

Chichester District Council

Planning Committee

Wednesday 29 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

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
SDNP/16/02175/FUL WR (B Stubbington)	Timberley Farm Bury Common Bury Pulborough West Sussex RH20 1NP - Widen existing farm entrance.
SDNP/16/04313/FUL WR (L Kent)	Highfield 161 Bury Road Bury Pulborough West Sussex RH20 1NL - Erection of replacement dwelling - revised scheme to that granted under SDNP/15/05945/FUL.
SDNP/16/05456/HOUS WR (J Shore)	Hollow Farm The Street Bury Pulborough West Sussex RH20 1PA - Construction of outdoor swimming pool and associated changing room building.
CC/16/02363/FUL WR (C Boddy)	34 Ormonde Avenue Chichester PO19 7UX - Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 3 no. dwellings, with associated access, parking and landscaping.

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
SY/16/02196/FUL WR (P Hunt)	Arun Posts Southern Road Selsey Chichester West Sussex PO20 0BD - Change of use of existing ancillary outbuilding to a 2 bedroom dwelling with external alterations, formation of a projecting front gable and new access
WE/16/00565/FUL WR (C Boddy)	Land West Of Jubilee Wood Hambrook Hill North Hambrook West Sussex - Agricultural building, compound and access track.
WE/16/01218/OUT WR (C Boddy)	Land At Mill Lane Westbourne Emsworth West Sussex PO10 8RT - Construction of 3 no. dwellings.

2. DECISIONS RECEIVED

Reference/Decision	
BX/16/01909/FUL WR (J Cross) DISMISSED	Land North East Of 51Halnaker Boxgrove West Sussex - 2 bedroom single storey oak framed self-catering holiday accommodation unit.
<p>Planning Decision "... As it would be intended to be rural tourist accommodation, then it follows that a rural location would be required. I have no evidence before me that it could be accommodated elsewhere, but any location outside the countryside would not have the same attractions for the intended tourists. Whilst it may be the case that other, more appropriate sites are available within existing built up settlements, no substantive evidence is before me in this regard and such locations would not provide countryside tourist accommodation. ... I note that there is development nearby, which would have the effect of increasing ambient light levels. However, I did not observe any building in the locality so close to the SDNP boundary with similar patterns of glazing. In the absence of substantive evidence to the contrary, even though the proposed development is small scale and its rear glazing would be broken up, the appeal proposal would be likely to increase light levels close to the SDNP and result in harmful light spill, so as to adversely affect its tranquillity and character. ..."</p> <p>Cost Decision "... The appellant suggests that the Council, in concluding that the appeal development does not require a rural location and results in unnecessary reliance on the private motor vehicle, acted unreasonably, in light of the facts of the case. However, the Council acknowledges that the appeal development would be close to a bus route but considers that it would not provide access to wider parts of the District and its major tourist attractions. In light of this, its conclusion that it would result in unnecessary reliance on the private motor vehicle is reasonable. Whilst I have taken a different view to the Council on this matter, I consider that the Council acted reasonably in coming to the conclusion that it did. Further, the appellant suggests that the Council was inconsistent in its arguments regarding the appeal site's proximity to 'local tourist attractions' and 'more minor or localised places of interest'. The Council explains that the former relates to places likely to attract visitors from outside the District, the latter to those likely to attract visitors from within the District. In referring to both, and concluding that the appeal site was not close to many of the former, although again, I took a different view, I consider that the Council acted reasonably. In having come to such a conclusion on the</p>	

Reference/Decision - Continued	
<p>principle of the proposed development, I consider that the Council acted reasonably in not requesting amendments to the rear elevation of the proposed tourist accommodation to overcome its concern regarding light spill. In any event, bearing in mind the Council's first reason for refusal, this matter would not have avoided the need for an appeal. ..."</p>	
<p>CC/16/01842/FUL WR (C Boddy) PART DISMISSED, PART ALLOWED</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>" In so far as it relates to the proposed roof extension, the appeal is dismissed. With regard to the remainder of the proposed scheme, the appeal is allowed. ... Neither... party raises any objections to the proposed rear ground floor extension, or the related demolition and access works, or to the internal alterations to the existing flats at first and second floor levels.Although not listed, it is an attractive and characterful building, and its neo-Georgian styling successfully complements the original Georgian architecture that predominates throughout the town centre. the building is prominent in the street scene. The draft CA Character Appraisal Review identifies it as a positive contributor to the CA. For the reasons given above, I concur with that assessment. ... The building is a heritage asset, although since the site is within the CA, it forms part of such an asset, and indeed a designated one, in any event. The proposed development wouldrepresent a tall and bulky addition above the existing parapet. And ... would be seen clearly in angled views along North Street, and from Crane Street..... would appear over-assertive and over-dominant in relation to its neighbours and the street scene as a whole. This would significantly damage the CA's architectural harmony and unity, and the settings of the listed buildings in the vicinity. In addition, the new rooftop structure would compete with the existing pediment feature at North House, detracting from the building's own distinctiveness and its under-stated charm. in the present case the development would be uncharacteristic and incongruous in relation to the appeal building and its setting. the harm that I have identified, to both the designated and non-designated heritage assets, would be to undermine their significance as heritage assets. In all these respects, the proposed new mansard roof extension would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Chichester CA, or the settings of the nearby listed buildings detailed above. ... The creation of two additional residential units, to be provided within the proposed mansard roof, would constitute a public benefit, However, there is no evidence to suggest that the district's housing needs are so great that they cannot be met without accepting harm to heritage assets. The public benefits ..do not outweigh the harm. ... With regard to the SPA, I note that a payment has been made, and an undertaking entered into, towards the Solent Disturbance Mitigation Project. ... I have taken account of all the other matters raised,, I conclude that the proposed mansard roof extension would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the building and of the area. The appeal in respect of that element is therefore dismissed. ... In the circumstances, I have issued a split decision, allowing these parts of the development only."</p>	

Reference/Decision - Continued	
CH/16/00806/DOM FT (P Hunt) ALLOWED	3 Wayte Cottages Chidham Lane Chidham Chichester West Sussex PO18 8TQ - New rear facing dormer window.
<p>The main issue is the effect of the proposed dormers on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the adjoining cottages and the wider landscape designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). ... Wayte Cottages comprise two pairs of semi-detached cottages... with variations to both front and rear elevations, but each pair has its own symmetry... Immediately to the west of the group is 'Mardon', a chalet bungalow in a large plot with large dormers to the front and rear. ... I am unable to agree with the Council's assessment that the proposed dormers would 'be excessively large and dominate the roof'... The second point, the effect on symmetry, is more finely balanced... However, the cottages are not subject to the constraints of being listed buildings, located in a conservation area, or forming part of a street scene. ... The nub of this matter is therefore whether the introduction of proportionately sized dormers on one of the four cottages would have an unacceptable effect on the AONB landscape. On balance I consider that it would not, because of a combination of three reasons: (i) as the dormers are not disproportionate they would not draw the eye as an inappropriate or obtrusive addition; (ii) the perception of a high quality landscape would not be altered by an alteration seen only in the context and massing of the existing building and not in isolation and (iii) in terms of the relationship between roof forms and the surrounding countryside, the much larger dormer windows of the adjoining 'Mardon' (and arguably also the nearby 'Fieldgate' and 'St Anns') already have a visual impact at least equal to that now proposed.</p>	
CH/16/02071/FUL WR (R Ballam) DISMISSED	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>"... I consider that the increased proximity to No 1 and the associated reduction in outlook would outweigh any limited benefit arising from the garage structure 'breaking up' the appearance of the main flank wall. The common boundary fence would partly screen the garage from view, but the pitched roof and top section of the wall would be visible above it. While the trees to the common boundary would soften the impact to a degree, they would not mitigate the additional proximity of built form to the principal south-facing elevation of No 1, or the further erosion of outlook from the rearward projection. While I have found no significant harm arising in relation to noise and disturbance, I have identified harm in relation to the proximity of the garage to No 1 and the erosion of the outlook therefrom. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of 1 Kings Meadow. Accordingly, it would conflict with Policy 33 of the adopted Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029 (CLP) and Paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework. ..."</p>	
SDNP/16/04021/FUL FUNTINGTON WR (D Price) DISMISSED	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.

Reference/Decision - Continued	
<p>"... West Ashling is a small village the area has a very verdant and enclosed quality, and a strongly rural character and setting to the village. The detailed design and use of traditional materials would be similar to some other buildings found in the wider area. However, due to the open nature of the site and height of the site relative to the road, the house would be prominent with the long main elevation facing towards the road in fairly close proximity to it.Large areas of hardstanding and formal landscaping would introduce a stronger suburban character than exists even with the modifications made to the appeal site recently. Moreover, it would be located some distance away from Braefoot and this separation would appear strongly out of character with the tightly knit form of the village. The scheme would extend development in a ribbon form which would be to the detriment of the overall rural appearance of the road and entrance and exit to the village. I consider there would be a significant negative change in the character of the setting of the village. ... I conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. .. contrary to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) ... The combined adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area and SDNP would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the scheme. The scheme would not be sustainable development for which there is a presumption in favour. ..."</p>	
<p>SDNP/16/03734/HOUS GRAFFHAM WR (J Shore) DISMISSED</p>	<p>Heath Ridge Graffham Common Road Graffham GU28 0PT - Erection of 2 storey side extension, single storey rear extension, double garage to rear and new access and egress.</p>
<p>"... The proposed side extension would be designed as a subsidiary element of the building, with a slight set-back at the front and a less stylised roof line. Although it would disrupt the formal symmetry of the house, I consider this to be acceptable in this rural, countryside situation where the house's formality sets it apart from others in the vicinity. The building's frontage and much of this side elevation would be seen from the lane, but would not be unduly intrusive due to a generous set back and the landscaping of the front garden. The garage wing to the rear would be lower and less prominent. It would be a minor and appropriate feature for a house of this scale, even with its dormer windows. ... The proposed double access arrangement, with frontage parking and manoeuvring space, would however urbanise the front of the site. It would reduce the amount of space available for landscaping and result in a frontage dominated by vehicles and hard surfacing. I fully share the Parish Council's reservations about this aspect of the proposal. ... "</p>	
<p>SDNP/16/01027/HOUS LAVANT WR (J Shore) DISMISSED</p>	<p>60 Midhurst Road, Lavant, West Sussex, PO18 0BP - Rear extension and conversion of outbuilding. LINKED TO SDNP/16/01028/LIS</p>
<p>"... The link element, even though predominantly glazed and mainly lightweight, would have some solidity and bulk at roof level and a large footprint. Overall, the effect would be to diminish the historic separate and physically and functionally subservient relationship between the outbuilding and the main house. In coming to this judgement, I have had regard to the fact that appreciation of the width of the proposed link would be from limited viewpoints. Furthermore, the appeal proposal would include the removal of sections of the outbuilding's walls and a section of the rear elevation of the main house, which would, together, result in more loss of historic fabric than those extant permissions. In removing window and door openings in the rear elevation of the main house, it would diminish reference in the listed building's history as two separate</p>	

Reference/Decision - Continued	
<p>dwellings. ... Overall, the loss of historic fabric, in the manner proposed, would further erode an understanding of the history of the listed building. As the historic fabric would be lost, in these circumstances, documentary evidence and recording of the listed building would not overcome my concerns in this regard. Moreover, the bulk of the proposed roof, at the point that it would join the outbuilding would be large in relation to it and significantly alter its simple clear roof slopes. ... The incorporation of a flat roof element and the use of modern materials such as fibre glass would appear out of place against the simple form of the outbuilding and the historic high quality materials of the listed building. When seen together with the existing rear additions it would diminish the simple, modest, rural, vernacular, character and appearance of the listed building. ... The proposed scheme would include a significant amount of glazing, both as part of the link and in the elevations of the outbuilding. Whilst I note that openings in the outbuilding were approved as part of the extant permissions brought to my attention, the glazed areas proposed would, together, erode the simple and solid appearance of the outbuilding. This would further erode its significance as a heritage asset. ..."</p>	
<p>SDNP/16/01028/LIS LAVANT WR (J Shore) DISMISSED</p>	<p>60 Midhurst Road, Lavant, West Sussex, PO18 0BP – Rear extension and conversion of outbuilding. LINKED TO SDNP/16/01027/HOUS</p>
AS ABOVE	
<p>SDNP/16/00067/OPDEV WR (J Shore) DISMISSED AND ENF NOTICE UPHELD</p>	<p>Wassell Barn Streels Lane Ebernoe Petworth West Sussex GU28 9LD – Erection of building.</p>
<p>"...Ground (b) appeal .. The hardstandings referred to in the enforcement notice exist as a matter of fact and therefore the ground (b) appeal does not succeed... Ground (a) appeal The unauthorised development does not make a positive contribution to its setting. The track, hardstandings and timber equestrian buildings are not in keeping with the character and appearance of the rural area... They are utilitarian in design and unsympathetic to the historic field pattern. The Appellant draws attention to tennis courts nearby but the prevailing character and appearance of the surrounding area is rural and any harm from other development nearby does not justify additional harm from the development the subject of this appeal. I note the use of the buildings for the rescue of animals but this does not outweigh the identified harm caused to the character and appearance of the area... I do not consider that landscaping, by for example the planting of native hedgerow as suggested by the Appellant, would remedy the identified harm... I conclude that the appeal should not succeed and I refuse to grant planning permission on the deemed application. Ground (f) appealThe Appellant says that the access track has not been completed and that allowing this to remain and infilling the depression with topsoil and seeding would facilitate year round access to the fields and remedy any injury to amenity. The Council argue that the topsoil would erode quickly and expose the hardcore base. I agree..... the ground (f) appeal does not succeed. Ground (g) appeal ...period for compliance... I consider that six months would strike an appropriate balance for the completion of all steps set out in the notice. I shall amend the notice accordingly... ground (g) succeeds to that limited extent..."</p>	

Reference/Decision - Continued	
Formal Decision ...the enforcement notice is varied by substitution of a six months period for compliance. Subject to that variation the appeal is dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld..."	
WE/16/02259/FUL WR (R Ballam) DISMISSED	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 WE/16/02260/LBC
WE/16/02260/LBC WR (R Ballam) DISMISSED	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 WE/16/02259/FUL
"The appeal proposals would seriously harm the modest rural character and appearance of the listed building. ... I have found that the appeal property positively contributes to the character and appearance of the WCA. I have also found that unacceptable harm to that property would be a consequence of the appeal development and works. It follows, therefore, that the appeal proposal would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the WCA. ... I conclude that the appeal proposal would fail to preserve the special architectural or historic interest of the listed building. The appeal development and works would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the WCA. It would therefore fail to accord with the Adopted Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029 (LP), Policies 1, 33 and 47. ... I consider that the harm to the significance of the listed building and the WCA would be less than substantial. However, I attach considerable importance and weight to that harm. In this case, no public benefits, as identified in paragraph 134 of the Framework, are before me, which would outweigh that harm. "	

3. OUTSTANDING APPEALS

Reference/Status	Proposal
BI/15/00139/CONSH PI (S Archer) In Progress Site Visit 20.03.2017 Adjourned until 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 BI/15/01288/FUL and BI/15/00194/CONTRV
BI/15/00194/CONTRV PI (S Archer) Site Visit 20.03.2017 Adjourned until 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 BI/15/01288/FUL and BI/15/00139/CONSH

Reference/Status	Proposal
BI/15/01288/FUL PI (S Archer) Site Visit 20.03.2017 Adjourned until 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
BX/16/01909/FUL 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
SDNP/14/04865/FUL 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 SDNP/15/00336/COU .
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 SDNP/14/04865/FUL
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.
CH/14/00399/CONMHC H (R Hawks) Hearing to be held on 6 June – Assembly Rooms Chichester City Council at 10am	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 CH/16/01902/PA3P
CH/14/03647/OUT I (R Jones) Public Inquiry to to held 23-24 May – WSCC at 10am	Land North Of Aviary Close Hambrook Chidham West Sussex - Outline application for 39 no. dwellinghouses and open space.
* CH/16/01087/FUL WR (C Boddy) In Progress	Moola House, Main Road, Nutbourne, West Sussex, PO18 8RN - Construction of 5 no. dwellings and associated works including access and landscaping.

Reference/Status	Proposal
CH/16/01902/PA3P H (M Tomlinson) In Progress	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
SDNP/16/03955/HOUS Easebourne FT (R Grosso MacPherson) In Progress	The Old Pump House Henley Old Road Henley Easebourne GU27 3HQ - Two storey rear extension and front porch addition.
SDNP/15/03654/FUL Elsted & Treyford WR (D Price) In Progress	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.
SDNP/16/03109/FUL Harting WR (D Price) In Progress	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.
LX/15/00498/ELD 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
SDNP/14/00448/COU Lurgashall WR (S Pattie) In Progress	Northurst Farm Dial Green Lane Lurgashall Petworth West Sussex GU28 9HA - Extension of residential curtilage.
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 SDNP/16/04559/FUL
SDNP/16/04559/FUL 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

Reference/Status	Proposal
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.
O/16/02254/OUT I (J Bushell) Public Inquiry to be held 6&7 June – WSCC at 10am 13&16 June – Chichester Park Hotel at 10am 14&15 June – Chichester District Council at 10am	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.
PS/13/00015/CONCOU I (R Hawks) In Progress 25 th -28 th April & 3 rd -4 th 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.
PS/16/00562/PLD 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.
SY/16/00373/FUL WR (M Tomlinson) In Progress	Tidewall Cottage 85 East Street Selsey West Sussex PO20 0BU - Erection of 1 no. dwelling.
SY/16/02694/FUL WR (M Tomlinson) In Progress	47 Gainsborough Drive, Selsey, PO20 0HG - 1 no. dwelling.

Reference/Status	Proposal
WE/15/00363/CONBC H (R Hawks) Hearing to be held on 16 May – City Council at 10am	The Woodlands, Marlpit Lane, Hambrook, Westbourne, Emsworth, West Sussex, PO10 8EQ - Breach of condition 2 to 12/00559/FUL - occupation agricultural. LINKED TO WE/15/03965/FUL
WE/15/03965/FUL 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

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 is being 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.

Prosecutions		
Site	Breach	Stage
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.

Prosecutions - Continued		
Site	Breach	Stage
Barn North of Hunston Dairy Farm	Breach of Condition Notice	Legal approved proceedings. Waiting for Head of Planning to authorise then obtain court date.
Site	Breach	Stage
37 North Street, Midhurst	Breach of Enforcement Notice	Legal approved proceedings. Waiting for Head of Planning to authorise then obtain court date.

7. POLICY MATTERS

NONE