

# Chichester District Council

## Planning Committee

Wednesday 17 August 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
<a href="#">LX/15/03623/PA3Q</a> WR (F Stevens) In Progress	Mallards Farm Buildings, Guildford Road, Loxwood, West Sussex, RH14 0QW - Part 3 Class Q application for prior approval. Change of use from agricultural building to dwelling (C3 Use class).
<a href="#">SDNP/15/03433/FUL</a> LYNCHMERE WR (C Cranmer) In Progress	Danley Hill, Danley Lane, Linchmere, West Sussex GU27 3NF - Demolish fire damage cottage and re-build as existing before fire damage. (Renewal of permission reference LM/09/03061/FUL).
<a href="#">PS/15/03095/FUL</a> WR (A Miller) In Progress	Hardnips Barn, Crouchlands Farm, Rickmans Lane Plaistow, Billingshurst, West Sussex RH14 0LE - Retention of wood store and general garden store on land adjacent to Hardnip's Barn
<a href="#">PS/15/03745/FUL</a> WR (F Stevens) In Progress	Dale Farm, The Lane, Ifold, Loxwood, RH14 0UL - Change of use from stable to dwelling and associated works.

## 2. DECISIONS RECEIVED

Reference/Decision	
<a href="#">CC/15/02885/FUL</a> WR (P Hunt) Allowed Costs Refused	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.
<p>“The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted... The condenser units are in a courtyard that provides service access and parking with access from Market Avenue and Old Market Avenue surrounded by buildings. However, visibility into this courtyard is restricted by the orientation of the surrounding buildings such that their rear elevations are screened by the surrounding buildings from public view. On this basis any effects on the character and appearance of the conservation area are restricted to that courtyard... The air conditioning condenser units subject of this appeal are arranged in a line above a service entrance to the rear of the building, reflecting the location of the units over the other service entrance adjacent that appear to have been granted permission under reference 09/02329/FUL. I understand the Council’s concerns about a proliferation of plant and that such plant may dominate the rear elevation of the building. However, the manner in which the units subject of this appeal have been arranged reflects those above the adjacent service entrance such that these units do not unacceptably add to the clutter to the rear of the building and do not dominate the building...For these reasons, I conclude that the air conditioning condenser units subject of this appeal preserve the character and appearance of the Chichester Conservation Area...”</p>	
<p><b>COSTS DECISION</b></p>	
<p>“... relevant policies refer to the development preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the Conservation area and do not necessarily relate to whether such development is visible from the public domain... Whilst [a hidden location] may affect the weight attributed to the harm, it is not unreasonable to suggest that such harm exists. The appellant suggests that the Council failed to fully consider the proposed development in light of the three dimensions to sustainable development. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) is clear that sustainable development is defined as development in accordance with the Framework as a whole ... whilst the Council did not explicitly deal with the three dimensions to sustainable development, it was not unreasonable for them to conclude that the proposed development would not constitute sustainable development by reason of being contrary to the development plan (policy 47) The Council did suggest an alternative location for the air conditioning units on the roof of the building in their report. I note that this alternative is not considered satisfactory by the appellant, but does indicate a reasonable willingness by the Council to consider alternatives...”</p>	
<a href="#">CC/15/03784/FUL</a> WR (R Ballam) Allowed Costs Refused	3 Whistler Avenue, Chichester, West Sussex PO19 6DL - Proposed glazing to terrace openings.
<p>"The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for proposed glazing to terrace openings at 3 Whistler Avenue, Chichester, PO19 6DL... The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area...Significantly No 3 is in the south west corner of this block, with no properties between it and Broyle Road...there are several semi-mature trees and substantial flint wall between No 3 and Broyle Road, intervening features that largely obscure views of the property from surrounding vantage points outside of Roussillon Park...The homes of Roussillon Park share a very strong consistency of scale and finish. Whilst windows are consistent in their vertical emphasis and frame colour, there are nonetheless differing window designs present in the immediate vicinity of No 3...At the time of my site visit Broyle Road appeared to be relatively heavily trafficked commensurate with its role as an arterial route to and from the centre of Chichester...its balcony...is not screened from vehicular noise or emissions by the intervening boundary wall or by other properties (particularly given that it lies to the south west, in the direction</p>	

of the prevailing wind). The proposal would therefore clearly better insulate the balcony and internal rooms of the property in respect of vehicular noise and emissions, and making the balcony a more useable and comfortable space. Whilst I appreciate that Roussillon Park was designed with precise attention to detail as a whole, given the extending vertical emphasis of the balcony openings, and as the glazing proposed would contain no visible transoms or glazing bars, I cannot find other than that proposal would be broadly in line with the consistent proportions of windows present in Roussillon Park. Moreover given the variety of window designs in the immediate vicinity of No 3 and the highly limited visual impact of the proposal, which would be essentially confined to glazing frames and mullions, the proposal would not appear incongruous in this context subject to a condition related to the appearance of the glazing frames, transform and mullions... on account of the boundary wall and inventing trees, that No 3 is substantially screened from many viewpoints (unlike nearby Royal Sussex House or other properties within Roussillon park where no such substantial screening is present). The proposal would consequently be of minimal visual impact beyond the confines of Roussillon Park... I find that the proposal would not be inappropriate in respect of its effect on the character and appearance of the host building or surrounding area...I acknowledge the concern of Chichester City Council that allowing this proposal may set a precedent. However I have set out above that it is the specific location and surrounding context of this particular proposal that makes it acceptable, and each proposal must be determined on its particular merits.

### **COSTS DECISION**

The application of an award of costs is refused... whilst policy 1 'Sustainable Development Principles'...sets out that the Council will 'work proactively with applicants jointly to find solutions' this is qualified by the following phrase 'wherever possible'...evidently there is no assurance therein that all development proposed will ultimately prove acceptable... in my view it is not unreasonable for the Council to have failed to arrive at mutually agreed approach with the appellant... I agree with the appellant, however, as detailed in appeal decision, that policy 40 'Sustainable Design and Construction' of the Local Plan cannot reasonably be said to be relevant to the development proposed in that appeal by virtue of appearing to apply only to 'new dwellings' rather than existing dwellings. Council suggest that the 'general thrust' of policy is in line with the design objectives within the National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework') this does not sufficiently justify its application in that case. Where this was the sole policy conflict cited by the Council in respect of the proposal, this may have amounted to unreasonable behaviour... Council has also explained that the proposal would in their view conflict with the design requirements of policy 33 'New Residential Development' of the Local Plan, which is not expressly limited to applying to 'new dwellings' ...is consistent with various relevant elements of the Framework in respect of requiring good design... although the Council's reasoning in respect of the policy context relevant to the proposal is convoluted, this does not in my view amount to unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense. I acknowledge that no explicit regard is given in the Council's reasoning in in respect of the development proposed to the benefits that would arise to the appellant. However, the benefits of the proposal are self-evident and integral to the development proposed. I also accept that the proposal would not be readily apparent from Broyle Road, it would nonetheless be visible from vantage points within Roussillon Park, and its degree of prominence and consequent impact is a matter of planning judgement rather than absolutes. Council could have demonstrated more clearly the consideration that they gave to these issues, and indeed I have reached a different view on the appropriateness of the proposal to them, nonetheless it appears to me that they reached a balanced judgement in respect of the proposal with reference to its intended objectives and having taken account of its effects upon the surrounding environment... Council has consequently undertaken no action or inaction that would amount to unreasonable behaviour to justify an award of costs against them.

<b>Reference/Decision</b>	
<a href="#">CC/15/04093/ADV</a> FT (M Tomlinson) Dismissed	Wagamama's, 26 South Street, Chichester, West Sussex PO19 1EL - Projecting sign, wrought iron style hanging bracket fixed back to the building fabric.
<p>"...Although projecting signs are not unusual in South Street, the majority of buildings do not have such signs. As such, the sign adds to the visual clutter of the street and does not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area. It is suggested that the historic importance of the street is derived from the appearance of the upper floors of buildings, but the proposed sign is attached at upper floor level and detracts from the simple appearance of this elevation of the building. The sign attracts attention toward this building and away from the neighbouring listed buildings, harming their setting. I understand that the sign has been installed to make the restaurant more visible in longer views on South Street in order to promote and grow the business. Given the width of the street and of the shopfront, the projecting sign has minimal effect on the visibility of the restaurant in views along the road, so this does not outweigh the effect of the projecting sign on the character and appearance of the conservation area or setting of surrounding listed buildings..."</p>	
<a href="#">SDNP/15/04111/FUL</a> HARTING WR (J Shore) Dismissed	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.
<p>"...Although the dwellings would be in a much more central part of the site than the existing structures and storage area shown on the CLEUD plan, they would be more obvious to adjoining residents due to their position and size. The dwellings would also be noticeable from the turning head of Greenfields Close and the adjoining dwellings. The site slopes gently down from Greenfields Close but it would be possible to see the higher parts of the proposed dwellings from further away as one approaches the site. I am mindful that if the lawful use were to be re-introduced, the presence of machines, vehicles as well as the storage of materials would have a greater visual impact than the present situation. However, I do not consider that this would be as noticeable from adjoining properties or the wider area as two permanent dwellings along with the paraphernalia associated with residential use...However the proposed development would appear as an incursion of further sub-urban development into the woodland and into a distinct gap between dwellings. The dwellings would not be in line with the neighbouring houses and the development would not appear as a natural infill as suggested by the appellant. The proposal would harm the pleasant woodland backdrop to the built up area of Nyewood. A similar conclusion was reached by the Planning Inspector in dealing with the previous appeal on this site in 1998 (Ref T/APP/L3815/A/98/298713/P4) in relation to that outline proposal for 2 dwellings. That scheme was intended to be for 2 storey dwellings and the current proposal would involve the first floor being partially within the roof space. That does not however overcome my concerns. The dwelling and the use of land surrounding them would still be very noticeable from outside of the site. The NPPF at Paragraph 115 makes it very clear that great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks which have the highest status of protection in relation to these matters. This reflects the statutory purposes of the SDNPA. In relation to the first main issue, the proposals would have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the area failing to conserve the landscape and scenic beauty of the SDNP. This would not comply with the saved policy BE11 of the Chichester District Local Plan – First Review, adopted April 1999 (LP)...The proposal would provide 2 additional dwellings that would be a modest benefit to housing provision in the area. My finding that the development would fail to conserve the landscape and scenic beauty of the SDNP means that this is a case where specific policy in the NPPF, at Paragraph 115, indicates that development should be restricted. In these circumstances, in accordance with paragraph 14 of the Framework, the fact that relevant policies are out of date is not, in itself, a reason to</p>	

<p>grant planning permission...The site is close to existing built up development within this rural settlement. Paragraph 55 of the NPPF seeks to avoid new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances. The site is not isolated from dwellings. However, that fact does not make this a sustainable location when looking at the NPPF as a whole. Isolation needs to be considered with respect to accessibility to services as well. Nyewood includes some commercial buildings that could be reached by foot or by bicycle over level roads and footpaths within a reasonable journey time. They would be potential places of employment for prospective occupants of the dwellings. I also noted the position of the bus stop within a short walk from the site on the main road through the settlement. The appellant draws attention to the bus services which appear however to be limited. Whilst they link Nyewood with Petersfield, Midhurst, South Harting and other local towns as well as villages, the services do not appear to me to be sufficient to make up for the lack of facilities nearby such as schools and shops..."</p>	
<p><a href="#">KD/15/03896/FUL</a> * WR (C Boddy) Dismissed Costs Refused</p>	<p>Emily's Wood, Roundwyck Copse, Scratching Lane, Kirdford West Sussex - Erection of storage shed.</p>
<p>"The appeal is dismissed....Planning Background an 'Article 4 direction', dated 14 January 2013, applies in respect of forestry permitted development rights throughout Roundwyck Copse, and hence planning permission is required for the development proposed...the main issue is...whether the development is reasonably necessary for the purposes of forestry....and would be fairly and appropriately related to the forestry management requirements of Emily's Wood, and whether its effect upon the surrounding environment would be acceptable visually and environmentally....Permission has previously been granted by the Council for a tool shed within a plot of woodland named Lovers' Landing approximately 500 metres distant from Emily's Wood....There is no strong evidence... indicating why,...this facility could not be used jointly by the appellant...no quantification provided by the appellant of the extent of the forestry works proposed in Emily's Wood, the frequency of such works or the working hours involved....and that it is necessary to house certain tools on site rather than to import them from time to time as required....therefore....on the basis of the evidence before me that it has not been demonstrated that the proposed storage shed would be fairly and appropriately related to the forestry management requirements of Emily's Wood...Turning to the second main issue...it would...result in man-made development in what is presently an area of ancient woodland...bringing the proposal into conflict with policy 48 'Natural Environment' of the Local Plan... concern...that such development would cumulatively prove detrimental to the character of the area....As such I conclude that the proposal conflicts with the approach within paragraph 118 of the Framework and with policy EM.2 of the Kirdford Neighbourhood Plan..."</p>	
<p><a href="#">SDNP/15/01349/HOUS</a> &amp; <a href="#">SDNP/15/01351/LIS</a> ROGATE WR (R Grosso Macpherson) Dismissed</p>	<p>Lower House Durloughmarsh Rogate Petersfield West Sussex GU31 5AX - Oak framed glazed garden room extension to side. <b>Linked to</b> <a href="#">SDNP/15/01351/LIS</a></p>
<p>" 3129777 &amp; 3129778 Lower House Durloughmarsh Rogate Petersfield, SDNP/15/01349/HOUS &amp; SDNP/15/01351/LIS...dismissed...main issues...effect of the proposed development...on the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building...and the landscape and scenic beauty of the National Park...The extent of the proposed glazing would be much greater than the existing windows and would have a vertical emphasis in contrast to the horizontal emphasis of the existing...the contrast...would allow the extension to be read as a distinct, separate element without competing with or distracting from the original building...strong concerns regarding the proposed dormer window...existing rear elevation of the house...large expanse of roof...This is a prominent feature of...the very large and prominent new dormer would be</p>	

disproportionate to the roof of the extension and to the only other dormer window in the rear elevation. It would disrupt the rear elevation and would be unduly imposing. This would be evident from both the rear and the side view of the house...I am not persuaded that the dormer is necessary to bring additional light into the room given that the extension would have three glazed elevations and two rooflights. The energy efficiency benefits suggested by the appellant would be limited by virtue of the small scale of the proposal...additional living space provided would be a private benefit and is not necessary to secure the...optimum viable use as a dwelling...the limited public benefits...do not outweigh the identified harm...not preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building...”

[SY/15/04091/DOM](#)  
WR (M Tomlinson)  
Dismissed

Summerdown, Medmerry, Selsey, West Sussex, PO20 9BJ.  
Removal of condition 3 of permission [SY/15/01787/DOM](#).

“Summerdown is a detached dwelling located within a large holiday park and is orientated so that its rear elevation faces directly towards the beach and the Solent beyond. The holiday park is mainly occupied by static caravans but there are also a number of permanent residential dwellings. There is a static caravan, known as Four Winds, set within in a relatively large plot immediately to the east of the of the appeal property and which has an area of timber decking constructed to provide a terrace for sitting out with direct access from the side and rear doors. The evidence tells me that Four Winds is used as holiday accommodation for about 9 months of the year. In seeking to protect the privacy of those staying at Four Winds, the Council has granted permission subject to part of the new obscure glazed balcony surround being of a height that would prevent any overlooking of next door’s terrace from the balcony. It is clear from the relative positioning of the two properties that some of the outdoor space around Four Winds would still be visible from the balcony...I note the fall-back position raised by the appellants but it is unclear exactly what form this would take. It is stated within the appeal statement, that the existing balustrade would be retained and the permission part implemented. However, it is also stated that the balustrade would be replaced on a like-for-like basis. Nevertheless, I am not convinced, given its relatively poor condition, that the existing balustrade would be suitable for reinstatement without a substantial amount of remedial work. In addition, regardless of whether the balustrade was reused or replaced, the newly erected posts would need to be removed, which would cause disruption to the surface of the balcony. I therefore have no substantive evidence to indicate that there is a significant likelihood that the existing balustrade would be reinstated or replaced with a like-for-like item, which limits the weight that I can attach to it as a fall back position..... the removal of Condition No 3 would not accord with the principles of creating a high quality living environment sought by Policy 33 of the Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies (2015). Furthermore, for similar reasons, the identified harm would not accord with the Development Considerations set out in the Selsey Neighbourhood Plan Part 1 Audit Final version for submission (February 2015) (NP). Although not yet adopted, the NP is at an advanced stage, having been through independent examination and therefore carries moderate weight...”

<b>Reference/Decision</b>	
<a href="#">SI/14/04249/ELD</a> PI (R Hawks) Dismissed	Magnolia Cottage Cloverlands Chalder Lane Sidlesham Chichester West Sussex PO20 7RJ- To continue use of building as a single dwelling.
<p>"The use for which a certificate of lawful use or development is sought is the use as a single dwelling without any planning constraint....The key issues are therefore what was the situation in December 2004 when Magnolia Cottage was first occupied and has that changed over the intervening years?...The position in 2004...I have no doubt that the original intention was to create a single planning unit with Magnolia Cottage occupied effectively as a "granny annex", albeit not with a granny, but similar to the manner of occupation in Uttlesford....when Magnolia Cottage was first occupied in December 2004 it was occupied as part of the single planning unit of Cloverlands and it was the intention of the joint family members to occupy the building as a single planning unit in accord with the planning permission granted. Utilities and bills... the utilities are primarily to service Cloverlands...it does suggest that Magnolia Cottage was being used as an annex to Cloverlands rather than as a separate planning unit. Maintenance and curtilage...the parties...until the breakdown of relations, treated the property as a shared responsibility....Conclusions...There was no separate curtilage, no separate utility supplies...a large shared garden and plenty of evidence of shared maintenance of the property as a whole.... it was treated as a single planning unit....Although the degree of interconnectivity between the two sets of occupiers has clearly weakened since the falling out, there would seem to be no actual evidence that Magnolia Cottage has been used as separate planning unit during the 10 year period and certainly not in the early years prior to 2009. Consequently I shall refuse to issue the LDC applied for."</p>	
<a href="#">SI/16/00184/OUT</a> WR (M Tomlinson) Dismissed	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.
<p>"...The appellant refers to a need for additional residential development in the area, but there is no evidence of what the nature and extent of this need is...The appellant suggests that the proposed development should be considered as windfall development that contributes to the need for dwellings in the area. However, windfall development would normally be expected to meet the terms of all other development plan policies. Given that the only previous use of the site was as residential garden land but it is now blending back into the landscape, I do not consider it comprises previously developed land as defined in the Framework...[the proposal] does not comprise sustainable development as defined in the Framework'...The proposed dwellings would introduce additional buildings within the ribbon of development on Selsey Road that would provide continuous development for a substantial stretch along this side of the road. That would alter the rural character of the area and space between development, consolidating it and thereby adversely affecting the character and appearance of the open countryside in the area... conclude that the proposed dwellings would adversely affect the character and appearance of the surrounding rural area...in particular the local landscape character.in the absence of an appropriate planning obligation, the development would harm the Chichester and Langstone Harbours and Pagham Harbour SPAs..."</p>	
<a href="#">SB/14/00313/CONMHC</a> H (S Archer) Dismissed	Land North Of Marina Farm Thorney Road Southbourne - Stationing of a mobile home. Appeal against Enforcement Notice.
<p>"...The unauthorised development on the appeal site and ancillary uses elsewhere on Janine Loader's land are, in my assessment, an incongruous and unacceptable form of development in the AONB. By its very nature the mobile home does not meet the highest standards of design that are required in such an attractive, open and undeveloped landscape. Clearly, the introduction of the unauthorised development does not reinforce or respond to the attractive and undeveloped character and appearance of the AONB....Accordingly, it is contrary to the relevant parts of the Local Plan....The</p>	

<p>Equality Act 2010 legally protects people from discrimination in wider society...Ricky Ramsey is a gypsy or traveller as defined in PPTS....however, to allow this appeal and to grant planning permission for development that is wholly unacceptable in planning terms and which would not be in accordance with the Development Plan would fail to foster good relations between the occupiers of the Appeal Site and the settled community....The appeal is dismissed and the Enforcement Notice is upheld. Planning permission is refused on the application deemed to have been made under Section 177(5) of the 1990 Act.”</p>	
<p><a href="#">WR/15/02080/FUL</a> WR (M Tomlinson) Dismissed</p>	<p>Goose Cottage, Durbans Road, Wisborough Green, Billingshurst, West Sussex, RH14 0DG - Change of use of existing store building to residential.</p>
<p>“...In the development strategy the Council have categorised the village of Wisborough Green as a service village where sustainable development would be able to be accommodated. However the appeal site lies outside the settlement boundary of the village and therefore, in planning terms, is in open countryside. In addition, the recently adopted Wisborough Green Neighbourhood Plan has selected specific sites in conjunction with a settlement plan based on an approximate five minutes walking distance to the centre of the village<sup>3</sup>. However the appeal site lies outside the five minutes walking distance to the centre of the village, and neither has the appeal site been selected in the Neighbourhood Plan process....I acknowledge that Durbans Road has a pedestrian pathway linking the site to the centre of the village, and that the distance by road from the site to the Settlement Boundary is about 700m. I also acknowledge that the site is not isolated from other dwellings, that the existing storage building would be able to be converted and that the design of the storage building is appropriate to its surroundings...Notwithstanding these factors, I have found that the proposed development would be located in open countryside remote from the majority of day to day services. It would therefore not be in a sustainable location...the conversion of it to a residential use on a back land site would make the new residential unit together with associated domestic paraphernalia appear as an anomaly in the street scene compared to the surrounding residential properties, resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the area...Given the close proximity of the adjacent properties such an increase in activity on the site would lead to noise disturbance and harm to the living conditions of adjacent residents [from the use of the driveway]....”</p>	
<p>CC/15/00331/CONCOM WR (S Archer) <b>Withdrawn 11.7.16</b></p>	<p>46 South Street, Chichester, West Sussex PO19 1DS - Works to shop front and grill on the north elevation. Appeal against enforcement notice.</p>

### 3. OUTSTANDING APPEALS

Reference/Status	Proposal
<a href="#">AP/15/00465/ELD</a> WR (C Boddy) Awaiting Decision	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.
<a href="#">BI/15/00139/CONSH</a> PI (S Archer) In Progress 7 <sup>th</sup> – 9 <sup>th</sup> February 2017	Land North West Of Premier Business Park, Birdham Road Birdham, West Sussex – Access track, hardstanding and fencing. Appeal against enforcement notice. <b>Linked to <a href="#">BI/15/01288/FUL</a> and <a href="#">BI/15/00194/CONTRV</a></b>
<a href="#">BI/15/00194/CONTRV</a> PI (S Archer) In Progress 7 <sup>th</sup> – 9 <sup>th</sup> February 2017	Land North West of Premier Business Park Birdham Road Birdham, West Sussex - Use of land as a Traveller Site. Appeal against enforcement notice <b>Linked to <a href="#">BI/15/01288/FUL</a> and <a href="#">BI/15/00139/CONSH</a></b>
<a href="#">BI/15/01288/FUL</a> PI (S Archer) In Progress 7 <sup>th</sup> - 9 <sup>th</sup> February 2017	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. <b>Linked to <a href="#">BI/15/00194/CONTRV</a> and <a href="#">BI/15/00139/CONSH</a></b>
<a href="#">BO/14/03677/PLD</a> H (F Stevens/D Price) Awaiting Decision	Land west of Sweet Meadow Bosham Hoe Bosham Chichester PO18 8ET - Use of site for 1no. dwelling.
<a href="#">SDNP/14/04865/FUL</a> BURY I (D Price) In Progress 13 <sup>th</sup> -16 <sup>th</sup> September at Bury Village Hall	Land North of Junction with B2138 Bury Road Bury West Sussex - Change of use from agricultural land to a Gypsy and Traveller's site. <b>Linked to <a href="#">SDNP/15/00336/COU</a>.</b>
<a href="#">SDNP/15/00336/COU</a> BURY I (R Hawks) In Progress 13 <sup>th</sup> -16 <sup>th</sup> September at Bury Village Hall	Land North of Junction with B2138 Bury Road Bury West Sussex - Stationing of two caravans for human habitation. Appeal against enforcement notice <b>Linked to <a href="#">SDNP/14/04865/FUL</a></b>
<a href="#">CC/15/02449/FUL</a> H (N Langford) In Progress 8 <sup>th</sup> September 2016 at The Old Court Room, Chichester City Council	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.
<a href="#">CC/15/04197/DOM</a> FT (H Chowdhury) Awaiting Decision	39 Ormonde Avenue, Chichester PO19 7UX – Proposed Conservatory
<a href="#">E/14/00348/CONCOU</a> 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. <b>Linked to <a href="#">E/15/01644/FUL</a></b>
<a href="#">E/15/01644/FUL</a> 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. <b>Linked to <a href="#">E/14/00348/CONCOU</a></b>

Reference/Status	Proposal
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.
<a href="#">FU/15/02504/FUL</a> H (K Rawlins) In Progress 11 <sup>th</sup> October 2016 at Vicars Hall, Chichester Cathedral	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
<a href="#">SDNP/15/02792/HOUS</a> HARTING FT (R G Macpherson) In Progress	3 Loppers Ash, Elsted Road, South Harting, Petersfield West Sussex, GU31 5LR - Replacement shed.
<a href="#">SDNP/15/03829/CND</a> 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.
<a href="#">SDNP/16/00382/HOUS</a> LAVANT FT (J Shore) In Progress	29 Northside, Mid Lavant, Chichester West Sussex, PO18 0BX - Retention of arctic cabin.
<a href="#">LX/15/00498/ELD</a> I (C Boddy) Awaiting decision	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
<a href="#">SDNP/15/05454/FUL</a> Lurgashall H (D Price) Awaiting decision	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) 11 <sup>th</sup> -12 <sup>th</sup> October at North Mundham Village Hall	Nurses Cottage, Post Office Lane, North Mundham, Chichester, West Sussex PO20 1JY - Erection of a buildings, play structure and garden items
<a href="#">NM/15/02119/FUL</a> WR (M Tomlinson) In Progress	The Chalet, Southgate Farm, Fisher Lane, North Mundham, Chichester, West Sussex PO20 1YU - Erection of replacement dwelling.
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.
<a href="#">O/15/02834/DOM</a> WR (C Boddy) Awaiting Decision	Tapners Barn, Marsh Lane, Merston, Oving, West Sussex, PO20 1DZ - Retrospective orangery extension to side of existing barn. <b>Linked with O/15/00277/CONHH</b>
<a href="#">SDNP/14/06285/MPO</a> PETWORTH H (J Saunders) 17 <sup>th</sup> August at City Council	Land At Laundry Cottage Woodlea and Grass Mere Horsham Road Petworth West Sussex - Removal of affordable housing obligation attached to planning permission <a href="#">SDNP/12/02721/FUL</a> .
<a href="#">SDNP/16/00360/HOUS</a> PETWORTH FT (B Stubbington) Awaiting decision	Trevornick, 65 Sheepdown Drive, Petworth, West Sussex GU28 0BX - Double storey rear extension.

Reference/Status	Proposal
PS/13/00015/CONCOU I (R Hawks) In Progress 25 <sup>th</sup> -28 <sup>th</sup> April & 3 <sup>rd</sup> -4 <sup>th</sup> May 2017 <a href="#">WSSCC CLU Appeal :            Appeal Allowed 22.6.16</a>	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 s78 appeal against refusal of planning permission by WSSCC.
SY/14/00304/CONHH WR (S Archer) In Progress	100 Beach Road, Selsey, Chichester West Sussex, PO20 0SZ - Erection of a fence adjacent to the highway. Appeal against enforcement notice.
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 <a href="#">SY/15/02518/DOM</a>
<a href="#">SY/15/02518/DOM</a> WR (P Hunt) Awaiting Decision	47 Wellington Gardens Selsey West Sussex PO20 0RF - Self-contained annexe. <b>Linked with SY/15/00074/CONHH</b>
SI/14/00397/CONMHC WR (R Hawks) Awaiting decision	Land at Church Farm Lane, Sidlesham, West Sussex - Stationing of caravans. Appeal against enforcement notice.
<a href="#">SB/16/00092/FUL</a> WR (M Tomlinson) In Progress	Land West Of Fieldside, Prinsted Lane, Prinsted, Emsworth, Hampshire - Proposed two bedroom gatehouse dwelling with car parking.
WE/15/00135/CONWST WR (R Hawks) Awaiting Decision	Land South East Of Hopedene Common Road Hambrook Westbourne West Sussex – hard surfaced access track without planning permission. Appeal against enforcement notice.
<a href="#">WH/15/04038/FUL</a> WR (F Stevens) In Progress Site visit 16 <sup>th</sup> August 16	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.
<a href="#">WW/15/01408/FUL</a> WR (F Stevens) Awaiting Decision	Ullswater, Malden Way, Selsey, Chichester, West Sussex, PO20 0RW. Construction of chalet bungalow on land east of Ullswater.
<a href="#">WR/15/03504/DOM</a> WR (R Ballam) Awaiting Decision	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 <a href="#">WR/15/03505/LBC</a>
<a href="#">WR/15/03505/LBC</a> WR (R Ballam) Awaiting Decision	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 <a href="#">WR/15/03504/DOM</a>

#### 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	The defendants have appealed the enforcement notices (Public Inquiry to be held in Feb 2017). This has affected the timetable of the injunction proceedings. There is evidence of further works on the land since the court proceedings in June 2015. Counsel's opinion was sought on 02.08.16 on how to proceed. This case is complicated by the large number of defendants and the need for precision in the way it is handled. .

Prosecutions		
Site	Breach	Stage
Nell Ball	Various unauthorised developments and breach of statutory notice	Letters before action were sent (25.07.16) in regard to 3 Enforcement Notices. No reply has been received. After a short further period summonses will be issued.

Prosecutions		
Site	Breach	Stage
Wassall Barn	Various unauthorised developments & breach of statutory notice	A draft statement has been prepared but no decision has been taken on whether to proceed with a prosecution (for failure to comply with a Stop Notice) pending collation of the key evidence in this matter to finalise the officers witness statement. In the meantime an enforcement has been issued to require removal of the unauthorised development from the land.

#### 7. POLICY MATTERS

NONE