

We (REDACTED), object to the proposal in regard to 'Retrospective application for agricultural maize silage clamp and 3 metre high walls with safety rail' APP/19/01048

Havant Borough Council has invited us the owners, to comment on the application and therefore, our comments are detailed below:

1. This is a unique planning application which seeks to build a very large maize clamp / silo which partially borders the garden of a listed building (listing number 1091611). This garden is used for recreation where both adults and children relax and play. We believe that any reasonable person viewing this new maize clamp would say that this is an hideous industrial structure far too close to a historic English property. We say it should be relocated.
2. We have noted that the answer to question no 24 (Authority Employee/Member) in the planning submission document has been answered 'yes". The name of the person was redacted when we accessed the website. We understand the person related is the Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Lead for Planning, Regeneration and Communities and is the son of the applicant. Clearly a material conflict of interest exists and it is essential prior to any decision making how this conflict of interest would be handled e.g. which personnel would be disqualified or even if the Council might acknowledge it appropriate to pass to another Council entity or other independent body to process. In any event and as a minimum, we would request that the decision on this proposal would go to the planning committee.
3. This new build structure is more than twice the size of the previous maize clamp which did precede it. There does not appear to be any plans lodged with the Council for the original structure but it is estimated that the height of the sleepers used before was about six to seven feet.
4. The working capacity of this new structure has increased we estimate by approximately thirty-five percent. This has been achieved by adding approximately one metre in height around the area which the applicant asserts is the base. Additionally the ability of the mechanised equipment to work at a greater height with a safety rail also allows the clamp to be filled to its maximum.
5. We say that the change from what was an existing and relatively low profile structure to what is now proposed is materially changed from what existed before due its increased size, the proximity to a listed building that this build cannot be contemplated under 'Permitted development rights for agriculture and forestry'. This is confirmed by the Council's requirement for retrospective planning.
6. The last bay (West) of the new clamp which extends to the southern border of the garden of North Farm House is approximately one metre from the boundary.
7. At approximately five metres in height the structure towers above the corner of the garden where adults sit and children play from time to time. JCB and telehandler equipment will operate at elevated levels above and adjacent to the garden. Although unlikely, accidents can and do happen even when safety measures are implemented NB. Very large equipment can still topple sideways even with safety rails. We say this risk is real and represents a Health and Safety issue. We say Northney Farm would be able to use the maize clamp at any time of the day as required.
8. The design of his structure is grotesquely ugly. The materials used are not sympathetic to the landscape, vista or setting of the listed building. By reason of its proximity to the listed building of North Farm House (built 1598) and its dominating size, it has a visually and physically overbearing impact on North Farm House and the landscape. This structure impacts the Residential Amenity previously enjoyed. We assert that this proposed structure contravenes Havant Borough Core Strategy 2011 CS16. We also assert that Development Management Policies - Caring For Our Borough - The Coast and Natural Environment DM8 Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features would be contravened should this structure prevail. We believe that the Council has a legal duty to satisfy themselves that any development would not adversely affect the setting of our listed building.
9. This new structure with its increased capacity brings with it additional pollution over and above what pre-existed. This comes in the form of additional noise, odours and fumes closer to the garden. The increased risk of the already present vermin and the danger of toxic effluent from a maize clamp which can damage water sources, wild life and pose a health risk to humans. A particular concern is how any effluent and ground water is handled by the farm as it relates to the maize clamp. This is a particular concern as Northney Farm yard and the field next the proposed clamp are already located in a NVZ (Nitrate Vulnerable Zone).
10. The submitted plan does not describe that new build maize clamp, completed 20 September 2019, complies with current legislation (Storing silage, slurry & agricultural fuel oil regulations) required by the Environmental

Agency and Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. We note that question 15 'Trade Effluent' has been answered 'NO'. The management of toxic effluent from a maize clamp is critical and the example in the link below demonstrates how things can go badly wrong. Two Nottinghamshire farming companies have been fined a total of £28,800 for causing pollution to a pond through the discharge of maize silage effluent from Sutton Grange farm in Sutton-cum-Lound near Retford. <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/28000-penalty-for-nottinghamshire-farming-companies-who-caused-serious-pollution>

11. In certain climatic conditions (prolonged rainfall and tidal events) groundwater can flow from the adjoining field at the corner of the garden where the silage clamp is located and does flow towards the House. This groundwater creates a risk of water pollution in our garden, and to the roman well which is forty metres away. The water abstracted from the well is used for watering the garden and growing vegetables in our two small plots.
12. It is acknowledged that a 'soakaway' is mentioned under Section 11 Assessment of flood risk but there is no specification. There is no description of how floodwater or effluent would be channelled into described 'soakaway' What flood capacity is the 'soakaway' designed to capture. We would have expected to see this type of information in a planning submission and we note the 'soakaway' is not identified in any of the drawings submitted.
13. The plan submission for this structure and its future contents does not deal with aspects of pollution that may impact neighbours including North Farm House e.g. water, air or soil or pollution through noise, smell, smoke, fumes, gases etc. We say that the Council must be satisfied that the risks are fully understood and that any mitigating measures adopted are robust. We do not believe this planning proposal demonstrates or complies with Development Management Policies - DM10 Pollution.
14. It appears that the submitted plan has been assembled with little regard for the impact on the adjacent listed building which is only forty metres from the new structure. We do acknowledge that North Farm House has been identified on two drawings.

Lastly we have attached some photographs of the 'maize clamp' and other relevant views which the planning authority might find helpful in coming to a decision. Some additional views will be sent separately in a further email.

View before new maize clamp



View after new maize clamp



View from garden Patio



Please find some additional photographs relating to APP/19/01048 OBJECTION dated 8/1/2020 for your consideration. The previous owners told us that the well in the photograph was Roman

WELL LOCATED ON PATIO



VIEW AT GARDEN CORNER



SIDE VIEW



