

Steven King

From:
Sent:
To:



Subject: DM/25/3129 - Land at Borde Hill Lane

Dear Councillor



I should be very grateful for your help in **REJECTING** planning permission for 117 homes on Lane East of Borde Hill Lane.

- Case Officer Steven King notes that the application does not meet many of the criteria in the District Plan
- The Localism Act 2011 has been ignored
 - Pre app advice given by Steve Ashdown in November 2020 to Woolf Bond states: *"it is considered that the proposed development of the site is contrary to the Development Plan and as such were an application to be submitted it is not considered something that could be supported."* Nothing has changed since that date and the site has been rejected on previous occasions.

Lack of 5 Year Housing Land Supply

I should be grateful if you would give further consideration to the policies referred to in paragraph 11(d)(i) of the NPPF.

- This site is included in Historic England's description of Borde Hill's Grade II* Parkland Listing: "To the ... **east**, the site's parkland and woodland merge into the adjacent undulating, wooded farmland.
- Grade II* sites are considered to be particularly important sites, of more than special interest (only around 28% of registered sites have this designation. [Planning-System-in-England-and-Protection-of-Historic-Parks-and-Gardens-2016-v1.pdf \(thegardenstrust.org\)](#))
 - Under Statutory Consultee Requirements, LPAs must consult The Gardens Trust in relation to Grades 1, II* Parkland
 - I believe the could be classed as a heritage asset (see description in The Gardens Trust document above). At the very least it should be a non-designated heritage asset.
 - "The addition of parks and gardens to the Register means that they are subject to a statutory designation, and have the same weight in policy terms under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) as scheduled monuments and listed buildings. In NPPF terms, they are 'designated heritage assets', with those registered at Grade I or Grade II* identified as being 'of the highest significance'."
- The harm therefore would be raised to 'substantial' and the site should be rejected.

Thank you for taking my concerns into consideration.

With kind regards

