
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 February 2021

by N Holdsworth MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 May 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/W/20/3260889

Northney Farm, St Peters Road, Hayling Island, PO11 0RX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Pike of A.H. Brown Ltd. against the decision of Havant Borough Council.
 - The application Ref APP/19/01048, dated 14 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 July 2020.
 - The development proposed was originally described as agricultural maize silage clamp. 3 metre high walls with safety rail required by health and safety.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for agricultural maize silage clamp and 3 metre high walls with safety rail at Northney Farm, St Peters Road, Hayling Island, PO11 0RX, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref APP/19/01048, dated 14 October 2019, and the plans submitted with it (site location plan, block/site plan, plan entitled 'Maize Silage Clamp at Northney Farm').

Procedural Matters

2. The development has already been carried out. I have dealt with the appeal on the basis that permission is sought to retain what has already been built. The submitted plans provide an adequate representation of the works.
3. The description of development in the formal decision has been taken from the Council's decision notice as it accurately describes the development. Some unnecessary wording has been removed.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the development on the setting of the Grade II listed building known as North Farm House.

Reasons

5. North Farm House is an attractive timber framed house dating back to the 17th Century. Its significance is derived from its retained architectural features, particularly its brickwork, doors and windows, together with its social and economic status as a building historically connected to the rural economy. It benefits from an open farmland setting to the east which reflects its agricultural origins and contributes positively to the asset's significance. The farm buildings to its immediate south associated with Northney Farm are an

integral part of this working rural landscape. Whilst modern in appearance the buildings, and activities associated with them, complement the listed building and contribute positively to its setting.

6. The recently constructed maize store blends in with this existing development, being subservient in height and scale to the other farm buildings at Northney Farm. The use of concrete and steel uprights is typical of modern construction methods in the farming industry. Whilst visible from the neighbouring listed building and its garden, the maize store is set well away from the main house, with a large private garden in the intervening space. As it sits within a cluster of well-established existing development, it does not obstruct any significant views of the heritage asset from the surrounding area.
7. Consequently, the development preserves the setting of North Farm House. There is no harm in this respect. It complies with policies CS11 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan Core Strategy 2011, together with policy DM20 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) 2014 which require, amongst other things, that new development responds positively to existing features of historic character. It also complies with the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks to conserve and enhance the historic environment.

Other Matters

8. I understand the concern about the impact of the maize store on the outlook from North Farm House and its garden. However, the structure occupies a relatively small part of the southern boundary of this property. It is visible from the neighbouring garden but is not so large as to be overbearing. In planning terms, there is no harmful loss of outlook. A maize store would not generate significant levels of noise or smells beyond what may be reasonably expected in a farming environment such as this, so there is no justification to impose controls on how the store is used. Overall, there is no harm to the living conditions of existing or future residents, in any respect.
9. The store is set away from the boundary of a nearby Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and does not adversely affect its setting. Concerns about the conduct of the Council are of no relevance to this decision. Compliance with health and safety legislation and pollution control rules are the responsibility of the owner of the farm. They are not grounds to refuse planning permission for the retention of this maize store.
10. Given my findings on the main issue there is no need to require that the store is camouflaged or disguised through painting, cladding or planting through planning conditions. Such steps are not necessary to make the proposal acceptable in planning terms, and I have therefore excluded the proposed planting plan from the list of plans in the formal decision. As the development has already been carried out and is acceptable in all respects, no conditions are necessary.

Conclusion

11. The proposal complies with the development plan and there are no other considerations that indicate planning permission should be refused. The appeal should therefore succeed.

Neil Holdsworth

INSPECTOR