

Matter 5

Issue 1

Q3. SP21 does not adequately reflect NPPF para 200-201 requirements to provide ‘a clear and convincing justification’ for harm caused to designated heritage assets ‘(from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting)’. This should demonstrate that “the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss”.

The policy should be amended to reflect the requirement for ‘a clear and convincing justification that the benefits outweigh losses in both Planning Applications and Local Development documents (including site assessments and the Sustainability Appraisal within the HDLP, and Neighbourhood Plans.)

HDC has provided no justification for STO1 which is adjacent to 3 Listed Buildings (West Wantley House 2*, East Wantley House 2, East Wantley Barn 2). The STO1 fields are an integral part of their farming setting. Indeed HDC did not assess the impact on East Wantley at all, even though the proposed ribbon development crossing all 3 fields will necessarily be less than 110m away. For more detail, see my statement for Matter 9.

STO1 has the lowest housing density of any site in the HDLP and crosses habitats containing protected species. This maximises the harm (setting and environmental) and minimises the housing benefit. Further detail is provided in my representation and other written statements.