

Chichester District Council

Planning Committee

Wednesday 19 December 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
17/01384/FUL Birdham Parish Case Officer: Shona Archer Informal Hearing	Plot 14 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.
17/03626/OUT Chidham & Hambrook Parish Case Officer: Jo Bell Written Representation	Chas Wood Nurseries Main Road Bosham Chichester West Sussex PO18 8PN - Construction of 10 no. dwellings.
SDNP/17/06433/HOUS Duncton Parish Council Case Officer: Jenna Shore Householder Appeal	Willow Cottage High Street Duncton GU28 0LB - Single storey side and rear extensions, garden room and change of use of barn to habitable space.

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p>18/00883/DOM Fishbourne Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Maria Tomlinson</p> <p>Householder Appeal</p>	<p>St Francis 122 Blackboy Lane Fishbourne PO18 8BL - Alteration of existing bungalow to provide first floor bedrooms under a new roof.</p>
<p>SDNP/17/06109/HOUS Lodsworth Parish Council</p> <p>Case Officer: Jenna Shore</p> <p>Householder Appeal</p>	<p>1 Gibbs Cottages Surrey Road Lickfold Lurgashall GU28 9DX - Two storey rear extension and associated alterations.</p>
<p>SDNP/18/03645/HOUS Milland Parish Council</p> <p>Case Officer: Rafa Grosso Macpherson</p> <p>Householder Appeal</p>	<p>14 Mill Vale Meadows Milland GU30 7LZ - Rear extension to main dwelling, change of loft space to habitable accommodation and garage extension.</p>
<p>SDNP/18/03262/HOUS Petworth Town Council</p> <p>Case Officer: Louise Kent</p> <p>Householder Appeal</p>	<p>Wickers Glasshouse Lane Kirdford GU28 9PA - Replacement single storey and two storey extensions.</p>
<p>SDNP/15/00492/COU Rogate Parish Council</p> <p>Case Officer: Steven Pattie</p>	<p>Laundry Cottage Dangstein Dangstein Road Rogate Petersfield West Sussex GU31 5BZ - Camp site, new tractor barn people living in woods.</p>
<p>Public Inquiry 09/04/2019 at 10:00:00 at Chichester District Council</p>	
<p>SDNP/18/01998/HOUS Easebourne Parish Council</p> <p>Case Officer: Rafa Grosso Macpherson</p> <p>Householder Appeal</p>	<p>Burnel Dodsley Lane Easebourne GU29 9AS - Retrospective permission for the erection of a boundary fence and outbuilding</p>

2. DECISIONS MADE

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p data-bbox="145 297 360 331">16/00933/OUT</p> <p data-bbox="145 333 368 367">Birdham Parish</p> <p data-bbox="145 432 564 465">Case Officer: Jeremy Bushell</p> <p data-bbox="145 490 360 524">Public Inquiry</p>	<p data-bbox="636 297 1445 443">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 data-bbox="497 557 1085 591">Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED</p>	
<p data-bbox="129 613 1445 1525">“... The appeal proposals would be contrary to the locational strategy for housing, and the approach to development in the countryside, jointly embodied in Policies 2 and 45 of the CLP and Policies 13 and 15 of the BPNP. It would also conflict with the aim of protecting Birdham’s horticultural industry, as required by BPNP Policy 23. These are the principal relevant policies relating to the proposed development as a whole. The scheme therefore fails to accord with the development plan. A 5-year supply of housing land has been demonstrated, and none of the relevant policies have been shown to be out-of-date or inconsistent with the NPPF. There is therefore no reason for me to give any of these policies less than full weight, or to apply the ‘tilted balance’ in NPPF paragraph 11. The proposed new housing, both affordable and open-market, and the B1 and retail units, would all bring some potential social and economic benefits for the local community. So too would the S.106 provisions for the footpath/cycleway, bus lay-bys, open space and play facilities. But on the other hand, the site is not within the areas where development on this scale is permitted, and no exceptional need has been established. The scheme would therefore cause harm not only to the planning strategy for the area, but also to the principle of planned decision-making, which is central to the NPPF and to the whole planning system. The development would cause little harm to the area’s character or appearance, and would be reasonably well located for access to some local facilities. These considerations would carry some weight, if there were a need to find a suitable location for a development of this type. But in the absence of such a need, they add nothing to the matters set out above; their effect on the overall balance is therefore neutral. The potential benefits arising from the proposed scheme are numerous, but nevertheless, even when these are all added together, they are not compelling. In the absence of a proven need, the considerations in favour of the development do not outweigh the harm due to the conflicts with the development plan. The appeal therefore fails.”</p>	

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p>* 17/01259/FUL East Wittering And Bracklesham Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Caitlin Boddy</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Billy's On The Beach Kiosk Bracklesham Lane Bracklesham Bay Chichester West Sussex PO20 8JH - Proposed decking with ramp and retractable canopy.</p>
<p>Appeal Decision: APPEAL ALLOWED</p>	
<p>“The main issues are the effects of the proposal upon highway safety and flooding. ... The proposal would enable the use of this area all year round, and subsequently support the local economy and tourist industry. ... The improvements, which would see the external seating area being formally enclosed, and the siting of the access slightly further away, are all elements which weigh in favour of the development, as they would assist in addressing potential conflicts between the maneuvering of boats and pedestrians. In addition, the changes to the resultant gradient at the point of access would remain minimal and I therefore consider that this would not prejudice the condition of highway safety to an unacceptable degree. ... I consider that the proposed development would enable safeguards to be put in place to ensure that existing highway safety issues would not be exacerbated. ... I am mindful that the Council, with the Foreshore Office, retains a degree of control over the launching operations, to ensure that these are undertaken in the interests of public safety. ... I do not consider that the proposal would, in the words of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), have an unacceptable impact on highway safety. ... The EA’s flood map reproduced in this document also clearly shows that the site is not at risk of tidal flooding. ... The appellant did not have to submit a flood risk assessment. The proposed development would result in the enclosure of an existing external seating area, and would not increase the risk of flooding. In addition, I note that the Council’s Coast Protection and Land Drainage Officer was consulted as part of the application and did not raise any objection to the proposal. Based on the evidence before me, I consider that the proposal would not increase the risk of flooding, and am satisfied that any drainage issues could be adequately addressed by the imposition of a condition. ...</p> <p>”COST DECISION The application for an award of costs is allowed. ... The applicant claims that the Council has acted unreasonably and refused to grant planning permission contrary to the advice of its professional officers, and failed to substantiate the reasons for refusal on the grounds of public safety and lack of information regarding drainage. ... The fact that the Planning Committee did not agree with the Officer’s recommendation does not in itself constitute unreasonable behaviour. Members are entitled to reach a different view, provided they do so whilst relying on substantive planning grounds. In this particular instance, members of the Planning Committee made their decision contrary to the consultation responses. ... The Council has provided little justification as to why the concerns regarding highway safety or flooding raised by members could not be adequately be dealt with by conditions. By reason of the lack of substantive evidence demonstrating harm, I consider that the refusal of planning permission constitutes unreasonable behaviour, which caused the applicant unnecessary expense in providing evidence to refute the reasons for refusal.”</p>	

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p data-bbox="150 228 504 300">SDNP/18/00384/HOUS Fernhurst Parish Council</p> <p data-bbox="150 331 414 398">Case Officer: Charlotte Cranmer</p> <p data-bbox="150 425 462 456">Householder Appeal</p>	<p data-bbox="552 228 1436 371">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>
Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED	
<p data-bbox="130 524 638 555">“...The main issues in this appeal are:</p> <ul data-bbox="130 560 1452 1960" style="list-style-type: none"> - The implications for light pollution, having regard to development plan policy. - The effect on the character and appearance of the locality... There would be two gabled features in the east and west elevations between those at the ends of the enlarged dwelling. These would rise above the top of first floor windows and the eaves to the ridge of the main roof, while being mainly glazed. Such relatively large areas of glass on both sides of the property would not minimise light pollution, while creating the potential for fairly high levels to result. Moreover, in relation to the upper parts this would occur at a relatively elevated position. In periods of leaf fall especially, it seems likely to me that light spillage would at the very least be apparent in the vicinity at other properties.... The site is outside the designated Settlement Policy Area of Fernhurst, where there is a significantly different character with appreciably fewer sources of light. The Appellant refers to the previously approved schemes and these are of relevance as a potential fall-back position as they may be built in the event of the appeal failing. ... As a result, in terms of potential light pollution, the main differences between the schemes are the atriums given the extent of their glazing and height. ...The current scheme would result in a materially greater potential for light pollution because of the greater height and extent of the glass in the atriums. ... It seems to me that in practice light would be likely to spill at an appreciably greater height and over a greater area than in the previously approved schemes. ... In this context I consider that the likely additional effect of the current scheme by comparison to those previously accepted would be significant. ... The previous schemes would not therefore provide a sound basis for allowing the appeal. It is concluded that the development would result in unacceptable potential for light pollution and be in conflict with Policy EE3. ... Other properties ... vary appreciably in matters such as their detailed design, scale, height and roof bulk. In this context the full two storey height of the enlarged property would not be excessive. ... The gabled projections would reflect those at the nearby detached property, Merryfield. Both these features and the main roof of the extended property would be of appropriate proportions. Due to factors such as these there would be no unacceptable loss of openness. The atrium features would have a lightweight character because of their largely glazed appearance and be of a significantly lesser width than the gable features at each end. ... I do not consider that the atriums would be unacceptably dominant or alien features. ... Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area. However, the enlargement would result in an improvement in the design of the dwelling and this is not such a case. For all the above reasons it is concluded that the character and appearance of the locality would not be harmed. ... There would also be no conflict with the statutory purpose of National Park designation to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area. ... The development would improve the appearance of the host dwelling. While this would comply with relevant policies, achieve an acceptable standard of design and not harm the character and appearance of the locality, it does not outweigh the adverse effect and conflict with the development plan in relation to light pollution. Taking account of all other matters raised, there is nothing else that would justify accepting the development and the appeal fails.” 	

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p data-bbox="148 230 403 304">17/00929/FUL Funtington Parish</p> <p data-bbox="148 365 552 400">Case Officer: Luke Simpson</p> <p data-bbox="148 432 504 468">Written Representation</p>	<p data-bbox="584 230 1433 338">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 data-bbox="504 528 1090 562">Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED</p>	
<p data-bbox="132 566 1453 1021">“...change of use from an agricultural building to a dwelling has been granted through the prior approval procedure. This fallback position is an important consideration which establishes the principle of a residential use on the site. I conclude that the site is an appropriate location for the proposed house.... The proposed dwelling would be characterised by its overtly domestic appearance, which is reflected by defining design features, including prominent chimney stacks, porch, etc. I consider that when compared with the fallback position, the proposal would increase the visual prominence of the dwellinghouse in the rural landscape to an unacceptable degree, by introducing a form of development which would appear contextually out-of-place in the countryside. I also note that the proposal would entail a larger residential curtilage than what was granted through the prior approval process. This consequently means that the development would inevitably entail a greater degree of domestication of the curtilage, for example with the creation of a front garden and other domestic paraphernalia, which could have a harmful impact on the existing open rural surroundings of the building.”</p> <p data-bbox="132 1059 1453 1798">“COST DECISION... I understand it is claimed that the Council failed to work proactively to work towards a positive outcome and that the period before a decision was issued was excessive. The appellant also argues that the Council changed its mind during the course of the application. Furthermore, it is alleged that planning permission should have reasonably been granted, having regard to all relevant material considerations. Within their costs rebuttal, the Council explained that the determination of the application was delayed by the subsequent submission of prior approval applications for the conversion of the existing building into a dwellinghouse. To that effect, I understand that extensions of time were agreed with the applicant, to enable the local planning authority to consider all relevant material considerations to the determination of the application, including potential fallback positions. Whilst I understand the applicant’s frustration caused by the length of the process, I do not consider that the Council behaved unreasonably on the procedure leading up to this appeal. In response to the second point, the case officer’s view during the determination of an application is not binding upon the Council’s decision or the ability for the officers responsible for the decision to take an opposing view. In any case, when taking account of the appeal, it is difficult to see how it justifies that unnecessary or wasted expense for the appellant occurred as part of the appeal process. The case officer report makes reference to the existence of a fallback position which was considered as an important material consideration. However, in the planning balance, the local planning authority took the view the harm caused by the proposal to the rural character and appearance of the locality justified the refusal of planning permission. I do not consider that the Council behaved unreasonably in reaching such a view, and their decision was accordingly justified....”</p>	

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p data-bbox="201 226 580 300">SDNP/18/00704/HOUS Lynchmere Parish Council</p> <p data-bbox="201 327 580 400">Case Officer: Rafa Grosso Macpherson</p> <p data-bbox="201 421 517 461">Householder Appeal</p>	<p data-bbox="716 226 1495 405">Marley House Coach House Marley Common Linchmere West Sussex GU27 3PT - Addition of 7 no. dormer windows and chimney, replacement of existing garage doors with new fenestration and internal alterations.</p>
Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED	
<p data-bbox="185 504 1495 1137">“...The main issue in this appeal is the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of Marley House Lodge (MHL), with regard to privacy. ... The two new dormer additions in the part of the rear elevation of the CH next to the back garden would allow overlooking of an area appreciably closer to the back of MHL. That serving the bedroom at the end would readily enable overlooking of the patio immediately to the rear. Because of the undue proximity and elevated position this overlooking would be particularly intrusive. Despite there being no significant overlooking into the living accommodation itself, this would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy. The Appellant suggests that there would be no material loss of privacy because MHL is not a separate independent dwelling, being ancillary to MH as a result of its occupation by employees. However, the property comprises a four bedroom bungalow and the Appellant indicates that it has all the amenities for self-contained living. I am not persuaded that the employment of those living there in connection with the overall group of properties and site means that a lower standard of privacy should apply than might otherwise be considered acceptable. In any event, regardless of this there is nothing to show that MHL could not be sold and occupied independently of MH anyway. The fact that potential purchasers would be aware of the overlooking would not be a sound basis for accepting such an inherently poor relationship.”</p>	
<p data-bbox="201 1178 596 1252">SDNP/18/02228/ADV Easebourne Parish Council</p> <p data-bbox="201 1279 496 1352">Case Officer: Rafa Grosso Macpherson</p> <p data-bbox="201 1373 517 1413">Householder Appeal</p>	<p data-bbox="716 1178 1495 1357">Gillhams Service Station Easebourne Lane Easebourne Midhurst West Sussex GU29 9AZ - 1 no. illuminated Wild Bean Cafe Sign, 1 no. illuminated M S Tower Sign, 1 no. illuminated Fascia Sign, 2 no. non illuminated WBC Poster Signs and 2 no. non illuminated AO Poster Signs.</p>
Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED	
<p data-bbox="185 1464 1495 2069">“...The Wild Bean Café sign, is an internally lit box. The illumination of this advertisement is unduly brash, to the extent that it appears substantially brighter and more intrusive than other sources of light on the forecourt. As a result, it draws the eye from numerous vantage points and stands out from the Registered Park and Garden. I appreciate that the pylon is also lit from within, but this lies within the corridor of street lighting along Easebourne Lane. It does not justify the harm resulting from the illumination of the Wild Bean Café sign. ... The M&S Tower Sign was not lit at the time of my visit and there were no obvious clues as to the method of illumination. ... The limited information provided in respect of illumination prevents a reliable assessment and therefore it would be inappropriate for me to allow this part of the appeal. The appellant company has indicated, however, its acceptance of a condition stipulating that the M&S Tower Sign is non-illuminated. To my mind, this is a reasonable compromise. ... For the reasons set out above I consider that the Wild Bean Café sign is materially harmful to visual amenity. Subject to a condition being imposed to prevent illumination of the M&S Tower Sign, the remainder of the signage scheme does not adversely impact upon the character and appearance of the locality or the landscape and scenic beauty of the South Downs National Park. These signs are acceptable in relation to their effect on amenity and public safety and therefore I shall allow the appeal to permit their display.”</p>	

3. CURRENT APPEALS

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p><u>16/00229/CONCOU</u> Birdham Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Steven Pattie</p> <p>Hearing</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p><u>17/01382/FUL</u> Birdham Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Shona Archer</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>Hearing to be held At The Old Court Room, The Council House, North Street, Chichester at 10am</p>	
<p><u>17/01384/FUL</u> Birdham Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Shona Archer</p> <p>Hearing – as above</p>	<p>Plot 14 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><u>SDNP/17/03475/HOUS</u> Bury Parish Council</p> <p>Case Officer: Beverley Stubbington</p> <p>Householder Appeal</p>	<p>The Farmhouse The Street Bury RH20 1PA - Proposed part demolition and refurbishment of dwelling, to include extensions and alterations.</p>
<p><u>15/00064/CONLB</u> Chichester Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Sue Payne</p> <p>Public Inquiry – awaiting Decision</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">17/01073/FUL Chichester Parish</p> <p data-bbox="197 362 587 398">Case Officer: Caitlin Boddy</p> <p data-bbox="197 461 552 497">Written Representation</p>	<p data-bbox="638 228 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="197 568 453 640">17/01368/FUL Chichester Parish</p> <p data-bbox="197 703 590 739">Case Officer: Fjola Stevens</p> <p data-bbox="197 801 552 837">Written Representation</p>	<p data-bbox="638 568 1420 676">Xavier House 5 Etrick Road Chichester West Sussex - Replacement of Victorian lean-to with a two storey rear extension.</p>
<p data-bbox="197 900 453 972">18/00525/ADV Chichester Parish</p> <p data-bbox="197 1034 558 1070">Case Officer: Vicki Baker</p> <p data-bbox="197 1133 552 1169">Written Representation</p>	<p data-bbox="638 900 1452 972">Unit 1 Portfield Way Chichester PO19 7YH - 2 no. double sided internally illuminated post signs.</p>
<p data-bbox="197 1218 437 1290">17/02563/DOM Fernhurst Parish</p> <p data-bbox="197 1352 590 1388">Case Officer: James Gellini</p> <p data-bbox="197 1451 552 1487">Written Representation</p>	<p data-bbox="638 1218 1404 1290">Stedlands Farm Bell Vale Lane Fernhurst GU27 3DJ - Proposed two storey rear extension.</p>
<p data-bbox="197 1536 552 1608">SDNP/17/05928/FUL Fernhurst Parish Council</p> <p data-bbox="197 1635 577 1706">Case Officer: Rafa Grosso Macpherson</p> <p data-bbox="197 1733 552 1769">Written Representation</p>	<p data-bbox="638 1536 1490 1644">Home Farm Bell Road Kingsley Green Fernhurst GU27 3LG - Installation of new vehicular access to agricultural field and five bar gate.</p>

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p>18/00883/DOM Fishbourne Parish Case Officer: Maria Tomlinson Householder Appeal</p>	<p>St Francis 122 Blackboy Lane Fishbourne PO18 8BL - Alteration of existing bungalow to provide first floor bedrooms under a new roof.</p>
<p>SDNP/17/01554/FUL Fittleworth Parish Council Case Officer: Jenna Shore Written Representation</p>	<p>Land at Withies Cottage School Lane Fittleworth West Sussex - Erection of 1 no. detached dwelling and associated parking.</p>
<p>SDNP/17/02666/OUT Fittleworth Parish Council Case Officer: Jenna Shore Written Representation</p>	<p>Amen Wood Yard Fitzleroi Lane Fittleworth RH20 1JN - Demolition of existing woodyard buildings and replacement with 1 no. dwelling house.</p>
<p>SDNP/16/00496/OPDEV Funtington Parish Council Case Officer: Shona Archer Hearing – as above</p>	<p>Land South of Braefoot Southbrook Road West Ashling West Sussex - Appeal against insertion of a cesspit and engineering works.</p>
<p>SDNP/16/00676/COU Funtington Parish Council Case Officer: Reg Hawks Written Representation</p>	<p>New Barn Farm Common Road Funtington West Sussex PO18 9DA - B8 container storage</p>
<p>SDNP/17/00949/FUL Funtington Parish Council Case Officer: Derek Price Hearing – awaiting decision</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>

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p data-bbox="197 230 512 297">SDNP/17/06292/FUL Lavant Parish Council</p> <p data-bbox="197 333 576 365">Case Officer: Jenna Shore</p> <p data-bbox="197 405 552 436">Written Representation</p>	<p data-bbox="638 230 1477 297">Down Haven A286 Oldwick Meadows To Sheepwash Lane Lavant PO18 0BQ - New 2 storey replacement dwelling.</p>
<p data-bbox="197 492 411 560">18/00244/FUL Kirdford Parish</p> <p data-bbox="197 624 587 656">Case Officer: Daniel Power</p> <p data-bbox="197 719 552 750">Written Representation</p>	<p data-bbox="638 492 1414 598">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="197 824 528 891">SDNP/18/00843/FUL Midhurst Town Council</p> <p data-bbox="197 956 528 1023">Case Officer: Charlotte Cranmer</p> <p data-bbox="197 1050 552 1081">Written Representation</p>	<p data-bbox="638 824 1493 999">Bowling Green June Lane Midhurst West Sussex GU29 9EL - Demolition of existing bowls club buildings and erection of 5 no. dwellinghouses with associated landscaping and parking and creation of new vehicular and pedestrian access.</p>
<p data-bbox="197 1142 485 1209">15/00202/CONAGR Oving Parish</p> <p data-bbox="197 1274 560 1305">Case Officer: Reg Hawks</p> <p data-bbox="197 1368 552 1400">Written Representation</p>	<p data-bbox="638 1142 1450 1247">Ham Farm Church Lane Oving West Sussex PO20 2BT - Appeal against new agricultural building, earth bund and access track.</p>
<p data-bbox="197 1478 555 1545">17/02572/FUL Plaistow And Ifold Parish</p> <p data-bbox="197 1588 571 1619">Case Officer: Claire Coles</p> <p data-bbox="197 1659 552 1691">Written Representation</p>	<p data-bbox="638 1478 1445 1545">Land On The East Side Of The Lane Ifold West Sussex - Erection of 1 no. detached 4 bedroom dwelling.</p>
<p data-bbox="197 1747 555 1814">17/03545/FUL Plaistow And Ifold Parish</p> <p data-bbox="197 1856 587 1888">Case Officer: James Gellini</p> <p data-bbox="197 1928 552 1960">Written Representation</p>	<p data-bbox="638 1747 1445 1852">Little Wephurst Walthurst Lane Loxwood RH14 0AE - Replacement dwelling, following demolition of an existing dwelling.</p>

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p data-bbox="197 228 520 300">SDNP/17/06029/TPO Rogate Parish Council</p> <p data-bbox="197 360 587 394">Case Officer: Henry Whitby</p> <p data-bbox="197 434 512 468">Householder Appeal</p>	<p data-bbox="638 228 1487 300">White Rose Group London Road Rogate GU33 7NX - Fell 1 no. Oak tree (T1) subject to RG/83/00853/TPO.</p>
<p data-bbox="197 512 448 584">17/03086/FUL Tangmere Parish</p> <p data-bbox="197 645 475 716">Case Officer: Maria Tomlinson</p> <p data-bbox="197 741 552 775">Written Representation</p>	<p data-bbox="638 512 1453 584">1 Boxgrove Corner Arundel Road Tangmere PO18 0DU - Erection of 1 no. 3 bed dwelling.</p>
<p data-bbox="197 831 544 902">SDNP/18/01704/FUL Tillington Parish Council</p> <p data-bbox="197 927 528 999">Case Officer: Charlotte Cranmer</p> <p data-bbox="197 1023 552 1057">Written Representation</p>	<p data-bbox="638 831 1487 974">Buildings West of The Manor of Dean Dean Lane Tillington West Sussex - Change of use of an agricultural building and the demolition and erection of another, to create a one bedroom holiday let.</p>
<p data-bbox="197 1106 576 1178">SDNP/16/00069/COU Upwaltham Parish Council</p> <p data-bbox="197 1202 592 1236">Case Officer: Shona Archer</p> <p data-bbox="197 1270 411 1303">Public Inquiry</p>	<p data-bbox="638 1106 1453 1178">The Mill Eartham Lane Eartham Chichester West Sussex PO18 0NA - Use of workshop as residential.</p>
<p data-bbox="197 1352 496 1424">17/00448/FUL West Itchenor Parish</p> <p data-bbox="197 1485 584 1518">Case Officer: Caitlin Boddy</p> <p data-bbox="197 1579 624 1612">Hearing – awaiting decision</p>	<p data-bbox="638 1352 1497 1458">Old Haven The Street Itchenor PO20 7AN - Demolition of existing building and construction of 6 bedroom replacement dwelling, garage and associated works.</p>
<p data-bbox="197 1706 568 1778">17/03457/DOM Wisborough Green Parish</p> <p data-bbox="197 1839 520 1910">Case Officer: Beverley Stubbington</p> <p data-bbox="197 1935 552 1968">Written Representation</p>	<p data-bbox="638 1706 1487 1778">Albion House Petworth Road Wisborough Green RH14 0BH - Construction of single storey side and rear extension.</p> <p data-bbox="638 1818 979 1852">Linked to 17/03458/LBC</p>

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
17/03458/LBC Wisborough Green Parish Case Officer: Beverley Stubbington Written Representation	Albion House Petworth Road Wisborough Green RH14 0BH - Construction of single storey side and rear extension. Linked to 17/03457/DOM

4. VARIATIONS TO SECTION 106 AGREEMENTS

5. CALLED-IN APPLICATIONS

Reference	Proposal	Stage

6. COURT AND OTHER MATTERS

Injunctions		
Site	Breach	Stage
Birdham, Land North-West of Premier Park	Enforcement Notices	Legal and client working on evidence to submit with application to the court
Newells Lane, Old Allotment Site		Legal and client working on evidence to submit with application to the court
Court Hearings		
Site	Matter	Stage
Decoy Farm, Aldingbourne	CDC's Civil Claim to recover costs of clearance	Pre-Trial Review in January to be adjourned as Defendants suffered a bereavement. Parties continue to exchange evidence as per court's directions.

Prosecutions		
Site	Breach	Stage
Field West of five Oaks	Enforcement Notice	Sentence on 18 January 2018.
Portsoy, 16 Bonnar Road, Selsey	Enforcement Notice	First hearing date on 15 Feb. 2019 provided by the court. Summons to be prepared to go to defendants (not yet aware of court date until they receive summons).

7. POLICY MATTERS