

Chichester District Council

Planning Committee

Wednesday 3 February

Report of the Head of Planning Services

Schedule of Planning Appeals, Court and Policy Matters

This report updates Planning Committee members on current appeals and other matters. It would be of assistance if specific questions on individual cases could be directed to officers in advance of the meeting.

Note for public viewing via Chichester District Council web site To read each file in detail, including the full appeal decision when it is issued, click on the reference number (NB certain enforcement cases are not open for public inspection, but you will be able to see the key papers via the automatic link to the Planning Inspectorate).

- WR – Written Representation Appeal
- H – Hearing
- I – Inquiry
- () – Case Officer Initials
- * – Committee level decision

1. NEW APPEALS

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
AP/14/04250/LBC WR (M Tomlison) In progress	Crown and Anchor Dell Quay Road Dell Quay Appledram PO20 7EE - 2 no. free standing signs and 1 no. plaque.
BO/15/02233/DOM WR (N McKellar) In progress	Brook House Quay Meadow Bosham West Sussex PO18 8LY - Retrospective construction of pitched roof to existing outbuilding.
BO/15/02234/LIS WR (N McKellar) In progress	Brook House Quay Meadow Bosham West Sussex PO18 8LY - Construction of pitched roof to existing outbuilding.
BX/14/03827/OUT H (V Colwell) In progress	Land West Of Abbots Close Priors Acre Boxgrove West Sussex - Outline planning permission is sought for development of the site for up to 22 residential units, public open space, landscaping, access and car parking. All matters are to be reserved except for point of access.
BX/15/02533/DOM HH (C Boddy) In progress	17 Priory Close Boxgrove Chichester West Sussex PO18 0EA - Proposed detached garage.
CC/15/02154/ADV HH (M Tomlinson) In progress	Pizza Hut Portfield Way Chichester West Sussex PO19 7WT - 3 no. illuminated fascia signs, 2 no. illuminated internal suspended signs, 2 no. illuminated pole sign, 1 no. hanging sign.

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
CC/15/02681/ADV HH (C Boddy) In progress	Sainsburys Unicorn House 8 Eastgate Square Chichester West Sussex PO19 1JN - 1 no. externally illuminated thin aluminium fascia sign, 2 no. non-illuminated aluminium projecting signs and 1 no. non-illuminated ATM surround sign.
SDNP/15/04270/HOUS EARTHAM HH (J Shore) In progress	The Coach House Eartham Lane Eartham West Sussex PO18 0LP - Construction of a small oak barn for domestic storage/workshop use.
EWB/15/01239/FUL H (N Langford) In progress	148 Stocks Lane East Wittering West Sussex PO20 8NT - Demolition of the existing commercial building and the development of 26 no. one and two bed sheltered apartments for the elderly including communal facilities, access, car parking and landscaping.
O/15/00277/CONHH WR (R Hawks) In progress	Tapners Barn Marsh Lane Merston Oving Chichester West Sussex PO20 1DZ - Erection of side extension that requires planning permission.
SDNP/15/01863/HOUS ROGATE HH (R Jones) In progress	The Hug House Durlieghmarsh Rogate West Sussex GU31 5AY - Erection of an oak framed garden room to rear elevation, reduction of door-set to rear elevation, replacement doors to side elevation and new wall off side elevation.
SY/15/00074/CONHH WR (S Archer) In progress	47 Wellington Gardens Selsey Chichester West Sussex PO20 0RF - Without planning permission, erection of a single dwellinghouse.
SY/15/01408/FUL WR (F Stevens) In progress	Ullswater Malden Way Selsey Chichester West Sussex PO20 0RW - Construction of chalet bungalow on land east of Ullswater.
SY/15/02518/DOM WR (P HUNT) In progress	47 Wellington Gardens Selsey West Sussex PO20 0RF - Self-contained annexe.
SB/15/01837/FUL H (C Boddy) In progress	Thornham Products Thornham Lane Southbourne West Sussex PO10 8DD - Retrospective grant of planning permission to station the existing single mobile home.
SB/15/02508/FUL I (S Archer) In progress	Acre View Cottage Thornham Lane Southbourne West Sussex PO10 8DD - Continuation of use of building as a single dwellinghouse.
SB/15/02509/FUL I (S Archer) In progress	Willow Cottage Thornham Lane Southbourne Emsworth Hampshire PO10 8DD - Use of building as a single dwellinghouse.
WE/15/00135/CONWST WR (R Hawks) In Progress	Land South East Of Hopedene Common Road Hambrook Westbourne West Sussex - Untidy land.
WW/15/01350/FUL WR (P Kneen) In progress	Land Between Windsor and Maycroft Church Road East Wittering West Sussex PO20 8PS - Erection of two storey single family dwelling house, garage and driveway with access onto Sandpiper Walk, off Church Road.
WW/15/02400/DOM HH (C Boddy) In progress	Courts Haugh Rookwood Lane West Wittering West Sussex PO20 8QH - Garage, store room with garden store and bin / cycle store to either end respectively. Re-submission of 15/01447/DOM

2. DECISIONS RECEIVED

Reference/Decision	
<p>BO/14/01911/FUL WR (F Stevens)</p> <p>DISMISSED</p>	<p>Land To The North Of Bosham Station Ratham Lane Bosham West Sussex - New 4-bed detached two storey house with attached single garage.</p>
<p>"... The appellant considers the Council have not substantiated their claim of having a housing land supply, but nor has the appellant provided evidence to the contrary. On the basis of the evidence before me, it appears as if the Council have a supply. As such housing applications must be considered against the policies within the current LP.... For planning purposes the site is in the countryside where the provision of an additional single dwelling has to be justified by special circumstances, in accordance with the current LP and paragraph 55 of the Framework.... The site would be close to a number of services and facilities. Nevertheless, the development plan is clear with regard to development in the countryside. It will only be granted where it requires a countryside location and meets the essential, small scale and local need which cannot be met within or immediately adjacent to existing settlements. The proposed house would not meet these requirements, and thus would fail to accord with the requirements of the LP policies referred to above, nor be the sustainable development required by the Framework.... Whilst there is sufficient visibility from the layby to the south to the north visibility is restricted by treesand whilst I accept some could be removed to improve visibility,, the access would have very limited visibility, and movements into and out of it would come as a surprise to other users of the highway.... However, the appellant has referred to a fallback position with the resumption of the former nursery uses of the land occurring.... Vehicular and pedestrian movements using the existing access would occur with either nursery or agricultural uses, and could be much greater than that resulting from a single dwelling. Furthermore, the appellant would seek to obtain an income from the land if the appeal were to fail and I consider there to be a reasonable prospect of this occurring as I note a commercial nursery firm has expressed an interest in the site. This being so, the fallback position is an important material consideration to which I must attach substantial weight.... The use of the access for a dwelling has to be balanced against the fallback position, and for the reasons given the use of the access could be much less harmful than a nursery or agricultural use. The proposal would accord with the objectives of LP Policy 39 that seeks amongst other things, safe and adequate means of access..... The appellant has provided a survey with the appeal demonstrating that newts are not present in a neighbouring pondOn this basis the Council have withdrawn this reason for refusal,. Reference has been made by the parties to the emerging Bosham Neighbourhood Plan (NP). Whilst I have had regard to the policies within it, the NP has not yet been examined. As it is still at an early stage, this limits the weight that can be accorded to it. Local residents are concerned that the proposed house would exacerbate flood risk in the area. However,I have no evidence before me that there would be an unacceptable impact on flooding within the area.the positioning of the proposed house within its plot combined with the separation between the two buildings would not significantly harm the occupiers of the neighbouring bungalow with regard to privacy and daylight....Even though I have found the proposal would not exacerbate highway safety matters or harm protected species, this would not outweigh the conflict of the proposal with the aims of national and local planning policies which seek to restrict new residential development in the countryside. Thus, for the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed."</p>	

CC/15/01099/FUL WR (P Kneen) DISMISSED	21 Whyke Lane Chichester West Sussex PO19 7US - Change of use from a 4 bedroom semi detached house to 2 no. 2 bedroom self contained flats including two storey rear extension, internal and external alterations.
<p>"...The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on flood risk...The site is located within an area identified by the Environment Agency as being within Flood Zones 2 and 3. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and policy 42 of the Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014- 2029 (LP) require a sequential test be undertaken to direct development away from areas at highest risk of flooding. This test was not undertaken in support of this application...I have read the Flood Risk Assessment submitted with the application. This has limited value in the context of a lack of sequential test and does not fully address the potential risk of flooding on occupants of the proposed flats, nor does it address any potential increased risk of flooding elsewhere from the development as proposed...On the basis of the above, I must conclude that the development would have an unacceptable effect on flood risk and would conflict with the Framework and policy 42 of the LP...The site is located just outside the Chichester Conservation Area...The proposals would provide a two storey rear extension and conversion of the building to two flats that would not cause harm to the setting of the conservation area...I agree with the Council that the development would preserve the conservation area, in accordance with policy BE6 of the LP. However, this does not outweigh the harm that I have found in the main issue above...</p>	
CC/15/01122/DOM WR (A Miller) DISMISSED	28 Westgate Chichester West Sussex PO19 3EU - Single storey rear extension. Linked to CC/15/01123/LBC
<p>"Appeal A Ref: APP/L3815/W/15/3128788 28 Westgate, Chichester, West Sussex PO19 3EU ...The application Ref CC/15/01122/DOM, dated 7 April 2015, was refused by notice dated 12 June 2015. The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.... Appeal A: The appeal is dismissed.... 28 Westgate is a grade II listed building that lies within the Chichester Conservation Area.... The Council refused the planning application under the requirements of policies in the Chichester District Local Plan - First Review (1999). However, in July 2015 the Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies (LP) was adopted, and the Council have stated that the 1999 plan policies referred to in the reason for refusal have been cancelled and superseded by those in the LP.. I am obliged to determine the appeals against the most up to- date policies and have considered it on this basis, and am satisfied that natural justice would not be breached.... The main issues are, firstly whether the proposed single story extension would preserve the special architectural or historic interest of a grade II listed building; and secondly, whether the proposal would harm the living conditions of neighbouring residents, with particular regard to outlook.... The proposed single storey extension would replace the existing one which was constructed in the 1960s.... However, unlike the existing extension it would extend the width of the garden, It would be an overly long and wide, bulky addition to the house at odds with the tall, narrow nature of the building....The introduction of such a complex roof would be a strident and incongruous contrast to the simplicity of the form of the main house.....impact of the proposal on the historic fabric has not been ascertained, nor therefore how much of the garden walls could be retained.... harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.... The appellant has pointed out that the extension would not be visible from the public realm. However, the statutory requirement is to preserve the special architectural or historic interest of a listed building in all cases, not just where it is prominent or highly visible.the proposed extension would unacceptably harm the special interest of the listed building.... depth would form a dominant and oppressive outlook to its occupiers, including from the garden.... unacceptably harm the living</p>	

conditions of the occupiers of No 30 with regard to outlook... The appeal property lies within the Chichester Conservation Area where there is a statutory requirement to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of a conservation area..

CC/15/01123/LBC WR (A Miller)	28 Westgate Chichester West Sussex PO19 3EU - Single storey rear extension. Linked to CC/15/01122/DOM
DISMISSED	

"Appeal B Ref: APP/L3815/Y/15/3132188 28 Westgate, Chichester, West Sussex PO19 3EU The application Ref CC/15/01123/LBC, dated 7 April 2015, was refused by notice dated 12 June 2015. The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.... Appeal B: The appeal is dismissed.... 28 Westgate is a grade II listed building that lies within the Chichester Conservation Area.... The Council refused the planning application under the requirements of policies in the Chichester District Local Plan - First Review (1999). However, in July 2015 the Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies (LP) was adopted, and the Council have stated that the 1999 plan policies referred to in the reason for refusal have been cancelled and superseded by those in the LP. The main issues are, firstly whether the proposed single story extension would preserve the special architectural or historic interest of a grade II listed building; and secondly, whether the proposal would harm the living conditions of neighbouring residents, with particular regard to outlook.... The proposed single storey extension would replace the existing one which was constructed in the 1960s.... However,it would extend the width of the garden, The full height partly glazed doors and windows would extend most of the width of the extension, and would exaggerate its breadth. The introduction of such a complex roof would be a strident and incongruous contrast to the simplicity of the form of the main houseThestatutory requirement is to preserve the special architectural or historic interest of a listed building in all cases, not just where it is prominent or highly visible. Thus, for the reasons given above, the proposed extension would unacceptably harm the special interest of the listed building.... depth would form a dominant and oppressive outlook to its occupiers, including from the garden.... unacceptably harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No 30 with regard to outlook... The appeal property lies within the Chichester Conservation Area where there is a statutory requirement to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of a conservation area. The appelland has drawn my attention to a number of other developments that are considered comparable to the appeal proposal. However, I do not have the full planning history of these properties before me to ascertain if they form a direct comparison, and in any case each scheme has to be treated on its own individual merits in accordance with the requirements of the current development plan and all other material considerations, as I have undertaken in this instance...."

CC/15/01245/DOM WR (M Tomlinson) In progress	30 Brandy Hole Lane Chichester West Sussex PO19 5RY - Garage conversion with bay window and new open bay garage with first floor gym and shower.
DISMISSED	

"...The absence of outbuildings in the front gardens contributes to this character and appearance, and although the building next door to the front of No. 32 is an exception its simple form and low profile does not have a detrimental effect...However, the proposed outbuilding at over 6m would be of a much greater height and clearly visible above the existing front hedge which is currently at about 3m. With its significant scale and a design including roof lights, dormers and an external staircase I agree with the Council that it would be both incongruous and visually intrusive. This is especially the case given

<p>its substantial separation from the dwelling and its proximity to the front boundary hedge...The grounds of appeal refer to other outbuildings in the front gardens of properties in Brandy Hole Lane and also to other permissions in the District considered to set a precedent for this type of development...However, whilst I have noted these, I do not consider that they offset the harmful impact that this particular proposal would have on a part of Brandy Hole Lane that has the pleasing rural character and appearance and un-built frontages that I have already described. Indeed, in respect of the Lane itself, I am of the view that the other developments make it all the more important to retain the less developed form of the area around the appeal property..."</p>	
<p>CH/15/01250/DOM WR (M Tomlinson) In Progress</p>	<p>La Traite Chidham Lane Chidham West Sussex PO18 8TH - New porch and loft extension.</p>
<p>ALLOWED</p>	
<p>"...I accept the Council's view to the extent that the considerable length of the proposed dormer with its row of five evenly spaced identical windows would appear more appropriate to an institutional or community building than a domestic dwelling. In that sense there is an element of incongruity...However with that said, the existing rear of the dwelling is of a poor design and appearance given the over-dominant gable on its northern side. Despite its large scale the dormer would provide a more cohesive and balanced appearance than currently exists. Furthermore, the dormer would be set in from the sides and the eaves of the roof plane, and even allowing for its length would have no measurable visual impact outside the private rear garden of this large plot...The dormer would therefore not be visible from the street scene; would not be prominent in the outlook from the adjoining dwellings to the north and south given their siting and oblique views, and would be unlikely to be seen other than in long distance glimpses from the open AONB countryside to the west...On balance, I therefore consider that the extensions would not have a harmful effect on the appearance of the dwelling and the character and appearance of the area..."</p>	
<p>CH/15/01956/DOM WR (C Boddy)</p>	<p>Dene Cottage Broad Road Hambrook Chidham PO18 8RG - Loft conversion including replacement roof.</p>
<p>ALLOWED</p>	
<p>"...appeal is allowed...The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area....there is a variety of dwelling types and architectural styles in the immediate vicinity of the site including two storey properties with substantial roof alterations giving rise to an apparent 3 storey scale, and in the case of a detached property on the other side of the road, a ridge height at least as high as the appeal proposal. I also noted that 3 storey properties are in the course of construction on a development immediately to the south in Kiln Drive. Accordingly, whilst in any event the majority of accommodation would be within the roof space, I do not regard additional windows in the front and rear gables at 3 storey level would be out of character with the area.... The property is currently somewhat recessive in the street scene because of the staggered siting of the adjoining properties Furness and Alness which stand forward of it... In my view the appeal proposal would be no more prominent than that with the proposed side dormers being modest in scale and set down well below the ridge. From the rear, the roof of the property would be visible from Kiln Drive but the alterations would be seen in the context of the rear gables to Furness and Alness and the large rear dormer extension to the rear of the adjoining property Waterman House.... Although the occupier of the neighbouring property to the north has raised concerns regarding loss of light, I do not consider that would be the case given that both properties are broadly in alignment with one another and that the proposal would not result in any significant increase in height nor rearward projection other than the formation of a gable. I note that</p>	

<p>both windows to the dormers would be obscure glazed and taking these factors together, I agree with the Council that there would be no harm to amenity. Whilst the proposal would change the form and appearance of the property, for the above reasons it would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area...."</p>	
<p>SDNP/15/00997/HOUS COMPTON HH (B Stubbington)</p> <p>ALLOWED</p>	<p>Keepers Cottage Lye Common West Marden Chichester PO18 9EH - Proposed two storey side extension. (Amendments to planning permission SDNP/14/03145/HOUS).</p>
<p>"...The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and its surroundings, which comprise the designated landscape of the National Park...the proposed further amendments in the appeal proposal do constitute a move away from the building's modest origins as a local workman's (keeper's) cottage in the countryside. However the approval of the extension has already done this through the substantial increase in the size of the building...the building is not a heritage asset and (ii) the absence of relevant conditions on permission ref. SDNP/14/03145/HOUS enable most if not all of the amendments now sought to be implemented in a similar manner in a separate and subsequent phase of development under permitted development..."</p>	
<p>SDNP/14/06393/FUL EASEBOURNE WR (C Cranmer)</p> <p>DISMISSED</p>	<p>Ilex House Upperfield Easebourne West Sussex GU29 9AE - Construction of a new dwelling.</p>
<p>"...The proposed dwelling would sit in the centre of the plot, some 3m from the side boundaries...although less than some of the distances between other dwellings and their side boundaries, is a generous gap that would maintain the spacious character of its surroundings...The new dwelling would not be clearly seen within the street scene and would maintain the spacious, leafy character and appearance of the area...I am satisfied that it would not result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area or the landscape and scenic beauty of the National Park...S40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 requires that decision makers have regard to the purpose of conserving biodiversity...It was considered that the tree had roosting potential and recommended that a further echolocation survey was carried out between May and August to determine the presence of any bats...the good practice guidelines for such surveys referred to in the appellant's original habitat survey (Bat Conservation Trust 2012) recommend two or three activity surveys on different dates within one season...precautionary approach is taken as I cannot be satisfied that there would be no harm given the limited survey work carried out for this proposal...the proposed development would harm biodiversity and would be contrary to the Council's development plan policy and to national policy in the Framework as a whole...."</p>	
<p>SDNP/15/02367/HOUS HH (R Grosso Macpherson)</p> <p>DISMISSED</p>	<p>Sparkes Farm Ebernoe Road Balls Cross Ebernoe GU28 9JU - Proposed demolition of various extensions to the rear and east sides of the house and their replacement with new extensions.</p>
<p>The appeal is dismissed....house has already been extended...substantially....giving it a somewhat rambling character....proposal would remove a small 2 storey extension and a conservatory, replacing them with a substantial 2 storey extension covered by a flat crown roof...The proposed extension would be more unified in design,...sash windows in all primary positions....would have mainly stone walls with brick quoins...the main proposed extension....would be taller than the existing house and its block like layout would be much bulkier compared to the more linear form of the house, with its traditional</p>	

proportions....the design dominance of the extension would be further emphasised by its extensive use of stone and its more formal design, with...large sash windows... The proposed extension would therefore overwhelm the original house both in scale and in design terms, becoming the dominant part...altering the building's character.... the extension would be largely set behind the existing house as seen from the public footpath. However, it would still be seen from those public vantage points, appearing as an unsympathetic, out of scale addition to the house....the proposal would harm the character and appearance of...house...landscape...scenic beauty of...national park...conflict with the first purpose of national park designation...framework..."

[SDNP/14/04664/FUL](#)
WR (D Price)

DIMISSED

Downlands B2146 Elsted Road To Torberry Lane South Harting Petersfield West Sussex GU31 5PJ - Demolition of existing dwelling, garage and domestic outbuildings, and change of use to agriculture of existing dwelling curtilage. Demolition of agricultural barn, stables, formation of new access and erection of a replacement dwelling in new residential curtilage with associated landscaping, formation of a ha-ha and mitigation planting.

"...I see nothing in local or national policy that is inimical to the principle of what the appellants have in mind. The decisive factors in my view are the sustainability of the proposals, and whether or not, considered as a whole, they would transgress the objective of conserving the landscape and scenic beauty of this part of the NP...I share the view expressed by the appellants that the existing dwelling is of no particular architectural merit...However, the hedge, together with other local hedges and coppices, provides an effective screen, and as a result, the house itself does not materially impinge on the overall landscape quality of this part of the Park...The stable block... removal would prove to be relatively inconsequential, as would the removal of some overhead cables and their support...The Dutch barn...should come as no great surprise to users of the Way to see a building of this type in agricultural surroundings, its removal should be regarded as a minor overall benefit to the wider landscape...The proposed new dwelling would...be of an imaginative design, conceived to reflect its agrarian context in form and external materials...However, the new dwelling would be clearly visible and prominent from a lengthy portion of South Down Way when approaching from the south-east for the initial period of its existence...tic gardens, altering the essential rural characteristics of this part of the Park. The proposal, judged in isolation, notwithstanding the creative design, would harmfully impact on the local landscape... The appellants consider the whole of their proposals to be intertwined, meriting consideration as a holistic package...In time, landscaping may prove effective in mitigating the worst effects of building anew and the introduction of a residential curtilage into a largely open agricultural landscape. However, it would certainly not mitigate all the effects, and the proposed extensive new planting, in itself, would materially alter the currently open nature of the landscape where the new dwelling is proposed...The South Downs Way is a popular long distance footpath and is one of Britain's National Trails. When approached from the south-east, the new dwelling and its curtilage, together with the associated landscaping, would be viewed and perceived by users of the Way as a harmful and contrived incursion into the currently open local agricultural scene, harming its undoubted scenic beauty...The relatively minor benefits gained from the demolition of the other buildings owned by the applicants do not justify granting permission for a development harmful to the Park's scenic beauty...I acknowledge that my assessment and judgment on this matter may not be shared by all. However, great weight should be given to protecting and conserving the landscaping and scenic beauty of the NP, in accord with national policy, and I am not persuaded that others have attributed sufficient weight to these aspects, as required...when assessed against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole, I conclude that the adverse impacts of the proposed

development on the landscape and scenic beauty of the NP would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the relatively minor benefits, which I have already described..."

"...Costs Decision...The application for an award of costs is refused...Set against the background of national policy on National Parks and achieving sustainable development, I find no convincing evidence to justify the claim that the Authority's treatment of the application was either flawed or erroneous. In this regard I consider the original officer report to be methodical and comprehensive, and the Authority's evidence for the appeal stood up to scrutiny....The Authority was provided with advice from the County Council's landscape department...The Authority clearly disagreed with the advice that had been provided, which is its entitlement, provided that it can present cogent and convincing evidence on appeal to substantiate its reasons for refusing the original application. The outcome of the substantive appeal and the reasons for that decision clearly indicate that I consider the Authority was justified in taking a contrary view to the external landscape advice proffered....Whilst the appellants cite the proposal as a clear example of sustainable development...it was not unreasonable for the Authority to emphasise the requirement to conserve the landscape and scenic beauty of the national park and to afford great weight to this aspect...I consider that the Authority exercised its duty to determine the application in a reasonable manner, and its refusal to grant permission was based on valid planning grounds that were adequately explained and defended on appeal. The reason for refusal accordingly stood up to scrutiny, and in these circumstances the Guidance advises that the Council should not be liable for an award of costs...I therefore find that unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense...has not been demonstrated. Accordingly, the application for costs is refused..."

[SDNP/15/00246/HOUS](#)

ROGATE
WR (R JONES)

DISMISSED

Annexe Middle Meadow Durleighmarsh Rogate West Sussex GU31 5AX - Alterations to roof to provide 1st floor accommodation to residential annexe with retention of ground floor link extension.

"...The proposal would result in a building which appeared uncharacteristically large in the context of the surrounding housing. It would appear overdeveloped and disjointed from successive enlargements, with little overall coherence in form or arrangement. Given the amount of building and hard-standing already on the site, together with the bulk and mass resulting from the proposal, the development would detract from the wide and open character of the surrounding landscape and would harm the setting and appearance of the National Park...Despite the pitched roof of the proposal which would slope away from the boundary, the resultant height and breadth of the proposal at such proximity to Middle Mist, would have an overbearing impact on the outlook from the ground floor rooms and from the garden of Middle Mist...The proposal would result in harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining dwelling 'Middle Mist', with particular regard to outlook, contrary to policies BE11 and BE12 of the LPR which require the effect of proposals on neighbouring development to be taken into account and for extensions to meet appropriate standards of design...the annexe has its own frontage and already has an entrance door in its front elevation, independent from the main building, with access from the road. The proposal and the main building would be capable of being isolated from each other, with, as I noted during my visit, a door, or by a more permanent infill...The proposal would result in a two-storey building with independent access, providing two, large habitable rooms, a bathroom, a kitchen, and its own stairway. Given the volume of accommodation resulting from the proposal, the limited connection to the main building, and the relative ease by which it could be isolated from the main building, I consider that the proposal would result in a dwelling in the Rural Area which is readily capable of conversion into more than one dwelling...I conclude that notwithstanding the area of the present dwelling, the proposal would

conflict with policy H12 of the LPR, resulting in the loss of a small dwelling by creating an increase in gross floor area of more than 50% of the original dwelling...While the proposed development would provide additional living accommodation, this is outweighed by the harm it would cause to the character and appearance of the National Park, the harm to the living conditions of the adjoining occupiers and harm resulting from its capability of being converted into more than one dwelling and the effect of its enlargement on the availability of small dwellings. For the reasons given above, and taking account of all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed...

[WE/14/00911/FUL](#)

I (J Bushell)

ALLOWED

Land on the North Side of Long Copse Lane Westbourne West Sussex - Erection of 16 no dwellings, vehicular and pedestrian access, car and cycle parking and landscaping.

"...I consider that the main issues of the appeal are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and whether the development represents sustainable development, having regard to the development strategy of the Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029 (2015)...Character and appearance...the previous Inspector raised particular concern that the previous scheme would be prominent and would present a dense and consistent frontage that would not allow for views through the site. The previous Inspector went on to find that the previous scheme would dominate the scene and would not be seen in the context of the existing village, but rather as a separate urban extension...The proposal that is before me has been altered to seek to address these concerns...I consider that the proposal would not be a prominent projection into the rural area and through careful design has addressed the previous Inspector's concerns with regard to the western approach along Long Copse Lane. The rural aspect to the western approach would be retained...Whilst the appeal site is on elevated ground, I observed on my site visit that the dwellings on the opposite side of North Street are also generally set higher than the road. There would also be evident breaks between the dwellings, allowing views of the countryside behind. Consequently, I consider that the proposal would not be a prominent and overbearing form of development...there would also be gaps between the dwellings fronting onto North Street which would also allow views of the countryside beyond. The gaps and views through the site, would maintain a sense of openness and would allow North Street to retain a reasonable relationship with the countryside beyond...I consider that such views through the appeal site would retain the rural aspect of the village in this location and help to blend the proposal with the existing village...I am of the view that the change of use of the site would not so much alter the character of the area within which it falls as to change the character of the site itself...I accept that such views would dramatically alter, but such a change would not in itself be harmful in planning terms...I consider that the proposal would not cause harm to the wider pastoral landscape or conflict with the key characteristics or land management guidelines...I consider that the scheme would not materially harm the character and appearance of the area or the wider rural setting of the village. Further, I am of the view that the considered amendments to the scheme have overcome the previous Inspector's concerns...Turning to whether the proposal represents sustainable development, given the above, I consider that the proposal, with the exception of being located the wrong side of the settlement boundary, is generally consistent with the development strategy of the LP, namely Policies 2 and 5 of the LP. I acknowledge the views of many local residents that the Westbourne Neighbourhood Plan (the NHP) should be the mechanism to make decisions about where development should be located in Westbourne...However, the preparation of the NHP is at an early stage of production and therefore carries limited weight and at the present time there are no feasible alternatives before me...The matter of housing land supply was debated at the Inquiry. However, I have found that the proposal is sustainable in its own right, which in this case outweighs the identified

development plan conflict. Further, I am mindful that the presence of a five year housing land supply should not be considered as a 'cap' on additional housing or restrict sustainable development from being delivered. As a result, whether the Council can or cannot demonstrate a five year housing land supply or whether Paragraph 14 of the Framework is engaged has not had a significant bearing on my decision...I am not of the view that allowing the appeal would set a precedent for other similar development in Westbourne..."

[WE/14/04206/FUL](#)

(P Kneen)

ALLOWED

Land North of Recreation Ground Monks Hill Westbourne West Sussex PO10 8SX - Material change of use of land for stationing of caravans for residential occupation with associated hard standing and utility block.

"...The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for change of the use of land for the stationing of caravans for residential occupation with associated hardstanding and utility block at The Stables, Land north of recreation ground, Monks Hill, Emsworth PO10 8QP... The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, including the adjoining Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI).....I do not consider that the site and immediate surroundings could be said to be in open countryside away from existing settlements which the PPTS seeks to avoid, or to have an 'undeveloped appearance, uncluttered by development' as referred to in the Council's reason for refusal...it seems to me that it is a transitional area of open space between the open countryside to the north of Westbourne and the settlement itself. I consider that, with the retention and reinforcement of the existing vegetation, the proposed development would not be unduly prominent when seen from Monks Hill.....Any views obtainable from the SDNP would be quite distant and limited by the hedges and trees bordering the intervening fields of Valley Farm, and the site would be seen in the context of the nearby buildings and/or the village itself. I do not consider that there would be material harm to the views from the SDNP and it would not compromise any essential features of the nationally designated landscape... seen from the public footpath further to the east, the site would be partially screened by the trees and vegetation Again, I consider that there would not be unacceptable harm to the rural landscape...The Council is concerned that the effect of the development on the locally designated SNCI is unclear as no habitat survey has been conducted... the appeal site is some distance from, the SNCI and is separated from it by the stables, manège and the recreation ground. Within the SNCI is the cricket pitch, which is regularly used during the season, is subject to a mowing regime and where car parking takes place on the outfield at times during matches...There is therefore no substantiated reason to suppose that there would be harm to the conservation interest of the nearby SNCI as a result of the stationing of a mobile home The Council has also suggested that there could be harm to bats which has not been assessed. Nonetheless, the hedgerows might present foraging opportunities I find no evidence to suggest that there would be an adverse effect on the conservation interest of the SNCI as a result of the proposal...I am satisfied that the appellant is a gypsy for the purposes of the 2015 PPTS and this appeal...Broadly, policy 36 of the Local Plan sets out a number of requirements for Gypsy and Traveller sites which must all be met...given the size of the village, I have seen no substantiated evidence which persuades me that the settled community of Westbourne is, or would become, dominated by Travellers with the provision of one additional pitch... no objection to use of the access has been raised by the Highway Authority...The site is in a quiet location and there is no suggestion that either the occupiers, or the nearby residents would be subject to unacceptable noise and disturbance...Local residents claim that there would be increased flooding down the hill as a result of the development. However,I find no convincing evidence that the modest development proposed would add materially to the problem...I conclude that the proposed development would not conflict with Local Plan

policy 36 or the advice in the 2015 PPTS...General Need for Sites...The Council advises that a number of pitches have been provided in the last 2 years including a site for 12 pitches within Westbourne Parish. It is stated that the current 5-year supply (2015-2020) sets out a requirement for 8 additional pitches during this period with 2 more by 2017. It is intended to allocate more sites in the forthcoming Site Allocations DPD but this is not likely to be adopted before mid-2017. As, currently, there is not a 5-year supply of sites,there is still an immediate shortfall in available pitches to meet the identified need.....The appellant has family connections in this part of the south coast...he considers finding a settled base important for his children's education. The appellant also needs access to medical facilitiesno available alternative accommodation has been identified. Having regard to their Human Rights, particularly the primacy of the needs of the youngest child, and duties under the Equality Act 2010, I consider that the needs of the family add substantial weight in favour of the proposal...For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed..."

3. OUTSTANDING APPEALS

Reference/Status	Proposal
SDNP/14/02271/HOUS Bepton WR (M Mew) In progress	The Old Cottage Bepton Midhurst GU29 0JB – Conservatory Linked to SDNP/14/02272/LIS
SDNP/14/02272/LIS Bepton WR (M Mew) In progress	The Old Cottage Bepton Midhurst GU29 0JB - Conservatory Linked to SDNP/14/02271/HOUS
BI/14/02356/PLD WR (F Stevens) In progress	Martins Lea Martins Lane Birdham Chichester PO20 7AU - Construction of driveway to Lock Lane, in connection with additional hard surfacing.
BI/15/00194/CONTRV WR (SCA) In progress	Land North West of Premier Business Park Birdham Road Birdham West Sussex - Use of land as a Traveller Site. Appeal against enforcement notice Linked to BI/15/01288/FUL
BI/15/01288/FUL I (SCA) In progress	Land north west of Premier Business Park, Birdham Road Birdham West Sussex PO20 7BU - Proposed single pitch site including the provision of a utility building for settled gypsy accommodation together with existing stables. Linked to BI/15/00194/CONTRV
BI/15/01749/DOM WR (N McKellar) In progress	Premier Business Park 4 Birdham Road West Sussex PO20 7BU - Change of use of existing marine retail/storage/light industrial unit to new destination retail unit incorporating new shop front, entrance and side fire escape.
BO/14/03677/PLD H (F Stevens/D Price) In progress	Land west of Sweet Meadow Bosham Hoe Bosham Chichester PO18 8ET - Use of site for 1no. dwelling.
SDNP/14/04865/FUL BURY I (D Price) In progress	Land North of Junction with B2138 Bury Road Bury West Sussex - Change of use from agricultural land to a Gypsy and Traveller's site. Linked to SDNP/15/00336/COU.
SDNP/15/00336/COU BURY I (R Hawks) In progress	Land North of Junction with B2138 Bury Road Bury West Sussex - Stationing of two caravans for human habitation. Appeal against enforcement notice Linked to SDNP/14/04865/FUL
CC/14/03359/PDE WR (H Chowdhury) Awaiting decision	18 Juxon Close Chichester West Sussex PO19 7AA - Single storey rear extension (a) rear extension - 4.0m (b) maximum height - 3.7m (c) height at eaves - 2.3m.

Reference/Status	Proposal
CC/15/02316/ADV HH (M Tomlinson) In Progress	Vauxhall Frosts Chichester A27 Chichester Bypass Eastbound Kingsham Chichester West Sussex PO19 8TH - 1 no. internally illuminated entrance panel, 2no. internally illuminated wall mounted Vauxhall logos, 1 no. internally illuminated service and parts pole sign and 1 no. directional lawn sign.
CH/11/00538/CONBC H (RWH) In Progress	Five Oaks Newells Lane West Ashling Chichester, West Sussex PO18 8DF - Height of building in excess of that permitted under 10/01925/FUL - appeal against enforcement notice.
CH/14/00181/CONMHC H (S Archer) Awaiting decision	Land West of Five Oaks Newells Lane West Ashling West Sussex - Stationing of mobile home. Appeal against enforcement notice.
CH/14/02138/OUT I (J Bell) Awaiting Decision	Land East Of Broad Road Hambrook West Sussex - Residential development of 120 single and two storey dwellings comprising 48 affordable homes and 72 market price homes, garaging and parking together with retail unit, sports pavilion, community facility, new vehicular and pedestrian access to Broad Road, emergency and pedestrian access to Scant Road West, sports facilities, two tennis courts, football pitch and four cricket nets, children's play area, public open space and natural green space on a site of 9.31 ha.
CH/15/00151/CONDWE WR (R Hawks) In Progress	Cockleberry Farm Main Road Bosham West Sussex PO18 8PN - Retention of the Chalet. Appeal against enforcement notice.
SDNP/14/02401/CND EASEBOURNE WR (J Saunders) In progress	Blackberry Barn Hollist Lane Easebourne Midhurst West Sussex GU29 0QN - Removal of Condition 6 of planning permission EB/05/03463/FUL In order to make better use of the building.
SDNP/15/00299/ADV EASEBOURNE WR (C Cranmer) In progress	A286 Kings Drive to Henley Old Road Easebourne West Sussex - To erect and keep for the licence period two signs of a similar size and style to that shown on the attached illustration in positions shown on the attached location plan on Kings Drive.
EWB/14/01806/OUT I (F Stevens) Awaiting Decision	Land East of Barton Way Clappers Lane Earnley West Sussex - The erection of 110 residential dwellings, new vehicular access, open space, and other ancillary works.
SDNP/15/02147/FUL FERNHURST WR (C Cranmer) In progress	33 Nappers Wood Fernhurst West Sussex GU27 3PB - Divide existing large house into two separate dwellings.

Reference/Status	Proposal
SDNP/15/02426/HOUS FERNHURST WR (R Jones) In progress	Fernwood Cottage Bell Road Kingsley Green Fernhurst GU27 3LQ - Remove existing front flat roof and porch. Construct a two storey rear extension, New pitched roof over existing front extension, new dormers (resubmission of SDNP/15/00212/HOUS).
FU/15/00237/CONTRV WR (S Archer) In progress	Land South of The Stables, Newells Lane/Scant Road East,, West Ashling West Sussex – Creation of a hardstanding – appeal against enforcement notice.
SDNP/14/05057/LIS HARTING WR (M Mew) In progress	Old Manor House West Harting Petersfield GU31 5PA - Replacement of five timber single glazed windows on the rear 1930s extension with new timber double glazed units.
SDNP/15/01791/LDE HARTING WR (R Jones) In Progress	2 Ryefield Barns Killarney to Goose Green Road West Harting Petersfield West Sussex GU31 5PE - Existing domestic curtilage extension requested in line with garden boundaries on land between house and driveway.
SDNP/15/02779/HOUS LODSWORTH H (R Grosso Macpherson) In progress	Fitzlea House Fitzlea Wood Road Selham Lodsworth GU28 0PS - Internal alterations and external alterations including one 2-storey rear extension and one single-storey side extension.
SDNP/15/02780/LIS LODSWORTH H (R Grosso Macpherson) In progress	Fitzlea House Fitzlea Wood Road Selham Lodsworth GU28 0PS - Internal alterations and external alterations including one 2-storey rear extension and one single-storey side extension.
LX/13/03809/OUT I (N Langford) Awaiting Decision	Land South of Loxwood Farm Place High Street Loxwood – erection of 25 no residential dwellings comprising of 14 no private residential dwellings and 11 no affordable residential dwellings, associated private amenity space and parking.
SDNP/14/05019/FUL WR (R Grosso Macpherson) In progress	Leigh Barton Brook Hill Lurgashall Petworth GU28 9HB - Construction of tennis court on land to north. Resubmission of SDNP/13/02074/FUL .
SDNP/14/06285/MPO PETWORTH H (J Saunders) In progress	Land At Laundry Cottage Woodlea and Grass Mere Horsham Road Petworth West Sussex - Removal of affordable housing obligation attached to planning permission SDNP/12/02721/FUL .
PS/14/03665/FUL WR (P Kneen) In progress	Oakley Grange Plaistow Road Kirdford Billingshurst West Sussex RH14 0JY - Proposed track across paddock adjoining Oakley Grange, Kirdford.

Reference/Status	Proposal
PS/14/03983/FUL H (R Jones) In progress Hearing to be held 9 March 2016 at 10am, Old Court Room, Chichester City Council	Nell Ball Farm Dunsfold Road Plaistow Billingshurst West Sussex, RH14 0BF - Retention of existing mobile home as a permanent dwelling.
PS/14/04100/FUL H (F Steven) In progress	Little Springfield Farm Plaistow Road Ifold Loxwood Billingshurst West Sussex RH14 0TS - Demolition of existing industrial buildings and erection of 3 no detached dwelling houses with associated landscaping, surfacing, car parking provision and access works.
SDNP/14/04194/HOUS ROGATE WR (M Mew) In progress	Tollgate Cottage Durleigh Marsh Petersfield Hampshire GU31 5AX - Single storey rear extension and various works. Linked to SDNP/14/04195/LIS
SDNP/14/04195/LIS ROGATE WR (M Mew) In progress	Tollgate Cottage, Durleigh Marsh, Petersfield, Hampshire GU31 5AX - Single storey rear extension and various works. Linked to SDNP/14/04194/HOUS
SDNP/15/01349/HOUS ROGATE WR (R Grosso Macpherson) In progress	Lower House Durleighmarsh Rogate Petersfield West Sussex GU31 5AX - Oak framed glazed garden room extension to side. Linked to SDNP/15/01351/LIS
SDNP/15/01351/LIS ROGATE WR (R Grosso Macpherson) In progress	Lower House Durleighmarsh Rogate Petersfield West Sussex GU31 5AX - Oak framed glazed garden room extension to side and insertion of roof light on south elevation. Linked to SDNP/15/01349/HOUS
SY/15/00881/FUL WR (M Tomlinson) In progress	82 East Street Selsey West Sussex PO20 0BS - Elevation changes to convert shop to flat.
SY/15/00905/COUPMB WR (N McKellar) In progress	Ferry Farm Chichester Road Selsey West Sussex - Proposed change of use from agricultural building to 1 no dwelling (C3 Use Class).
SY/15/01741/DOM HH (M Tomlinson) In progress	Helmieh Chichester Road Selsey West Sussex PO20 9ED - Erection of a closed boarded fence to the front of the property.
SI/14/00397/CONMHC WR (R Hawks) In progress	Land south of Church Farm Lane, Sidlesham West Sussex - Stationing of caravan. Appeal against Enforcement Notice.

Reference/Status	Proposal
SI/14/04249/ELD WR (P Kneen) In progress	Magnolia Cottage Cloverlands Chalder Lane Sidlesham Chichester West Sussex PO20 7RJ- To continue use of building as a single dwelling.
SI/15/00157/CONMHC H (R Hawks) Hearing to be held 9 February 2016 at 10am, Chichester District Council	Land South of Green Lane Piggeries Ham Road Sidlesham West Sussex - Stationing of a mobile home and engineering works. Appeal against enforcement notice.
SDNP/15/00136/OPDEV SINGLETON WR (A Simpson) In progress	Manor Farm A286 Town Lane to the Grove Singleton Chichester West Sussex PO18 0EX – Sand school and earth works – appeal against enforcement notice.
SB/11/00022/CONDWE I (S Archer) In progress	R B S Nurseries Thornham Lane Southbourne Emsworth Hampshire PO10 8DD - Use of a building as a dwellinghouse – appeal against enforcement notice.
SB/11/00022/CONDWE I (S Archer) In progress	R B S Nurseries Thornham Lane Southbourne Emsworth Hampshire PO10 8DD - Use of a building as a dwellinghouse as above - relates to a different enforcement notice.
SB/14/00313/CONMHC H (S Archer) In progress	Land North Of Marina Farm Thorney Road Southbourne - Stationing of a mobile home. Appeal against Enforcement Notice .
SB/15/00113/FUL WR (F Stevens) In progress	Land between Meadowsweet and Appletrees Lumley Road Southbourne West Sussex - Construction of a dwelling.
SDNP/14/05772/LDE STEDHAM WR (D PRICE) In progress	The Old Studio Bridgefoot Cottages Stedham Midhurst GU29 0PT - Use of The Old Studio as a self-contained residential unit for a period in excess of 4 years.
SDNP/15/04020/HOUS TILLINGTON WR (J Shore) In Progress	Home Farm Upperton Road Upperton Tillington Petworth West Sussex GU28 9BE - Full and part demolition of previous extensions, construction of new orangery style extension, new south extension and minor internal and external alterations to original building.
SDNP/15/04021/LIS TILLINGTON WR (J Shore) In Progress	Home Farm Upperton Road Upperton Tillington Petworth West Sussex GU28 9BE - Full and part demolition of previous extensions, construction of new orangery style extension, new south extension and minor internal and external alterations to original building.

Reference/Status	Proposal
WE/14/01217/FUL H (J Bell) Awaiting Decision	Land West of Harwood Cemetery Lane Woodmancote Westbourne West Sussex - Provision of five Gypsy and Traveller pitches incorporating the re-design of an existing pitch (including the removal of stables granted in permission WE/13/03867/FUL) and the use of land for the stationing of caravans for residential purposes for an additional 4 no gypsy pitches, together with the formation of additional hard standing and utility/ dayrooms ancillary to that use.
WE/15/00134/CONACC WR (S Pattie) In Progress	Hambrook Car Wash Common Road Hambrook Westbourne West Sussex - Use of the land as a car wash. Linked to WE/15/01814/FUL – appeal against enforcement notice.
WE/15/01814/FUL WR (F Stevens) In progress	Hambrook Car Wash Common Road Hambrook Westbourne West Sussex - Creation of an access and removal of trees Linked to WE/15/00134/CONACC.
SDNP/15/03361/LDE WEST LAVINGTON H (D Price) In progress	Stable Cottage Dunford Hollow West Lavington West Sussex GU29 0ER - Use as single dwelling house with garden and amenity area.
WW/15/00353/FUL WR (P Kneen) In Progress	Land to the Rear of Tanglewood, Briar Avenue East Wittering West Sussex - Temporary retention for a period of three years of eight no lorry containers for storage purposes. Linked to WW/15/00363/FUL
WW/15/00363/FUL WR (P Kneen) In Progress	Land to the Rear of Tanglewood Briar Avenue East Wittering West Sussex - Proposed six pitch static caravan site with warden’s caravan for holiday proposes only. Linked to WW/15/00353/FUL
WW/15/02780/FUL WR (C Boddy) In Progress	34 Marine Drive West Wittering West Sussex PO20 8HQ - Demolition of existing residential property (2 Flats) and erection of 2 no. 4 bedroom properties.
WR/15/00038/CONMHC WR (R Hawks) In progress	1 Newfields Newpound Wisborough Green Billingshurst West Sussex RH14 0AX - Stationing of 2 mobile homes. - appeal against enforcement notices.
WR/15/00498/ELD I (C Boddy) In progress	Beech Farm Roundstreet Common Loxwood Wisborough Green West Sussex RH14 0AN - The siting of a mobile home for the purposes of human habitation independently to Beech Farm House.
WR/15/01974/DOM WR (A Miller) In Progress	Coed Afal Petworth Road Wisborough Green Billingshurst West Sussex RH14 0BH - Proposed two storey rear extension and internal alterations.
WR/15/01975/LBC WR (A Miller) In Progress	Coed Afal Petworth Road Wisborough Green Billingshurst West Sussex RH14 0BH - Proposed two storey rear extension and internal alterations.

4. VARIATIONS TO SECTION 106 AGREEMENTS

5. CALLED-IN APPLICATIONS

Reference	Proposal	Stage
NONE		

6. COURT AND OTHER MATTERS

Injunctions		
Site	Breach	Stage
Land at Premier Site Birdham Road	Stable and other preparatory works in the AONB without planning permission.	Contempt proceedings took place at the Crown Court has given a hearing date of 5 October 2015. Defendant found guilty after Court agreed to hear the evidence of officers in the absence of the defendant who failed to attend the hearing. On 30 November 2015 the defendant attended court for the handing down of the sentence. They pleaded not guilty. Legal submissions to be made at court on 27 January 2016 Due to ongoing breaches and further works injunctions, against further parties, are being sought in addition to further enforcement action taken relating to the erection of fencing in breach of the recently issued Article 4 Direction.
Land at Scant Road East	Preparation to convert use to residential without planning permission.	Prosecution of failure to adhere to requirements of a Stop Notice have been suspended following receipt of information relating to a change in ownership and statement of when works were carried out. There is an enforcement appeal pending in relation to the operational development carried out on the land. Case review to be carried out pending decision on whether to proceed with a prosecution.

Prosecutions		
Site	Breach	Stage
Nell Ball Farm Plaistow	Failure to comply with planning enforcement notices	(i) Prosecution authorised and papers passed to Legal Services (containers on the land). (ii) Prosecution proceedings to be recommenced in relation to the stationing of mobile homes. Court date scheduled for 12.2.16
Dean Ale and Cider House West Dean	Failure to comply with planning enforcement notice	Planning application has been received. Matter is listed to 25 September 2015 but likely to be adjourned and will be withdrawn if planning permission for relevant enforcement notice is granted. 25.09.15 – Court hearing adjourned until determination of the application. Prosecution postponed pending outcome of an appeal
Site	Breach	Stage

7. POLICY MATTERS

NONE