

## 12.0 CULTURAL HERITAGE

### Introduction

- 12.1 SLR Consulting was commissioned by Viridor Waste Management to prepare this assessment of the potential impact of the proposed development on cultural heritage resources. Cultural heritage includes many different elements of the historic environment: these are principally below-ground and above-ground archaeological remains and historic buildings and conservation areas and their settings, but they can also include intangible aspects such as customs and craft industries where appropriate to the scope of the study.
- 12.2 In drafting this assessment, it has been judged that, given the prior quarrying of the development site there could be no direct impacts on cultural heritage from the proposed scheme. This assessment has therefore been limited to the potential indirect impact of the proposed development on the settings of heritage assets, where impact on settings is a material consideration.
- 12.3 SLR Consulting is a Registered Organisation with the Institute of Field Archaeologists (IFA), and work has been carried out where relevant according to the IFA Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Desk-Based Assessments 2001.
- 12.4 A brief description of the legislation, national guidance and planning policies applying to the cultural heritage elements addressed in this assessment:
- details of the methodology used in this assessment;
  - description of the baseline data relating to the site and study area;
  - the potential impacts of constructing the scheme;
  - potential mitigation measures which might be applied to minimise the impacts of the scheme, were it to proceed;
  - residual effects following mitigation;
  - summary.

## LEGISLATION AND NATIONAL GUIDANCE AND PLANNING POLICIES

### Legislation and national guidance

- 12.5 The importance of cultural heritage is clearly recognised at both national and local levels. Certain features that are deemed to be of particular importance are given legal protection through various statutes including the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (scheduled monuments), the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (listed buildings) and the Hedgerows Regulations 1997. Further advice on how cultural heritage should be treated is given in national Planning Policy Guidance Notes (PPG) 15 and 16. PPG 15 (1994) deals with the historic environment, including listed buildings, conservation areas and other components of the historic environment whilst PPG 16 covers archaeology. PPG 16 (1990) describes archaeological

remains as a 'finite and non-renewable resource' that should not be 'thoughtlessly or needlessly destroyed'. It describes 'preservation in situ' of archaeological remains as being the most favourable outcome where they might be affected by development. However, where this is not possible, then a programme of archaeological excavation and recording in advance of development is an acceptable alternative for features of less than national significance.

### **Scheduled monuments**

- 12.6 Under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979, the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport is required to compile and maintain a Schedule of Monuments considered to be of national importance. The statutory consent of the Secretary of State is required before any works are carried out which would have the effect of demolishing, destroying, damaging, removing, repairing, altering, adding to, flooding or covering up a scheduled monument. Development works that may affect the setting of a scheduled monument form an important consideration in the granting or refusal of planning consent to conduct development works. Further information on development control procedures relating to scheduled monuments is provided in PPG 16 Archaeology and Planning (1990).

### **Listed buildings**

- 12.7 Under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the Secretary of State is required to compile a list of buildings of special architectural or historic interest. There is a presumption against development that would adversely affect the character of a listed building or its setting and planning authorities and the Secretary of State are required to have special regard for the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their settings and any features of special architectural or historic importance they possess.
- 12.8 Consideration is given to the settings of listed buildings as set out in the Historic Buildings and Monuments Act 1953, Local Government Act 1985 (paragraph 3 (1) of Schedule 2), and Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Further information on development control procedures relating to listed buildings is provided in Planning Policy Guidance Note (PPG) 15 Planning and the Historic Environment (1994).
- 12.9 In addition listed buildings are protected by law, and any alteration requires listed building consent administered by the Local Planning Authority (LPA).

### **Conservation areas**

- 12.10 Under the terms of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, areas of special architectural or historic interest can be designated as conservation areas, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance. Planning authorities are required to consider planning applications affecting the appearance, character or setting of conservation areas.

- 12.11 Consideration is given to the settings of conservation areas as set out in the Historic Buildings and Monuments Act 1953, Local Government Act 1985 (paragraph 3 (1) of Schedule 2), and Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
- 12.12 Even if there is no direct impact from a proposed development, the potential impact of a proposal on the settings of conservation areas is required to be assessed and will form part of the Local Planning Authority's determination of an application.

### **Historic parks and gardens**

- 12.13 The effect of a proposed development on a designated historic garden or designed landscape as maintained in the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England by English Heritage is a material consideration in the determination of a planning application, although the designation is non-statutory in effect. Local authorities are required by central government to make provision for the protection of historic resources in planning policy. Registration is a material consideration in planning terms (section 4.3.1.9 PPG 15) and as such, following a planning application which would affect a registered park or garden, local planning authorities must take into account the historic interest of the site when determining whether or not to grant planning permission.

### **Planning policies**

- 12.14 The Planning policies relating to the proposed development are described in the following sections.
- 12.15 Policy E1 of Regional Planning Guidance RPG9 states that priority should be given to protecting areas designated at international or national level either for their intrinsic nature conservation value, their landscape quality or their cultural importance.
- 12.16 Policy EN6 of the Adopted Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016 states that there will be a presumption in favour of preserving in situ nationally and internationally important archaeological remains, whether scheduled or not, and their settings. Development affecting other archaeological remains should include measures to secure their preservation in situ or where this is not feasible, their recording or removal to another site.
- 11.17 The Adopted Cherwell Local Plan (adopted 1996) contains many policies which have been saved and given an extended life by the Secretary of State, which means that they can continue to be used until such time as they are replaced by new policies under the Council's Local Development Framework documents. Amongst the saved policies, those related to the impact of the proposed development on cultural heritage are as follows: Policies C10, C18 and C25.

## Non-statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011

- 11.18 Due to changes to the planning system introduced by the Government, work on this plan was discontinued prior to adoption. The Non Statutory Local Plan 2011 is not part of the statutory development plan but it has been approved as interim planning policy for development control purposes. Policies in this plan are not saved but will nevertheless be a material consideration in planning decisions. The main policies relating to the impact of the proposed development on cultural heritage are as follows: EN34, EN40, EN47 and EN48.

## METHODOLOGY

- 12.17 The 'development site' is the area subject to the current application.
- 12.18 There is currently no existing English guidance on the distance from a proposed development for which assessment of the impact on settings of heritage assets is required. In the case of the proposed development, there would be considerable beneficial impact from the reinstatement of the landfill, the proposed structures would be static, and some mitigation has already been proposed, such as the setting of the formation level of the buildings in the floor of the quarry, careful design of the final landform of the landfill and planting of screening vegetation, in order to reduce the visual impact on their surroundings. A 'study area' comprising all land within 2km of the development site has been considered appropriate for the collection and assessment of baseline data. The potential visual impact on the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site 12km distant is considered to be negligible.
- 12.19 Due to the prior quarrying of the entire development site, this study has addressed only the potential impact of the proposed development on the settings of heritage assets: scheduled monuments, listed buildings, and registered parks and gardens.
- 12.20 Baseline data for this assessment has been derived from:
- heritage assets data (world heritage sites, listed buildings, scheduled monuments, registered parks & gardens, registered battlefields, and protected wreck sites) were downloaded from the English Heritage NMR data download area;
  - the Heritage Gateway for National Monuments Records within the study area and supplementary information on listed buildings;
  - conservation areas digitised from the Cherwell District Interactive Plan;
  - historic mapping available on-line;
  - consultation with English Heritage, Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council;

## CULTURAL HERITAGE 12

- Zone of Theoretical Visibility and visualisations prepared for the Landscape chapter (06) of this assessment;
- the existing Ordnance Survey mapping at 1:25,000 scale;
- UHCAA (RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area Appraisal 2006 Cherwell District Council);
- Extract from English Heritage's Record of Scheduled Monuments relating to RAF Upper Heyford air base: national monument no 30906;
- English Heritage (no date) Wind Energy and the Historic Environment;

### Impact Assessment

#### Assessment of importance

- 12.21 Annex 4 of Planning Policy Guidance 16: Archaeology and Planning (PPG 16) sets out the Secretary of State's non-statutory criteria for scheduling ancient monuments, and these criteria can be used as a basis for the assessment of the importance of historic remains and archaeological sites. They include period, rarity, documentation, group value, survival / condition, fragility / vulnerability, diversity and potential.
- 12.22 The categories of local and regional importance are less clearly established than that of national, and implicitly relate to local and regional priorities which themselves will vary within and between regions.
- 12.23 The criteria set out in Annex 4 of PPG16 can be used as a guide for judgements of importance augmented with an additional category of "International" leading to the categories listed below:

**Table 12/1  
Criteria for judging importance and sensitivity of sites**

Importance	On statutory lists	Not on statutory list	Sensitivity to visual impact
international	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• world heritage sites</li> <li>• scheduled monuments</li> <li>• listed buildings</li> <li>• registered historic battlefields</li> </ul>		high
national	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• registered historic parks and gardens</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• well-preserved historic landscapes</li> </ul>	high
regional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• conservation areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• moderately well-preserved historic landscapes</li> </ul>	moderate

# CULTURAL HERITAGE 12

Importance	On statutory lists	Not on statutory list	Sensitivity to visual impact
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the bulk of sites with reasonable evidence of occupation, ritual, industry etc.</li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>sites with some evidence of human activity, but in a fragmentary or poor state</li> <li>buildings of local importance</li> <li>dispersed elements of historic landscapes</li> </ul>	
local			low
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>destroyed sites</li> <li>mistaken non-antiquities</li> <li>random stray finds</li> <li>buildings of no architectural merit</li> </ul>	
unimportant			none
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>insufficient evidence to judge importance.</li> </ul>	
uncertain			Uncertain

## Assessment of impact/effect

12.24 Adverse impacts upon cultural heritage resources base are predominantly permanent adverse impacts resulting from the loss of elements as a result of construction activities. There may occasionally be temporary adverse impacts when the setting of a site or monument is affected by construction activities or permanent adverse impacts when such settings are affected by the new development itself. With regard to the historic built environment, or historic landscapes, well-designed development can result in permanent beneficial impacts where the setting of a historic building is enhanced, or where there is reversal of existing adverse impacts.

12.25 Impacts upon cultural heritage resources may be short term or long term and include:

- direct impacts – tangible physical impacts, for example demolition of a building. In cultural heritage terms, direct impacts are almost always permanent;
- indirect adverse impacts – these do not usually physically affect the resource, but may alter its setting. Examples of indirect adverse impacts include visually intrusive structures or the interruption of views. The effects of noise and light pollution are also indirect impacts. In

## CULTURAL HERITAGE 12

some cases indirect adverse impacts may indeed physically affect the resource, such as contamination of buried remains as a result of accidental spillages of pollutants, alterations to hydrological regimes, or alterations required to historic buildings, e.g., double glazing to mitigate a rise in noise levels;

- positive impacts - such as increased knowledge resulting from the recording and analysis of archaeological sites and historic buildings, or the potential to improve the setting and amenity of the historic environment, and the opportunity to involve and inform local business and residential communities regarding their historic environment.

### Assessment of magnitude of impact

12.26 The magnitude of each noted impact is assessed, in order to determine the likely outcome of development upon each cultural heritage feature. The following table shows the definitions used in determining the magnitude of impact, both direct and indirect.

**Table 12/2**  
**Definitions of Magnitude of Impact**

<b>Level of magnitude</b>	<b>Definition (direct impacts)</b>	<b>Definition (indirect impacts)</b>
High	Total or major physical loss to cultural heritage feature	Fundamental changes to the setting of the cultural heritage feature
Medium	Moderate physical damage to cultural heritage feature; does not fundamentally change feature	Partial change to the setting of the cultural heritage feature
Low	Minor physical damage to cultural heritage feature or immediate surroundings	Minor intrusion on setting of the cultural heritage feature
Negligible	Barely perceptible or no change to baseline condition	Barely perceptible or no change to setting of the cultural heritage feature

12.27 Due to the relatively flat form of the landscape, it has been considered sufficient to assess the potential indirect impacts through a desk-based study using Ordnance Survey mapping, supplemented by viewpoints taken from the Landscape Study in this ES (Chapter 6). No field inspection of the study area has therefore been carried out.

12.28 The discussion of the magnitude of visual impact on the existing settings of heritage assets considers the six aspects of settings set out in English Heritage's Wind Energy and the Historic Environment

- the intended visual dominance of the asset;
- the scale of the proposed development compared with that of the asset;
- any intended intervisibility between assets;

## CULTURAL HERITAGE 12

- intended vistas and sight-lines connected with assets; and
- any unaltered settings of assets.

### Assessment of significance

12.29 The final assessment of significance refers to the significance of the impacts to the receptors (the individual monuments) rather than the cultural significance of the monuments themselves; this is to assess the significance of the overall impact of the development from a combination of the importance / sensitivity of the monuments and the magnitude of the impacts of development.

**Table 12/3**  
**Comparative table for assessing significance of impact**

Magnitude of impact	Sensitivity to visual impact of cultural heritage element			
	High	Moderate	Low	None
High	Major	Major	Moderate	None
Medium	Major	Moderate	Minor	None
Low	Moderate	Minor	Negligible	None
Negligible	Minor	Negligible	Negligible	None

### Archaeological Site Surveys

No walkover survey and no intrusive site investigations of the development site have been carried out, due to the former quarrying of its entire area.

### BASELINE DATA

#### Location, geological and topographical setting

12.30 The application site is located within the County of Oxfordshire, the district of Cherwell and the civil parish of Ardley, approximately centred on National Grid Reference 454200 225900. It lies about 5km north-west of Bicester, and 19km north of Oxford. Nearby villages include Ardley 1km to the north, Bucknell 1.5km to the east, and Middleton Stoney 2km to the south.

12.31 The land surrounding the application site to the north and west is generally level, but drops away towards Bicester to the south-east. The drainage runs in small streams past the site from north to south, and from the east towards the south-east. The site immediately overlooks a small valley running south-west towards Middleton Stoney.

12.32 The local landscape is gently undulating, varying from around 90m AOD to the southeast of the application site, to over 130m AOD around the area of RAF Upper Heyford air base to the northwest. To the west the landscape descends into the Cherwell Valley (around 70m AOD). The local landscape

generally has gradients of around 1:50, with steeper gradients of up to 1:3 along some of the local streams and on the edges of the Cherwell Valley.

- 12.33 Large blocks of woodland are found within the surrounding landscape, but few close to the application site. Vegetation adjacent to the application site consists of hedgerows and linear belts of trees, in particular the belt along the Gaggle Brook on the eastern side of the application site.
- 12.34 The immediate sub-surface geology is the White Limestone Formation of the Middle Jurassic Great Oolite Group. The current use is landfill, and the quarry has been excavated to a depth of about 9m below surface. The landfill site is bounded by the B430 on the west side and the railway linking Bicester and Banbury 1km to the north. The M40 runs north/south, 500m to the east of the application site.
- 12.35 The application site is bordered by the local railway line to the north, the B430 to the west, Gaggle Brook to the east with the M40 motorway around 350m beyond the brook. To the south are agricultural fields with planning permission for mineral extraction.
- 12.36 Footprints of the giant carnivorous (meat-eating) Megalosaurus and the larger herbivorous (vegetarian) Cetiosaurus were found in the limestone floor of the quarry during removal of the overlying clay layer, see Chapter 11.

### **The proposed development**

- 12.37 The permitted landfill restoration would form a small hill approximately 1200m north to south and 750m east to west, and rising to a height of 128m AOD in comparison with an average level of about 109m AOD around the edges of the application site. The average gradients for the permitted landfill restoration would be approximately 1:25, with the steepest gradients around the proposed restoration includes the planting of a large block of woodland slightly south of the high spot on the landfill landform, with a rectilinear field pattern.
- 12.38 The floor level of the proposed EfW has been located close to the base of the mineral workings on the application site at 100m AOD to maximise the benefit of screening provided by the existing mineral void.
- 12.39 The proposed modifications to the final landfill landform have been designed not only to accommodate the building footprint, but also to envelope the building and provide additional screening to ground level operations and lower building levels from the south and southeast.
- 12.40 Woodland planting would be located along the crest of the final landfill landform to maximise screening of the building and stack from the northwest and north. This woodland planting would be extended down the landfill landform as it envelopes the EfW location to maximise screening for views from the east, west and southwest.
- 12.41 A rectilinear field pattern would be established for the majority of the restored landfill site. The enveloping landform around the proposed EfW would form a

## CULTURAL HERITAGE 12

natural bowl shaped landform, and it is proposed to follow this bowl shaped landform with the proposed woodland planting, rather than enforcing a contrary rectilinear pattern. This bowl shaped area would be restored and managed to create a limestone grassland habitat within the enveloping woodland planting, as a backdrop to the proposed EfW.

- 12.42 The HWRC and leachate treatment and landfill gas management facilities would remain in the top north western corner of the site.

### Heritage Assets

- 12.43 The heritage assets which lie within the study area are listed in Table 12/4.

**Table 12/4**  
**Details of heritage assets within the study area**

Asset group	Type	Ref. Number	Name	Location	Grade	NGR	Distance from development site
A	LB	244526	MANOR FARMHOUSE	FRITWELL ROAD	II	453846,227976	1.3
A	LB	244527	FEWCOTT FARMHOUSE	FRITWELL ROAD	II	454123,228017	1.3
A	LB	244528	CHURCH OF ST MARY	SOMERTON ROAD	II*	454242,227371	0.7
A	LB	244529	HEADSTONE APPROXIMATELY 5 METRES SOUTH EAST OF CHANCEL OF CHURCH OF ST MARY	SOMERTON ROAD	II	454259,227363	0.7
A	LB	244530	MANOR FARMHOUSE AND ATTACHED FARM BUILDING	SOMERTON ROAD	II	454043,227440	0.7
A	LB	244531	HUNTERS COTTAGE	SOMERTON ROAD	II	453969,227585	0.9
A	SM	28166	ARDLEY WOOD MOATED RINGWORK			453910,227361	0.6
B	LB	243699	FARM OFFICE AND ATTACHED COTTAGE AT SWIFT'S HOUSE	A41	II	456060,227642	1.6
B	LB	243700	STABLE RANGE AT SWIFTS HOUSE	A41	II	456090,227616	1.6
C	LB	244533	MANOR FARMHOUSE	BAINTON ROAD	II	456375,225771	1.5
C	LB	244534	LANESIDE HOUSE	BAINTON ROAD	II	456213,225700	1.4
C	LB	244535		5-6 BAINTON ROAD	II	456193,225689	1.4
C	LB	244536		8/9 BAINTON ROAD	II	456055,225648	1.3
C	LB	244537	OLD RECTORY	BAINTON ROAD	II	456092,225729	1.3
C	LB	244538	CHURCH OF ST PETER	BAINTON	I	456084,225598	1.3

# CULTURAL HERITAGE 12

ROAD							
Asset group	Type	Ref. Number	Name	Location	Grade	NGR	Distance from development site
C	LB	244539	BROCK MEMORIAL APPROXIMATELY 3 METRES SOUTH EAST OF PORCH OF CHURCH OF ST PETER	BAINTON ROAD	II	456082,225585	1.3
C	LB	244540	CHURCHYARD CROSS APPROXIMATELY 10 METRES SOUTH OF CHURCH OF ST PETER	BAINTON ROAD	II	456078,225579	1.3
C	LB	244541	MANOR HOUSE	BAINTON ROAD	II	456122,225540	1.4
C	LB	244542	OUTBUILDING APPROXIMATELY 30 METRES EAST OF MANOR HOUSE	BAINTON ROAD	II	456155,225555	1.4
C	LB	244544	NUMBER 13 AND ATTACHED OUTBUILDING	BAINTON ROAD	II	456004,225599	1.2
C	LB	244545	THE TRIGGER POND PUBLIC HOUSE	BICESTER ROAD	II	455955,225371	1.3
C	LB	244547	THE THATCHES	28 NEW ROW	II	455812,225479	1.1
D	LB	488051	TROW POOL WATER TOWER		II	454860,224802	0.5
E	LB	244546	LODGE FARMHOUSE	MIDDLETON ROAD	II	454307,223975	1.1
F	LB	408337	THE COTTAGE	ARDLEY ROAD	II	453424,223562	1.6
F	LB	408338	THE OLD RECTORY AND ATTACHED STABLE AND OUTHOUSE RANGES	OXFORD ROAD	II	453538,223290	1.8
F	LB	408420	THE CORNER HOUSE	SCHOOL LANE	II	453275,223484	1.7
F	LB	408421	THATCHED COTTAGE	1 SCHOOL LANE	II	453179,223541	1.6
G	LB	408301	CHURCH OF ALL SAINTS		II*	453108,223252	1.9
G	LB	408302	CHURCH OF ALL SAINTS WAYSIDE CROSS APPROXIMATELY 50 METRES TO NORTH		II	453110,223302	1.9
G	LB	408419	GATE LODGE AND ENTRANCE SCREEN TO MIDDLETON PARK	OXFORD ROAD	II	453411,223422	1.7
G	PG	4063	MIDDLETON PARK		II	452516,223136	1.4
G	SM	28134	MIDDLETON CASTLE	STONEY		453221,223257	1.8
H	LB	423069	LIME KILN APPROXIMATELY 150 METRES EAST OF LIME HOLLOW, LOWER HEYFORD (NOT INCLUDED)	B4030	II	451807,224659	1.9
I	SM	30906	COLD WAR STRUCTURES			452111,227341	1.7

## CULTURAL HERITAGE 12

---

AT THE FORMER UPPER HEYFORD AIRBASE								
J	LB	244525	BARN APPROXIMATELY 30 METRES NORTH OF ASHGROVE FARMHOUSE (NOT INCLUDED)	A43	II	453623,226212	0.3	

---

- 12.44 The assets have been grouped according to spatial proximity in order to simplify description and assessment.

### **Ardley village conservation area, listed buildings and scheduled monument moated ringwork 28166.**

- 12.45 Ardley village is located some 850m to the north of the development site, but with the bulk of the landfill site between the village and the proposed EfW development in the SE corner of the application site. The scheduled monument (28166) is a moated ringwork of Anglo-Saxon or medieval date and probably originally formed part of the surrounding village. The conservation area includes this monument and a number of listed buildings, (the church and farmhouses). Further listed buildings lie on the north edge of the village, outside the conservation area.

#### **B Swifts House Farm listed buildings**

- 12.46 Two 18th-century stable / groom's cottage and outbuildings, listed buildings 243699 and 243700, 1.6km northeast of the development site.

#### **C Bucknell listed buildings**

- 12.47 The village of Bucknell is located 1.2km to the east of the development site, with the M40 and local railway line lying between. The listed buildings comprise the church, crosses, farmhouses and the manor house.

#### **D Trow Pool water tower listed building**

- 12.48 A two-storey water tower of 1909 which served Bucknell village and the manor and estate.

#### **E Bucknell Lodge listed building**

- 12.49 An early and late 18th-century farmhouse.

#### **F Middleton Stoney village listed buildings**

- 12.50 The village of Middleton Stoney is located around 1.7km to the south and contains four listed buildings: houses and a rectory with outbuildings.

#### **G Middleton Stoney Castle scheduled monument 28134 and Middleton Park registered park 4063**

- 12.51 The medieval castle scheduled monument stands 1.8km south of the development site, set within parkland which itself included in the Register of

Parks and Gardens and approaches within 1.4km of the development site. The site also contains a Roman building known from excavation, a possibly early medieval earthwork bank and village earthworks, a stone cross in the bailey (removed from the adjacent churchyard), and an enclosed warren formed in the 17th century. The park contains a house separate from the castle, and was extended and landscaped in the 18th and 19th centuries.

### **H Lime kiln at The Gorse**

- 12.52 A lime kiln of 18th or early 19th-century date, now a shelter shed, probably connected with the adjacent disused quarry marked on the modern Ordnance Survey map 400m to the southeast.

### **I RAF Upper Heyford airbase conservation area and Cold War structures scheduled monument 30906**

- 12.53 There is an extensive literature on the airbase and its setting. It has recently been the subject of a conservation area appraisal (RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area Appraisal, Cherwell District Council 2006) (UHCAA) and RAF Upper Heyford Revised Comprehensive Planning Brief 2007 (Cherwell District Council).
- 12.54 The first construction for the air base took place in 1916, and use of the site as a military air base continued almost unbroken until 1994. It was used for training, including trainees from all the allied nations and the Commonwealth. The base housed the first aircraft to be tracked by radar in the 1930s and in the 1950s was one of the four main American bases in England used by the USAF, with nuclear capability. By the 1970s it was the largest fighter base in Europe. The base now retains a number of buildings and elements of its earlier World War II phases but its most important and unusual surviving structures relate to its Cold War phase.
- 12.55 From the early 1950s, the doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction led to the creation of ever larger and more advanced stockpiles of weapons and the necessary infrastructure to maintain and deliver them to their targets. MAD was replaced during the 1960s and 1970s by the doctrine of 'flexible response': providing a graduated reaction to any Soviet aggression. Upper Heyford is representative of both the above strategic doctrines.
- 12.56 Within the study area lie the Northern Bomb Stores and Special Weapons Storage Area contained within a security fence; part of scheduled monument 30906. The Northern Bomb Stores were built in the 1950s when the USAF began to operate nuclear bombers at Upper Heyford. These consisted of four individual concrete mounded 'Igloo' stores built within a double fenced enclosure, a feature which typifies the protection against ground attack of nuclear facilities in the period. All but one of these towers have since been removed but the bases remain. A further double-fenced Special Weapons Storage Area was built immediately to the west, which included a guardhouse and pillbox-controlled entrance and a set of two rows of a total of twenty one Igloo cells for storing weapons. In addition, a further large Igloo store was also constructed along with a trigger store; disguised externally to look like a double storey office block.

## CULTURAL HERITAGE 12

---

12.57 The remainder of the scheduled monument (beyond the study area) comprises:

- The Avionics Maintenance Facility
- the Battle Command Centre
- The Hardened Telephone Exchange
- The 'Victoria Alert' or 'Quick Reaction Alert (QRA) Area including aircraft shelters, security fence, watch tower, fuel supply point and hardened crew building

12.58 Listed buildings (all outside the study area) are

- The Grade II Nose dock hangars of 1951 (490616, 490929, 490931);
- The Grade II Control Tower of 1950-2 with associated blast wall and magnetometer base (495960);
- The grade II Former Squadron HQ of 1950s and 1970s (495959);

12.59 A number of non-listed buildings of local significance are also shown in UHCAA figure 7.

12.60 Upper Heyford retains some of the key buildings related to the Cold War policy of deterrence, a product of the global conflict between capitalism and communism that shaped the history of the late 20th century. Within the context of Upper Heyford as a whole, they form an iconic group of related and nationally important Cold War buildings.

### **J Barn at Ashgrove Farm listed building**

- A grade II barn of early-mid 18th century date (244525).

### **Other Statutory Listings**

12.61 There are no sites of the following status within the study area:

- World Heritage Sites
- Registered Battlefields
- Protected Wrecks

## **Historic landscape and archaeology**

12.62 The area is one with evidence for medieval settlement interspersed within a historic landscape of woods and heathland. Assessment from Ordnance Survey mapping shows that its rural character has been largely retained into the present century; the main effects of modern development being the suburban expansion of Bicester, some quarry activity, some major infrastructure (roads and railway) and the Upper Heyford airbase to the west.

12.63 Oxfordshire has no Historic Landscape Characterisation, and the following assessment of the historic landscape in the study area has been made chiefly from consideration of the modern Ordnance Survey 1:25,000 map, supplemented by assessment from earlier mapping, and general archaeological and historical published sources.

## CULTURAL HERITAGE 12

---

- 12.64 A Neolithic arrowhead was found about 400m south-east of the development site. It may represent casual loss, perhaps during hunting (338935).
- 12.65 A pit-alignment (1076788) is also recorded about 1km northwest of the application site. Pit-alignments generally date from the Bronze Age or Iron Age and are thought to be markers of early land-boundaries.
- 12.66 A series of enclosures recorded as cropmarks in air-photographs lies south-east of the Upper Heyford airbase, about 2km north-west of the application site. These include a 'banjo' enclosure facing east (1378602), an enclosure fragment or linear feature (1378612), and a group of intersecting enclosures (1378617). There is no direct dating evidence for any of these as they are all known only from air-photographs. However, the 'banjo' enclosure is a distinctive form characteristic of the Iron Age, consisting of a circular enclosure with two projecting arms extending from the entrance. On excavation elsewhere, some examples of this type of site have proved to be of high status. Other sub-rectangular cropmark enclosures tend to be of later prehistoric or Roman date, when excavated. About 2km west of the application site, a D-shaped enclosure with large dark central feature (1377702) lies east of a second possible enclosure ditch (1377700). These again may well be of later prehistoric or Roman date, though 1377700 appears to relate to a tree enclosure ring of recent date, and may be associated with Middleton Park.
- 12.67 Aves Ditch still survives as an extensive earthwork in the southwest of the study area, as far as Lower Heyford Road, from where its course is marked by Chilgrove Drive and Raghose Lane, to north and south of a lost stretch caused by the intrusion of the Upper Heyford Airbase. Its full detectable course can be traced in existing roads, tracks and earthworks, from Kirtlington to Fritwell. At Kirtlington its projected course would intersect with Akeman Street, the Roman road from Alchester to Cirencester, at its crossing of the river Cherwell. The Middleton Park – Ardley road (B430) is unusually straight over a significant distance including portions in two parishes, and has the appearance of an ancient routeway. It could perhaps be Roman especially in view of the existence of the Roman building in Middleton Park; it continues as a green lane towards the park while the current main road angles to the village centre reflecting the move of the village in the 19th century) Its course mirrors that of the Aves Ditch, 1.5km to the west. Neither of the routeways has any clear direct link with a known significant Roman roadside settlement, and origins as droveways is another possibility.
- 12.68 Footpaths are further routeways of unknown antiquity. Most notable amongst these is the path from Lord's Farm on the outskirts of Bicester, running past asset group D, as far as the road where viewpoint O is located. This route was interrupted by the quarry, and the footpath has been re-routed along the south side of the quarry area. From O the path continues towards Aves Ditch, where is again interrupted by the Upper Heyford airbase. Where it crosses the development site, it appears to ignore and therefore pre-date the rectilinear fields shown on the 19th century Ordnance Survey mapping.
- 12.69 The Roman small town of Alchester lies 6km southeast of the development site, linked with Cirencester to the west by the Akeman Street Roman road.

## CULTURAL HERITAGE 12

---

There is substantial evidence for Roman rural settlement in the vicinity of the development site. To the northwest the Ordnance Survey map of Roman Britain (1978) shows a road orientated northwest/southeast passing through the Roman settlement at Lower Lea; if this road extended as far as Alchester then it would pass close to the application site, though the sources consulted have no record of it. Aves Ditch a straight linear earthwork runs northeast, 3km west of the application site. It appears to be a relatively straight hollow way, interpreted as a connection of three Roman roads and a droveway. The Middleton Stoney - Ardley road mirrors its course 1.5km to the east, and may be related. It is followed for a short distance at its northern end by a parish boundary.

- 12.70 A chance find was made during trenching of a Roman-period cemetery including inhumations and possibly cremations about 1km northwest of the application site, south of Ash Grove Farm (338873). Roman coins have been found just north of the railway (338880).
- 12.71 A Roman building, though to be part of a farmstead or villa, was found in excavation beneath an earthwork enclosure adjacent to Middleton Stoney castle in Middleton Park.
- 12.72 Other early historic features visible in the existing landscape are those boundaries, mainly hedged, which follow parish boundaries. These can be seen to the northwest and south east of Ardley, and in the southeast part of the study area. The antiquity of the local territories marked by the parish boundaries is of course uncertain, though in general terms, like the villages to which they are closely related, they are likely to be at least as old as the 10th century AD. A number of curvilinear field boundaries are not topographically-related (such as a group north of Dewar's Farm), they might perhaps represent pre-Parliamentary enclosures.
- 12.73 The roads linking Ardley to Bucknell to Middleton Stoney, and from The Heath to Middleton Stoney have a meandering character suggestive of a medieval origin or earlier; in several places they are followed by parish boundaries, also suggestive of considerable antiquity. A number of curvilinear field boundaries south of the application site may be of medieval origin, and the boundary along the south side of the landfill site coincides with a parish boundary.
- 12.74 Ardley and Bucknell are listed in Domesday Book, indicating a late-Saxon origin, if not earlier, for these settlements. The location and extent of each of these settlements is unknown, but may be represented in the locations of the churches and manor houses. Ardley has what is thought to be a Norman ringwork on the southwest edge of the village (Scheduled Monument no. 28166): it measures 66x50m in plan, and contains a number of building platforms and is likely to represent a high-status defended or enclosed settlement. The church is similarly located at the southern margin of the existing village, suggesting some shift of settlement in historic times. Bucknell has a 17th century manor house on the site of a medieval moated manor, and the churchyard contains a 13th or 14th century cross.
- 12.75 The early historic settlement at Middleton Stoney lay to the north and west of Middleton Stoney Castle, where earthworks mark the site of the village which

## CULTURAL HERITAGE 12

was abandoned and demolished in 1824-25 when the park was extended eastwards. Most of the village was levelled, the only surviving features are visible as cropmarks or slight earthworks. There is some evidence that Middleton Stoney had borough status since 13 burgesses were documented there in 1279. Its 13th century status and absence from Domesday Book suggests a post-conquest planned settlement connected with the castle. The construction of the motte-and-bailey castle of Middleton Stoney is dated by documents to the late 1100s. The surrounding deer park was emparked in 1201.

- 12.76 The construction of the motte-and-bailey castle of Middleton Stoney is dated by documents to the late 1100s.
- 12.77 The landscape in the study area is entirely characteristic of champion countryside: nucleated villages and isolated farms with fields and woods generally straight-sided and geometric suggesting that they were created by reorganising former open field during Parliamentary enclosure in the 18th or 19th century. Some follow watercourses and their age is less certain. Other possible exceptions are Stoke Wood and Stoke Little Wood (east of Ardley), with irregular outlines suggesting an earlier origin for all or part of these woodland areas.
- 12.78 Middleton Park was extended from the deer park during the early 18th century and improved by Lewis Kennedy during the early 19th century; the park was also extended in 1814 and 1824-25, leaving All Saints' church isolated, close by the castle.
- 12.79 Recent (20th century) intrusions into this historic landscape include the Banbury-Bicester railway, the M40 motorway and the RAF Upper Heyford Airbase. A rectangular ditched enclosure, seen as a cropmark, intersected with the enclosure group 1378617 noted above. Its right-angled corners suggest a recent date and it may be related to the air base or other military activity as its northeastern side is followed by a zigzag trench, of probable military origin. Cold War structures survive at Upper Heyford air base and a Royal Observer Corps monitoring point east of Middleton Stoney village.

**Table 12/5**  
**Monuments within study area listed on Heritage Gateway**

338847	Manor House c. 1700 on site of medieval manor house with moat.
338873	Roman inhumations and possible cremations of 2nd to 3rd century date were found by workmen.
338880	Roman coins.
338935	Neolithic flint arrowhead.
338936	2 pieces of octagonal shaft - probably from a medieval cross.
Middleton Stoney	Settlement earthworks situated to the north and west of Middleton Stoney Castle.

## CULTURAL HERITAGE 12

Ardley Station	Site of railway station opened in 1910 and closed in 1963.
1076788	Cropmarks of a pit alignment of uncertain date.
1377700	A curving length of ditch c. 112m long, overlapping two shorter lengths of ditch, perhaps part of an enclosure, is visible as a cropmark on air photograph. The ditch appears to partly surround a tree enclosure ring of recent date, so may well be associated with the adjacent Middleton Park.
1377702	A possible D-shaped enclosure with large central dark feature visible as a cropmark on air photograph.
Upper Heyford airbase	An Iron Age "banjo enclosure" visible as cropmarks. The site lies immediately outside the fence of Upper Heyford airfield.
Upper Heyford airbase	A fragment of an enclosure (or, just possibly a linear feature) is visible as a cropmark on air photographs.
Upper Heyford airbase	A complex of sub-rectangular enclosures, probably representing Iron Age and/or Romano-British settlement.
Upper Heyford airbase	A ring ditch 14m across is visible as a cropmark on air photographs.
1378647	A large rectangular ditched enclosure is visible as cropmarks on air photographs.
1411426	The site of a Royal Observer Corps monitoring post.

### IMPACT ASSESSMENT

- 12.80 Due to the former extraction within the development site, there can be no surviving archaeological remains, or heritage assets within it, and there could be no possible direct impact from the proposed building and landfill restoration. The proposed improvements to the HWRC will also be on previously developed land.
- 12.81 The remainder of this section therefore restricts itself to assessment of potential indirect visual impact on cultural heritage elements from the proposed building and revised landform only.
- 12.82 The historic landscape within the study area is a multi-period entity with no particular chronological focus. The 20th century has produced nationally-important structures at Upper Heyford airbase, and so the contemporary developments of the motorway, the railway and even the Ardley quarry itself might be seen as aspects of its setting (although not particularly related to its function), and therefore as parts of the historic landscape, rather than

detrimental impacts upon it. There are no structures within the landscape at present to compare with the mass of the proposed building or the height of the proposed chimney stack.

- 12.83 **A Ardley village listed buildings and scheduled monument** moated ringwork 28166. There is perhaps no particular outward-looking aspect to be inferred from the original residential function of these buildings, including church and the scheduled ringwork, their primary setting being the contemporary village itself and its community, which was probably of lesser extent than at present. There is some woodland between the scheduled monument and the development site which would provide some screening although it is not certain that it would screen the assets from the proposed building. The magnitude of indirect visual impact on the setting is judged to be low, with a resulting visual impact sensitivity of moderate.
- 12.84 **B The Swifts House Farm listed buildings comprise outbuildings and groom's cottage.** These buildings arguably have no particular intended outlook. There is some existing woodland (Kilby's Copse) between the listed buildings and the development site which, together with the proposed landfill profile and planting would provide some screening from the proposed building, though the chimney might still be visible. At a distance of 1.6km from the development site (compared with the 1km distance of the proxy viewpoint shown here), the magnitude of indirect visual impact is judged to be low, with a resulting visual impact sensitivity of moderate.
- 12.85 **C Bucknell village listed buildings.** The majority of the buildings are well within the core of the village and probably screened from the visual impact of the proposed building by existing, non-listed buildings. The house 244547 and public house 244545 are the most westerly, and the rectory 244537 the most northerly, all of which might have views of parts of the proposed development. There would be no screening from intervening woodland, although the motorway would lie between the assets and the development site. There is no particular outward-looking aspect to be inferred from the original residential function of these buildings, including the church, their primary setting being the contemporary village itself and its community, which was probably of lesser extent than at present. The magnitude of indirect visual impact is therefore judged to be low, with a resulting visual impact sensitivity of moderate.
- 12.86 **D Trow Pool water tower listed building.** This asset lies closest to the development site. It was built in 1909 to serve Bucknell village the manor and possibly its estate, and became disused in the 1950s when mains water was supplied to the village. Its primary setting might be judged to be the buildings which it served, located away from the direction of the development site in Bucknell village, a relationship already impacted upon by the M40 motorway. There is no indication in the listing that the external platform on the water tower was to provide a prospect of the landscape. The visual impact from the proposed building taking into account its location, scale and proximity would be low, with a resulting visual impact sensitivity of moderate.
- 12.87 **E Bucknell Lodge listed building.** This farmhouse 244546 is located at about 100m OD, and it is unlikely that the intervening woodland (the ground level of which is less than 95m OD) provides any screening from the

development site, at around 105m+ OD. The magnitude of indirect visual impact is judged to be low, with a resulting visual impact sensitivity of moderate.

- 12.88 **F Middleton Stoney village listed buildings.** These 18th and 19th century buildings comprise houses and a former rectory with stable and outhouses. There is perhaps no particular outward-looking aspect to be inferred from the original residential function of these buildings. All the buildings have some level of screening from the proposed building from other non-listed buildings. A small triangular area of woodland, and Burntclose Copse would also provide some screening for some of the buildings. There is no particular outward-looking aspect to be inferred from the original residential function of these buildings, their primary setting being the contemporary village itself, which was probably of lesser extent than at present. At 1.6-1.8km distance, the magnitude of indirect visual impact is judged to be low, with a resulting visual impact sensitivity of moderate.
- 12.89 **G Middleton Park listed buildings,** and Middleton Stoney castle scheduled monument are well screened by trees and the village buildings of Middleton Stoney from the development site, and almost 2km distant from it. There are no clear intended vistas leading out of the park apparent from the existing layout, which is rather haphazard, no doubt on account of its episodic development. An outward-looking viewpoint might be argued for the lodge (408419), but the proposed building would be mainly if not entirely screened by the village buildings. Views out from the park to the north are limited: the northern side of the park, within the study area has a belt of trees along most of its northern edge. A roughly-200m stretch adjacent to the village is more open but there is a short avenue of trees set just within the park at this point. The dense woodland of Home Wood and other tree belts provide further screening within the park. Because of this and the distance of 1.7-2km, the magnitude of indirect visual impact is judged to be low, with a resulting visual impact sensitivity of moderate.
- 12.90 **H Lime kiln listed building 423069** is presumably linked with the disused quarry marked on the Ordnance Survey map north of Park Farm. The kiln is fully screened by woodland from the development site, and there can be no visual impact. The magnitude of indirect visual impact is judged to be negligible.
- 12.91 **I RAF Upper Heyford** Cold War structures and conservation area. There are identified views out from the east end of the flying field (UHCAA fig 9), and from the residential zone (UHCAA fig. 11). Under key views and vistas UHCAA mentions views from the flying field to the east.
- 12.92 UHCAA 6.4 concludes that:
- there are no views from public places into the site that give the observer an understanding of the layout, beyond the fact that there is a high concentration of HASs [hardened aircraft shelters] at the north end. Views are of individual buildings and structures and the observer cannot 'read' the landscape from the outside.

## CULTURAL HERITAGE 12

---

- 12.93 There are significant panoramas looking west from the airbase over the Cherwell valley from the west end of the runway, a location which lies outside the study area. The visual impact of the airbase itself on the landscape- and therefore the area from which its layout and setting can chiefly be appreciated - has been graded in UCHAA from high to low, the development site lying substantially outside all three areas, except for a strip down the western margin of the landfill site of about 160m, which falls within the zone of low visual and landscape impact, i.e. locations from where the airbase is a 'perceptible visual element'. This 160m-wide strip is of course part of the landfill at present, but the proposed large structures would not impinge on any views of the air base.
- 12.94 A key aspect of the setting of the airbase is the view from the air. The proposed building would be clearly visible from any height while approaching or leaving the vicinity of the airbase, but this would not impinge on any view of the airbase or the ability of any person to appreciate its form and relationship with the surviving historic landscape.
- 12.95 The overall magnitude of visual impact is judged to be low, and the resulting visual impact sensitivity generally is moderate.
- 12.96 **J Barn** north of Ashgrove Farm listed building. Most of the building is hidden by the lie of the land, and as a functional agricultural building, the primary setting of the barn is probably the farm itself. The combination of these factors results in a low magnitude of impact from the proposed building.

### MITIGATION

- 12.97 The key mitigation measures proposed are firstly the landfill restoration scheme which would match the general character of the surrounding historic landscape, including that of the pre-extraction layout within the development site, whilst not being an exact replacement of it. Over time the proposed planting scheme would assist in decreasing its visual impact and that of the proposed building.
- 12.98 The placing of the EfW facility close to the existing quarry floor level and the shaping of the landfill landform around it would provide the greatest possible reduction of its visual impact.

### SUMMARY

- 12.99 This Chapter has assessed the potential impact on the cultural heritage resource of the proposed development.
- 12.100 The historic landscape within the study area contains elements from several different periods of time, and has no particular focus in one period. There would be no direct impact on any cultural heritage elements from these proposals due to the former quarrying of the site.
- 12.101 The heritage assets present within the study area comprise grouped village buildings including houses and churches, and isolated farm buildings, and

## CULTURAL HERITAGE 12

---

industrial and other functional buildings. The villages also contain conservation areas, and there is a registered park and a scheduled castle. With the mitigation proposed, the proposed development would create a negligible to moderate indirect visual impact on the settings of the heritage assets.