

Heritage Team Response

Date – 10/5/2024

APP/24/00130 – 2 Towers Garden, Langstone

FURTHER RESPONSE TO ORIGINAL RESPONSE DATED 10/4/2024

Further to the response dated 10/4/24, I would like to provide further explanation in relation to the heritage position of the LPA:

Paragraph 208 of the National Planning Policy (NPPF) advises 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, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use’.

As the proposal to create a hardstanding would not result in the total loss of the heritage asset (in this case that being the Langstone Conservation Area), the level of harm is deemed to be ‘less than substantial harm’. The NPPF advises that such harm should be weighed up against the public benefits of the proposal.

In this case, the proposal would reduce demand for on street parking and as such, there would be some modest public benefit. However, as the hardstanding itself would only directly benefit the applicants, the benefits are predominantly more private than public and therefore, the modest public benefit is not considered to outweigh the ‘less than substantial’ harm to the significance of the Langstone Conservation Area.

Overall is considered that the proposal will would fail meet the test of Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as it would neither preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the area and would not meet the requirements of the NPPF, nor those of Policy CS11 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy 2011).