

**Chichester District Council**

**Planning Committee**

**Wednesday 1 March 2017**

**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**

<b>Reference/Procedure</b>	<b>Proposal</b>
<a href="#">CH/16/00806/DOM</a> WR (P Hunt)	3 Wayte Cottages, Chidham Lane, Chidham, Chichester West Sussex, PO18 8TQ - New rear facing dormer window.
* <a href="#">CH/16/01087/FUL</a> WR (C Boddy)	Moola House, Main Road, Nutbourne, West Sussex, PO18 8RN - Construction of 5 no. dwellings and associated works including access and landscaping.
<a href="#">SDNP/16/03955/HOUS</a> Easebourne WR (R Grosso Macpherson)	The Old Pump House, Henley Old Road, Henley Easebourne, GU27 3HQ - Two storey rear extension and front porch addition.

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<a href="#">SDNP/15/03654/FUL</a> Elsted & Treyford WR (D Price)	Elsted Road Bridge, Fitzhall Road, Elsted, West Sussex - Infill single span bridge with stone and foam concrete to provide long-term structural support to the bridge. Form new embankments to sides of bridge and drainage pipes laid at ground level.
<a href="#">SDNP/16/03109/FUL</a> Harting WR (D Price)	Wattons Barn, Hollist Lane, East Harting, GU31 5LU - Demolition of the existing Atcost barn and the conversion of the existing brick and stone dairy building into a two bedroom dwelling house together with associated alterations and off-street forecourt car parking for two cars and a garden amenity area.
<a href="#">O/16/02254/OUT</a> I (J Bushell)	Land To The South Of Oving Road/B2144, Shopwhyke West Sussex - Outline application for the development of the site to provide 100 no. dwellings (use class C3), with an associated access, parking, outdoor space, landscaping and infrastructure.

## 2. DECISIONS RECEIVED

Reference/Decision	
* <a href="#">EWB/16/00311/FUL</a> WR (J Cross) DISMISSED	22 Seafield Close, East Wittering, West Sussex, PO20 8DP - Demolition of garage and outbuildings, extension and loft conversion to bungalow. <a href="#">LINKED TO EWB/16/01793/DOM</a>
<p>"Appeal A is dismissed... The proposal in Appeal A is to extend and convert the existing building, to form two dwellings... I accept that amongst the other developments and building alterations now found in Seafield Close, there is a wide variety of shapes and sizes of roof extensions and dormers, including some that either reach to the ridge line, or project to the face of the building, or span its width or length. But in the present appeal, the proposed design combines all of these features together... Moreover, whilst I agree that the street's character has become more varied, this does not necessarily mean that 'anything goes'. Indeed, many of the developments and alterations that have taken place in recent times, such as those at Nos 2, 3, 7, 10, 12 and 18 Seafield Close, are to my mind attractive and high quality developments, which have evidently raised the area's overall quality and character, and in some cases strikingly so... In addition, the proposed development in Appeal A would include off-road parking for two vehicles per dwelling... to accommodate the parking needed for two separate dwellings, the great majority of the front garden area would need to be hard surfaced... the development now proposed would result in a substantial reduction in greenery, to be replaced by a significant increase in hard surfacing and parked vehicles... the frontage area would inevitably lose the appearance of being a garden, and this would detract further from the street scene... Overall therefore I conclude that the proposed development in Appeal A would have a</p>	

significant detriment impact on the area's character and appearance...

#### COSTS DECISION

"The application for an award of costs is refused.

In the case of the Appeal A scheme, it is clear that the Council's planning committee considered that the proposal would cause harm to the area's character and appearance. For the reasons set out in my decision, I have found their view to be justified, on its planning merits. The decision was therefore not unreasonable... In the case of Appeal B... I have come to a different conclusion, this does not make the planning officer's judgement unreasonable. The officer set out his reasoning in his delegated report, and there is no evidence that he was unaware of other developments in the street, or ignored their effects..."

[EWB/16/01793/DOM](#)

WR (J Cross)

ALLOWED

22 Seafield Close, East Wittering, West Sussex, PO20 8DP  
- Demolition of garage and outbuildings, extension and loft conversion to bungalow.

LINKED TO [EWB/16/00311/FUL](#)

"Appeal B is allowed and planning permission is granted, for the demolition of the garage and outbuildings and for the carrying out of an extension and loft conversion at 22 Seafield Close... In Appeal B the proposal is to extend the existing dwelling at ground floor level... and again to create a second story within the roof, including a dormer-style roof extension. Whilst all of these elements would be broadly similar to the earlier proposal, there are also some notable differences. Firstly the main eaves and ridge would be raised above their present heights. Secondly the proposed dormer would have a sloping roof; and it would be set below the new ridge line, and slightly recessed from the rear face of the building. And thirdly the building would remain as a single dwelling. changes to the design of the proposed dormer are relatively small, but nevertheless significant... the resulting design in Appeal B pays sufficient regard to the existing building to be acceptable in this location... I consider that the small increase in height now proposed would be in keeping with the character of the street scene as a whole... despite the loss of the existing garage, the submitted plans show that this could be achieved whilst still retaining about half of the front garden for planting. To my mind this would achieve an acceptable balance, retaining sufficient greenery to maintain the street frontage's well landscaped appearance... I find that the proposed development in Appeal B would adequately respect the character and appearance of the surrounding area, and meet an acceptable standard of design..."

#### COSTS DECISION

"The application for an award of costs is refused

In the case of the Appeal A scheme, it is clear that the Council's planning committee considered that the proposal would cause harm to the area's character and appearance. For the reasons set out in my decision, I have found their view to be justified, on its planning merits. The decision was therefore not unreasonable... In the case of Appeal B... I have come to a different conclusion, this does not make the planning officer's judgement unreasonable. The officer set out his reasoning in his delegated report, and there is no evidence that he was unaware of other developments in the street, or ignored their effects..."

<p><a href="#">EWB/16/02532/DOM</a> WR (M Tomlinson) DISMISSED</p>	<p>Dakar, Nab Walk, East Wittering, PO20 8DH - First floor extension over existing garage to provide new studio.</p>
<p>"... Despite variety the front building lines of the houses on both sides of the road are reasonably consistent... The proposal would comprise a first floor level extension above the garage... Whilst it would be secondary in height and bulk to the host dwelling it would project a significant distance forward of the principal frontage of the host dwelling. It would also protrude forward of the upper parts of nearby 2-storey houses... due to its siting, size and forward projection, the proposal would be an overly prominent and incongruous addition to the street scene which would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the street..."</p>	
<p><a href="#">FU/15/02504/FUL</a> H (K Rawlins) ALLOWED</p>	<p>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</p>
<p>"... Chichester and Langstone Harbours Special Protection Area. At the Hearing the appellant submitted a planning obligation in the form of a unilateral undertaking to make a financial contribution to mitigation measures should planning permission be granted. I consider the undertaking satisfies the tests in Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations and agree with the Council that it would overcome this reason for refusal. ... On the above basis I find that the six families I heard from maintain a nomadic existence and would meet the planning gypsy and traveller definition. The families who did not attend were said to have similar travelling patterns. If this is the case then it is likely that they too would meet this definition. ... The Council would like its traveller population spread evenly over the District and explains that that is what is intended in LP Policy 36(6). But that is not what the policy says and such an approach is not supported by the PPTS. From the evidence before me I do not find that the proposed development by itself or cumulatively would dominate the existing nearby settled or gypsy communities by reason of scale or in any other way so as to significantly harm social cohesion. There would be no conflict with LP Policy 36(6) or with PPTS paragraph 25. Little weight therefore attaches to this issue. ... However a foul drainage assessment could be secured by condition and if necessary a sealed cess tank would be an option as a last resort. On the basis of the evidence provided I conclude that it would be possible to put in place measures to protect groundwater quality. ... There is an overall shortfall in the provision of sites, no vacancies on public sites and only limited capacity on private sites. Taken together I consider overall need and availability of sites weighs significantly in favour of the proposal. ... The proposal would make a significant positive contribution to the lack of a five year supply of traveller sites and the limited availability/turnover on existing sites. The site is well related to services and well screened from public view. I find that little weight attaches to over-dominance and that whilst the lack of a properly evidenced drainage scheme counts against the proposal this is a matter that can be resolved by condition. The six criteria of LP Policy 36 would be met and the balance lies clearly in favour of the proposal. ... "</p>	

<a href="#">HN/16/01665/OUT</a> WR ( M Tomlinson) DISMISSED	Streamsides, 1 St Leodegars Way, Hunston, PO20 1PE - Outline application for the erection of 1 no. 3 bedroom dwelling.
<p>"... I see no problem per-se in a detached house in this location.....However, the appeal site is of an irregular shape. As a result .....in front of the proposed dwelling, .....would be a pre-fabricated garage on land in another ownership. The proximity of the proposed dwelling to this structure would cause it to appear a cramped and unattractive form of development. ... satisfactory living conditions would not be provided for future occupants of the proposed development. Thus there would be conflict with LP Policy 33 which requires new development to provide a high quality living environment... the proposed access would .... be safe to use. ... A small stream runs forward of the application site.... home to water voles..... However..... there would be no works to the stream's banks that could harm the voles' habitat. The appeal site is also within 3.5km of the Pagham Harbour Special Protection Area (SPA) and 5.6km of the Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA..... Although the appellant indicates that he may be willing to make a contribution none has been provided. In these circumstances it cannot be concluded that there would be no adverse effect on the integrity of the SPAs .... There are some advantages to the proposed development in that it would provide an additional house within a settlement boundary and in a reasonably sustainable location. However, with the provision of just one additional house the advantages of this would be small. ... "</p>	
SY/14/00304/CONHH WR (S Pattie) ALLOWED	100 Beach Road, Selsey, Chichester, West Sussex PO20 0SZ - Erection of a fence adjacent to the highway. Appeal against enforcement notice.
<p>"...Decision for both Appeals A and B.  The appeals are allowed on ground (f), and the enforcement notice is varied: by adding to requirement 5 (i) after the words "post", "or, reduce the fence and concrete post to a height of no more than 1m". Subject to this variation the enforcement notice is upheld... the Appeals on Ground (c)... as adjacent does not necessarily mean contiguous I consider it remains, in its entirety, adjacent to the highway. Consequently, the allegation is correct as the fence is over 1m tall and is adjacent to the highway. it thus does not benefit from the permitted development rights granted by Class A. The appeals on ground (c) fail.  The Appeals on Ground (f)...  Although there is no specific ground (f) appeal,... The allegation refers specifically to a fence that has been erected over 1 m in height. In my view therefore there would be no injustice to either party if I were to allow the appeal on ground (f) and vary the requirement to allow for the option of reducing the fence to 1m. Such a reduction would bring the fence within permitted development limits and so would be unobjectionable and is clearly a lesser step that would overcome the Council's objections..."</p>	
* <a href="#">WE/16/01529/FUL</a> WR (C Boddy) ALLOWED	The Meadow, Cemetery Lane, Woodmancote, Westbourne West Sussex - Use of land as a single pitch private gypsy plot. Resubmission of WE/15/01114/FUL.
<p>"The appeal is allowed... The main issues ...are the effects of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, and on the setting of Westbourne Cemetery... From my observations, travelling along Cemetery Lane or any of the surrounding roads, the main focus of visual interest is in the views to the hills in the middle and longer distance. The landscape in the foreground of these views...can best be characterised as of average quality...despite the area's openness, the existing gypsy, traveller and showmen's sites in Cemetery Lane are not prominent... are generally quite</p>	

well screened, by tree belts, hedges and other intervening features. The appeal proposal would extend the area given over to this type of development. However, the site's side and rear boundaries are well screened... these could be reinforced with additional planting. Although the front boundary is rather more open, a new 5-metre landscaping belt is proposed here, and there is no reason why such planting should not be effective within a timescale of 5-10 years. The proposed development would still be visible from the proposed access point, but in any longer or wider views it seems to me that it would not be unduly noticeable... the development would represent a further erosion of the open gap between the existing gypsy sites and Westbourne. But ...the appeal site contributes little to that gap, ...it appears as more closely related to the existing sites on its other side...this is a site where small scale development of the type now proposed could take place without undermining the integrity of the larger block of open countryside to the west. ... would have no significant adverse effects on the area's character and appearance. ... ..the cemetery ....is not included on any local list...it appears to have some historic interest, and therefore could be regarded as a non-designated heritage asset. The openness of the fields surrounding the cemetery, and the sense of separation, contributes to its setting, and to our understanding of its significance as a heritage asset. The proposed development would lie within this setting. ...the nearest corner of the appeal site would be directly opposite the cemetery's present vehicular entrance. But, due to its small scale and the existing and proposed vegetation, the development would not be visually intrusive within this setting. Consequently, the character of Cemetery Lane would be largely unchanged. ..the separation between the cemetery and the village would be unaffected. ... The level of such activity, and the number of movements, resulting from one additional pitch are likely to be small. In the context of the other existing and permitted developments nearby, this increase would be negligible. I conclude that there would be no discernible harm to the setting of the Westbourne Cemetery, and thus no adverse effects on its significance as a heritage asset. ... The present proposal is for only one new pitch, and I must consider it on its merits. I accept that incremental changes can have a cumulative impact, and that a point could be reached where a threshold was crossed. But, on the evidence before me I can see no basis for concluding that a single additional pitch would have any appreciable impact on the matters that the Parish raises. ...In terms of gypsy and traveller provision for the District ...there is a shortfall, albeit possibly a small one, against the most recent GTAA requirement. This does not mean that an unsuitable site should be allowed. But in the present case, given that I have found no significant harm, it adds some further weight in favour of the appeal. ... I find that the proposed development would not cause any significant harm to the area's character and appearance, nor to the setting of Westbourne Cemetery as a heritage asset... "

[SDNP/14/04141/FUL](#)  
 WISBOROUGH GREEN  
 WR ( D Price)  
 DISMISSED

Stroods, Strood Green, Wisborough Green, Billingshurst  
 RH14 0HL - Partial removal of low level boundary wall,  
 retention of remainder of wall and relocation of tennis court.  
 Retention of greenhouse and vegetable patch and removal  
 of patio area and post and rail fence. New post and rail  
 fence to tennis court.

"... The proposal includes a stone wall that separates the public footpath from the paddock and extends to enclose a small vegetable patch in the far corner furthest from the outbuildings. ... It is prominent and forms an alien, somewhat suburban, feature to this side of the footpath. Consequently, despite its limited height, it is a somewhat incongruous feature in this rural area. The Council suggest that the wall may comprise permitted development under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (GPDO). Whilst I accept that may constitute a fall-back position, I do not consider that it would overcome the harm to the landscape and scenic beauty of

the SDNP. The use of land within the paddock as a vegetable garden or for other uses ancillary to the residential use of the house would extend that residential use beyond the existing curtilage of the dwelling. ... It is located further from the house such that it would lead to encroachment of the residential use into the surrounding countryside, particularly if it included reinstatement of the greenhouse, which would be harmful to the landscape and scenic beauty of the SDNP. The revised location for the tennis court would be to the rear of the existing garage and outbuildings, extending the domestic curtilage and built development away from the dwelling. ... The proposed planting around the perimeter of the tennis court would assist in screening it from views across the paddock, and the open nature of the chain link fence reduces its visual impact. Nevertheless, it would result in a more domestic form of development extending beyond and away from the existing residential curtilage of the dwelling, introducing in a more suburban appearance to this part of the SDNP. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed change of use of land for the tennis court and vegetable garden, and associated landscaping, walling and greenhouse would not conserve the landscape and scenic beauty of the surrounding rural landscape within the South Downs National Park. As such, it would be contrary to Policies RE1, BE11 and R4 of the Chichester District Local Plan and the Framework that restricts development within the rural areas to ensure that it would not detract from its surroundings, including the setting of the landscape and the visual quality and distinctive character of the SDNP.

#### OTHER MATTERS

... Notwithstanding the effect of the development on the SDNP, the low height of the wall and nature of the separation of the proposed development from the listed building ensure that it would not harm the setting of the listed building. ..."

### 3. OUTSTANDING APPEALS

Reference/Status	Proposal
BI/15/00139/CONSH PI (S Archer) In Progress Site Visit 20.03.2017 Adjourned 27.03.17, 31.03.17 and 7.04.17 CDC Committee Room 2	Land North West Of Premier Business Park, Birdham Road Birdham, West Sussex – Access track, hardstanding and fencing. Linked to <a href="#">BI/15/01288/FUL</a> and BI/15/00194/CONTRV
BI/15/00194/CONTRV PI (S Archer) Site Visit 20.03.2017 Adjourned 27.03.17, 31.03.17 and 7.04.17 CDC Committee Room 2	Land North West of Premier Business Park Birdham Road Birdham, West Sussex - Use of land as a Traveller Site. Linked to <a href="#">BI/15/01288/FUL</a> and BI/15/00139/CONSH
<a href="#">BI/15/01288/FUL</a> PI (S Archer) Site Visit 20.03.2017 Adjourned 27.03.17, 31.03.17 and 7.04.17 CDC Committee Room 2	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

<a href="#">BX/16/01909/FUL</a> WR (J Cross) In Progress	Land North East Of 51, Halnaker, Boxgrove, West Sussex - 2 bedroom single storey oak framed self-catering holiday accommodation unit.
SDNP/15/00301/BRECON Bury WR (R Hawks) In Progress	1 Sutton Hollow The Street Sutton Pulborough West Sussex RH20 1PY - Breach of conditions - use and demolition
<a href="#">SDNP/14/04865/FUL</a> BURY I (D Price) Awaiting Decision	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 <a href="#">SDNP/15/00336/COU</a> .
SDNP/15/00336/COU BURY I (R Hawks) Awaiting decision	Land North of Junction with B2138 Bury Road Bury West Sussex - Stationing of two caravans for human habitation. Appeal against enforcement notice Linked to <a href="#">SDNP/14/04865/FUL</a>
CC/15/00409/CONBC WR (S Archer) In Progress	3 Pound Farm Road, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 7PX - Residential occupation of games room. Appeal against enforcement notice.
<a href="#">CC/16/01842/FUL</a> WR (C Boddy) In Progress	North House, North Street, Chichester, West Sussex - Demolition of existing ground floor rear extensions and erection of single storey floor rear extension, with new vehicular access. Roof extension to provide 2 no. one- bedroom flats. Internal alterations to existing flats.
CH/14/00399/CONMHC H (R Hawks) In Progress	Cockleberry Farm, Main Road, Bosham, West Sussex, PO18 8PN - Appeal against the stationing of 2 mobile homes (in livery yard) for purposes of human habitation. LINKED TO <a href="#">CH/16/01902/PA3P</a>
<a href="#">CH/14/03647/OUT</a> I ( R Jones) In Progress	Land North Of Aviary Close Hambrook Chidham West Sussex - Outline application for 39 no. dwellinghouses and open space.
<a href="#">CH/16/00806/DOM</a> FT (P Hunt) In Progress	3 Wayte Cottages Chidham Lane Chidham Chichester West Sussex PO18 8TQ - New rear facing dormer window.

<p><a href="#">CH/16/01902/PA3P</a> H (M Tomlinson) In Progress</p>	<p>Cockleberry Farm, Main Road, Bosham, West Sussex, PO18 8PN - Part 3 Class P application for prior approval - Proposed change of use of 3 no. B8 storage buildings to 3 no. dwellings. Revised application further to CH/15/02290/PA3P. LINKED TO CH/14/00399/CONMHC</p>
<p><a href="#">CH/16/02071/FUL</a> WR (R Ballam) In Progress</p>	<p>Land South Of Kings Meadow, Broad Road, Hambrook, Chidham, West Sussex - Revised house type on Plot 30 with attached single garage and drive, access onto Broad Road.</p>
<p><a href="#">SDNP/16/03955/HOUS</a> Easebourne FT (R Grosso MacPherson) In Progress</p>	<p>The Old Pump House Henley Old Road Henley Easebourne GU27 3HQ - Two storey rear extension and front porch addition.</p>
<p><a href="#">SDNP/16/04021/FUL</a> FUNTINGTON WR (D Price) In Progress</p>	<p>Land South of Braefoot, Southbrook Road, West Ashling, PO18 8DN - Construction of three bedroom thatched roof dwelling and double garage/car port following clearance of site including a shed and two existing caravans one being residentially occupied, installation of access gate, fences and landscaping.</p>
<p><a href="#">SDNP/16/01027/HOUS</a> LAVANT WR (J Shore) In Progress</p>	<p>60 Midhurst Road, Lavant, West Sussex, PO18 0BP - Rear extension and conversion of outbuilding. LINKED TO <a href="#">SDNP/16/01028/LIS</a></p>
<p><a href="#">SDNP/16/01028/LIS</a> LAVANT WR (J Shore) In Progress</p>	<p>60 Midhurst Road, Lavant, West Sussex, PO18 0BP – Rear extension and conversion of outbuilding. LINKED TO <a href="#">SDNP/16/01027/HOUS</a></p>
<p><a href="#">LX/15/00498/ELD</a> I (C Boddy) Awaiting Decision</p>	<p>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</p>
<p>SDNP/14/00448/COU Lurgashall WR ( S Pattie) In Progress</p>	<p>Northurst Farm Dial Green Lane Lurgashall Petworth West Sussex GU28 9HA - Extension of residential curtilage.</p>

SDNP/15/00361/COU Lurgashall H (R Hawks) In Progress	Old Hearne Farm, Jays Lane, Lurgashall, Haslemere, West Sussex, GU27 3BL - Without planning permission, the erection of a building and laying of a stone pavement. Linked with <a href="#">SDNP/16/04559/FUL</a>
<a href="#">SDNP/16/04559/FUL</a> Lurgashall H ( J Shore) In Progress	Old Hearne Farm, Jays Lane, Lurgashall, Haslemere West Sussex, GU27 3BL - Retention of the east barn and its immediate surroundings for mixed agricultural and equestrian purposes. Linked with SDNP/15/00361/COU
NM/15/00375/CONCOU I ( R Hawks) In Progress	Land North Of Fisher Common Nursery Fisher Lane North Mundham West Sussex - Change of use of barn to residential.
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	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 notice. Linked to s78 appeal against refusal of planning permission by WSCC.
<a href="#">PS/16/00562/PLD</a> WR (H Chowdhury) In Progress	Newhouse Farm, Shillinglee Road, Shillinglee, Northchapel GU8 4SZ - Construction of single storey outbuilding to be used for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling.
SY/15/00371/CONCOU H (R Hawks) In Progress	East Beach Evangelical Church, 6 Marisfield Place, Selsey, Chichester, West Sussex PO20 0PD - Stationing of a portacabin. Appeal against enforcement notice.
SY/15/00376/CONADV WR (S Archer) In Progress	2 Sherrington Mews, Ellis Square, Selsey, Chichester West Sussex, PO20 0FJ - Non-illuminated fascia sign within the front porch pitched roof over the entrance to door to Unit 2. Appeal against a discontinuance notice.
<a href="#">SY/16/00373/FUL</a> WR ( M Tomlinson) In Progress	Tidewall Cottage 85 East Street Selsey West Sussex PO20 0BU - Erection of 1 no. dwelling.
<a href="#">SY/16/02694/FUL</a> WR (M Tomlinson) In Progress	47 Gainsborough Drive, Selsey, PO20 0HG - 1 no. dwelling.

WE/15/00363/CONBC H (R Hawks) In Progress	The Woodlands, Marlpit Lane, Hambrook, Westbourne, Emsworth, West Sussex, PO10 8EQ - Breach of condition 2 to 12/00559/FUL - occupation agricultural. LINKED TO <a href="#">WE/15/03965/FUL</a>
<a href="#">WE/15/03965/FUL</a> H (C Boddy) In Progress	The Woodlands, Marlpit Lane, Hambrook, Westbourne, Emsworth, West Sussex, PO10 8EQ - Retention of 1 no. mobile home to serve the dual purpose of providing a single travelling show persons pitch and a single Gypsy pitch. LINKED TO WE/15/00363/CONBC
<a href="#">WE/16/02259/FUL</a> WR (R Ballam) In Progress	Yew Tree Cottage, North Street, Westbourne, PO10 8SN - Demolition of rear conservatory and construction of ground floor extension and part first floor infill extension. LINKED TO <a href="#">WE/16/02260/LBC</a>
<a href="#">WE/16/02260/LBC</a> WR (R Ballam) In Progress	Yew Tree Cottage, North Street, Westbourne, PO10 8SN - To demolish rear conservatory and construction of ground floor extension and part first floor infill extension. LINKED TO <a href="#">WE/16/02259/FUL</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	Breach of Enforcement Notices and Stop Notices	Court action held in abeyance pending the outcome of the appeal/public inquiry process which recommences in March (see above).

Prosecutions		
Site	Breach	Stage
Berryhill, Miggs Lane, Fernhurst GU27 3EZ	Breach of Enforcement Notice	Prosecution in progress. Court date obtained and summons to be sent to the defendant this week. First hearing at Worthing Magistrates' Court on 31 March at 14:00.

<b>Prosecutions</b>		
<b>Site</b>	<b>Breach</b>	<b>Stage</b>
Land west of Hopedene, Common Road, Hambrook, Westbourne	Breach of Enforcement Notice	Prosecution in progress. Court date obtained and summons to be sent to the defendant this week. First hearing at Worthing Magistrates' Court on 31 March at 14:00.
<b>Stage</b>	<b>Breach</b>	<b>Stage</b>
<b>Site</b>	<b>Breach</b>	<b>Stage</b>
1 The Quell Cottages	Breach of Listed Bulding Consent and Planning permission	Prosecution in progress against the owners and building Project Manager. At Court on 6 January 2017 the defendants pleaded guilty. At sentencing, a fine of £2,000 against the owner and £1,000 against the builder was imposed. Costs were given in full to the Council and split equally between the parties: total costs: £3,323.51 and £1,661,95 respectively

## 7. POLICY MATTERS

NONE