

## **ADDENDUM TO REPORT**

My proposed amendments are as follows:

### **Paragraph 10**

The appeal decision, dated 18<sup>th</sup> February 2019, notes that the proposed extension to the Development Boundary forms part of a gap at Station Road, which enables two dwellings to remain separate from the Village and maintains the open rural character of the area. The Planning Inspector concluded that development in this location would be contrary to Policy SWDP 2 (Development Strategy and Development Hierarchy) and would fail to safeguard the countryside. However, the appeal also concluded that Plot 1 is located to the rear of a pair of semi-detached dwellings and its rear boundary is adjacent to a further rear garden. As such, Plot 1 nestles within the Village boundary and built form. It would have a negligible effect on the open countryside. I have no evidence before me which suggests that the Inspector's conclusions should be disregarded. Furthermore, the appeal decision is clear that Plot 1 and the pair of semi-detached dwellings lie within the built-up area of the Village, and not within the countryside. Therefore, the Development Boundary should be amended to include Plot 1 **together with the adjacent four dwellings to provide consistency with the approach at Leamington Road and Springfield Lane**, within the Development Boundary and would guide infill development to a sustainable location to be consistent with SWDP 2.

### **Paragraph 23(2)**

In figure 3 amend the Development Boundary map to include Plot 1 of appeal APP/H1840/W/18/3213004, ~~land at Two Jays, and the two adjacent semidetached Plots 1-4 detailed on plan S/002A – Existing Site Block Plan submitted to the appeal,~~ to the south of the Station.

Edward Cousins  
Examiner

Radcliffe Chambers  
11 New Square  
Lincoln's Inn  
London WC2A 3QB

28<sup>th</sup> June 2022

