

Conservation Officer – Peter Fellows

Site: Northney Farm, St Peters Road, Hayling Island

Recommendation: No Objection

Site

Northney Farm is a working farm located in Northney Village. The main farm building complex is sited to the east of St Peters Road comprising a mix of traditional and modern farm buildings. Along the St Peters Road frontage are two historic Grade II listed dwellings which date from the 18th century. Within the farm itself the barn situated to the north of the farmyard has been confirmed as a building of local historic interest. The site is not located within a conservation area.

The proposals in question relate to a agricultural maize silage clamp which is located to the eastern most side of the farmyard. This is located close to North Farm House which is Grade II listed.

Proposals

Retrospective application for agricultural maize silage clamp and 3 metre high walls with safety rail

Legislative and Policy Background

Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 ("1990 Act") requires local planning authorities to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building, its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest when considering whether to grant listed building consent.

Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires planning authorities, when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

The above statute and its subsequent and consistent interpretation in recent high court decision emphasises the need for the policies of the NPPF to be implemented whilst always having regard to the need to give special or greater weight to the preservation of the setting of a listed building.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the policies that the Council must take into account when determining planning applications. The 'Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2', states at paragraph 4:

'The significance of a heritage asset is the sum of its archaeological, architectural, historic, and artistic interest' and provides at paragraphs 8, 9 and 10 that in order for the Local Planning Authority to make decisions in line with legal requirements, the objectives of the development plan; and, the policy requirements of the NPPF, great importance is placed on understanding the nature, extent and level of the significance of the heritage asset.

The revised NPPF sets out in Chapter 16, the core principles relating to development affecting Heritage Assets that local planning authorities should consider in making planning decisions in the following paragraphs:

'184. Heritage assets range from sites and buildings of local historic value to those of the highest significance, such as World Heritage Sites which are internationally recognised to be of Outstanding Universal Value. These assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner

appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations.

189. In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

190. Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

191. Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of, or damage to, a heritage asset, the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision.

192. In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Considering potential impacts

193. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

194. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:

- a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;
- b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional

Local Plan Policies

Policy CP16 (1a) of the Core Strategy states Planning permission will be granted for development that is designed to a high standard, which helps to create places where people want to live, work and relax. All development should demonstrate that its design:

Identifies and responds positively to existing features of natural, historic or local character within or close to the proposed development site.

Policy DM20 of the Allocations Plan states that development proposals must conserve and enhance the historic assets of Havant

Assessment

The relevant consideration relating to the historic environment in this instance is the impact of the proposals on the adjacent listed building (North Farm House) and locally listed buildings, their respective setting and any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Locally listed barn Northney Farm

In regards of the locally listed barn there will be no impact from the proposals. The barn is set within a complex of other modern large barns which screen the development from any view. As such there would be no harm to its setting.

North Farm House

North Farm House is Grade II listed and originates from the 17th century. It is a timber-framed building which has been clad later in brickwork. There are 18th & 20th additions to the dwellings. The plan (including the granary) and surrounding gardens add to the historic significance of the Listed Building and its setting. The significance of North Farmhouse not only lies in its architectural value but also in its evidential value as a physical document of past agricultural practices and rural settlement. This allows the observer to properly appreciate the functional origins of the complex and its relationship with the surrounding agricultural land.

A traditional farmstead or farm building will have significance if it makes a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness, whether it is designated as a heritage asset or not. It is clear in this case that North Farmhouse and the granary make a positive contribution in their current form to the character of the area.

The proposed silage clamp is located to the south east of North Farm House and is constructed with concrete walls (approximately 3 metres in height) and a steel frame with a safety rail/steel uprights which reach 4.9m. This replaced an existing timber clad enclosure of approximately 2m. It is located next to a large metal clad agricultural barn and is separated from the garden of North Farm House by mature hedging/shrubs.

Views of development from the house itself would be relatively distant and screened from view by mature vegetation. Any glimpse views of the silage clamp would be seen in the context and with the background of the large modern agricultural barn. It should also be noted that the steel frame allows for views through the structure above the height of the concrete walling. The red colour of the steel frame does currently make it stand out more and as such I would recommend that it is painted green to blend in with the vegetation. A softening of the concrete walling with timber cladding would have also been beneficial to try and blend the development into its surroundings.

From within the gardens themselves the development would come more into view the closer one gets to the boundary. However, again any views of the structure are intermittent with the mature screening available. It is also clear this is set to a backdrop of a longstanding working farm with large modern barns visually notable. In turn the existing farm does not allow for southern long-distance views from North Farm House into open countryside which might have made the existing view more significant. Furthermore, I do not consider that this development cause any harm to the spacious nature of the gardens as this is substantially maintained by the development.

CONCLUSION

The proposed silage clamp It is sufficiently distant from North Farm House and the locally listed barn not to materially impact on it. The red steel frame will be the most noticeable feature within the garden of North Farm House which could beneficially be softened by appropriate painting. However, even the steel frame is intermittently viewed even when in close proximity. The development would also not impact on the spacious feel of the surrounding gardens. As such even considering the importance of the neighbouring assets and the high sensitivity of the location, in my view is not such as to make the proposal unacceptable. Given the limited scale of the development and the backdrop of buildings against which it would be viewed I am firmly of the view that there would be no material harm to the architectural and historic interest of North Farm House and its setting.

Recommendations:

- Paint steel frame green
- Clad external concrete walling in timber