

From: Takeley Clerk [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 August 2022 17:46
To: Section 62A Applications <section62a@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Cc: Takeley Clerk [REDACTED]
Subject: S62A/22/0000004 - Land east of Parsonage Road, and south of Hall Road, Takeley

Good afternoon.

As discussed with Inspector Robins at the conclusion of yesterday's hearing, the Parish Council has asked me to send you the attached appeal decision notice for Land at Warish Hall Farm, Takeley which was released yesterday, Appeal Ref: APP/C1570/W/22/3291524.

I have also attached a map where Le Knells Cottage is marked for reference to the Stansted Airport Solar Farm proposed site. The parcels of land outlined in green and marked No.s 5, 6 and 7 are Land at Warish Hall Farm.

No.s 1 and 2 are Land East and West of Parsonage Road, allowed on appeal APP/C1570/W/19/324372723, referenced in Stansted Airport's application and in the Warish Hall Farm appeal decision paragraph 84.

Submission of the appeal decision notice is for information only and there is no supplementary Parish Council comment.

The inspector will note that the 'tilted balance' was not engaged in the Land at Warish Hall appeal. The following paragraphs do, however, comment on the weight of policies S7 and S8 as follows:

Paragraph 83.

In respect of recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, I consider Policy S7, in requiring the appearance of development "to protect or enhance the particular character of the part of the countryside within which it is set or there are special reasons why the development in the form proposed needs to be there", is broadly consistent with NPPF paragraphs 130 and 174b. Consequently, having concluded that there would be significant landscape character and visual impact harm arising from the proposal without special reasons being demonstrated as to why the development in the form proposed needs to be there, I give moderate weight to this conflict with the last strand of Policy S7, given it is not fully consistent with the NPPF. In reaching this view, I have had regard to the previous appeal decisions cited by the parties that reach contrasting views on the degree of weight to be given to breaches of Policy S7 based on the specifics of each of those particular cases.

Paragraph 84.

Turning to Policy S8 and the CPZ, I agree with the Inspector who in appeal ref. APP/C1570/W/19/324372723 concluded that Policy S8 is more restrictive than the balancing of harm against benefits approach of the NPPF, noting that the NPPF at paragraph 170 advises that decisions should recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and that the 'protection' afforded to the CPZ in Policy S8 is not the same as the Framework's 'recognition'.

Paragraph 85.

Given the policy is not fully consistent with the NPPF and there is a pressing need for deliverable housing land in the District, I consider that the conflict

with LP Policy S8 should be given moderate weight. Again, I have taken account of the previous grants of planning permission within the CPZ both by the Council and at appeal. However, I have reached my conclusion on the weight to be given to the conflict with this policy based on the effect of the proposal on the site-specific circumstances of this case.

Paragraph 104 (extract)

I have identified that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area in terms of its adverse effect on landscape character and visual impact, would reduce the open character of the CPZ

Thank you for the opportunity to send this information for your consideration.

Kind regards

Jackie

Jackie Deane
Locum Clerk to Takeley Parish Council

PLEASE NOTE OUR NEW EMAIL ADDRESS

