprises an area of Iron Age features of an archaeological origin in the north-western part of the Main Site. **AR12** is considered to be a Low sensitivity receptor of local interest.

10.4.20 **AR13** includes a number of Roman cremations and a young female skeleton orientated NE-SW, along with coffin nails, pots and hairpins. These remains were discovered by workmen digging a trench for the North Oxford watermain. No trenching could be carried out in this area due to its close proximity to the watermain. AR13 is a Low sensitivity receptor of local interest.

10.4.21 **AR14** is located in the north-western part of the Main Site and is a possible Iron Age banjo enclosure as identified by the Historic Environment Record (HER MOX4860). **AR14** is a Medium sensitivity asset of up to Regional importance.

Archaeological Receptors in the Proposed M40 Junction 10 Highways Improvements

10.4.22 **AR10** comprises an Iron Age banjo enclosure, identified through aerial photograph survey, geophysical and trial trenching. Trial trenching of this receptor demonstrates that **AR10** is a Medium sensitivity receptor of up to Regional interest.

Archaeological Receptors in the Proposed Middleton Stoney Relief Road

10.4.23 No archaeological receptors have been identified in the proposed Middleton Stoney Relief Road.

Built Heritage Receptors

10.4.24 There are a number of built heritage receptors located within the Application Site and the surrounding 2km study area. The significance of those which could be affected by the Proposed Development is summarised below and they are identified on **Figure 10.2**. A full assessment of significance of these receptors is provided in the Built Heritage Assessment of Significance (see **Appendix 10.4**).

10.4.25 Located within the Main Site is **BHR1**; the Barn (Grade II Listed Building, NHLE: 1046879), approximately 30 meters north of Ashgrove Farmhouse hereafter referred to as the 'Barn'. This is a receptor of Medium sensitivity. The Barn is associated with **BHR2** Ashgrove Farm, a non-designated heritage asset and receptor of Low sensitivity.

10.4.26 The significance of the Barn derives in part from its historic special interest as the oldest surviving element of an eighteenth century Oxfordshire farmstead (Ashgrove Farm) that was one of the first outlying farms to be constructed following the Enclosure of land in Ardley. The Barn also provides a record of a once common, but now obsolete, agricultural building type developed specifically for the processing and storing of wheat; this understanding has been lessened over time by later changes and the physical degradation of the building. The Barn also illustrates local vernacular styles and construction techniques from the eighteenth century although it is currently in a very poor state of repair. The more recent lean-to structures to the rear are not of special interest.

Formatted

10.4.27 With regard to the setting of the Barn, its immediate setting is defined by the farmstead of Ashgrove Farm (**BHR2** – considered separately below), of which it forms a constituent part. The other buildings that form the farmstead including the farmhouse were all constructed later than the Barn. Nevertheless, these buildings help to place the asset in its functional, agricultural context, as well as providing an understanding of the historic development and changing functions of Ashgrove Farm over time, contributing to the special interest of the Barn. It is also within this immediate context that the Barn's historic structure can be most readily seen, and its historic and architectural special interest most strongly experienced and appreciated. The immediate setting of the Barn consequently makes a strong positive contribution to its significance.

10.4.28 The wider setting of the asset principally comprises the surrounding open fields to the north, south and west of the farmstead and much of this land has been functionally connected to Ashgrove Farm since at least the turn of the eighteenth century. It therefore shares an enduring functional connection to the asset and helps to place it in its historic rural and agricultural context. There is, however, only limited intervisibility between the Barn and the surrounding agricultural landscape and the audible presence of the M40 also detracts from the Barn's rural context. The Barn's wider setting therefore makes a mixed contribution to its significance; where this contribution is positive, it is secondary to the contribution made by its historic form, fabric and immediate setting.

10.4.29 The Barn lies within the northern part of the Main Site, as does the entirety of the Ashgrove Farm buildings and much of the agricultural land comprising the Barn's wider setting. The Main Site is therefore considered to make a positive contribution to the Barn; with its immediate setting of the farmstead (**BHR2** also located within the Main Site) the most important element. The south-eastern part of the site comprising the area of the proposed Middleton Stoney Relief Road shares no known historic functional connection with the Barn, nor any visual association and it is not considered to contribute to the Barn's significance.

10.4.30 **BHR2** comprises Ashgrove Farm (HER ref: MOX27753), a non-designated heritage asset of Low sensitivity. The farm possesses low, local heritage significance which is derived in part from its historic interest as one of the earliest post-Enclosure outlying farms in Ardley. The later buildings also further illustrate changes over time in local farming practices, which also contribute to the farm's significance. The farm is considered to be of only limited aesthetic value, but it does possess a degree of local architectural interest where its

traditional farm buildings display vernacular styles and materials. The modern buildings at Ashgrove Farm are of no historic or architectural interest.

10.4.31 The setting of **BHR2** largely comprises the surrounding open fields to the north, south and west of the farmstead. Much of this land forms part of the farm's landholding and has done since the turn of the eighteenth century. It therefore shares an enduring functional connection to the farmstead and places it within its historic and agricultural context, contributing to its low significance. The setting of the farm is also not wholly rural; the edge of RAF Upper Heyford is visible from the farmstead and the M40 is an audible presence. The Viridor Ardley ERF also features in views from and to the farmstead. These aspects of the farm's setting represent more recent urban and industrial interventions in the local area and detract somewhat from an understanding of the asset's historic rural context. Therefore, whilst setting makes an important contribution to the significance of Ashgrove Farm, some elements make a lesser or negative contribution.

10.4.32 Ashgrove Farm lies wholly within the northern part of the Main Site, as does much of the agricultural land comprising its setting. This part of the Application Site therefore positively contributes to the significance of the farmstead with the fields immediately surrounding the farmstead making the greatest contribution. There is no known historic functional association between the farm and the south-eastern part of the Application Site including the area containing the Middleton Stoney Relief Road and no visual connection; this part of the Application Site is not considered to contribute to its significance.

10.4.33 **BHR3** comprises the Trow Pool Water Tower (Grade II Listed Building, NHLE: 1389392), a receptor of Medium sensitivity. The Tower's significance relates to its historic special interest in illustrating the developments in the provision of public water supplies that took place in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. The Tower also illustrates the wealth, social status and philanthropic role of local landowners in the early-twentieth century. Although functional in its purpose, the Water Tower is treated architecturally, demonstrating that aesthetic considerations were important and the Tower was clearly intended to make an impressive visual statement.

10.4.34 Due to the height of **BHR3**, its setting is extensive and it is visible from a large swathe of the surrounding landscape. These views allow for a clear appreciation of its architectural special interest as well as imbuing the asset with landmark status. Whilst it was built to serve the residents of Bucknell, the construction of the M40 has severed the Water Tower from the village and much of the parish, weakening the legibility of this historic connection. The

proximity of the M40 to the Water Tower also has a substantially detrimental effect on the ability to appreciate the historic and architectural interest of the receptor.

10.4.35 The Main Site principally lies to the west of **BHR3** and it is not readily visible from within this area. There are views of the receptor from the south-eastern part of the Main Site, including the proposed area of the Middleton Stoney Relief Road and this is considered to contribute to the ability to appreciate its significance.

10.4.36 **BHR4** comprises Troy Farmhouse (Grade II Listed Building, NHLE: 1225639), a receptor of Medium sensitivity. The significance of the farmhouse derives in part from the historic interest the asset possesses as an example of an historic Oxfordshire farmhouse with early-eighteenth century origins. Its significance also relates to its architectural interest; the principal range of the farmhouse illustrates local vernacular design and methods of construction from the eighteenth century, with later additions demonstrating nineteenth-century fashions and the increased availability and use of imported materials. The farmhouse is of considerable aesthetic value, which has been enhanced by a patina of age. It also possesses some archaeological interest as the right-hand bay appears to pre-date the rest of the building and may relate to the earlier fifteenth-century manor house that previously stood in the location of **BHR4**.

10.4.37 The immediate setting of Troy Farmhouse comprises the large plot in which it is situated and this makes a positive contribution to its significance. Beyond this, the farmhouse is surrounded by agricultural fields, some of which share a historic functional association with the asset and help to place it within its historic context; this also positively contributes to its significance. However, the agricultural character of the farmhouse's wider setting has been impinged upon by the arrival of the railway which passes close by and also by the development of RAF Upper Heyford. These elements are considered to detract from the ability to appreciate the farmhouse's historic and agricultural setting.

10.4.38 The north-easternmost corner of the Main Site lies c.1km from Troy Farmhouse at its closest point and there are some glimpsed views of the receptor from this part of the site. However, this forms only a very small part of the agricultural surroundings of the farmhouse, appears in the context of the adjoining airfield and is not visible from the farmhouse itself, nor its immediate setting. Furthermore, these glimpsed views provide little to no appreciation of the significance of the farmhouse. The north-eastern part of the site therefore makes only a limited positive contribution to **BHR4**, and the remainder of the site is not considered to form part of its setting.

10.4.39 **BHR5** comprises Lodge Farmhouse (Grade II Listed Building, NHLE: 1200299), a receptor of Medium sensitivity. The significance of the farmhouse derives partly from its historic interest as a material record of a rural agricultural building and dwelling dating from the eighteenth century. It also derives from the architectural interest and aesthetic value the asset possesses, including the illustration of local vernacular styles and construction techniques from this period.

10.4.40 The immediate setting of **BHR5** is formed of the large plot within which it is situated; this makes a positive contribution to the asset's legibility as a historic working farmhouse. Within the wider setting of the farmhouse, an oil depot lies immediately to the north and is considered to be a detracting element. Otherwise, the farmhouse's wider setting largely comprises agricultural fields across which there are long-distance views in all directions due to the elevated location of the farmhouse. This surrounding agricultural land – some of which shares a historic functional connection with the farmhouse – helps to place the asset in its historic context, thereby contributing to its special interest. However, this is detracted from somewhat by the M40 which has a notable audible presence in the immediate setting of the farmhouse.

10.4.41 The Middleton Stoney Relief Road passes to the west and south of **BHR5** and there is some inter-visibility between them; the farmhouse also features in views of the asset in conjunction with this area of the site from the B430 bridge over the M40. The south-eastern area of the Main Site therefore comprises part of the asset's wider agricultural surroundings and allows for the appreciation of the historic and architectural interest of the asset, positively contributing to its significance in this regard. It is however considered that the contribution from this part of the site is secondary to that made by its historic form, fabric and immediate setting. The Main Site does not share any known historic functional association with the farmhouse and is not inter-visible with the asset; this part of the site therefore does not form part of its setting.

10.4.42 **BHR6** comprises the Grade II Middleton Stoney Registered Park & Garden (NHLE: 1001405) and is a receptor of Medium sensitivity (hereafter referred to as 'Middleton Park'). Middleton Park derives its significance from the remaining and often fragmentary built and landscape elements within its boundary that illustrate its past use and design from the eighteenth to the twentieth century. It is a multi-layered landscape in which each surviving phase contributes to Middleton Park's significance through demonstrating changing styles and fashions of landscape design and architecture, as well as changing demands of the owners of the Middleton Park estate. The Park's significance is also

attributed to its historic association with leading designers of the period. Not all elements of Middleton Park contribute to its significance, however, with areas of ploughed land in particular considered a detracting element, having resulted in the loss of areas of treed parkland.

10.4.43 The surroundings of Middleton Park have remained largely unchanged since the parkland was expanded to its current extent in the early-nineteenth century and it is set within a largely agricultural landscape. It therefore continues to be experienced as a largely isolated country seat. The relationship between Middleton Park and Middleton Stoney also makes an important contribution to the significance of the asset. However, relatively few of the design features of the Park or the buildings within can be seen from beyond its boundaries as a result of the well-treed boundaries. Consequently, the significance of Middleton Park is difficult to appreciate from its setting.

10.4.44 The Application Site lies c.600m north and c.450m east of **BHR6** at the closest points and presently forms part of the Park's wider agricultural setting which contributes to its appreciation as an isolated country seat. There is also a historic functional association with some areas of the Main Site and Middleton Park. However, there is no strong visual connection between the Main Site and Middleton Park; there are some glimpsed views towards parts of the Main Site from the B430 where it adjoins Middleton Park but the well-planted nature of the Park's boundaries means the Main Site is unlikely to be visible from within the Park itself. Furthermore, return views of Middleton Park from the Main Site only comprise mature specimen trees and very little of its heritage significance can therefore be appreciated. This is similar to how Middleton Park is experienced from the south-eastern part of the site where the Middleton Stoney Relief Road is proposed. The Application Site is therefore considered to only make a small positive contribution to the significance of Middleton Park, which derives from it forming a part of the asset's agricultural setting.

10.4.45 **BHR7** comprises Ardley Conservation Area (designated 2005) which is a receptor of Medium sensitivity. The significance of this receptor relates to the historic and architectural interest of its built form, which is largely vernacular and is grounded in its agricultural history, and its archaeological interest.

10.4.46 The setting of **BHR7** makes a mixed contribution to its significance. The Conservation Area is surrounded to the south, east and west by agricultural fields and woodland, which contributes positively to an understanding of its historic interest as a rural settlement whose economy and development depended upon agriculture for most of its history. However, the residential development to the north has resulted in the coalescence of Ardley and

Fewcott which detracts from the ability to appreciate them having developed as distinct settlements, and therefore the historic interest of the Ardley Conservation Area. The agricultural land to the south has also been cut through by the railway; this physically severs the Conservation Area from the land to the south but as it is located within a cutting has a low visual impact. Indeed, the visual connection between the Conservation Area and the surrounding landscape is somewhat limited due to the screening effect of the trees and hedgerows within and around the edges of the Conservation Area. As a result, it is difficult to appreciate the historic, architectural and archaeological interest of the Conservation Area from beyond its boundaries.

10.4.47 The northern boundary of the Main Site, and the proposed Ardley Bypass, lie in relatively close proximity to **BHR7** and form part of the settlement's agricultural hinterland for much of its history. The northern part of the Main Site is experienced as part of the Conservation Area's wider agricultural surroundings when approaching the village from the south along the B430, although the rural character of this route has been somewhat detracted from by the presence of the quarry and the energy from waste power plant along this route. However, there is no direct intervisibility between the Main Site and the Conservation Area as a result of the local topography and the screening effect of Ardley Woods and other trees to the south of the Conservation Area. The northern part of the Main Site is therefore considered to only make a very low contribution to the significance of Ardley Conservation Area. The area for the proposed Ardley Bypass is considered to comprise a neutral element of the Conservation Area's setting. The majority of the Application Site, including much of the Main Site, and the proposed Heyford Park Link and Middleton Stoney Relief Road are not considered to form part of the receptor's setting.

10.4.48 **BHR8** comprises the RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area (designated 2006) and is an asset of Medium sensitivity. The Conservation Area derives some significance from having been the model on which many RAF airfields were based in the Interwar period, and from its active role during WWII. However, the significance of the Conservation Area is primarily as a Cold War Airbase that is of particular importance due to its completeness. Furthermore, the allocation[6] of the area of Heyford Park for additional residential development (up to 2,300 dwellings), and recently proposed planning application for up to 9,000 new dwellings[7] at Heyford Park, is likely to have further impacts on its heritage significance, both through works within the

[6] Cherwell Adopted Local Plan ref: Policy Villages 5
[7] Cherwell application ref. 25/02190/HYBRID

designated area and within its setting. This is addressed more fully in the Cumulative Effects section. The Conservation Area also includes a number of separately designated heritage assets.

10.4.49 The location of RAF Upper Heyford on the Upper Heyford Plateau was no doubt an important consideration in its selection to build the airfield in 1916. However, in its active role in WWII and in its later, more significant roles as a USAF SAC base during the Cold War, it was not intended to interact with, or be integrated into, its surroundings. The perimeter fencing therefore marks a clear boundary between the two landscapes of vastly differing character; the functional Cold War landscape of the airbase and the rural, agricultural landscape that surrounds it. By virtue of its elevated location there are long-distance views available from the Conservation Area over the surrounding landscape, particularly to the west. However, these views are incidental and with the exception of the views towards RAF Croughton to the north, they are not considered to contribute to the Conservation Area's core significance as a USAF SAC Cold War airbase. It is also difficult to appreciate the historic and architectural interest of the Conservation Area from beyond its boundaries. As such, setting therefore makes a very limited contribution to the significance of BHR8.

10.4.50 However, as raised by the Historic England consultation response, there are some instances where the interaction of the Conservation Area and its wider setting provides an understanding of the historic function and therefore interest of the airfield. In particular, these relate to the views out from the Conservation Area to the east and west from either end of the runway where an understanding of the movements of the aircraft can be discerned. This is characterised by the perception of the open land beyond the airfield which would have facilitated and formed part of the experience of the aircraft taking off and landing at the airfield; aircraft generally took off to the west and landed from the east.

10.4.51 The western boundary of the northern part of the Main Site directly abuts the Conservation Area's boundary. However, the Application Site shares no functional relationship with the Conservation Area and whilst the airbase is a dominant visual feature from the north-western edge of the Main Site, such views provide no meaningful understanding of the airbase's layout and little overall appreciation of the overall significance of the Conservation Area. Also, none of the separately designated structures within the Conservation Area are visible from the Main Site.

10.4.52 The north-western part of the Main Site wraps around the eastern end of the runway and this view from the Conservation Area takes in a perception of the open land beyond. As such, it contributes to the ability to appreciate how the airfield operated with the open space beyond the runway necessary to ensure a clear field of view on the aircraft's approach to the runway and to avoid any collisions with buildings should a landing fail. This is only appreciated from within the Conservation Area itself, with the return view from the Main Site not allowing for any meaningful appreciation of this experience. It is therefore considered that the north-western part of the Main Site contributes to the ability to appreciate the significance of the RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area;. however, this contribution remains minor due to the insular and contained character of the Conservation Area.

10.4.53 The remainder of the Main Site as well as the area comprising the proposed Ardley Bypass and the Middleton Stoney Relief Road also shares no visual connection with the Conservation Area (nor any historic or functional connection to the airbase) and therefore does not form part of its setting.

Future Baseline

10.4.54 The Application Site currently comprises a number of parcels of agricultural land used for a mix of pasture and arable purposes. The archaeological evaluation undertaken on the Application Site identified areas of Iron Age, Romano-British and Early Medieval activity.

10.4.55 In terms of the future baseline, it is considered that without the implementation of the project, the Application Site would remain in use as agricultural land. The likely evolution of the current archaeological environment would include the unrecorded loss of the archaeological receptors on the Application Site through continued agricultural practices.

10.4.56 In respect of built heritage, there is unlikely to be any physical changes to the receptors located within the site (**BHR1** and **BHR2**) including the potential repair, restoration and conversion of the assets at Ashgrove Farm to provide a sustainable future use and their condition would likely continue to deteriorate. There would also be no potential impact on the significance of the identified receptors (**BHR1** – **BHR8**) through changes within their settings.

10.4.57 The allocation of Heyford Park in the adopted Local Plan and draft allocation for further development in the emerging Draft Local Plan (Policy HEY 1) for up to 2,600 dwellings has the potential to directly affect the character and appearance of the RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area (**BHR8**), as well as

impact its significance through changes within its setting should built development within these areas come forward. Changes to the setting of **SM1** could also be experienced due to this allocation. This impact of the Proposed Development of the Application Site on the Conservation Area could be reduced if the character of the Conservation Area or its setting was irreversibly changed by the development of these allocations.

10.5 ASSESSMENT OF LIKELY EFFECTS

10.5.1 This section sets out an assessment of likely effects after the embedded mitigation has been taken into account within the assessment..

Embedded Mitigation

10.5.2 The Proposed Development has been designed to minimise the physical impact on **AR10**. The route of the road will avoid the main 'settlement' area of **AR10** but will impact part of its entrance ditches.

10.5.3 The Proposed Development will include a number of embedded mitigation measures relating both to the built form and transport infrastructure to reduce the impact on heritage receptors, including works proposed to retain and enhance buildings associated with Ashgrove Farm and views that contribute to the significance of the RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area. These include:

- Repair and conversion of the Grade II listed Barn at Ashgrove Farm **(BHR1)**;
- Retention and conversion of Ashgrove Farm, maintaining their intrinsic heritage significance and their contribution to the Grade II listed Barn **(BHR2)**;
- Reduced building heights within northern part of the Site (Zone B) reducing impact on Ardley Conservation Area **(BHR7)** and RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area **(BHR8)**;
- Half-height bund orientated on eastern end of runway within RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area **(BHR8)**;
- Setback of built form from Ashgrove Farm complex within the Site (**BHR1** and **BHR2**);
- Areas of planting and setback of built form from southern boundary of the Site to mitigate impacts on Middleton Park **(BHR6)**;
- Control of construction activity, through implementation of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), relating to hours of operation, lighting, noise and dust to manage extent of activity with setting of built heritage receptors.

Formatted: English (United States)

Formatted: Fairhurst, Left, Indent: Left: 2 cm, Hanging: 0.75 cm, Line spacing: Multiple 1.15 li

Construction Phase

10.5.4 Sources of potential impacts on archaeological and built heritage resources during the demolition and construction phases are:

- Soil stripping and terracing;
- Cutting of new roads, foundations and associated services
- Changes to surface or groundwater flows;
- General hard and soft landscaping of the site; and
- Indirect setting impacts.

10.5.5 There will also be permanent effects from the construction phases resulting from the loss of the undeveloped land within the site and the delivery of buildings and associated infrastructure.

Archaeology

10.5.6 Archaeological receptors **AR1-AR11** and **AR13** are located in areas that will be subject to groundworks, resulting in their removal. This is a High magnitude of effect as outlined in Table 10.2. However, receptors **AR1, AR2, AR4, AR5, AR7, and AR13** are of no more than local significance and considered to be Low sensitivity assets. Therefore, the resulting significance of effect on these receptors would be **Minor Adverse**. Receptors **AR3, AR6, AR8, AR9 AR10 and AR11** are considered to be of regional significance due to their state of preservation and the nature of their remains. Therefore, these receptors are considered to be Medium sensitivity assets. The significance of effect of the development on these assets is **Moderate Adverse**, and so would be significant in the absence of mitigation.

10.5.7 Receptors **AR12** and **AR14** are located in an area of green open space. Therefore, there is not expected to be any impact on these assets.

10.5.8 No waterlogged archaeological receptors or finds or features that would rely on special surface/groundwater conditions were identified during the trial trench evaluation within the Application Site.

10.5.9 Archaeological Resource **SM1** is of High sensitivity. However, **SM1** is not located within the Application Site and will not be subject to any physical impact as a result of development. Consequently, and in line with Table 10.2, there will not be a high magnitude of effect on the receptor. However, the desk-based assessment

determined that the Proposed Development would cause in a slight change to the wider setting of the overall monument, resulting in a ~~**Negligible**~~**Minor** **Adverse** significance of effect.

Built heritage

10.5.10 The magnitude of impact of the construction phase on built heritage receptors has been assessed following the finalisation of the Proposed Development post the Stage 2 consultation, and from a review of the visualisations prepared as part of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (ES Chapter 7). The scale, layout and positioning of the proposed built form as well as the landscaping strategy will all affect the magnitude of impact and therefore the significance of effect on each receptor. This section provides a high-level assessment based on the emerging scheme and plans available at the time of writing. Table 10.6 summarises the significance of effect on each built heritage receptor from the construction phase.

10.5.11 The temporary effects of the construction phase relate to the construction activity itself; this will result in an increase of noise and vibration, odour, dust and light levels. There will also be visual effects associated with the introduction of spoil heaps and machinery as well as construction traffic. The temporary effects of the construction phase will cease at the end of the construction phase. There will also be permanent effects during this phase as a result of the introduction of built form within the settings of the receptors and in some cases, from the direct works proposed to the receptors. Temporary effects during the construction phase can be controlled through embedded mitigation measures included as part of the implementation of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (ES Appendix 2.3).

10.5.12 The listed barn within the Main Site **BHR1** will be sensitively repaired and converted to provide a welcome building, delivering a sustainable use for the Listed Building **BHR1** will continue to form part of the retained Ashgrove Farm complex **BHR2**, with the farmstead forming a central hub within the development providing facilities such as a gym, creche and cafes, in addition to offices and equipment stores within the existing buildings. This will result in both permanent and temporary direct effects to **BHR1** and **BHR2**, with the conversion of the building and associated repairs considered to deliver beneficial impacts with regarding to sustaining the heritage significance of the Listed Building The forthcoming Listed Building Consent application will be in accordance with the conclusions of the ES relating to impacts on **BHR1**.

10.5.13 **BHR1** will also be affected by changes within its setting from both the temporary and permanent effects of the construction phase. The retention of Ashgrove Farm will minimise changes within the immediate setting of **BHR1** and protect an element of

its setting that makes a strong positive contribution to its significance, maintaining an understanding of the Listed Building within its built agricultural setting. There will also be areas of open space within and around the farmstead complex which provides some separation between the Listed Building and the proposed built form to the north, south and west. This includes a large area of open space to the east.

10.5.14 However, the development of the Main Site would fundamentally alter the wider setting of **BHR1**; the character of the receptor's current agricultural setting would be lost and the barn would be experienced within a developed context. Whilst the barn's wider setting has been identified to make a secondary positive contribution, the temporary and permanent effects from the construction phase will detract from the ability to appreciate the asset's heritage significance. **BHR1** is a receptor of medium sensitivity. The construction phase will have a moderate impact on **BHR1** and result in an overall **Moderate Adverse** significance of effect.

10.5.15 Ashgrove Farm (**BHR2**) will be largely retained within the scheme and will be subject to both direct and indirect temporary and permanent effects during the construction phase. The buildings that form **BHR2** will be converted to provide new uses associated with the operation of the Proposed Development. A number of modern detached farm buildings are proposed for demolition; these are modern additions of no heritage interest and are not considered to form part of the receptor. Some small additions and extensions to the farmhouse and outbuildings that form part of **BHR2** will be demolished; however, these structures have been identified as being of no heritage interest and their loss will not cause harm to the receptor.

10.5.16 Importantly, the built elements of **BHR2** where its significance is principally vested will be retained thereby minimising any adverse direct and indirect impacts. The group value comprising the visual and physical relationship between the farm buildings which also contributes to their significance and that of **BHR1** will also be protected. The proposed uses of the buildings have been informed by their respective heritage significance in order to reduce any direct impacts. The approach set out to the restoration and conversion of **BHR2** in the Design & Access Statement (**Appendix 10.8**) is considered to be appropriate to its significance and secures the sustainable future use of this heritage asset.

10.5.17 The development of the Main Site will however cause harm to **BHR2** through the introduction of built form and the loss of its wider agricultural setting. The proposed rail corridor will be located between the main area of the farmstead and the model cottages to the east, affecting the legibility and understanding of the cottages as well as the present layout of the farmstead. The presence of modern buildings to the north, south and west of **BHR2** will remove its wider agricultural setting, detracting from the ability to appreciate its local heritage significance. This impact can be

mitigated to some degree by the landscaping strategy as well as the open space maintained adjacent to **BHR2**. However, the construction phase is considered likely to have a moderate adverse impact on **BHR2**, resulting in a **Minor Adverse** significance of effect.

10.5.18 The Main Site makes no contribution to the significance of the Trow Pool Water Tower (**BHR3**) as part of its setting. The present views of **BHR3** are only possible from the area of the Middleton Stoney Relief Road and these will not be affected by the Proposed Development. As such, there will be **No Impact** on **BHR3** from the construction phase.

10.5.19 The Proposed Development would introduce a significant amount of built form into the wider landscape to the south-east of Troy Farmhouse (**BHR4**). However, given the distance and intervening built form and vegetation between the Main Site and **BHR4** in addition to proposed landscaping measures, it is likely that the built form would be largely screened in views from the receptor. There are likely to be some permanent and temporary effects associated with the construction phase, mainly in relation to the provision of the intermodal rail terminal which is the closest element of the Proposed Development to **BHR4**. These are likely to relate to the construction activity as well as the presence of some built form. It is therefore considered that the construction phase will have a low adverse impact on **BHR4**, resulting in a **Minor Adverse** significance of effect.

10.5.20 It has been established that the Main Site does not form part of the setting of Lodge Farmhouse (**BHR5**). Indirect temporary and permanent effects from the construction phase will therefore be limited to those associated with the Middleton Stone Relief Road. This is likely to result in the erosion of the rural and agricultural character of the receptor's setting which provides some contribution to its heritage significance, and therefore result in a moderate adverse impact. The significance of effect on **BHR5** would be **Moderate Adverse**.

10.5.21 The development of the Application Site would introduce a significant amount of built form to the wider landscape to the north of Middleton Park (**BHR6**). This would result in a reduction in the ability to appreciate **BHR6** as an isolated country seat; however, neither the development within the Main Site or the Middleton Stoney Relief Road would be highly visible from **BHR6** itself and there would remain a large area of agricultural land between **BHR6** and the Application Site. The landscaping strategy – particularly along the southern boundary of the Main Site – would mean the temporary and permanent impacts on **BHR6** would be low adverse. The construction phase would therefore result in a **Minor Adverse** significance of effect on **BHR6**.

10.5.22 In respect of the Ardley Conservation Area (**BHR7**), the development of the Main Site will introduce a substantial volume of built form in relatively close proximity to its southern edge, on land that has historically formed part of the settlement's agricultural hinterland. The introduction of built form and the intermodal rail corridor will result in temporary and permanent effects that will affect the present agricultural character of **BHR7**'s setting and the contribution that this makes to its significance. The construction of the Ardley Bypass will have no impact on **BHR7** and it will remain a neutral element of its setting. It is considered the impact on **BHR7** from the construction phase will be moderate adverse, resulting in a **Minor Adverse** significance of effect.

10.5.23 The construction phase of the development of the Application Site will change an area of the predominately rural agricultural landscape that currently adjoins the eastern boundary of the RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area (**BHR8**). However, it is considered that as the airbase was not intended to interact with nor integrate with its surroundings, the temporary and permanent effects of this phase will have little impact on the ability to appreciate the significance of **BHR8**. The presence of built form will be experienced to the periphery of this view as the Construction phase continues. As such, the impact on **BHR8** from the construction phase is low adverse. This would result in a **Minor Adverse** significance of effect on **BHR8**.

Table 10.6: Summary of Heritage Effects – Construction Phase

Receptor ID	Description	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Impact	Significance of Effect
BHR1	Barn approximately 30m north of Ashgrove Farmhouse (Grade II Listed Building)	Medium	Moderate Adverse	Moderate Adverse
BHR2	Ashgrove Farm (non-designated heritage asset)	Low	Moderate Adverse	Minor Adverse
BHR3	Trow Pool Water Tower (Grade II Listed Building)	Medium	None	No Impact
BHR4	Troy Farmhouse (Grade II Listed Building)	Medium	Low Adverse	Minor Adverse
BHR5	Lodge Farmhouse (Grade II Listed Building)	Medium	Moderate Adverse	Moderate Adverse
BHR6	Middleton Park (Grade II Registered Park and Garden)	Medium	Low Adverse	Minor Adverse
BHR7	Ardley Conservation Area	Medium	Moderate Adverse	Minor Adverse
BHR8	RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area	Medium	Low Adverse	Minor Adverse
SM1	Scheduled Cold War Structures	High	Low Adverse	~~Negligible~~Minor Adve

AR1	Iron Age, Roman and Undated linear features and former field boundaries	Low	High Adverse	Minor Adverse
AR2	Iron Age and Roman ditches	Low	High Adverse	Minor Adverse
AR3	Iron Age and Roman ditches. Roman stone structure	Medium	High Adverse	Moderate Adverse
AR4	Post Medieval agricultural structure	Low	High Adverse	Minor Adverse
AR5	Roman enclosures	Low	High Adverse	Minor Adverse
AR6	Iron Age banjo enclosure	Medium	High Adverse	Moderate Adverse
AR7	Iron Age enclosure and cremations	Low	High Adverse	Minor Adverse
AR8	Iron Age ditches and Roman settlement including Roman structure	Medium	High Adverse	Moderate Adverse
AR9	Early Medieval pit, possible Sunken Featured Building	Medium	High Adverse	Moderate Adverse
AR10	Iron Age banjo enclosures	Medium	High Adverse	Moderate Adverse
AR11	Iron Age possible banjo enclosure	Medium	High Adverse	Moderate Adverse
AR12	Iron Age ditches	Low	No Impact	No Impact
AR13	Roman cremations and inhumation	Low	High Adverse	Minor Adverse
AR14	Possible Iron Age banjo enclosure	Medium	No Impact	No Impact

10.5.24 Where significant effects are anticipated to archaeological receptors, consideration is given below as to whether additional mitigation measures can be used to address them. In respect of the historic landscape character of the Application Site, no specific mitigation measures are proposed as it has been established in ES Appendix 10.6 that the Proposed Development would not result in a significant or unacceptable loss of landscape type regionally. The effects are anticipated to be a low/negligible level of harm and not significant in EIA terms.

Operational Phase

Archaeology

10.5.25 Archaeological Receptors **AR1-AR11** and **AR13** will have been removed through archaeological excavation and so will no longer be present to be impacted by Operation Phase factors. The effects of the completed development on archaeological receptors **SM1, AR12 and AR14** are considered to be the same as those identified for the construction phase, without additional mitigation.

10.5.26 It should be noted that upon completion of the Proposed Development as a whole, the archaeological resources would have already been subject to a programme of archaeological works and reporting, undertaken throughout the construction phase of the development, and secured by a DCO requirement. As such the additional mitigation measures (see below) would have already been implemented at this point; however, the reporting, publication and dissemination of these investigations would continue after the commencement of construction works and potentially some early operation of the proposed development.

Built heritage

10.5.27 The effects of the operational phase on **BHR1** and **BHR2** will be the same as the permanent effects identified for the construction phase, although the temporary effects associated with the construction activity will cease. The receptors at Ashgrove Farm will continue to function as part of the operation of the Proposed Development and the effects from the presence of built form within their wider settings will remain. However, the planting and landscaping delivered during the construction phase will mature and become more established over time and there would be beneficial impacts arising from the sensitive restoration and conversion of the listed Barn and wider farmstead, providing them with a sustainable future use as well as providing greater public engagement with the assets. The magnitude of impact from the operational phase would therefore be low Adverse in respect of **BHR1** and **BHR2**, resulting in a **Minor Adverse** to **BHR1** and **BHR2**.

10.5.28 The effects of the operational phase on **BHR3** – **BHR8** will maintain the permanent effects identified from the construction phase; the significance of effect from this phase on each receptor is summarised in Table 10.7. The cessation of the construction activity associated with the delivery of the Middleton Stoney Relief Road would reduce the magnitude of impact on **BHR5** to low adverse with the effect reduced to minor adverse**.** The establishment of the planting along the Application Site boundaries over time would also reduce the impact of the Proposed Development on **BHR6** – **BHR8**.

Table 10.7: Summary of Heritage Effects – Operational Phase

Receptor ID	Description	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Impact	Significance of Effect
BHR1	Barn approximately 30m north of Ashgrove Farmhouse (Grade II Listed Building)	Medium	Low Adverse	Minor Adverse
BHR2	Ashgrove Farm (non-designated heritage asset)	Low	Low Adverse	Negligible Adverse

BHR3	Trow Pool Water Tower (Grade II Listed Building)	Medium	None	No Impact
BHR4	Troy Farmhouse (Grade II Listed Building)	Medium	Negligible Adverse	Negligible Adverse
BHR5	Lodge Farmhouse (Grade II Listed Building)	Medium	Low Adverse	Minor Adverse
BHR6	Middleton Park (Grade II Registered Park and Garden)	Medium	Low Adverse	Negligible Adverse
BHR7	Ardley Conservation Area	Medium	Moderate Adverse	Minor Adverse
BHR8	RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area	Medium	Low Adverse	Minor Adverse
SM1	Scheduled Cold War Structures	High	Low Adverse	~~Negligible~~ Minor Adverse
AR12	Iron Age ditches	Low	No Impact	No Impact
AR14	Possible Iron Age banjo enclosure	Medium	No Impact	No Impact

10.6 ADDITIONAL MITIGATION AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Additional Mitigation

10.6.1 A programme of archaeological excavation, recording, analysist, reporting and publication is planned for archaeological receptors **AR1-13**. This archaeological work will be carried out in accordance with an archaeological mitigation strategy which has been shared with the County Archaeology team. The strategy will be secured via a DCO requirement.

10.6.2 The archaeological mitigation strategy identifies eleven areas for archaeological strip, map and sample (excavation), along with six evaluation trenches to test areas of the Application Site that were previously inaccessible (see ES **Appendix 10.8**). Should archaeological features be recorded in the evaluation trenches, further mitigation areas may be required.

Formatted: Font: Bold

Residual Effects

10.6.3 The mitigation by recording action for the loss of the identified archaeological resources within the Application Site that would be subject to physical effects would serve to realise much of the research potential and provide potential enhancements in understanding that is inherent in many archaeological remains. However, this would not completely mitigate the loss of these

resources; no record, however complete, can replace the physical resource in every detail. It would nonetheless serve to reduce the significance of residual effect from **Moderate Adverse** to **Minor Adverse for AR3, AR6, AR8, AR9, AR10 and AR11** and from **Minor Adverse** to **Negligible** for Archaeological Resources **AR1, AR2, AR4, AR5, AR7 and AR13**. Therefore, while the excavation, recording and reporting would not completely mitigate the loss of the remains, it would ensure that the resulting residual effects would not be significant.

10.6.4 The Proposed Development incorporates a number of primary embedded mitigation measures. There are opportunities for the detailed design stage to include additional secondary design mitigation measures which will be explored as the scheme is progressed; however, as the mitigation measures most relevant to built heritage receptors have been embedded into the scheme, any secondary mitigation would be beneficial but would be unlikely to reduce the magnitude of residual impact to any receptor in ES terms. The residual effects of the Proposed Development on **BHR1** – **BHR8** are therefore unlikely to be changed from the operational phase; this is summarised in Table 10.8 below.

10.6.5 As set out in Section 10.2 of this ES Chapter, the effects identified in Table 10.8 below would all fall within less than substantial harm as categorised by the NPS and NPPF.

Table 10.8: Summary of Heritage Effects – Residual Effects

Receptor ID	Description	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Impact	Significance of Effect
BHR1	Barn approximately 30m north of Ashgrove Farmhouse (Grade II Listed Building)	Medium	Low Adverse	Minor Adverse
BHR2	Ashgrove Farm (non-designated heritage asset)	Low	Low Adverse	Negligible Adverse
BHR3	Trow Pool Water Tower (Grade II Listed Building)	Medium	None	No Impact
BHR4	Troy Farmhouse (Grade II Listed Building)	Medium	Negligible Adverse	Negligible Adverse
BHR5	Lodge Farmhouse (Grade II Listed Building)	Medium	Low Adverse	Minor Adverse
BHR6	Middleton Park (Grade II Registered Park and Garden)	Medium	Low Adverse	Negligible Adverse
BHR7	Ardley Conservation Area	Medium	Low Adverse	Minor Adverse
BHR8	RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area	Medium	Low Adverse	Minor Adverse

SM1	Scheduled Cold War Structures	High	Low Adverse	~~Negligible~~Minor Adve
AR1	Iron Age, Roman and Undated linear features and former field boundaries	Low	High Adverse	Negligible Adverse
AR2	Iron Age and Roman ditches	Low	High Adverse	Negligible Adverse
AR3	Iron Age and Roman ditches. Roman stone structure	Medium	High Adverse	Minor Adverse
AR4	Post Medieval agricultural structure	Low	High Adverse	Negligible Adverse
AR5	Roman enclosures	Low	High Adverse	Negligible Adverse
AR6	Iron Age banjo enclosure	Medium	High Adverse	Minor Adverse
AR7	Iron Age enclosure and cremations	Low	High Adverse	Negligible Adverse
AR8	Iron Age ditches and Roman settlement including Roman structure	Medium	High Adverse	Minor Adverse
AR9	Early Medieval pit, possible Sunken Featured Building	Medium	High Adverse	Minor Adverse
AR10	Iron Age banjo enclosures	Medium	High Adverse	Minor Adverse
AR11	Iron Age possible banjo enclosure	Medium	High Adverse	Minor Adverse
AR12	Iron Age ditches	Low	No Impact	No Impact
AR13	Roman cremations and inhumatio	Low	High Adverse	Negligible Adverse
AR14	Possible Iron Age banjo enclosure	Medium	No Impact	No Impact

Climate Change

10.6.5 The archaeological remains will have been sufficiently excavated and recorded prior to their removal through the Proposed Development. Once the archaeological remains have been removed and recorded, they will not be affected by climate change.

10.6.6 There will be no residual effects on the identified built heritage receptors from climate change.

~~10.6.6~~

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: List Paragraph,DBK List,Main Body of Text, Justified, Indent: Left: 1.5 cm, Right: 0 cm, Line spacing: single, No bullets or numbering

Human Health

10.6.7 The archaeology and built heritage receptors recorded on the Application Site and within the study area are not considered to make any contribution to human health. Therefore, the removal of the archaeological receptors, and the associated recording of such, is not considered to have any effect on human health. There will also be no effect on human health from either the direct or indirect impacts to built heritage receptors.

Mitigation Summary

10.6.9 The archaeological receptors within the Application Site will be exposed to High levels of impact through the development. The mitigation of this impact will take the form of a programme of archaeological excavation, recording, analysis, reporting and publication. This is to be considered additional mitigation and not embedded.

Table 10.9: Mitigation Summary

Receptor ID	Issue	Impact	Mitigation	Level of Effect
AR1-AR11 and AR13	Loss of archaeological receptors within the Application Site through development	High	Archaeological excavation, recording, analysis, reporting and publication	Minor (AR3, 6, 8, 9, 10 and 11) Negligible (AR1, 2, 4, 5, 7 and 13)

Formatted Table

10.7 CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

10.7.1 The following applications have been assessed for cumulative impacts (please also see Table 1.3 in ES Chapter 1):

Table 10.10: Cumulative Effects

Site	Heritage/Archaeology comment
Heyford Park	Archaeological impacts identified for this application were deemed to be insignificant in the applicant's ES Chapter. Built Heritage impacts are deemed to be moderate/major adverse.
Bicester expansion/eco-town	A moderate/substantial adverse archaeological impact was identified through the applicant's ES Chapter.
Great Wolf leisure resort	Archaeological evaluation for this application did not identify any significant finds or features.

David Wilson homes residential site (was Pye Homes)	The County Archaeologist requires archaeological trial trenching for these applications. It is not clear if this work has been undertaken to date. Therefore, archaeological implications are currently uncertain.
Distribution development proposals (by Albion Land and Tritax) in the vicinity of the A43, north of M40 Junction 10	The County Archaeologist requires archaeological desk-based assessment and evaluation for these applications. It is not clear if this work has been undertaken to date. Therefore, archaeological implications are currently uncertain.
M40 J9, associated with Tritax development (for Siemens), and wider proposed (draft) allocations	The County Archaeologist has recommended an archaeological condition for this application.
Richborough Estates	Archaeological work on this site identified Roman remains. An archaeological condition recommended by the County Archaeologist.
Puy du Fou	Geophysical survey and trial trenching identified archaeological activity on the site. Oxfordshire County Archaeological Services had no objection subject to a condition. The Puy du Fou ES Chapter 11 states that heritage impacts would not be significant in ES terms.

10.7.2 The archaeological interest of the Application Site as a whole is related to the buried archaeological remains within its boundary. No archaeological settings implications have been identified that would be cumulatively significant. The archaeological fieldwork undertaken on the above applications has, in some cases, identified remains of the same broad period (i.e., Iron Age, Roman for example). Therefore, the cumulative fieldwork that would be undertaken on the basis of the applications being approved, would add a lot of beneficial data to the local and regional archaeological record. This ES Chapter identifies a ~~negligible~~ minor adverse potential impact to **SM1** through limited changes to its setting. The proposals for Heyford Park would also result in a change to the setting of **SM1**. However, the ~~negligible~~minor adverse impact on **SM1** through the Proposed Development on the Application Site would not materially increase the magnitude of impact from the Heyford Park development.

10.7.3 In respect of built heritage receptors, only one of the Cumulative Schemes has been identified as having the potential to result in a cumulative impact; this

relates to the proposed scheme at Heyford Park[8]. This also relates only to the impacts on the RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area (**BHR8**) in respect of the cumulative impacts with the Proposed Development. In conjunction with the Application Site, this scheme would result in substantial changes within the setting of **BHR8**. This scheme also has the potential to directly affect the character and appearance of **BHR8**. It is however anticipated that the Heyford Park scheme will incorporate mitigation measures which would reduce impacts arising from this scheme on **BHR8**, which would reduce the level of cumulative impact. As such, the cumulative effect on **BHR8** from the development of the Application Site and the Heyford Park site could result in a higher magnitude of impact due to greater changes within its setting, but with mitigation included to reduce the overall effects.

10.8 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

10.8.1 This ES Chapter has identified the heritage receptors which would be affected by the Proposed Development and has assessed the significance of the effects the development would have on them.

10.8.2 The baseline assessments have assessed the extent and character of the non-designated buried archaeological assets within the Application Site, as well as their significance. This evidence includes late Prehistoric and Roman occupation/settlement activity. With additional mitigation, the residual effects from the Proposed Development will be **Minor Adverse for AR3, AR6, AR8, AR9, AR10 and AR11** and **Negligible** for **AR1, AR2, AR4, AR5, AR7 and AR13**. Therefore, while the mitigation would not completely mitigate the loss of the remains, it would ensure that the resulting residual effects would not be significant.

10.8.3 This ES Chapter has concluded that the only significant effect from the Proposed Development on heritage receptors is limited to the **Moderate Adverse** effect to the Grade II listed Barn (**BHR1**) arising from the Construction Phase. This is anticipated to be reduced at the Operational Phase to a **Minor Adverse** significance of effect.

[8] Cherwell planning application ref. 25/02190/HYBRID