

**Title:** Appeal Decisions

**Item 5**

**Author:** Nigel Brown –

<b>SITE ADDRESS</b>	<b>APPLICATION NO</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>APPEAL DATE &amp; DECISION</b>	<b>SUMMARY OF DECISION</b>	<b>DECISION BY OFFICER/OVERTURNED BY COMMITTEE</b>
The Old Guildhall Church End Clavering	UTT/12/5837/LB	Replacement Windows	20 December 2013  Dismissed	In dismissing the appeal the Inspector did state: I have given due weight to the fact that the majority of the existing windows are non-historic, nonetheless, their replacement with double-glazed sealed units would not preserve the special architectural or historic interest of this Grade II* listed building. However, this would not mitigate the degree of harm that would arise from the replacement of most of the windows on the main range. I conclude the works would cause substantial harm to the special architectural and historic interest of the building, contrary to the aims of 'saved' Local Plan1 policy ENV2.	<b>N/A</b>
Pratts Farm Pratts Field Lubberhedges Lane Stebbing	UTT/12/5082/FUL	Change of use from agricultural land to D2 use for dogs agility club	28 November 2013  Allowed	The Inspector concluded that the structures and equipment associated with the dog agility activities were modest and did not cause harm to the character of the landscape.  In terms of sustainability, accepting that the nature of the activity made it highly likely that the location of the site would encourage the use of the private car, a	<b>N/A</b>

				<p>remote countryside was likely to be preferable.</p> <p>He did conclude that the nature of the business would not result in problems around highway safety.</p>	
<p>Land adj Belstock Cricketfield Lane Molehill Green, Takeley</p>	<p>UTT/13/1190/OP</p>	<p>Erection of 4 no. dwellings with all matters reserved</p>	<p>05 December 2013</p> <p>Dismissed</p>	<p>Although accepting that the proposal would not result in coalescence between the countryside and Stansted Airport, the Inspector did conclude that the proposal would result in the harmful encroachment of new development into open and undeveloped land. The Inspector did not accept that appellant's argument that the introduction of private owner occupied housing (as opposed to the majority in the village that had been compulsorily purchased by the airport) would create investment into the village. He did also did not feel that the offered contribution of a formal parking area for the cricket club outweighed the harm from the proposed development.</p>	<p><b>Officer recommendation was supported at committee</b></p>
<p>53 Landscape View Saffron Walden</p>	<p>UTT/13/1735/TPO</p>	<p>Reduce branches by maximum of 50% 1 no. walnut</p>	<p>04 December 2013</p> <p>Dismissed</p>	<p>The Inspector concluded that "the appeal tree contributes to local visual amenity and landscape quality. The works proposed would degrade such attributes (albeit temporarily). The degree of pruning proposed is likely to have negative effects on long-term tree health and vigour. Shading issues have been considered and, in my view, the works proposed are unlikely to significantly resolve these and would not justify the works proposed. I saw nothing to indicate that the tree poses a</p>	<p><b>Officer recommendation was supported at committee</b></p>

				current and identifiable hazard...I do not consider that the tree is excessively large for its setting, or that it is oppressive.”	
Helpeston Manor Hollow Road Felsted	UTT/13/1167/HHF	New detached cartlodge building with domestic facilities.	28 November 2013  Dismissed	The Inspector concluded “I do not consider that there are any ‘special reasons’ for the development and that, because of its scale and appearance, the proposal would not protect or enhance the character of the locality. The requirements of LP saved policy S7 would not be met”	<b>N/A</b>
15 East Street Saffron Walden	UTT/13/1705/HHF	Erection of single and two storey rear extension.	31 December 2013  Dismissed	The Inspector accepted “that the single storey extension would have a pitched roof and would be stepped down from the existing floor level. However, whilst the greatest impact, in terms of direct sunlight, would be in the morning, this does not take into account the loss of ambient daylight throughout the day, which would be exacerbated by the combination of the depth and height, and proximity of the extension to the window at No 13. Accordingly, the proposal would result in an overbearing development that would be harmful in terms of both outlook and loss of daylight.”	<b>N/A</b>