

Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2012-2036 Examination

MATTER 14 – The Historic Environment (LP25)

Central Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee
Hearing Statement

October 2016



MATTER 14 – The Historic Environment (LP25)

Issue 14a – The Historic Environment – Policy LP25

Q1. In considering proposals that ‘affect the significance of a heritage asset’, does Policy LP25 need to make a distinction between substantial and less than substantial harm to be consistent with paragraph 126-141 of the Framework?

No, it is not considered necessary to make a distinction between substantial and less than substantial harm within Policy LP25.

The policy requires an applicant to provide proportionate justification for proposed works which can then be assessed against the tests set out in the NPPF. The “tests set out in the NPPF” are explicitly referenced in the policy and it is not considered necessary to replicate them in full.

Q2. Following on from Q1, does Policy LP25 need to more explicitly reflect paragraph 134 of the Framework which states that where a development proposal 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.

No.

As stated above, whilst the policy does not makes reference to harm being “weighed against public benefits”, it requires an applicant to provide proportionate justification for proposed works which can be assessed against the tests in the NPPF and it is not considered necessary to repeat the NPPF.

Q3. In its approach to ‘Listed Buildings’ in Policy LP25 is the plan consistent with paragraph 132 of the Framework which states that substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building, park or garden should be ‘exceptional’. Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be ‘wholly exceptional’.

It is accepted that the policy wording does not explicitly reference whether substantial harm to or loss should be ‘exceptional’ or ‘wholly exceptional’ and therefore, to avoid any potential of the reader assuming that the Local Plan policy is in some way a conscious decision to amend national policy, the following modification (Main/SC/12) is suggested:

“Permission **that results in substantial harm to or loss of** ~~to demolish or partly demolish~~ a Listed Building will only be granted in exceptional **or, for grade I and II* Listed Buildings, wholly exceptional** circumstances.”

Q4. Is the requirement for planning applications to provide ‘an appropriate and proportionate assessment’ to assess archaeological remains sufficiently clear? Is the Policy effective in this regard?

The policy and supporting text are considered to be clear, effective and reflect paragraph 128 of the NPPF in requiring an appropriate and proportionate assessment. The NPPF specifically requires “developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation”.

No further wording is considered necessary, unless words '*in accordance with the NPPF*' be added to the second paragraph of the archaeology section of the Policy. The Committee does not think this is necessary, and somewhat would contradict para 1.1.4 of the Local Plan, but the Committee would have no objection if the Inspector requires such modification.