

NOTE

BACKGROUND EXPLANATION

1. My attention has been drawn by Wychavon District Council to comments made by RCA Regeneration Ltd to certain apparent ambiguities contained in two paragraphs of my Final Report relating to Policy HD.1 – Development Boundary and Infill. The two paragraphs in question are 10 and 23(2). RCA Regeneration Ltd represent Mrs N Harrison who has an interest in land known as ‘Land South of Two Jays, Station Road’. Mrs Harrison has expressed concern as to the current wording which, it is said, currently lacks clarity and should be reworded. I am happy to clarify this and I apologise for any difficulty in interpretation that may have arisen.
2. The following is a summary of the background circumstances. The development boundary proposed in the draft Neighbourhood Development Plan included an amendment to the approved Local Plan by extending the boundary to include a large extent of land to the south of the Railway Station. In 2019 a Planning Inspector dismissed an appeal for the inclusion of parcels of land within this area. He concluded that the appeal as a whole was outside the built-up part of the village and as such, in policy terms, lay in the countryside. However, in doing so, the Planning Inspector did advocate that Plot 1, between frontage development on Station Road and newly developed plots, formed part of the built form. He stated that ‘plot one is nestled within the village boundary and built form. It would have a negligible effect on the open countryside.’
3. The Block Plan which was part of the appeal application is attached in the submitted documentation. This identifies Plot 1 and the adjacent development. My intention in the Report was to include Plot 1 and the adjacent dwellings (plots 1 to 4) within the development boundary, but I noted the Inspector’s reference to semi-detached dwellings on the other side of Plot 1. The two semi-detached dwellings are already in the development boundary.
4. Subsequent to the appeal Plot 1 has been granted planning permission under application 21/00084/FUL. The Regulation 16 representation made by Ms Harrison refers to Plot 2

which is currently subject to an appeal, and is also subject to an extant planning application.

5. Thus, for the purposes of clarity, I consider that proposed changes are needed to the Report so as to alter the references from two adjacent semi-detached houses to Plots 1 to 4.
6. I therefore suggest that the Report be amended in relation to Paragraphs 10 and 23(2) so as to include the following observations: -

Paragraph 10

The appeal decision of the Planning Inspector, dated 18th February 2019, notes that the proposed extension to the Development Boundary forms part of a gap at Station Road. This enables two dwellings to remain separate from the Village and to maintain the open rural character of the area. The 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. Furthermore, the appeal also concluded that Plot 1 is located to the rear of a pair of semi-detached dwellings and that 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 Planning Inspector's conclusions should be disregarded. However, 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 in order 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 the Development Boundary map should be amended 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

28th June 2022