

# Chichester District Council

## Planning Committee

Wednesday 16 January 2019

### Report of the Director Of Planning and Environment Services

#### Schedule of Planning Appeals, Court and Policy Matters (SDNPA)

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

None received

#### 2. DECIDED

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<a href="#">SDNP/17/06292/FUL</a> Lavant Parish Council  Case Officer: Jenna Shore  <b>Written Representation</b>	Down Haven A286 Oldwick Meadows To Sheepwash Lane Lavant PO18 0BQ - New 2 storey replacement dwelling.
<b>Appeal Decision: APPEAL ALLOWED</b>	
<i>Heritage assets and National Park:</i> The property occupies the eastern end of its plot, nearest the boundary with Little Manor, an Arts and Crafts styled house which is listed at Grade II. ... The existing dwelling lies within the immediate setting of Little Manor but its modest eaves and ridge heights combine to limit the visual impact. Only the roof is visible above the tall brick boundary wall from the grounds of the listed building. The outlook for residents of Little Manor is dominated by greenery... The dwelling would have greater physical presence in comparison to the bungalow but it would remain subservient to the listed building and the increased height and mass would be offset by the positioning of the dwelling further from the boundary... Although facing toward open	

Reference/Procedure	Proposal	Continued
<p>countryside, the development would be screened from public view by the dense vegetation along the banks of the Centurion Way. Small gaps in the hedging along the northern boundary of the site would afford only the briefest of transitory glimpses...</p>		
<p><i>Living conditions:</i> The building would be larger than the chalet bungalow it would be replacing. ... However, it would not be intrusive or overbearing. ... all but one of the openings would serve bathrooms or circulatory spaces. Given this, and the degree of separation between the two properties, I do not consider that there would be a significant adverse effect on the privacy of the neighbours . ... I therefore conclude that the proposal would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of Little Manor.</p>		
<p><a href="#">SDNP/17/02666/OUT</a> Fittleworth Parish Council  Case Officer: Jenna Shore  <b>Written Representation</b></p>	<p>Amen Wood Yard Fitzleroi Lane Fittleworth RH20 1JN - Demolition of existing woodyard buildings and replacement with 1 no. dwelling house.</p>	
<p><b>Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED</b></p>		
<p>“...the site comprises .....a number of buildings primarily faced in corrugated metal, set within a small clearing within a contained area of woodland between two country roads. ... The existing buildings ....have a rustic appearance ...are low in height and are not visually prominent ... As a woodyard it appears to have a clear functional connection to its wooded surroundings, even though the materials may in fact be transported to the site from another location. By contrast, an unrestricted residential use of this site would have no functional connection to the working of the surrounding countryside. It is likely that any proposals advanced at the reserved matters stage would comprise a large freestanding building, with a defined residential curtilage....domestic landscaping and paraphernalia, including a large area of hardstanding. This would have an urbanising effect that is at odds with the prevailing appearance of the undeveloped countryside that surrounds the site.... there are no safeguarding measures proposed as part of this outline planning application which would prevent trees from being removed. I therefore conclude that the proposal would lead to unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would also fail to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the South Downs National Park. From what I observed on site, the site is still in use as a woodyard. There is no significant evidence before me to suggest that it is not viable, or could not be otherwise used for business purposes. There is no significant evidence before me to substantiate the appellant’s claim that the existing use of the site is leading to unacceptable noise and disturbance for residential properties in the surrounding area. These considerations lead me to the view that the loss of the existing employment use has not been justified. ... The Council argue that the site would comprise an isolated dwelling in the Countryside.....as defined in the Framework, without any convincing justification. ... Future occupiers would be dependent on the private car to access services and facilities.</p>		

Reference/Procedure	Proposal	Continued
<p>The appellant argues that the cessation of the existing use as a woodyard would lead to a reduction in travel movements to and from the site. ... This consideration does not amount to a persuasive justification for the proposed development. I therefore conclude that the accessibility of services and facilities would be poor, and the location is inappropriate for the residential development proposed. ... the proposal would conflict with the development plan and the Framework on each of the main issues in this appeal. The fact that one additional residential unit would be provided does not justify the proposal, in the face of this harm. The proposal would not amount to sustainable development, as defined in the Framework. ...”</p>		
<p><a href="#">SDNP/17/00949/FUL</a>  Funtington Parish Council  Case Officer: Derek Price    <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><b>Appeal Decision: APPEAL ALLOWED</b></p>		
<p>“.... The Council contends that the Appellants do not meet the Government’s definition of “gypsies and travellers” as set out in PPTS. ... Personal circumstances are a consideration in these appeals, so I will address the question of status. Mr Watson and Ms Weale are or were partners, and have children. It is common ground that Mr Watson is an ethnic Romany Gypsy and Ms Weale is not. ... To contest the Council’s conclusion that Mr Watson is not currently involved in a travelling way of life, he provided copies of a number of signed letters from other Gypsies, confirming that they have travelled with him to horse fairs and for work purposes. He also gave evidence that he has custody of one of his children, but intends to continue travelling in the school holidays, and resume a fully nomadic way of life once the children have completed their education. I have no good reason to doubt Mr Watson’s evidence. I shall determine the appeals on the basis that he accords with the relevant definition and has ceased to travel temporarily on the grounds of the educational needs of his dependants. ... I consider the main issues are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The effect of the development on the landscape and scenic beauty of the National Park;</li> <li>· The need for, the availability of, and the Council’s provision of gypsy and traveller pitches; and</li> <li>· The personal circumstances of the Appellants and their family</li> </ul> <p>Landscape and Scenic Beauty - The land to the south of West Ashling is flat and, consistent with the description of this area in the South Downs Integrated Landscape Character Assessment (ILCA), consists predominantly of small, irregular fields and paddocks enclosed by hedges, such that its character is perceived as secluded and rural. The appeal site is reasonably well screened in views from the wider area. However, its level is a little higher than that of the adjoining road and views of the site, including the mobile home and summerhouse, are available through breaks in the hedgerow along Southbrook Road. The boundary between the appeal site and the dwelling known as “Braefoot” functions as the settlement boundary, and consists of a thick hedgerow containing mature trees. The Inspector who determined the 2017 appeal described it as both representative of the sense of enclosure within the landscape, and as providing a clear boundary between the appeal site and the village. I agree with that assessment. ...</p>		

Reference/Procedure	Proposal	Continued
		<p>The access has now been finished with compacted shingle and edged with wooden kerbing. It runs along the northern boundary of the appeal site and then turns to run along the eastern boundary, creating a large shingle-covered area of hardstanding, on part of which the mobile home and shed are sited. The rest of the appeal site, between the hardstanding and the roadside boundary, is laid out as a garden with a well-kept lawn enclosed by ornamental hedges, some trees and shrubs, and a walled enclosure for refuse storage in the north-western corner. The verge along the roadside boundary has been widened and mown, a timber post and rail fence installed at its rear, and behind that an evergreen hedge has been planted. ... It is important to bear in mind that former uses of the site for horticultural activities and grazing, however untidily managed, would have been compatible with its location in countryside outside the settlement. ... In marked contrast, domestic features such as the wide shingle drive, lawn, mobile home and other residential structures, and the replacement of the roadside hedgerow with post and rail fencing backed by an ornamental hedge are at odds with the rural quality of the landscape in which the appeal site lies. The effect of the development is to visually extend the built-up area of West Ashling southward into open countryside, in a ribbon form which is out of keeping with the well-established nucleated form of the settlement. This has a suburbanising effect on the adjacent stretch of Southbrook Road, and detracts from the pastoral setting of the settlement. In the course of the appeals, the Appellants put forward a Landscape Mitigation Strategy. ... I am not persuaded that the retention of the ornamental hedgerows, in particular that which has replaced the former native hedgerow along the roadside boundary of the appeal site, can properly be regarded as mitigation. ... This hedge is a visibly domestic feature which contributes to the harm caused to the pastoral character and appearance of the appeal site and the surrounding countryside. Increasing its height to provide some additional screening would also increase its prominence in public views. In my judgment, the impact of this measure would be harmful rather than beneficial. As to the proposed buffer plantations, one would be located along the southern boundary of the site, to screen views of the appeal site and its residential structures, and the other would be located along the boundaries of the south-western corner of the paddock to the south of the appeal site, to screen views of the sub-divided pony paddocks, and the equestrian yard / storage area to the east. At the Hearing it emerged that there is now some doubt as to whether the landowner would in fact permit the creation of the proposed buffer plantation in the second location. I consider that screening views of the pony paddocks and equestrian yard would be of limited value. As noted above, these uses are not out of keeping with the character of the landscape, so the only potential benefit would be improving visual amenity. Hiding the sub-divided paddocks and untidy yard is not the same as achieving their sympathetic integration. ... The buffer plantation along the southern boundary of the appeal site would have some benefit in terms of visual amenity, since it would screen views of the appeal site from the southern approach along Southbrook Road. It would not, however, redress the harm caused to the character and scenic beauty of the landscape by the domestication of this part of it. Overall, I consider that the proposed Landscape Mitigation Strategy would not appreciably reduce the adverse impact of the development. ... The development not only fails to conserve and enhance the landscape and scenic beauty of the National Park, but further, causes significant harm to the character and appearance of this secluded and pastoral area. It would continue to cause such harm even if the proposed Landscape Mitigation Strategy was implemented. The development conflicts with the NPPF and PPTS. ... There is no single overall assessment of the need for gypsy and traveller</p>

Reference/Procedure	Proposal	Continued
<p>pitches in the South Downs National Park. Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessments (GTAA's) have instead been prepared for six areas, each of which covers part of the National Park and land outside it: Brighton &amp; Hove, Coastal West Sussex, East Sussex, Hampshire, Horsham and Mid Sussex. ... The appeal site lies within the area covered by the Coastal West Sussex GTAA ("the GTAA 2013"), which identified a need for six pitches within this part of the National Park. The supporting text to Policy SD33 notes that, since the GTAA 2013 was published, 16 pitches have been provided in this part of the National Park, and two more are expected to become available through the movement of people to bricks and mortar accommodation. It is said that 12 more pitches have been provided than the identified need for the period to 2027/28. Based on the six GTAA's listed above, the SDLP indicates that there is a total need for 32 pitches within the National Park to 2027/28, but allocations will be made through the plan process for 13 such pitches. Thus, there is a remaining unmet need for 19 permanent traveller pitches as a whole within the South Downs National Park. Since the SDLP is not yet adopted it follows that no pitches have yet been allocated, let alone permitted for use as traveller sites. I also note that the Council provided no information on the extent of any need for pitches in those areas of Coastal West Sussex outside the National Park. ... I conclude, from the evidence before me that the appeal site is unlikely to fall within an area where no pitches are needed as the Council suggests. There is likely to be, as a minimum, an outstanding need for 32 pitches in the National Park to 2027/28. It is also probable that neither the SDNPA nor CDC has a supply of land to meet the needs of travellers for deliverable sites over the next five years. Adding weight to that finding, a letter from the Traveller Team Manager at West Sussex County Council dated 29 December 2017 confirms that, at that date, there were 71 families on the waiting list for a pitch on a public traveller site in West Sussex. ... If anything like 71 families were on this waiting list just under a year ago, that strikes me as fairly persuasive evidence of unmet need for pitches in and around the SDNP area.</p> <p>Availability - The Appellants contend that no suitable alternative sites are available in the area. ... The Council argues that the Appellants ought to have conducted a search of planning permissions for sites, or contacted owners of unoccupied land which is subject to a planning application or an extant permission for traveller use. However, there is no requirement for an applicant to prove that no other sites are available or that particular needs could not be met from another site. ... Moreover, the Council did not put forward any evidence itself that such sites might actually exist. It did not identify any alternative sites which might be available to, and suitable for, the Appellants. ... It was suggested in the delegated officer's report on the application that is now the subject of Appeal C that the Appellants would be willing to live in a bricks-and-mortar dwelling, which would clearly broaden the choice of available homes. At the Hearing, the Authority clarified that Ms Weale had indicated that she and Mr Watson would have had first refusal for the thatched dwelling on the site proposed by the previous owner (see paragraph 3 above). However, at the Hearing Mr Watson made it very clear that he did not, and could not, contemplate occupying a dwellinghouse as opposed to a caravan. ... I accept that it would not be suitable for Mr Watson. The overarching aim of the PPTS is to ensure fair and equal treatment for travellers, in a way which facilitates their traditional and nomadic way of life. In the absence of any conflicting evidence from the Council, I consider the evidence provided by the Appellants sufficient to establish that on the balance of probabilities, there are currently no other suitable alternative sites available to them in the area. This reinforces my view that there is likely to be a general need for pitches in this area.</p> <p>Provision - Draft SDLP Policy SD33 seeks to safeguard permanent lawful sites, establish the need for new sites, and set the criteria</p>		

Reference/Procedure	Proposal	Continued
<p>against which applications will be considered. However, it is important to bear in mind that Policy SD33, and the evidence on which it is based, have yet to be examined as part of the SDLP process. Since there is evidence that there are unresolved objections to this emerging policy, it carries limited weight as a means for the Authority to address its need for sites. As indicated above, since the SDLP is not yet adopted, it is not certain that the authority will be able to allocate land for 13 pitches as proposed in Policy SD33. Even if that were to prove possible, the supporting text acknowledges that the SDNPA could not identify land for the remaining 19 pitches said to be required, because very few sites were put forward by land owners or other interested parties for consideration, and the SDNPA does not itself own any land on which sites might be provided. ... It follows that the SDNPA might have an even greater problem identifying sufficient sites if it is found, in the plan process, that the need for pitches has been underestimated. ... I conclude that there is likely to be an outstanding need for gypsy and traveller pitches within both the SDNP and Chichester areas. There are no suitable alternative sites available to the Appellants, and the existing shortfall in provision is unlikely to be addressed through planning policy in the near future. My findings in relation to the need for, availability of, and provision of pitches together carry significant weight in favour of permitting the appeal development. The Personal Circumstances of the Appellants and their Family - The Appellants have separated and Ms Weale did not attend the Hearing. ... I do not dispute Mr Watson's evidence that she left the site due to anxiety and uncertainty. I cannot speculate as to whether or not Ms Weale would ever return to the appeal site, but Mr Watson stated it to be his dearest wish, and I note that she did not withdraw Appeal B or move very far away. The Appellants have three children between them: K1 and H, who are of primary school age, and K2, who was born in 2017. I am not clear as to whether both Appellants are the birth parents for all three children, but that is the case for K2; in any event it is reasonably certain that all three children are siblings or half-siblings, and have previously lived together with the Appellants as a family. K1 and K2 live with Ms Weale, and K1 attends a school near to their current accommodation. Mr Watson expressed concern as to the quality of that accommodation. ... However, it could not be a decisive consideration because there is no objective evidence that Ms Weale's current home is of a poor standard, or that she herself considers it unsatisfactory for K1 or K2. Mr Watson lives in the mobile home at the appeal site, which is his only home. He has custody of H, who attends a primary school nearby (although not the most local primary school, which is in West Ashling) and lives with Mr Watson for most of the week. ... None of the children have any particular problems with their health. If the appeals were dismissed, Mr Watson would be made homeless, and so would follow a roadside existence. It would also adversely affect such chance as he may have of persuading Ms Weale to resume their relationship and live with him and their children as a family. He would have no realistic prospect, at least in the short term, of finding another site where he could live with Ms Weale, and K1 and H could stay at their current schools, or where he would be close enough to Ms Weale's house to at least have regular contact with K1 and K2. Refusing permission would also mean that H would lose the settled base where he lives with his father. ... It is not clear whether or not dismissing the appeals would necessarily make H homeless, but if it did, that would plainly be highly damaging to the health, wellbeing and continued education of a small child. I have no doubt that Mr Watson would make every effort to ensure H's schooling was not interrupted and general welfare did not suffer, but an inevitable consequence of having no fixed address is that education and health services become much harder to access. ... I conclude that the personal circumstances of the Appellants and their children carry considerable weight in favour of allowing the appeals.</p>		

Reference/Procedure	Proposal	Continued
	<p>Living Conditions and Community Cohesion - ... It seems to me that any tension between the appellants and neighbouring occupiers is due in large part to the fact that the development that has taken place is currently unauthorised. Travelling and settled residents are more likely to co-exist peacefully when traveller sites have the benefit of planning permission. ... I conclude that permitting the development would be unlikely to cause any harm to the living conditions of nearby occupiers, or to community cohesion.</p> <p>Accessibility - The appeal development is sufficiently close to West Ashling that there is no conflict with paragraph 25 of the PPTS. ... The settlement is poorly served by public transport, and has only a limited range of facilities: there is a primary school and a village hall, but no shops. It is likely, then, that occupiers of the appeal site would be reliant on the use of a private car to access facilities and services such as shops and healthcare, which conflicts with national planning policy to promote sustainable transport. However, the NPPF also recognises that opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas. ... I conclude that the lack of accessibility via sustainable modes of transport is a consideration which, in these circumstances, does not carry any appreciable weight against permitting the development.</p> <p>Intentional Unauthorised Development - ... In this particular case, the development at issue was undertaken without planning permission first having been obtained, and it therefore amounts to intentional unauthorised development. ... In the light of my findings above about the need for pitches in the area and the lack of any available alternatives for the Appellants, it seems to me that it would be unfair to place the blame for enforcement action solely upon them. The failure of local policy to make sufficient provision, in accordance with national policy, for gypsy and traveller sites has clearly played a significant role. In my judgment, the consideration that the residential use of the appeal site amounts to intentional unauthorised development does not, in these particular circumstances, carry any appreciable weight against a subsequent grant of permission for that use.</p> <p>The Overall Planning Balance - ... I have also found that there is likely to be an outstanding need for, and no five year supply of land for, traveller sites. There are no alternative available sites, and no immediate prospect of land being provided through the planning process to remedy these problems. The personal circumstances of the Appellants and their children carry considerable weight in favour of allowing the appeals. However, taking all of the relevant material considerations into account, I consider that they do not outweigh the great weight that attaches to the harm that would be caused to this part of the National Park by granting permanent planning permission. ... The Council suggested at the Hearing, without prejudice, that any such permission should be granted for a maximum of two years. The Appellants' agent suggested a period of five years. ... It is clear that the planning policy context is likely to change during the next few years. ... While two years would not in my judgment provide sufficient time for the new policies to bed in and sites to come forward, there is at least a reasonable prospect that suitable alternative accommodation for the Appellants and their family will become available within the next five years. Granting a temporary permission for a period of five years would also provide the appellants with a settled base, at least for the immediate future, and the opportunity to try to live together as a family again; it is likely that by the end of that period all three children would be in school, and whether together or apart, the family would have more settled relationships. The harm that the development would be causing to the National Park throughout a five year period remains a concern, but would be of lesser extent than the harm caused by a grant of permanent permission, since it would eventually cease. ... On balance, I find that the considerations in favour of granting temporary permission for a period of five years are sufficient to outweigh</p>	

Reference/Procedure	Proposal	Continued
<p>the harm that would be caused to the National Park. Since personal circumstances are a critical consideration in this balance, it follows that permission should be granted subject to a “personal” condition, restricting occupancy of the site to the Appellants and their resident dependents. I have considered the rights of the Appellants under the Human Rights Act 1998 (HRA). ... This is a qualified right, and interference with it may be justified where in the public interest. The concept of proportionality is crucial. ... Given the circumstances overall, I find that a grant of personal permission limited to a period of five years would be proportionate and necessary. ... For the reasons set out above, and with regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that Appeals A and B should succeed on ground (a); the deemed planning applications should be approved; and Appeal C should be allowed. ... “</p>		
<p><a href="#">SDNP/17/01554/FUL</a> Fittleworth Parish Council  Case Officer: Jenna Shore  <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><b>Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED</b></p>		
<p>“ ... A significant number of dwellings have on-plot parking to the front, but the visual impact of the hard surfacing is softened by trees and roadside hedging ....giving the street a distinctive semi-rural character. ... The appeal site ..... would be broadly commensurate with other residential plots in this part of the Conservation Area. ... The gaps to the side boundaries would be sufficient to ensure that the new dwelling does not appear unduly cramped ..... Notwithstanding this, the position of the dwelling within the plot would give rise to a constrained form of tandem development. The tight relationship between the two properties would be at odds with the pattern of development and prevailing sense of space in the locality. For this reason, the scheme would fail to preserve the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The area to the front of the dwelling would be taken up by vehicle parking and therefore the amenity space would be to the rear of the property. ... Nonetheless, at approximately 4.5 m in depth the garden would be too shallow to constitute a useable outdoor space for a 3-bed family sized dwelling. Moreover, the property and its garden would be directly overlooked from first floor windows in Withies Cottage, leading to poor levels of privacy. .... the dwelling would be a dominant feature for the occupiers of the existing property and it would give rise to a significant loss of outlook. There would also be a material reduction in privacy resulting from first floor bedroom windows in the new property overlooking Withies Cottage. The proposal would fail to maintain a high standard of amenity for existing occupiers ..... For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.”</p>		

### 3. CURRENT APPEALS

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p><a href="#">SDNP/17/03475/HOUS</a> Bury Parish Council</p> <p>Case Officer: Beverley Stubbington</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="#">SDNP/17/06029/TPO</a> Rogate Parish Council</p> <p>Case Officer: Henry Whitby</p> <p><b>Householder Appeal</b></p>	<p>White Rose Group London Road Rogate GU33 7NX - Fell 1 no. Oak tree (T1) subject to RG/83/00853/TPO.</p>
<p><a href="#">SDNP/17/06433/HOUS</a> Duncton Parish Council Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Jenna Shore</p> <p><b>Householder Appeal</b></p>	<p>Willow Cottage High Street Duncton GU28 0LB - Single storey side and rear extensions, garden room and change of use of barn to habitable space.</p>
<p><a href="#">SDNP/17/05928/FUL</a> Fernhurst Parish Council</p> <p>Case Officer: Rafa Grosso Macpherson</p> <p><b>Written Representation</b></p>	<p>Home Farm Bell Road Kingsley Green Fernhurst GU27 3LG - Installation of new vehicular access to agricultural field and five bar gate.</p>
<p><a href="#">SDNP/18/00843/FUL</a> Midhurst Town Council</p> <p>Case Officer: Charlotte Cranmer</p> <p><b>Written Representation</b></p>	<p>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>

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p data-bbox="137 230 485 300"><a href="#">SDNP/18/01704/FUL</a> Tillington Parish Council</p> <p data-bbox="137 331 405 400">Case Officer: Charlotte Cranmer</p> <p data-bbox="137 427 493 456"><b>Written Representation</b></p>	<p data-bbox="571 230 1410 371">Buildings West of The Manor of Dean Dean Lane Tillington West Sussex - Change of use of a agricultural building and the demolition and erection of another, to create a one bedroom holiday let.</p>
<p data-bbox="137 553 504 622"><a href="#">SDNP/17/06109/HOUS</a> Lodsworth Parish Council</p> <p data-bbox="137 654 517 683">Case Officer: Jenna Shore</p> <p data-bbox="137 745 451 775"><b>Householder Appeal</b></p>	<p data-bbox="571 553 1423 622">1 Gibbs Cottages Surrey Road Lickfold Lurgashall GU28 9DX - Two storey rear extension and associated alterations.</p>
<p data-bbox="137 844 474 913"><a href="#">SDNP/18/03645/HOUS</a> Milland Parish Council</p> <p data-bbox="137 978 429 1048">Case Officer: Rafa Grosso Macpherson</p> <p data-bbox="137 1075 451 1104"><b>Householder Appeal</b></p>	<p data-bbox="571 844 1398 949">14 Mill Vale Meadows Milland GU30 7LZ - Rear extension to main dwelling, change of loft space to habitable accommodation and garage extension.</p>
<p data-bbox="137 1167 474 1236"><a href="#">SDNP/18/03262/HOUS</a> Petworth Town Council</p> <p data-bbox="137 1267 507 1296">Case Officer: Louise Kent</p> <p data-bbox="137 1359 451 1388"><b>Householder Appeal</b></p>	<p data-bbox="571 1167 1339 1236">Wickers Glasshouse Lane Kirdford GU28 9PA - Replacement single storey and two storey extensions.</p>
<p data-bbox="137 1449 529 1518"><a href="#">SDNP/18/01998/HOUS</a> Easebourne Parish Council</p> <p data-bbox="137 1550 429 1619">Case Officer: Rafa Grosso Macpherson</p> <p data-bbox="137 1646 451 1675"><b>Householder Appeal</b></p>	<p data-bbox="571 1449 1362 1554">Burnel Dodsley Lane Easebourne GU29 9AS - Retrospective permission for the erection of a boundary fence and outbuilding</p>

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p><u>SDNP/16/00496/OPDEV</u> Funtington Parish Council Case Officer: Shona Archer</p> <p><b>Informal Hearing</b></p>	<p>Land South of Braefoot Southbrook Road West Ashling West Sussex - Appeal against insertion of a cesspit and engineering works.</p>
<p>SDNP/16/00069/COU Upwaltham Parish Council Case Officer: Shona Archer</p> <p><b>Public Inquiry</b></p>	<p>The Mill Eartham Lane Eartham Chichester West Sussex PO18 0NA - Appeal against issue of Enforcement Notice</p>
<p><u>SDNP/15/00492/COU</u> Rogate Parish Council Case Officer: Steven Pattie</p> <p><b>Public Inquiry</b></p>	<p>Laundry Cottage Dangstein Dangstein Road Rogate Petersfield West Sussex GU31 5BZ - Appeal against</p>
<p><u>SDNP/16/00676/COU</u> Funtington Parish Council Officer: Reg Hawks</p> <p><b>Written Representation</b></p>	<p>New Barn Farm Common Road Funtington West Sussex PO18 9DA - Appeal against storage unit</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

#### 7. POLICY MATTERS