

## **HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL**

At a meeting of the Development Management Committee held on 16 July 2020

Present

Councillor Satchwell (Chairman)

Councillors Mrs Shimbart (Vice-Chairman), Crellin, Howard, Keast, Lloyd and Lowe

Other Councillors Present:

Councillor(s):

### **24 Apologies for Absence**

There were no apologies for absence.

### **25 Site Viewing Working Party Minutes**

The minutes of the Site Briefing held on 8<sup>th</sup> July 2020 were received.

### **26 Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest relating to items on the agenda.

### **27 APP/19/01048 - Northney Farm, St Peters Road, Hayling Island**

The site was the subject of a site briefing by the Site Viewing Working Party.

Proposal: Retrospective application for agricultural maize silage clamp and 3-metre-high walls with safety rail.

The Committee considered the written report and recommendation from the Head of Planning to grant permission.

The Committee received the supplementary information, circulated prior to the meeting which:

- 1) included the minutes of the Site Viewing Working Party held on 8 July 2020;
- 2) included a copy of the presentation given to the Site Viewing Working Party held on 8 July 2020;
- 3) included a written deputation received in advance of the Committee;
- 4) gave responses to the information requested by the Site Viewing Working Party which included:

- a. more recent photographs showing the site in summer foliage;
  - b. the results of an investigation into the suitability of using Ash trees to screen the proposal;
  - c. the results of an investigation into the most suitable size for proposed planting; and
  - d. clarification on the limits of the capacity of the silage clamp and the height of the silage within the metal frame;
- 5) included updates to the officers' report; and
- 6) included an amended Condition to the officers' recommendation.

All members confirmed that they had read the above supplementary papers prior to the meeting.

The members received a presentation from the officers outlining the report and answering the questions raised by the Site Viewing Working Party and individual members of the Committee since the agenda was published.

In response to issues raised within the deputation, the officers explained that the application was made following consideration by the Council's Enforcement Team, and that the application needed to be decided based on planning merits alone. The Heritage Team Leader also informed the Committee that they had visited the application site twice and had been able to have full view of the silage clamp in relation to the listed building and its surroundings. They believed that the intermittency of the frame did not have a significant enough impact for them to object to the application.

The Chairman stated to the Committee that the photos shown in the presentation were a snapshot of a moment in time, and so were not representative of the full site. They also reaffirmed the retrospective nature of the application, and that they should question, debate, and make a decision on the application as if it was not already erected.

In response to questions raised by the Committee, the officers answered that:

- i. agricultural permitted development rules were complex but give increased rights to developers, meaning that the concrete walls of the silage clamp were permitted without the need to seek planning permission up to a height of 3m. It was the railings and metal framework of the development which required permission to be sought;
- ii. the applicant had informed officers that the railing was a necessary safety requirement for agricultural use of the silage clamp, and whilst not being requested by the Council, did offer the addition of supporting the walls of the structure;

- iii. officers believed that the development would be more acceptable if the presently red railings were painted green, as this would be more in keeping with its surroundings and would therefore create a less harmful visual impact to the area;
- iv. the condition concerning cladding could be varied to agree the extent of the cladding necessary according to the sections of the structure which required it, should the Committee be minded to grant planning permission;
- v. the process of adding cladding would require some shrubbery along the clamp walls to be removed;
- vi. the listed farmhouse was significant in terms of architectural detailing, the mature grounds in which it was based, the holistic appearance of the building and the wider surrounds, but there was no calculation to use to determine whether an application was harmful to the setting of a listed building - this was assessed on a case by case basis on the merits of the proposals;
- vii. the investigation by Planning Enforcement as to whether the silage clamp was permitted under agricultural permitted development had taken time, but the Committee would be deciding on whether to grant planning permission within the meeting, and so should focus on planning merits only;
- viii. an additional condition could be included should the Committee be minded to grant planning permission to restrict the capacity of the silage clamp to no more than 3 metres high;
- ix. the proposed cladding would blend the concrete walls of the silage clamp into the rural setting, whilst the railings painted green would help further disguise the clamp in the natural surroundings, giving the maximum visual softening of a manmade structure;
- x. the maximum height of the silage was 3 metres to match the height of the concrete walls of the clamp, but this did not include the height of the tyres placed on top to secure the silage in place.

The Committee discussed the application in detail together with the views raised in the deputation received.

Although a minority of the members considered that the proposed development was acceptable subject to added conditions and would not have an unacceptable impact on the neighbouring property, a majority of the members felt that the proposal by reason of its design and siting would result in a harmful impact on the setting of the listed building and its surroundings.

It was therefore:

RESOLVED that application APP/19/01048 be refused for the following reason:

The development by reason of its height causes less than substantial harm to the setting of the adjacent grade 2 listed building, North Farm House. On the basis of the information available to the Local Planning Authority, it is not considered that this harm is outweighed by the benefits of the scheme. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies CS11 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, Policy DM20 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) 2014, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

**The meeting commenced at 5.00 pm and concluded at 7.08 pm**

.....

**Chairman**