



Summary Proof of Evidence

**APP/D1265/C/24/3351182/3
/4/5/6/7**

Development at:

**Land known as Anchor
Paddock, Batchelors Lane,
Holtwood BH21 7DS**

Prepared By

James Cain MA(Hons), MPlan,
MRTPI

Planning Base Ltd
5 Seymer Close
Shillingstone
Dorset
DT11 0PH

On Behalf of the Appellant

14th January 2025

1.0 Summary Proof of Evidence

- 1.1 My proof will assess the three Enforcement Notices in isolation and the individual matters in dispute relating to the ground (a) appeals at the Tree House, Anchor Paddock and White Barn. A comprehensive Statement of Common Ground has been agreed between the parties and my Proof focusses on those matters in dispute in support of the case of the appellant.
- 1.2 In terms of the Tree House, the Inspector will have to consider the ground (d) appeal and this will have a bearing on the ground (a) appeal. The main issue in dispute at the Tree House is whether it should be treated as a new dwelling, a replacement dwelling or a residential annexe and whether a Flood Risk Assessment is required.
- 1.3 In terms of Anchor Paddock, my proof looks at what elements of the ancillary buildings can be determined as not inappropriate development under paragraph 154 of the NPPF and which buildings need to be demolished to create volumetric equalisation for the dormer to remain in situ.
- 1.4 White Barn is the subject of the most amount of evidence because this has more matters in dispute than the other two Notices. Again, issues of compliance with paragraph 154 for certain buildings, denoting the curtilage and previously developed land are assessed in the evidence.
- 1.5 In the event that the Inspector considers that some or all of the individual aspects of development are inappropriate within the Green Belt, then there is commentary upon Very Special Circumstances in relation to the COVID pandemic