

# Chichester District Council

## Planning Committee

Tuesday 17 October 2018

### Report of the Director Of Planning and Environment 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).

\* - Committee level decision.

#### 1. NEW APPEALS

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<a href="#">16/00229/CONCOU</a> Birdham Parish  Case Officer: Steven Pattie  <b>Informal Hearing</b>	Kellys Farm Bell Lane Birdham Chichester West Sussex PO20 7HY - Appeal against change of use of the land to mixed use as a horticultural nursery and operation of a car wash business.
<a href="#">17/01382/FUL</a> Birdham Parish  Case Officer: Shona Archer  <b>Informal Hearing</b>	Plot 12 Land To The Rear Of Premier Business Park Main Road Appledram West Sussex - Retrospective application for single pitch for gypsy occupation comprising touring caravan, hardstanding and provision of static mobile home.
<a href="#">18/00525/ADV</a> Chichester Parish  Case Officer: Vicki Baker  <b>Written Representation</b>	Unit 1 Portfield Way Chichester PO19 7YH - 2 no. double sided internally illuminated post signs.

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p data-bbox="197 230 416 264"><a href="#">17/02563/DOM</a></p> <p data-bbox="197 271 437 304">Fernhurst Parish</p> <p data-bbox="197 367 587 400">Case Officer: James Gellini</p> <p data-bbox="197 434 552 468"><b>Written Representation</b></p>	<p data-bbox="638 230 1406 304">Stedlands Farm Bell Vale Lane Fernhurst GU27 3DJ - Proposed two storey rear extension.</p>
<p data-bbox="197 526 507 560"><a href="#">SDNP/17/02666/OUT</a></p> <p data-bbox="197 566 564 600">Fittleworth Parish Council</p> <p data-bbox="197 622 576 656">Case Officer: Jenna Shore</p> <p data-bbox="197 689 552 723"><b>Written Representation</b></p>	<p data-bbox="638 526 1477 633">Amen Wood Yard Fitzleroi Lane Fittleworth RH20 1JN - Demolition of existing woodyard buildings and replacement with 1 no. dwelling house.</p>
<p data-bbox="197 790 403 824"><a href="#">18/00244/FUL</a></p> <p data-bbox="197 831 411 864">Kirdford Parish</p> <p data-bbox="197 927 587 960">Case Officer: Daniel Power</p> <p data-bbox="197 994 552 1028"><b>Written Representation</b></p>	<p data-bbox="638 790 1414 898">Land South East Of Sewage Works Glasshouse Lane Kirdford West Sussex - Demolition of old buildings and erection of new workshop for storage and carpentry.</p>

## 2. DECISIONS MADE

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p>* <a href="#">17/00898/REM</a> Boxgrove Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Rhiannon Jones</p> <p><b>Informal Hearing</b></p>	<p>Land West Of Abbots Close Priors Acre Boxgrove West Sussex - Application for approval of reserved matters in respect of appearance, layout, scale and landscaping for the erection of up to 22 no. residential units, public open space, landscaping, access and car parking following outline planning permission 14/03827/OUT.</p>
<b>Appeal Decision: APPEAL WITHDRAWN</b>	
Appeal Withdrawn	
<p><a href="#">17/02708/ADV</a> Chichester Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Fjola Stevens</p> <p><b>Householder Appeal</b></p>	<p>3 West Street Chichester PO19 1QD - 1 no. non-illuminated fascia sign and 1 no. non-illuminated hanging sign.</p>
<b>Appeal Decision: APPEAL ALLOWED</b>	
<p>"The fascia sign is of a size scale and dimensions that respects the small pane wooden window frame of the shop front. Its depth and dimensions and plain background are appropriate in the nature of the shopfront. The lettering of the sign is of a similar restrained size and dimension and although the material and style of lettering is more modern in form this does not significantly detract from the general appearance scale or form of the shop front. The sign sits comfortably on the property and is not excessively dominant or strident in the street such that detracts from the building or its surroundings, including the important historical assets and their significance. ... There are other examples of a variety of materials used in the application of lettering in the centre and given the small scale form of the lettering and manner in which it is applied and sits on this property there is no material harm to the character or appearance of the area, including the conservation area and surrounding listed buildings. There is therefore no material injury to amenity. ... The hanging sign is located above the fascia level with the bottom of the sign in line with the bottom of the first floor window. The advert has a similar restrained, if modern colour palette, and is of a size and scale that is in keeping with traditional hanging signs. There are not many hanging signs in the immediate locality but there are a couple and this sign is of no greater size or prominence than those. The sign is in a strong commercial area, does not appear excessively dominant, overly large or inappropriately sited at too high a level. ... I have taken into account policies 1, 2 and 47 of the Chichester Local Plan which seek to protect amenity and so are material in this case. Given I have concluded that the proposal would not harm amenity; the proposal does not conflict with these policies."</p>	

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p data-bbox="197 230 416 259"><a href="#">17/02881/DOM</a></p> <p data-bbox="197 271 485 333">East Wittering And Bracklesham Parish</p> <p data-bbox="197 365 600 394">Case Officer: Luke Simpson</p> <p data-bbox="197 432 512 461"><b>Householder Appeal</b></p>	<p data-bbox="638 230 1469 333">Shore House East Bracklesham Drive Bracklesham PO20 8JW - Demolition of small garage and erection of front and rear extensions.</p>
<p data-bbox="552 486 1139 515"><b>Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED</b></p>	
<p data-bbox="181 524 1485 1644">“...in terms of the front area, the appeal proposals would lead to a very extensive percentage of the garden area being used for substantial height single storey development. At the scale proposed the extension work would not be suitably subservient to the main property, would detract from its simple but striking appearance, and would represent excessive and sprawling coverage of the curtilage. The planned work would appear alien and out of character both with the existing dwelling and its surrounds. The visual impression given would be one of marked and incongruous overdevelopment of the plot unsympathetic to the immediate and wider context. To the rear, whilst much more modest in ground coverage than the road-side works, there would be a cumulative issue and more particularly the ungainly block-like addition would also detract from the distinctive aesthetic qualities of the host property. The steep gable end would become unfortunately screened in part and the architectural pedigree blurred. Views from the beach are of a very diverse range of elevations and property types but nevertheless this scheme would stand out as a graceless and awkward arrangement of built form with a lesser degree of clarity of design and elevational simplicity than is presently the case. This adds to my concerns in respect of the rear area. ... it would be a reasonable aim to seek to protect neighbours adjacent to the appeal site from impositions on their amenity resulting from over-development. In this instance the planned front extension works would simply be too extensive in height and length and uncompromising in block form, and in this instance would be overly proximate to the boundaries with these gardens. This would not be about modest non-critical loss of sunlight or daylight, but rather the sheer sense of being hemmed-in by building mass. The appeal scheme would be overbearing and oppressive to degrees which would be unreasonable. I am satisfied that because of relative siting and comparative heights the extension planned to the rear would not unduly impact upon the property to the east. However it would be overly imposing due to the degree of forward projection, proximity and height of the side elevation in relation to the seaward elevation and immediate outdoor amenity area of the property to the west. This adds to my concerns about the principal residential amenity impacts from the appeal scheme on the front landward side. ... For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality as well as on living conditions for neighbours. Accordingly the appeal is dismissed.”□</p>	

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p data-bbox="197 230 560 300"><u>17/00055/CONCOU</u> Plaistow And Ifold Parish</p> <p data-bbox="197 365 560 398">Case Officer: Reg Hawks</p> <p data-bbox="197 461 549 495"><b>Written Representation</b></p>	<p data-bbox="638 230 1457 300">Nell Ball Farm Dunsfold Road Plaistow Billingshurst West Sussex RH14 0BF - Appeal against enforcement notice</p>
<p data-bbox="408 526 1286 560"><b>Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED - NOTICE UPHELD</b></p>	
<p data-bbox="178 562 1497 1025">“The basis of the appellant’s case is that he would like more time to comply with the requirements of the notice to allow for an appeal against the refusal of planning permission on 29 June 2018, for the retention of the building, to be determined. I appreciate the appellant’s agent’s concern to avoid a scenario where the building is demolished only for planning permission for its retention to be granted on appeal shortly afterwards. However, there is currently no record of such an appeal having been made. Therefore, whether one will be submitted can only be considered as a matter of speculation at this stage. I cannot justify extending the compliance period in such circumstances. In any event, I certainly cannot justify extending the period to 2 years, which is tantamount to a temporary planning permission. This is not something that is within my powers to do under an appeal on ground (g). I am also mindful that some 10 months have elapsed since the appeal was submitted with enforcement action effectively suspended. Therefore, as the compliance period will begin again from the date of this decision, the appellant will effectively have had some 16 months in which to comply with the requirements of the notice. In these circumstances, I see no good reason to extend the compliance period further. ... The appeal is dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld without variation.”</p>	
<p data-bbox="197 1090 520 1160"><u><a href="#">SDNP/17/02779/FUL</a></u> Rogate Parish Council</p> <p data-bbox="197 1225 480 1294">Case Officer: Claire Coles</p> <p data-bbox="197 1337 549 1370"><b>Written Representation</b></p>	<p data-bbox="638 1090 1457 1160">Nell Ball Farm Dunsfold Road Plaistow Billingshurst West Sussex RH14 0BF - Appeal against enforcement notice</p>
<p data-bbox="555 1386 1126 1420"><b>Appeal Decision: APPEAL ALLOWED</b></p>	
<p data-bbox="178 1422 1457 1899">“The proposed location of the stables and the use of the site would not have an impact on amenity of neighbours due to the change in topography and distance between the site and neighbouring properties. I am content through considering the evidence that as the use is solely for the occupants of Hambledon Cottage it would be of a domestic scale and there would be no adverse impact on the road network. I find that the proposal would conserve the scenic beauty of the SDNP. It would be situated in a well screened location, with additional hedgerow reinforcing the landscape qualities. The design and scale of the structure would be sympathetic to the adjacent built form and would sit comfortably within its surroundings. I am satisfied that the construction would preserve the health of the nearby trees. The proposal would therefore comply with Policies R6 and BE11 which seek to protect the character of the area. It would also comply with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) provides that great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks. ...”</p>	

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p><b>COSTS DECISION</b></p> <p>“The decision notice referred to the wrong policy, this was acknowledged by the council. The council officer report specifically considered the application in accordance with Policy R6 of the Local Plan, nowhere is there any reference in the report to Policy RE6. Policy RE6 applies to sites within the strategic gap, and is not relevant to the appeal site. Whilst it is clearly an administrative error, the council was quick to admit the mistake, and confirm that policy RE6 was not applicable. The reason for refusal, when read in accordance with Policy R6, is complete, precise and specific to the relevant application. The reasons were substantiated in the officer report, with an explanation as to how the council considered that the proposal would result in harm to the character of the area. ... The council did not refuse to engage with the applicant in respect of the Landscape Visual Impact Assessment. It is clear that the proposal was considered by the County Landscape officer, and the council contacted the appellant to inform them that the proposal would be recommended for refusal. The officer was clear that the two landscape consultants had concluded differently with regards to the impact on the landscape. They confirmed that it would be possible to have further discussions, but that these would not necessarily change the recommendation, I therefore do not consider that a lack of co-operation has been demonstrated. It was the council’s role to consider all of the evidence submitted with the Application, along with the responses from the consultees, and reach a conclusion. The Council did that, and was not unreasonable in the way it conducted that process. ...”</p>	
<p><u><a href="#">16/00359/CONTRV</a></u> Sidlesham Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Emma Kierans</p> <p><b>Informal Hearing</b></p>	<p>Land Adj To Ham Road Sidlesham West Sussex - Appeal against Enforcement Notice SI/69</p> <p>Linked to <a href="#">16/03383/FUL</a></p>
<p><b>Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED - NOTICE MODIFIED</b></p>	
<p>“Without planning permission, material change of use of the land to a mixed use for agriculture and keeping/ breeding horses and use as a residential caravan/ mobile home site. ... Enforcement notice be varied by the deletion of the words “Six months” as the time period for compliance at section 6 and the substitution of the following words “Twelve months”. ... The fragmentation caused by the proposed landscaping would have the opposite effect, being harmful of itself whilst failing to adequately mitigate against the harmful visual impact of the caravans. The harm to the character and appearance of the area, as described, is contrary to the aims of policy 48 of the Local Plan, particularly sub-sections 2 and 3 and the second limb of sub-section 1 of that policy and the aims of paragraph 26(b) of the PPTS. ... The fragmentation caused by the proposed landscaping would have the opposite effect, being harmful of itself whilst failing to adequately mitigate against the harmful visual impact of the caravans. 26. The harm to the character and appearance of the area, as described, is contrary to the aims of policy 48 of the Local Plan, particularly sub-sections 2 and 3 and the second limb of sub-section 1 of that policy and the aims of paragraph 26(b) of the PPTS. ... My concerns with regard to flood risk weigh extremely heavily against the grant of planning permission in relation to both appeals. ... My concerns relating to flood risk would not be tempered by any notable degree if considered in the context of a temporary permission. ... Based upon the information before me the development is clearly contrary to local and national planning policy and I attach the</p>	

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p>upmost weight to those matters, having regard to the potential consequences. ... Thus, in environmental terms, the site is poorly located and likely to facilitate unsustainable trip generation, contrary to the policies identified above. ... There has been no new provision of permanent public pitches, contrary to the recommendation in the 2013 GTAA, even though the waiting lists in relation to the existing sites continue to grow ...</p> <p>Consequently, I find that the Council is unable to demonstrate a robust calculation of need or demonstrate that it can identify a five-year supply of sites to meet that need. ... Transit sites and bricks and mortar accommodation would be unlikely to offer associated land for the keeping/ breeding of horses and no sites that would provide such capability have been put forward. ... Thus, I conclude that there is unmet need and that the Council is unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of sites to meet the likely level of need. ... even when those personal factors are taken into account I am unconvinced that continued occupation of the site is in the best interests of the family and the children. ... I have concluded that the development has caused harm to the landscape character and the appearance of the area and that harm could not be satisfactorily mitigated through the use of conditions. ... I attach the upmost importance and weight to my concerns relating to the potential for the site to flood and find that the location of the site is unsuitable for residential development ... As for Appeal A, the development would be contrary to the relevant policies of the development plan. ... Factors are put together the outcome of the overall balance remains the same. Thus, the development, either in relation to Appeal A or Appeal B is not acceptable for a time limited period. ... Accordingly, to dismiss Appeal on ground (a) and uphold the enforcement notice and to dismiss Appeal B would not result in a violation of their rights under Article 8. ... Thus, the ground (g) appeal succeeds to that extent and I shall vary the terms of the notice accordingly. ... For the reasons given above I conclude that the development is unacceptable and that the appeal should not succeed. Accordingly I shall dismiss the appeal, refuse to grant planning permission on the deemed application and uphold the enforcement notice. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.” □</p>	
<p><a href="#">16/03383/FUL</a> Sidlesham Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: James Cross</p> <p><b>Informal Hearing</b></p>	<p>Land Adjacent To Ham Road Sidlesham West Sussex - Use of land as a travellers caravan site consisting of 2 no. touring caravans, 1 no. amenity structure and associated development.</p> <p>Linked to <a href="#">16/00359/CONTRV</a></p>
<p><b>Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED</b></p>	
<p>As Above</p>	

Reference/Procedure	Proposal - Continued
<p data-bbox="197 230 416 264"><a href="#">18/00747/DOM</a></p> <p data-bbox="197 268 483 302">Southbourne Parish</p> <p data-bbox="197 365 600 398">Case Officer: Luke Simpson</p> <p data-bbox="197 461 512 495"><b>Householder Appeal</b></p>	<p data-bbox="638 230 1501 338">4 Park Road Southbourne PO10 8NZ - Change of use of loft space into habitable accommodation with front and rear dormers plus cable build ups.</p>
<p data-bbox="552 512 1139 546"><b>Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED</b></p>	
<p data-bbox="181 553 1493 875">“No 4 Park Road is one half of a two-storey, semi-detached pair, with similar properties to either side. ... Notwithstanding, it would occupy a prominent position on the front roof slope of No 4 and would noticeably unbalance the roof profile of the building as a whole. It would show little correlation with the window positions below, at first floor level, and would appear overall as an obvious and unsympathetic addition that would fail to harmonise with the simple form of the original building. Its incongruous form would be further heightened by its solitary presence amongst buildings of similar design and appearance within the street scene and wider area. ... However, whilst the buildings within the estate influence the street scene, they do not obviate the fact that No 4 is residential in character, form and setting.”□</p>	

### 3. CURRENT APPEALS

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p><a href="#">16/00933/OUT</a> Birdham Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Jeremy Bushell</p> <p><b>Public Inquiry</b> <b>02/10/2018 at 10am</b> The Vicars Hall Cathedral Cloisters Chichester PO19 1PX</p>	<p>Koolbergen, Kelly's Nurseries And Bellfield Nurseries Bell Lane Birdham Chichester West Sussex PO20 7HY - Erection of 77 houses B1 floorspace, retail and open space with retention of 1 dwelling.</p>
<p><a href="#">17/01382/FUL</a> Birdham Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Shona Archer</p> <p><b>Informal Hearing</b> <b>15/01/2019 at 10am</b> The Old Court Room, The Council House, North Street, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 1LQ</p>	<p>Plot 12 Land To The Rear Of Premier Business Park Main Road Appledram West Sussex - Retrospective application for single pitch for gypsy occupation comprising touring caravan, hardstanding and provision of static mobile home.</p>
<p><a href="#">SDNP/17/03475/HOUS</a> Bury Parish Council</p> <p>Case Officer: Carol Garfield</p> <p><b>Householder Appeal</b></p>	<p>The Farmhouse The Street Bury RH20 1PA - Proposed part demolition and refurbishment of dwelling, to include extensions and alterations.</p>
<p><a href="#">15/00064/CONLB</a> Chichester Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Sue Payne</p> <p><b>Public Inquiry</b> <b>30/10/2018</b> Edes House West Street Chichester West Sussex PO19 1RQ</p>	<p>13 Parchment Street Chichester West Sussex PO19 3DA - Appeal against removal of x 3 wooden casements and fitting of x 3 UPVC casements in Grade II listed building in Conservation Area.</p>

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p data-bbox="197 228 453 300"><a href="#">17/01073/FUL</a> Chichester Parish</p> <p data-bbox="197 362 587 398">Case Officer: Caitlin Boddy</p> <p data-bbox="197 430 552 465"><b>Written Representation</b></p>	<p data-bbox="635 228 1484 407">22A Lavant Road Chichester West Sussex PO19 5RG - Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 2 no. 4 bed detached properties with shared garage, 3 no. 3 bed link detached properties with integral garages, parking and new access drive.</p>
<p data-bbox="197 519 453 591"><a href="#">18/00525/ADV</a> Chichester Parish</p> <p data-bbox="197 654 555 689">Case Officer: Vicki Baker</p> <p data-bbox="197 721 552 757"><b>Written Representation</b></p>	<p data-bbox="635 519 1455 591">Unit 1 Portfield Way Chichester PO19 7YH - 2 no. double sided internally illuminated post signs.</p>
<p data-bbox="181 801 485 909">* <a href="#">17/01259/FUL</a> East Wittering And Bracklesham Parish</p> <p data-bbox="197 936 587 972">Case Officer: Caitlin Boddy</p> <p data-bbox="197 1003 552 1039"><b>Written Representation</b></p>	<p data-bbox="635 801 1493 909">Billy's On The Beach Kiosk Bracklesham Lane Bracklesham Bay Chichester West Sussex PO20 8JH - Proposed decking with ramp and retractable canopy.</p>
<p data-bbox="197 1102 485 1209"><a href="#">17/02433/FUL</a> East Wittering And Bracklesham Parish</p> <p data-bbox="197 1236 475 1308">Case Officer: Maria Tomlinson</p> <p data-bbox="197 1335 552 1370"><b>Written Representation</b></p>	<p data-bbox="635 1102 1372 1209">Bon Ami Peerley Road East Wittering PO20 8DW - Erection of 1 no. bungalow - resubmission of EW/17/00240/FUL.</p>
<p data-bbox="197 1415 437 1487"><a href="#">17/02563/DOM</a> Fernhurst Parish</p> <p data-bbox="197 1559 587 1594">Case Officer: James Gellini</p> <p data-bbox="197 1621 552 1657"><b>Written Representation</b></p>	<p data-bbox="635 1415 1404 1487">Stedlands Farm Bell Vale Lane Fernhurst GU27 3DJ - Proposed two storey rear extension.</p>
<p data-bbox="197 1702 552 1809"><a href="#">SDNP/18/00384/HOUS</a> Fernhurst Parish Council Parish</p> <p data-bbox="197 1836 526 1908">Case Officer: Charlotte Cranmer</p> <p data-bbox="197 1935 510 1971"><b>Householder Appeal</b></p>	<p data-bbox="635 1702 1500 1854">Little Woodfold Woodfold Fernhurst Haslemere West Sussex GU27 3ET - Demolition of glasshouse, two storey side extension, replacement of roof to create further first floor living space and new timber boundary fence.</p>

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p><a href="#">SDNP/17/01554/FUL</a> Fittleworth Parish Council Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Carol Garfield</p> <p><b>Written Representation</b></p>	<p>Land at Withies Cottage School Lane Fittleworth West Sussex - Erection of 1 no. detached dwelling and associated parking.</p>
<p><a href="#">SDNP/16/00496/OPDEV</a> Funtington Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Shona Archer</p> <p><b>Informal Hearing</b></p>	<p>Land South of Braefoot Southbrook Road West Ashling West Sussex - Insertion of a cesspit and engineering works.</p>
<p><a href="#">17/00929/FUL</a> Funtington Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Luke Simpson</p> <p><b>Written Representation</b></p>	<p>Brick Bat Farm Moutheys Lane Funtington Chichester West Sussex PO18 8AA - Demolition of barn, removal of mobile home and erection of 1 no. dwelling.</p>
<p><a href="#">SDNP/17/00949/FUL</a> Funtington Parish Council Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Derek Price</p> <p><b>Informal Hearing</b></p>	<p>Land South of Braefoot Southbrook Road West Ashling West Sussex - Retention and continued use of mobile home for gypsy family occupation including existing timber shed and refuse enclosure.</p>
<p><a href="#">SDNP/17/06292/FUL</a> Lavant Parish Council Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Jenna Shore</p> <p><b>Written Representation</b></p>	<p>Down Haven A286 Oldwick Meadows To Sheepwash Lane Lavant PO18 0BQ - New 2 storey replacement dwelling.</p>
<p><a href="#">SDNP/18/00704/HOUS</a> Lynchmere Parish Council Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Rafael Grosso Macpherson</p> <p><b>Householder Appeal</b></p>	<p>Marley House Coach House Marley Common Lynchmere West Sussex GU27 3PT - Addition of 7 no. dormer windows and chimney, replacement of existing garage doors with new fenestration and internal alterations.</p>

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p data-bbox="197 237 411 309"><a href="#">18/00244/FUL</a> Kirdford Parish</p> <p data-bbox="197 371 587 405">Case Officer: Daniel Power</p> <p data-bbox="197 439 552 472"><b>Written Representation</b></p>	<p data-bbox="638 237 1414 344">Land South East Of Sewage Works Glasshouse Lane Kirdford West Sussex - Demolition of old buildings and erection of new workshop for storage and carpentry.</p>
<p data-bbox="197 544 485 616"><a href="#">15/00202/CONAGR</a> Oving Parish</p> <p data-bbox="197 678 560 712">Case Officer: Reg Hawks</p> <p data-bbox="197 745 552 779"><b>Written Representation</b></p>	<p data-bbox="638 544 1453 651">Ham Farm Church Lane Oving West Sussex PO20 2BT - Appeal against new agricultural building, earth bund and access track.</p>
<p data-bbox="197 828 480 900"><a href="#">16/00359/CONTRV</a> Sidlesham Parish</p> <p data-bbox="197 963 608 996">Case Officer: Emma Kierans</p> <p data-bbox="197 1030 453 1064"><b>Informal Hearing</b></p>	<p data-bbox="638 828 1477 900">Land Adj To Ham Road Sidlesham West Sussex - Appeal against the Stationing of a mobile home</p>
<p data-bbox="197 1113 576 1220"><a href="#">SDNP/16/00069/COU</a> Upwaltham Parish Council Parish</p> <p data-bbox="197 1240 592 1274">Case Officer: Shona Archer</p> <p data-bbox="197 1308 411 1341"><b>Public Inquiry</b></p>	<p data-bbox="638 1113 1453 1184">The Mill Eartham Lane Eartham Chichester West Sussex PO18 0NA - Use of workshop as residential.</p>
<p data-bbox="197 1397 499 1469"><a href="#">17/00448/FUL</a> West Itchenor Parish</p> <p data-bbox="197 1489 587 1523">Case Officer: Caitlin Boddy</p> <p data-bbox="197 1543 627 1650"><b>Informal Hearing</b> 22 November 2018 at 10am – Chichester District Council</p>	<p data-bbox="638 1397 1497 1505">Old Haven The Street Itchenor PO20 7AN - Demolition of existing building and construction of 6 bedroom replacement dwelling, garage and associated works.</p>

#### 4. VARIATIONS TO SECTION 106 AGREEMENTS

None

#### 5. CALLED-IN APPLICATIONS

Reference	Proposal	Stage

#### 6. COURT AND OTHER MATTERS

Injunctions		
Site	Breach	Stage

Court Hearings		
Site	Matter	Stage

Prosecutions		
Site	Breach	Stage
Field West of Five Oaks	Breach of Enforcement Notice	Guilty plea at Worthing Magistrates' Court on 3 August. Court adjourned for sentence to 18 Jan. 2019 in view of the Defendant's appeal of the new planning application refused in July 2018.
Land North of White Barn, Elm Lane	Breach of Enforcement Notice	Guilty plea at Worthing Magistrates' Court on 3 August. Sentence: Fine of £505 and all of our costs claimed of £751.85. Our costs were promptly paid to us at the beginning of September.

#### 7. POLICY MATTERS

None