

Chichester District Council

Planning Committee

Friday 17 June 2016

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
- FT – Fast Track (Householder/Commercial Appeals)
- () – Case Officer Initials
- * – Committee level decision

1. NEW APPEALS

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
CC/15/04083/DOM FT (P Hunt) In Progress	71 Parklands Road Chichester West Sussex PO19 3DX - First floor and loft extension.
FU/15/02504/FUL H (K Rawlins) In Progress	Land South of The Stables Scant Road East Hambrook West Sussex PO18 8UB - Change of use of land from equestrian use to half equestrian and residential gypsy and traveller site with the erection of barn and 2 no stable building
SDNP/15/05454/FUL Lurgashall H (D Price) In Progress	Courts Yard Jobsons Lane Windfall Wood Common Haslemere West Sussex GU27 3BX - Erection of 2 detached dwellings and garages following the cessation of the current use and demolition and removal of all existing buildings, hardstandings.
NM/15/00306/CONCOU PI (S Archer) In Progress	Nurses Cottage Post Office Lane North Mundham Chichester West Sussex PO20 1JY - Erection of a buildings, play structure and garden items
NM/15/02119/FUL WR (M Tomlinson) In Progress	The Chalet Southgate Farm Fisher Lane North Mundham Chichester, West Sussex PO20 1YU - Erection of replacement dwelling.
SB/16/00092/FUL WR (M Tomlinson) In Progress	Land West of Fieldside Prinsted Lane Prinsted Emsworth Hampshire - Proposed two bedroom gatehouse dwelling with car parking.
WH/15/04038/FUL WR (F Stevens) In Progress	Land North of March Primary School Claypit Lane Westhampnett West Sussex - Erection of two storey detached dwelling house and detached single storey double car port with attached storage.

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
CC/15/04197/DOM FT (H Chowdhury) In Progress	39 Ormonde Avenue Chichester PO19 7UX – Proposed Conservatory

2. DECISIONS RECEIVED

Reference/Decision	
BO/15/00801/FUL * WR (C Boddy) Allowed	The Garden House Bosham Lane Bosham West Sussex PO18 8HG - Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of 1 no dwelling and associated works.
<p>The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of one dwelling and associated works, at The Garden House, Bosham Lane, Bosham, Chichester, West Sussex PO18 8HG. The appeal site is a rectangular plot, located within the village and settlement boundary of Bosham and within the Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The Inspector concluded that the plot size is generous and the replacement dwelling would not be too large for the site. Furthermore the amount of glazing to the north elevation would not harm the character or appearance of the wider landscape or surrounding area, due to it set in a deep recess, with landscaping. Concluding that whilst the proposed development would be a contemporary style of architecture, its appearance would not be of a poor standard of design. In addition it would be located in an area with a character of varied architectural styles and appearance, and with limited public views of it in conjunction with the surrounding buildings. The Inspector did not consider the proposal would conflict with Bosham Village Design Statement, Section 7 or paragraph 60 of the Framework, or Policies 33, 44 and 48 of the CDLP 2014-2029.</p>	
BO/15/02233/DOM & BO/15/02234/LBC WR (N McKellar) Dismissed	Brook House Quay Meadow Bosham West Sussex PO18 8LY - Retrospective construction of pitched roof to existing outbuilding.
<p>The main issue for both appeals is whether the pitched roof would preserve the special architectural or historic interest of a grade II listed building, the settings of nearby listed buildings, and linked to that whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Bosham Conservation Area. Copying the garage roof produces a visual cohesion to the Brook House outbuildings, but due to the height and design of the appeal roof it does not respect the plain form or modest proportions of the historic outbuilding nor its subservience within the setting of the listed house and wall. I share the concerns of the Council as regards the use of modern materials. The timber will silver over time and I appreciate reclaimed tiles have been used. However, the black plastic rainwater goods are particularly noticeable, especially the lengths below the half hips, and they would weather and deteriorate in appearance, unlike metal ones. Nor does the use of plastic reflect the traditional materials that are an essential part of the attractive historic appearance of the house and walls. Plastic rainwater goods and the white painted timber may well be present on the garage, but the use of these on the appeal building is a jarring contrast to the historic fabric of the building and adjoining wall. Furthermore, to the rear of the outbuilding the presence of roof felt to cap the boundary wall and form a gutter has a clumsy appearance... The modest size of the roof and it being within the context of the built form of the village as a whole would not unacceptably harm the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB...would not have a significantly harmful impact on the living conditions of neighbouring residents. The use of the outbuilding as an annexe and any alterations to the building would need to be the subject of further applications.</p>	

Reference/Decision	
CC/15/01696/FUL* WR (P Kneen) Dismissed	Land North of Stockbridge House Stockbridge Road Chichester West Susse. Proposed 1 no studio house.
<p>Main Issues: The effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the locality and whether it would provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers, with regard to private amenity space and outlook. The appeal proposal would be single storey, uncharacteristically small and more cramped on its site than the norm in the locality. It would therefore appear at odds with its surroundings. It would take up a significant part of the appeal site and would appear contrived. It would result in the loss of some planting near to the boundary with Stockbridge Road, which would increase its prominence in the street and add to the harm identified. The appeal proposal would result in a small and awkwardly shaped garden that would taper significantly at one end...as the wall fronting Stockbridge Road is low level, pedestrians using the footpath on the other side of the wall, would afford close range views into the proposed garden. Whilst I acknowledge that the appeal dwelling would be one bedroom, it could accommodate up to two people. Overall, I consider that the appeal development, in providing limited private outdoor space would result in unsatisfactory living conditions for future occupiers. This would be the case, even though the LP does not set out size standards in this regard</p>	
CC/15/02479/FUL WR (M Tomlinson) Allowed	Unit R1A Chichester Gate Chichester West Sussex PO19 8EL Proposed installation of HVAC kitchen extraction flue and air intake louvre grill.
<p>The Inspector summaries that; 'All in all, whilst I acknowledge efforts made to minimise the clutter caused by extraction equipment on buildings in the Leisure Park, in this case, for the reasons set out above, I consider that the appeal proposal would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the locality. It would therefore generally accord with Policy 47 of the Chichester District Council Adopted Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029. This seeks that development respects distinctive local character and sensitively contributes to creating places of a high architectural and built quality. It would also accord with paragraphs 17, 59 and 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which together, have generally similar aims'.</p>	
CH/11/00538/CONBC H (R Hawks) Dismissed	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.
<p>"The appeal fails. Ground (d)... given the photographic evidence I judge that this onus has not been discharged. I find that although construction work on the building started before 7 August 2011, the building was not substantially completed by then. Therefore the building had not become lawful by the time the enforcement notice was issued, so the appeal on ground (d) does not succeed. Ground (a)... Because of the scale of the building as built, the increases in eaves and roof height compared with what was permitted make a considerable difference to the structure's overall bulk, and so its visual impact...having granted planning permission for a lower building, the council had good reasons to refuse permission for the structure as built. I conclude that planning permission should not be granted. Therefore the appeal on ground (a) fails. Ground (f)... The building is unauthorised, and requiring its demolition is not excessive as a means of remedying the breach of planning control...For those reasons, the appeal on ground (f) does not succeed."</p>	

Reference/Decision	
CH/15/00151/CONDWE WR (R Hawks) Dismissed	The Chalet Cockleberry Farm Main Road Bosham West Sussex PO18 8PN - Retention of the Chalet. Appeal against enforcement notice.
<p>"...Summary of Decision: The enforcement notice is corrected and varied to reflect the finding that the building itself is found to be lawful, but not its use. The appeal is dismissed and the notice as corrected and varied is upheld...The planning merits of the development are not germane to this appeal because there is no ground (a) appeal or deemed application...Ground (d)...A key issue of dispute in this case is whether the development enforced against constituted a material change of use of the land or was operational development...the chalet has been in its present position since early 2010...the internal measurement from the lowest floor level to the ceiling at the highest level is more than...3.05 metres. Therefore the chalet does not fall within the definition of a caravan...its presence on the land resulted from operational development as defined by Section 55 of the 1990 Act...Since the chalet had been in place for more than four years before August 2015, it became immune from enforcement...However, that is not the end of the matter...I find that residential use was either not continuous, or did not start until some time after October 2012..it has no use rights as a dwelling... I shall correct the allegation in the enforcement notice so that it refers to the erection of a building, and I shall vary the requirements so as to substitute a requirement to cease the use of the building, instead of demolishing it and removing the resultant debris. It is also appropriate to require the removal of all items associated with the use of the chalet, otherwise the effect would be to allow it to be used for storage..."</p>	
SDNP/15/04270/HOUS EARTHAM HH (J Shore) Allowed	The Coach House Eartham Lane Eartham West Sussex PO18 0LP - Construction of a small oak barn for domestic storage/workshop use.
<p>"...I have found that the proposed development would preserve the character and appearance of the Eartham Conservation Area. However I have also found that it would cause less than substantial harm to the setting, and thereby the significance of a listed building, and I have to attach considerable importance and weight to this harm. There would also be conflict with policy BE4. The Framework makes clear at paragraph 134 that where a proposed development would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, the harm should be weighed against the benefits of the proposal. In this case the benefit would be the living conditions of the occupiers of the host property in that a storage building/workshop facility would be provided. On balance, given these benefits, and taking into consideration only minor harm would be occasioned to the setting of the listed building from views along a private driveway, I consider that the benefits outweigh the harm. I also consider that these factors outweigh any potential conflict with policy BE4...."</p> <p>Letter from The Planning Inspectorate dated 31.5.16:</p> <p>Thank you for your letter of 5 April regarding the above planning appeal. This has been passed to me for reply as a member of the Customer Quality team whose role is to deal with post appeal decision issues and correspondence. Please accept my apologies for the time taken to respond. I should explain that in investigating the issues raised I sought feedback from the Inspector and subsequently consulted with Inspector Group Manager Ben Linscott. Careful consideration has been given to your points of concern regarding this appeal and the decision letter. Having now completed my investigation it is acknowledged that regrettably the Inspector has not followed correctly the tests in paragraph 133 of the National Planning Policy Framework in terms of identifying 'public' benefits arising from the development. You are correct that where less than substantial harm is identified, benefits should be of a nature or scale to be of benefit to the public at</p>	

large and should not be a private benefit. It is accepted that in this case the Inspector's interpretation of benefits was confined to private benefits. In applying the term "minor", the Inspector has used an inappropriate word that conveys a particular meaning in the context that he has used it, which can reasonably be said to have led to a charge of misapplication of the Framework. The Inspector found that the proposal is contrary to the development plan policy cited and, whilst he found the private benefit to outweigh that conflict, that is not the test. The proper test is whether there are material considerations which warrant a decision being made other than in accordance with the development plan. There is no suggestion that the policy is not Framework compliant so accordingly is the starting point for the decision maker. It is not clear how that private benefit could reasonably be said to warrant such a departure and the decision letter does not explain how that would be so. With the above comments in mind, I can advise you a significant upheld complaint has been recorded as a result of this investigation. Please accept our sincere apologies that this appeal decision falls short of the standards to which we aspire in this particular aspect. I can assure you that we take such matters seriously and are keen to learn from our mistakes. Our findings on this case have been brought to the attention of both the Inspector and his professional manager. I note your concern regarding the matter of precedent in terms of the future consideration of heritage appeals. Previous appeal decisions are material considerations which may be put before a Council when considering any future application for planning permission. However, a previous decision is not a directive. It is a decision on an individual appeal. If a party submits a scheme it is for your Council to consider each application on its own circumstances and planning merits. Your Council is of course entitled to reach its own conclusions on any new application.

[SDNP/15/01791/LDE](#)
HARTING
WR (R Jones)
Allowed

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.

"The documentary evidence submitted in support of the appeal includes various sworn declarations and what Mr Le Butt calls "testimonials", most of the latter being copies of emails. The planning authority maintain that the evidence is inconclusive, and either does not relate to the appeal site itself or does not refer to the use of the land as garden land for the necessary ten year period...Much of the documentary evidence only covers the period of the appellant's ownership, which is well short of ten years. The aerial photographs are inconclusive. Other evidence is contradictory...I can see why the planning authority refused to grant a certificate. There are inconsistencies in the evidence, much of the submitted written material has limited weight as it is unsworn, and it lacks detail. The onus of proof is on the appellant, and he has certainly not established his case beyond reasonable doubt. The decision is marginal. Applying the lesser standard of the balance of probability, I judge that there is just sufficient evidence to show that the appeal site has been used for domestic garden purposes in association with the residential occupation of 2 Ryefield Barns during the ten years preceding 1 April 2015. Therefore I conclude that the use had become lawful by the date of the application."

Reference/Decision	
SDNP/15/04781/HOUS LURGASHALL WR (J Shore) Dismissed	Orchard Park Farm Dial Green Lane Lurgashall West Sussex GU28 9EU Proposed chain link fencing around tennis court.
<p>"...So, in views from within the Conservation Area, within the wider setting of the listed building, looking roughly northwards across the green, from the green, and from the pub garden within its immediate setting, the openness beside and behind the listed building makes a positive contribution its significance. The open rural character at the site is also important to the setting of the Conservation Area, and to the scenic beauty of the National Park. Due to its substantial length, depth and height, its siting close to the listed building and its grounds, and its hard-edged rectilinear man-made form, the proposed tennis court fencing would look unacceptably incongruous in its rural surroundings. Whilst the existing vegetation by the track would partially screen its form, the proposal would harmfully extend the built-up appearance at Orchard Park Farm towards the listed building. Because the fencing would unacceptably intrude into the important gap between the Orchard Park Farm buildings and the listed building, it would damage the important openness within the setting of the listed building that contributes to its significance. For the same reasons, the fencing would be harmfully prominent in views across and from the green, so it would harm the character and appearance of the setting of the Conservation Area, and, in turn, it would erode the scenic beauty of the National Park....As the asset is the listed building, that is, the pub, its optimum viable use is not relevant here. Whilst the fenced tennis court would offer opportunities for sport and recreation that would contribute to health and wellbeing, these would be private benefits for the appellant, and almost no other public benefits have been put to me. Thus, the public benefits would not outweigh the less than substantial harm that the development within its setting would cause to the significance of the listed building as a historic rural public house. Furthermore, insufficient clear and convincing justification has been put to me to explain why the proposal would be necessary to preserve the setting of the listed building. The appellant's agent has suggested conditions to control the colour and height of the fencing, lighting, planting, and the provision of fencing by the boundary to the listed building. However, their imposition would not overcome the damage that this development within the setting of the listed building would cause. Also, whilst there is no public access to the land at the back of the site of the listed building, Planning Practice Guidance¹ advises that the contribution that setting makes to the significance of the heritage asset does not depend on there being public rights or an ability to access or experience that setting..."</p>	
PS/15/00922/COU WR (M Tomlinson) Dismissed	The Coach House Oak Lane Shillinglee Plaistow Godalming West Sussex GU8 4SQ Change of use from existing residential garden and private amenity/sports to club use for yoga, meditation and fitness.
<p>This appeal was dismissed due to the harm found to the tranquillity of the rural area and the site's unsustainable location. The Inspector considered that this tranquil and unsustainable location harm that was found outweighed their findings that the proposal did not result in adverse visual effects on the area's character or appearance, harm to the experience of those using the PRow or on biodiversity.</p>	
SB/15/01837/FUL H (C Boddy) Allowed	Thornham Products Thornham Lane Southbourne West Sussex PO10 8DD - Retrospective grant of planning permission to station the existing single mobile home.
<p>The appellants health is a material consideration and due regard is given to Article 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998. No information has been provided to demonstrate remaining on site permanently. However, planning permission is granted on a temporary basis for three years to enable the appellants to find alternative location or accommodation.</p>	

With regard to the other main issues; Location: By reason of the distance from amenities and services, on narrow unlit roads, the site would not be sustainable in terms of its location. Chichester Harbour AONB: Whilst the tree belt and fencing screen the mobile home, the trees and hedges are non-native evergreens, which are at odds with the natural setting of the open marsh land/tidal creek character of the locality and the fence appears alien to the rural character of the area. The use of conditions for landscaping and removing pd rights would not enable the development to be acceptable. The proposed use of the site for the stationing of a mobile home would harm the open natural landscape character of the AONB. Flooding: No flood risk assessment has been carried out and there is insufficient evidence to assess whether the measures that are proposed would adequately reduce the risk. A sequential test has also not been provided. Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA- The contribution would adequately mitigate harm caused to the protected species.

[SDNP/14/05772/LDE](#)

STEDHAM

WR (D Price)

Dismissed

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.

"...Mr Leazell, moved from the cottage at 5 Bridgefoot Cottages into the studio in January 2008...Until January 2008, the studio had been in effect an outbuilding, located within the grounds of Number 5 and used by Mr Leazell as an art studio...On the balance of probability, I find that from early 2008 until a much more recent date unknown to me, the cottage at Number 5 was used for storage, initially by Mr Leazell and then after his death some of his possessions continued to be stored there. This does not necessarily mean that "storage" was an independent, separate use for the purposes of planning law...The original circumstances where Mr Leazell lived in Number 5, and the studio was an outbuilding used for purposes ancillary or incidental to the residential use of Number 5, were reversed in January 2008: the studio became Mr Leazell's dwelling and Number 5 became used for ancillary or incidental purposes (storage) in much the same way as a garden shed or other outbuilding in the grounds of a house might be used...When defining the use of land (which includes a building)...a key starting point is to consider the planning unit. Normally, this is the unit of occupation...Before Mr Leazell moved into the studio, the property at Number 5 and the studio comprised a single planning unit, with one dwelling and a building used for ancillary purposes (the studio). After Mr Leazell started living in the studio, the property at Number 5 and the studio still comprised one planning unit, with one dwelling and a building used for ancillary purposes (the cottage used for storage). So there was no material change of use of the planning unit. When Mr Spencer's residential occupancy of the Old Studio began, as Mr Spencer himself puts it "wholly independent of Number 5 Bridgefoot Cottages", a new chapter in the planning history of the site as a whole began... there is little physical subdivision (such as a fence or wall) between Number 5 and the Old Studio, but the two buildings became functionally separate units of occupation in July 2013...Whatever view is taken on the definition of the planning unit, the fact remains that where until very recently there was one dwelling, there are now two...Neither side in this case has placed any weight on the breach of condition which seems to have occurred when Mr Leazell moved into the studio during the flood...Having reviewed the history, I conclude that the use of the Old Studio as an independent dwelling had not been carried on for long enough to become immune from enforcement and so lawful by the date of the certificate application. The new chapter in planning history which I have mentioned was not opened until July 2013, when the Old Studio became hived off to form a separate unit of occupation from the cottage at Number 5...the council's refusal to grant a certificate of lawfulness...was well-founded. Therefore the appeal does not succeed. I dismiss the appeal."

Reference/Decision	
WH/15/02785/FUL* WR (C Boddy) Allowed	Maudlin Mill Side Green Lane Maudlin Westhampnett Chichester West Sussex PO18 0QU. Erection of B1/B2 industrial unit.
<p>The site is of industrial and with run down appearance and is generally well-screened by the hedgerows. Policy 26 refers to countryside and indicates that it does not prohibit the development of employment floorspace on existing employment sites. The Inspector was not persuaded that Policy 45 was relevant to the type of development proposed, especially given the long term B2 use of the site. The site would be close to the A27, with good junction. It would be located away from residential properties. The proposal would fulfil an economic role by way of its contribution to business growth and would meet the social dimension of sustainable development through the provision of new jobs. There would be no impact on the SDNP, due to its distance and vegetation and earth bunds. The recreational users of the PROW would not be affected, due to the limited glimpses that would only be achieved.</p>	
WR/15/00864/FUL WR (A Miller) Dismissed	Land at Wilton Cottage Kirdford Road Wisborough Green West Sussex RH14 0DB Construction of a two storey detached dwelling, means of access and detached garage.
<p>The main issues in this appeal are (i) whether the proposal would be an acceptable form of development with due regard to the development plan strategy for the location of housing; (ii) its effects on the character and appearance of the countryside including the Kirdford Road street scene; and (iii) whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of designated heritage assets...although the appeal site lies outside the settlement boundary, it is close to services and facilities in Wisborough Green, which I am satisfied would provide for some of the day-to-day needs of the dwelling's occupants. Nevertheless, the site has not been allocated in the NP and, in combination with its location beyond the settlement boundary, would therefore conflict with the spatial strategy and the objectives set out in NP Policies... The proposed dwelling would be positioned relatively close to the road and although the frontage hedgerow would be retained, it would nonetheless create the sense of a clear increase in built form within the local gap. Further, no substantive landscape and visual information has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposal would not diminish openness or affect views. The proposal would diminish the site's contribution to the open setting of the Conservation Area by reducing its openness, thus harming the significance of the designated heritage asset. – <i>The Inspector went on to comment that the development would not adversely affect the setting of a nearby Grade II listed building.</i></p>	
EWB/15/01239/FUL H (N Langford) Withdrawn 24.5.16	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.
SDNP/15/03361/LDE WEST LAVINGTON H (D Price) In Progress Withdrawn 6.6.16	Stable Cottage Dunford Hollow West Lavington West Sussex GU29 0ER - Use as single dwelling house with garden and amenity area.

3. OUTSTANDING APPEALS

Reference/Status	Proposal
AP/15/00465/ELD WR (C Boddy) In Progress	Crouchers Farm 163 Birdham Road Appledram Chichester, West Sussex PO20 7EQ - Certificate of lawful use in respect of the constituent parts of the above property.
BI/15/00139/CONSH PI (S Archer) In Progress	Land North West of Premier Business Park Birdham Road Birdham West Sussex – Access track, hardstanding and fencing. Appeal against enforcement notice. Linked to BI/15/01288/FUL and BI/15/00194/CONTRV
BI/15/00194/CONTRV PI (S Archer) 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 and BI/15/00139/CONSH
BI/15/01288/FUL PI (S Archer) 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 and BI/15/00139/CONSH
BO/14/03677/PLD H (F Stevens/D Price) In Progress 7 June 2016 at City Council – Assembly Room	Land West of Sweet Meadow Bosham Hoe Bosham Chichester PO18 8ET - Use of site for 1 no dwelling.
BX/15/03922/FUL WR (F Stevens) Awaiting Decision	1-6 The Old Granary The Street Boxgrove Chichester West Sussex PO18 0ES. Change of use from Class B1 business to Class B1 business and/or Class D1 private health and well-being clinic with rehabilitation centre.
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/15/01300/FUL H (P Kneen) In Progress Site visit 21 st June 2016	146 Whyke Road Chichester West Sussex PO19 8HT Proposed demolition of existing recent single storey extension and roof terrace, and replacement with a 1.5 storey extension; and conversion of existing Whyke Grange into 1 no. five-bed house (including converted stables forming a one-bed annex) and 1 No. three-bed house; erection of 2 no. detached four-bed cottages, with parking and external works.
CC/15/02449/FUL H (N Langford) In Progress 8 th September 2016 at	WKB Toyota 117 The Hornet Chichester West Sussex PO19 7JW - Redevelopment of car garage site to form a development comprising 35 one and two bed sheltered apartments for the elderly including communal facilities (Category II type accommodation), access, car parking and landscaping.

Reference/Status	Proposal
CC/15/02885/FUL WR (P Hunt) In Progress	Interactive Transactions Solutions Ltd Midland House 1 Market Avenue Chichester West Sussex PO19 1JU - Retrospective installation of 4 no. air conditioning condenser units to rear wall in service yard area.
CC/15/02962/FUL WR (N Mckellar) Awaiting Decision	Jalna Church Road Chichester West Sussex PO19 7HN - Replacement two storey dwelling.
CC/15/03784/FUL WR (R Ballam) In Progress	3 Whistler Avenue Chichester West Sussex PO19 6DL - Proposed glazing to terrace openings.
CC/15/04093/ADV FT (C Boddy) Awaiting Decision	Wagama's 26 South Street Chichester West Sussex PO19 1EL - Projecting sign, wrought iron style hanging bracket fixed back to the building fabric.
CH/15/02332/FUL* WR (F Stevens) In Progress Site visit 17 th June 2016	Land North of The Avenue Hambrook Chidham PO18 8TZ. Erection of 6 no. dwellings and associated works.
E/14/00348/CONCOU WR (S Pattie) Awaiting Decision	107 First Avenue Almodington Batchmere Chichester West Sussex PO20 7LQ. Change of use of land to storage of caravans, motorhomes, boats and containers. Linked to E/15/01644/FUL
E/15/01644/FUL WR (M Tomlinson) Awaiting Decision	107 First Avenue Almodington Batchmere Chichester West Sussex PO20 7LQ. Retrospective application for extended hard standing to the north of the glasshouse and change of use of land to south of glasshouse for the storage of caravans, boats and storage containers. Linked to E/14/00348/CONCOU
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/15/02792/HOUS HARTING FT (R G Macpherson) In Progress	3 Loppers Ash Elsted Road South Harting Petersfield West Sussex GU31 5LR - Replacement shed.
SDNP/15/03829/CND HARTING WR (J Shore) In Progress	Copper Beeches Torberry Farm B2146 Ditcham Lane to Hurst Mill Lane Hurst South Harting Petersfield West Sussex GU31 5RG - Variation of condition 1 of permission HT/02/69. To remove agricultural occupancy from Copper Beeches, Torberry Farm.
SDNP/15/04111/FUL HARTING WR (J Shore) In Progress	Nyewood Timber Yard Greenfields Close Nyewood South Harting West Sussex GU31 5JQ - Demolition of existing buildings and structures. Erection of semi detached pair of dwellings, parking and access.
KD/15/03896/FUL* WR (C Boddy) In Progress	Emily's Wood Roundwyck Copse Scratching Lane Kirdford West Sussex - Erection of storage shed.
LX/15/00498/ELD I (C Boddy) In Progress 2-3 August 2016 at CDC Offices; Committee Room	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

Reference/Status	Proposal
O/15/00277/CONHH WR (R Hawks) Awaiting Decision	Tapners Barn Marsh Lane Merston Oving Chichester West Sussex PO20 1DZ - Erection of side extension without planning permission. Appeal against enforcement notice.
O/15/02834/DOM WR (C Boddy) Awaiting Decision	Tapners Barn Marsh Lane Merston Oving West Sussex PO20 1DZ - Retrospective orangery extension to side of existing barn. Linked with O/15/00277/CONHH
O/15/03622/FUL WR (C Boddy) Awaiting Decision	Lime Kiln Barn Colworth Lane Colworth Oving PO20 2DS - Removal of condition 3 of planning permission O/16/92.
SDNP/14/06285/MPO PETWORTH H (J Saunders) Awaiting Decision	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 .
SDNP/16/00360/HOUS PETWORTH FT (B Stubbington) Awaiting decision	Trevornick 65 Sheepdown Drive Petworth West Sussex GU28 0BX - Double storey rear extension.
PS/13/00015/CONCOU I (R Hawks) In Progress 27 September- 4 October 2016 at WSCC – Edes house WSCC CLU Appeal : Awaiting decision	Crouchlands Farm Rickmans Lane Plaistow Billingshurst West Sussex RH14 0LE. Use of anaerobic digestion tanks and equipment for importation of waste and export of biomethane. Construction of a digestate lagoon without planning permission. Appeal against enforcement notices. Linked to s 78 appeal against refusal of planning permission by WSCC.
SDNP/15/01349/HOUS ROGATE WR (R Grosso Macpherson) Awaiting Decision	Lower House Durloughmarsh 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) Awaiting Decision	Lower House Durloughmarsh 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/15/00074/CONHH WR (S Archer) Awaiting Decision	47 Wellington Gardens Selsey Chichester West Sussex PO20 0RF - Without planning permission, erection of a single dwelling house. Appeal against enforcement notice. Linked with SY/15/02518/DOM
SY/15/02518/DOM WR (P Hunt) Awaiting Decision	47 Wellington Gardens Selsey West Sussex PO20 0RF - Self-contained annexe. Linked with SY/15/00074/CONHH
SY/15/04091/DOM WR (M Tomlinson) In Progress	Summerdown Medmerry Selsey West Sussex PO20 9BJ Removal of condition 3 of permission SY/15/01787/DOM .

Reference/Status	Proposal
SI/14/04249/ELD PI (R Hawks) In Progress	Magnolia Cottage Cloverlands Chalder Lane Sidlesham Chichester West Sussex PO20 7RJ - To continue use of building as a single dwelling.
SI/16/00184/OUT WR (M Tomlinson) In Progress	Land North of Swan Cottage, Selsey Road Sidlesham West Sussex - Outline Application for 2 no detached dwellings with garages, parking and access from B2145 Selsey Road.
SB/11/00022/CONDWE I (S Archer) Awaiting Decision	Acre View R B S Nurseries Thornham Lane Southbourne Emsworth Hampshire PO10 8DD - Use of a building as a dwelling house – appeal against enforcement notice. Linked to SB/15/02508/FUL
SB/14/00313/CONMHC H (S Archer) Awaiting Decision	Land North of Marina Farm Thorney Road Southbourne - Stationing of a mobile home. Appeal against Enforcement Notice.
SB/15/02508/FUL I (S Archer) Awaiting Decision	Acre View Cottage Thornham Lane Southbourne West Sussex PO10 8DD - Continuation of use of building as a single dwelling house. Linked to SB/11/00022/CONDWE
SDNP/15/05144/HOUS STEDHAM FT (C Cranmer) Awaiting Decision	Talbots Ash House Lane Stedham Midhurst West Sussex GU29 0PX - 2 storey rear extension.
WE/15/00135/CONWST WR (R Hawks) Awaiting Decision	Land South East of Hopedene Common Road Hambrook Westbourne West Sussex – hardsurfaced access track without planning permission. Appeal against enforcement notice.
WH/14/01159/OUTEIA I (J Bell) In Progress 19-21 July 2016 at City Council and 22-26 July 2016 at CDC Offices	Land between Stane Street and Madgwick Lane Westhampnett West Sussex Residential development comprising up to 300 residential dwellings, including an element of affordable housing, with vehicular access from Stane Street and Madgwick Lane, associated landscaping, a community facility, open space and children's play space, surface water attenuation and ancillary works.
WH/14/03827/OUT H (K Rawlins/J Bell) Awaiting Decision	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.
WW/15/01408/FUL WR (F Stevens) Awaiting Decision	Ullswater Malden Way Selsey Chichester West Sussex PO20 0RW Construction of chalet bungalow on land east of Ullswater.
WR/15/02080/FUL WR (M Tomlinson) Awaiting Decision	Goose Cottage Durbans Road Wisborough Green Billingshurst West Sussex RH14 0DG - Change of use of existing store building to residential.
WR/15/03504/DOM WR (R Ballam) In Progress	Park Cottage Kirdford Road Wisborough Green West Sussex RH14 0DF - Demolition of existing incongruous rear dormer. New rear dormer, rear extension and connecting walkway to existing bothy. Linked to WR/15/03505/LBC

Reference/Status	Proposal
WR/15/03505/LBC WR (R Ballam) In Progress	Park Cottage Kirdford Road Wisborough Green West Sussex RH14 0DF - Demolition of existing incongruous rear dormer. New rear dormer, rear extension and connecting walkway to existing bothy. Linked to WR/15/03504/DOM

4. VARIATIONS TO SECTION 106 AGREEMENTS

NONE

5. CALLED-IN APPLICATIONS

Reference	Proposal	Stage
NONE		

6. COURT AND OTHER MATTERS

Injunctions		
Site	Breach	Stage
Birdham Farm	Unauthorised Development	Awaiting notification from court of next hearing

Prosecutions		
Site	Breach	Stage
Tinwood Estate	Illegal sign	File closed. Summons withdrawn; Defendant gave written undertaking not to put sign again.

Prosecutions		
Site	Breach	Stage
Nell Ball	Various unauthorised developments and breach of statutory notice	Legal letter imminent in response to contact from Parish Council

Prosecutions		
Site	Breach	Stage
Wassall Barn	Various unauthorised developments & breach of statutory notice	Referred to client for clarification and further evidence.

7. POLICY MATTERS

NONE