

Matter 5 – Development Quality, Design and Heritage.

Q3. Is Policy 21: Heritage Assets and Managing Change within the Historic Environment sound and legally compliant?

Response:

No. The NPPF states:

“Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:

a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;

Where is the “clear and convincing justification”?

In any case, even if Policy 21 were deemed sound, HDC then proceed to ignore it in relation to ST01 where there is harm to the setting of three listed buildings.

Policy 21 states:

“Proposals which would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the heritage asset should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal and will only be supported where public benefit is considered to outweigh the harm”.

It has already been established at the previous appeal for 102 houses on this site that the harm outweighed the public benefit.

Once again this site does not comply with the policies of the Plan.