

Chichester District Council

Planning Committee

Thursday 06 June 2019

Report of the Director Of Planning and Environment Services

**Schedule of Planning Appeals, Court and Policy Matters
Between 04-Apr-2019 and 16-May-2019**

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 (Lodged)

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<u>17/00371/CONCOM</u> Donnington Parish Case Officer: Tara Lang Informal Hearing	Donnington Manor Farm Selsey Road Donnington Chichester West Sussex PO20 7PL - Appeal against D/9
<u>18/03126/FUL</u> Donnington Parish Case Officer: Robert Sims Written Representation	Louene 34 Birdham Road Donnington PO19 8TD - 1 no. dwelling and associated work.
<u>18/03255/FUL</u> Selsey Parish Case Officer: James Gellini Written Representation	Land Adjacent To 71 West Street Selsey Chichester West Sussex PO20 9AG - Erection of 1 no. 2 bed bungalow - resubmission of SY/18 02197/FUL.

<p>19/00084/TPA Sidlesham Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Henry Whitby</p> <p>Informal Hearing</p>	<p>35 Chalk Lane Sidlesham Chichester West Sussex PO20 7LW - Fell 1 no. Black Poplar tree (T3). Reduce crown widths/spreads to 5m and heights down to 15m, sever ivy and remove deadwood on 2 no. Black Poplar trees (T4 and T5) and 1 no. Black Poplar tree (quoted as T1 - northern tree, within Group, G3). All 4 no. trees are subject to SI/86/00938/TPO.</p>
<p>18/03121/DOC West Wittering Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Calum Thomas</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Rife Cottage Piggery Hall Lane West Wittering Chichester West Sussex PO20 8PZ - Discharge of condition 3 from planning permission WW/17/02506/DOM - schedule of materials.</p>
<p>18/02003/FUL Westhampnett Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Daniel Power</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Greytiles Claypit Lane Westhampnett PO18 0NU - Demolition of existing garage, construction of additional dwelling and associated works, subdividing plot.</p>

2. DECISIONS MADE

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p>18/03317/DOM Bosham Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Oliver Naish</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>The Old Town Hall Bosham Lane Bosham PO18 8HY - Proposed outdoor swimming pool.</p>
<p>Appeal Decision: APPEAL - NO FURTHER ACTION</p>	
<p>... Thank you for your Householder (HAS) Appeal received on 11 May 2019. Appeals and all of the essential supporting documentation must reach us within 12 weeks of the date of the local planning authority's notice of the decision. As we received this appeal(s) after the time limit, we are unable to take any action on it. I am sending a copy of this letter to the local planning authority. ...</p>	
<p>18/02423/DOM Chichester Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: William Price</p> <p>Householder Appeal</p>	<p>19 Cleveland Road Chichester PO19 7AF - Proposed alterations to the size and materials of existing rear dormer.</p>
<p>Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED</p>	
<p>... I am concerned that the proposed extension to the dormer would only add to this anomaly. The dormer would dominate the roof in an awkward and disproportionate way. Regrettably the overly large dormer would be ungainly, incongruous, and create a 'top heavy' dwelling seen in the context of the fenestration below and the building as a whole. ... I appreciate that there would only be views of the planned work available from private gardens. However an absence of viewing from the public realm does not negate the need to achieve a suitable good quality design approach to extending a home especially within a Conservation Area. ... The appeal proposal which I shall not allow would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset however what public benefits there would not outweigh this harm. Furthermore there are no other benefits, including to the Appellant, which to my mind would be of a scale to outweigh the harm to the Conservation Area. ...</p>	

<p>17/03152/FUL East Wittering And Bracklesham Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Maria Tomlinson</p> <p>Informal Hearing</p>	<p>Land North Of Hawthorns And The Willows Bracklesham Lane Bracklesham Bay West Sussex - Use of land for the stationing of caravans for the residential purposes for 1 no. gypsy pitches together with the formation of additional hard standing and utility/ dayroom ancillary to that use as well as the retention of an existing stable block (variation of condition 1 of EWB/09/07501/FUL, APP/L3815/A/10/2127404 - amendments to plans, larger dayroom).</p>
---	---

Appeal Decision: APPEAL ALLOWED

... Whilst the alternative utility/dayroom proposed would be larger in overall size to that of the original utility/dayroom approved, the increase in height and bulk of the building would be modest. Changes to windows, door openings and the introduction of a canopy over the entrance would not significantly alter the appearance of the building. I therefore consider the proposal would not substantially alter the size and/or nature of the development at the site and, as such, I conclude that the proposal would represent a minor material amendment to the original scheme. Accordingly, I conclude that the previously approved plans can be varied by the procedure set out under Section 73 of the Act. In reaching this conclusion I have had regard to the Government's Planning Policy Guidance (the PPG) and case law. ... the proposed development would result in very limited harm to the character and appearance of the rural area. ... I do not consider the overall enlarged size of the utility/dayroom and its appearance would manifest itself as a significantly more noticeable or conspicuous building in the context of this existing site. Consequently, I do not consider harm would arise to the character and appearance of the rural area. Thus, there would be no significant conflict with Policies 45 and 48 of the Local Plan that seek, amongst other matters, to protect the rural character of the area. ... In exercising my function on behalf of a public authority I am aware of my duties under the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) contained in the Equality Act 2010 which sets out the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation, and to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it. In consciously thinking about the aims of the PSED I have had due regard to the appellant's traditional way of life and the personal circumstances of the wellbeing of Mr Brazil, his wife and family. I have also had regard to the best interest of the appellant's young children. The accessible and secure environment that the proposal would provide carries significant weight. ... I have found the larger utility/dayroom can be treated as a minor material amendment to the original planning permission and the impact of the development on the rural area to be acceptable. The development would therefore accord with Policies 1, 45 and 48 of the Local Plan as it would not harm the rural character of the area and, as such, would be in line with the Council's presumption in favour of sustainable development. ... The conclusion reached by the Council in refusal reason one, as I see it, was a matter of judgement and a decision the Council was entitled to make. This does not demonstrate a failure to understand its statutory position or the Act. The fact that I have arrived at a contrary view does not, of itself, show that the Council has behaved unreasonably in respect of this matter. Therefore, I cannot conclude that the hearing could have potentially been avoided as the Council was unlikely to reach an alternative conclusion in respect of refusal reason one. ... The appellant contends that the Council did not have regard to the utility/dayroom that has planning permission and did not undertake an assessment as to whether the building could be seen from any public viewpoint.

The Council's Statement of Case makes a comparison between the approved and proposed utility/dayroom and discusses where the site and building would be visible from. I am satisfied that the Council gave due consideration to these matters and, therefore, I do not agree with the appellant on this point. ... In looking at this proposal in the context of a Section 70 application, it has been suggested that this has clouded the Council's approach to its character assessment. The Council's Statement of Case undertakes an assessment of the impact of the proposed development upon the character of the area. To my mind this shows that the Council considered it prudent to undertake such an assessment irrespective of which section of the Act it considers should be applied. It does not appear to me that the Council's consideration of this matter is in any way marred by its conclusions within refusal reason one. Again, I do not agree with the appellant on this point. ... The appellant also claims that the Council has failed to consider whether the tilted balance has been engaged and considers that the Council should look to the National Planning Policy Framework to assess whether its development plan policies are absent or silent. The Council comments that it is required to approve development in accordance with an up-to-date development plan and considers its development plan to be up-to-date. As I see it both parties have made their own judgements as to whether the tilted balance has been engaged and again this is a judgement that the parties are individually entitled to make. ... In considering the points made by both parties, it appears to me, that the refusal reasons given by the Council were reached as a result of the Council having given due consideration of the Act and Government guidance. ...

<p>18/01618/FUL East Wittering And Bracklesham Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Maria Tomlinson</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Neska Longlands Road East Wittering PO20 8DD - Proposed dwelling.</p>
<p>Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED</p>	
<p>... From the back garden, and from the rear facing opening which serves living space in the part of Miggles closest to the boundary, the site currently provides a substantially open outlook. This balances the appreciably more congested arrangement of built form to the south, and further along the Longlands Road frontage, where infilling has occurred previously. ... The proposed dwelling would be moderately set back from the boundary with Miggles, and would feature a low eaves line across much of the its rear elevation. The ridge height would however be much greater than that of adjacent parts of Miggles, and the building itself would occupy a substantial proportion of its plot width parallel to the boundary. It would as such have a significant physical and visual presence viewed both relative to adjacent back garden space to the rear of Miggles, and to Miggles itself. This would be further accentuated within the proposed design by the prominent rear facing gable, and would not be relieved by the slope of the main roof away from the boundary, given that the roof would remain a substantial and bulky feature. The resulting enclosure of the outlook along the boundary with Miggles, together with the overbearing scale of the proposed dwelling relative to adjacent space and built form, would be oppressive in its effect. This would significantly diminish the quality of outdoor amenity space at Miggles, and would also adversely impact upon the quality of outlook from internal living space within the adjacent part of Miggles. In each case the living conditions of occupants would be harmed. ... I acknowledge that the current occupants of Miggles raise no objection to the proposed development. However this does not mean that the identified adverse effects would fail to arise, or that the effects would be acceptable. Furthermore it does not remove a need to consider the likely long-term duration of the effects, and thus their impact on future occupants. As such, given my reasons above, the lack of objection from current occupants does not alter my view of the acceptability of the proposed development. ... I have had regard to paragraph 127(f) of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which amongst other things states that planning decisions should ensure that developments create places which promote a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. In view of my reasons above the proposed development would conflict with this advice, further indicating that permission should be refused. ... The fact that the development would be located to the north of Miggles would mean that it would cast no shade. This would not however alter the existence or acceptability of its overbearing effects ... The development would complement Neska and the general streetscene within Longlands Road, whilst plot density would appear comparable with that of other infill sites within the area. This does not however alter the fact that the development would have an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of occupants at Miggles. ... My attention has been drawn to advice within the Framework which encourages the efficient use of land, indicates that great weight should be given to the development of windfall on suitable sites within settlements, and that substantial weight should be given to the value of using suitable brownfield land for homes.</p>	

However residential gardens within built-up areas fall outside the Framework's definition of brownfield land, and paragraph 122(e) of the Framework highlights the importance of securing well-designed, attractive and healthy places in the context of achieving efficiency. Taking into account the amenity objectives set out in paragraph 127(f) of the Framework, whether or not the site is itself judged to be generally suitable for windfall development, the design of the proposed development is unsuitable within its context. My consideration of the planning merits of the appeal scheme has not therefore been altered. ... Whilst the site may be located within an area identified within the LP as suitable for housing, this again has no particular bearing on the acceptability of the proposed development with regard to the living conditions, as considered above. ...

[18/02184/DOM](#)

Fishbourne Parish

Case Officer: Vicki Baker

Householder Appeal

Tambelup 127 Salthill Road Fishbourne PO19 3PZ -
Extension to existing property to create attached double garage

Appeal Decision: APPEAL ALLOWED

... I did note that whilst properties are set back there are no rigid building lines locally and in many ways this variety beyond the main front sizeable gardens adds to the local aesthetic. A matching projection of the scale proposed with its relatively subtle roof and sited a considerable distance from the highway would not be jarring on the eye. The pitched element of the roof would neatly integrate with the existing ground floor mono-pitch and there would be cohesion on the front elevation. ... Seen against the backdrop of the main property this addition would be suitably subordinate in appearance and integrated with the principal structure. ...

[18/00706/FUL](#)

Loxwood Parish

Case Officer: Fjola Stevens

Written Representation

Loxwood Meadow Roundstreet Common Loxwood RH14 0AL - Extension to an existing barn of a toilet, shower and rest area for agricultural workers.

Appeal Decision: APPEAL ALLOWED

... The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for an extension to an existing barn of a toilet, shower and rest area for agricultural workers ... The main issues are whether the proposal is justified in this location and its effect on the character and appearance of the area. ... Whilst noting the Council's concern about the use of the appeal site, it seems from my observations and from the evidence before me that the site is in agricultural use. ... There are no existing facilities on site for those working on the land, other than a tap in the corner of the field. On site presence may only be required at certain times of the year but the type of work is such that it is likely to require washing and cleaning facilities. ... The on-site facilities are to provide a specific function for the workers of the land, and in light of the above I am satisfied that the proposal is justified in this location. ... The new extension would be modest in size and would be a direct extension of the existing timber barn ... It would be of a design reflective of the existing barn and its rural location. The barn is set some distance back from the road beyond an area of woodland and is not visible from the wider area. ... I therefore find that the proposal would have a minimal impact on the landscape and rural character of the area. ...

<p>17/02726/OUT Plaistow And Ifold Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Claire Coles</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Foxbridge Golf Club Foxbridge Lane Plaistow RH14 0LB - Outline application for the demolition of the existing golf club house and commercial premises of KM Elite Products Ltd, and construction of 10 no. dwellings, together with vehicular access, replacement clubhouse, access and car park.</p>
<p>Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED</p>	
<p>... main issues therefore are (a) whether the appeal site would be suitable for housing having regard to its location and the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (b) the impact of the proposal on availability of employment land. ... It is in a location not ideally suited to new housing. The proposed housing does not require a countryside location ... proposal would nonetheless have an adverse effect on the undeveloped character of this part of the countryside ... Overall, on the basis of the evidence available to me, it would appear that the Council does have a five year housing land supply. The tilted balance in Paragraph 11 of the Framework would not therefore apply. ... The appellant has submitted a unilateral undertaking to use reasonable endeavours to procure a golf club tenant as soon as reasonably practicable following the grant of planning permission. However, this obligation would only apply for 12 months from the date of the permission. I am not persuaded that this would be long enough to procure a tenant given that obtaining approval of reserved matter following the grant of outline planning permission may take more than 12 months and there would be uncertainty on the overall nature of the golf enterprise. Furthermore, the unilateral undertaking and suggested planning conditions do not provide certainty that the new golf club house would definitely be provided as part of the development. ... whilst capital from the housing development could provide a short-term boost for the golf club, it has not been demonstrated that the investment would enable the club to remain a viable proposition given its relatively remote location from catchment areas and the prevailing economic climate that has led to its recent unprofitability. ... The unilateral undertaking proposes to use reasonable endeavours to procure a village shop tenant for a 12 month period from commencement of any dwelling unit at the appeal site. A rent free period of 4 years would be offered to a new tenant to help in the establishment of the new business ... there is no certainty that the proposal would lead to the opening of the village store if a tenant could not be found within 12 months or that the business would thrive if a tenant is found. ... the benefits arising from additional housing and the potential benefits in relation to investment for the golf course and the reopening of the village shop in Ifold would be outweighed by the unsuitable location for the housing and the harm resulting on the character and appearance of this rural area. The proposal would result in a block of housing remote from the nearest settlement and only partly built on brownfield land. Occupiers would be heavily reliant on private cars as the site would not be close to public transport and there are no footways along Foxbridge Lane. It would not amount to sustainable development and would not accord with the development strategy for additional housing set out in the CLP. The proposal would thereby be contrary to Policies 1, 2 and 45 of the CLP. There are no material considerations that lead me to a decision other than in accordance with the development plan. ... from the information available, it seems unlikely that an independent alternative employment use is likely to arise or that the loss of the barn to employment use would significantly impact on the availability of premises of similar size in the district. As such there would not be substantive conflict with the requirements of Policy 26.</p>	

The housing element in the proposal would have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the countryside and would not be a sustainable form of development in relation to its location some distance beyond the nearest settlement boundary. The benefits offered in relation to the golf club and the reopening of a village store in Ifold do not outweigh this harm and there remains uncertainty that these benefits would be delivered. For the reasons given and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

[18/00346/LBC](#)

Selsey Parish

Case Officer: Claire Coles

Written Representation

Fern Cottage 4 Albion Road Selsey Chichester West Sussex PO20 0DH - Replacement rear first floor window and side door and french doors.

Appeal Decision: APPEAL ALLOWED

... The extension has affected the original form and shape of the listed building and its originally approved fenestration was double glazed and did not reflect the sash windows of the original property. ... The introduction of UPVc elements into the more recent extension replaces features which were not of historic or architectural interest and which did not add to or contribute to the significance of the listed building. The doubleglazed aspect of the units replaced what was previously approved and the bulky form identified by the Council would result from the design to incorporate such units. Whilst the UPVc material may add to this and introduce an alien element, in the context of the overall extension the effect would be extremely limited. None of the new UPVc elements would be viewed in the same view as the remaining undisturbed elements of the original building and would have little if any effect on the appreciation and understanding of those matters that contribute to the significance of the listed building. ... the works the subject of this appeal would preserve the Grade II listed building known as Gull Cottages, 4 Albion Road (listed as Fern Cottage, 4 Albion Road) ... Even if I had concluded that there was harm I would categorise this harm at the very lowest level of less than substantial harm. This harm would be outweighed by the positive benefits of replacing the previously poor condition and damaged elements such that would assist in securing and maintaining the listed building, which is a public benefit. ...

<p>18/02821/DOM Selsey Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Summer Sharpe</p> <p>Householder Appeal</p>	<p>78 Kingsway Selsey Chichester West Sussex PO20 0SY - Replace existing front bedroom window with new french doors and side windows forming external balcony.</p>
<p>Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED</p>	
<p>... The main issues are (i) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene, and (ii) the effect on the living conditions for the occupiers of No. 76 as regards privacy. ... the appeal dwelling forms one half of a pair of semi-detached dwellings in a group of other pairs of the same design. ... From a combination of driving and walking along Kingsway, it appeared to me that between No. 64 adjoining Ruskin Close and No. 90 just one dwelling away from Fraser Close, there is a uniformity to the street scene in the form of pairs of semi-detached houses of the same original design. If I were to allow this appeal the proposed changes would noticeably and harmfully disturb the symmetry of the pairs and rhythm of development in the road. Moreover, it would also be difficult for the Council in all fairness to resist similar applications to houses in this cluster In Kingsway. ...</p>	

<p>18/00201/FUL Southbourne Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Claire Coles</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>306 Main Road Southbourne PO10 8JN - Demolition of the existing building and construction of five homes with associated parking, access and landscaping.</p>
<p>Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED</p>	
<p>... The resultant effect is that the roofs are a more dominant feature of the design and somewhat alien in the context of the adjacent residential properties. Whilst the roof forms are pitched with ridges running parallel to the road the lower eaves and higher ridge results in a greater and more dominant expanse of roof which is further accentuated by the introduction of the gable features this would appear at odds with the simple proportions of the adjoining buildings. ... The height scale and form of the roof with a high ridge, low eaves and raised flank eaves is particularly incongruous in the street scene. ... The property would be significantly taller than the bungalows at this end of the street and be in a highly prominent and visually sensitive location at the eastern termination of the east west section of the street. It pays little regard to the general pattern and form of properties in the street and its orientation adds to the alien appearance that it would introduce. ... The overall lack of separation between the buildings within the development, proximity to the property boundaries and the surrounding properties is a function of the lack of space within the site and the excessive level of development that is proposed. This creates a cramped appearance as well as issues in respect of living conditions ... proposed development would result in material harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. ... The proposed amenity space would be dominated by the adjoining building and given its narrow dimension and location between the adjoining building and proposed car parking for the proposed development would not provide for a particularly pleasant environment even if screened to some extent by fencing. Overall the living conditions provided for the future residents of this property would be poor. ... proposed development would not provide for satisfactory living conditions for future occupants of the development with reference to privacy and amenity space. ... The positioning, height and scale of the proposed bungalow would substantially reduce any amenity afforded by this window to the occupants of that property and would be harmful to their living conditions ... proposed development would result in material harm to the living conditions of the occupants of properties in the surrounding area. ... The proposal would result in the loss of a premises the last use of which was for retail. ... As matters stand the proposal would remove the premises from retail use and would therefore reduce shopping facilities that exist in the settlement today. There has been no evidence or demonstration of the viability of a retail use and therefore the proposal would conflict with the policies in the development plan. ...</p>	

<p>18/00945/DOM West Wittering Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: James Gellini</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Merston Cottage Chichester Road West Wittering PO20 8QF - Change of use of the garage and workshop into a 2 bedroom annexe.</p>
<p>Appeal Decision: APPEAL ALLOWED</p>	
<p>... The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for change of use of the garage and workshop into a 2 bedroom annexe ... The main issue is whether the site is a suitable location for residential development with particular regard to whether the proposal would amount to the creation of a separate dwelling, and its effect on the character and appearance of the area, including the landscape and scenic beauty of the Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (the AONB) ... the Council's main concern, which arises from its view that the development would amount to the creation of a separate dwelling, is the impact this would have on the rural character of the area. ... the annexe would be located very close to Merston Cottage, would be accessed off the same driveway as at present, would be clearly subservient in terms of both its physical scale and the scale of accommodation contained, and would share utilities. Therefore, notwithstanding the fact that it would be generously sized, and irrespective of where the external doors would be positioned, there is no particular reason to consider that the proposed annexe would fail to credibly function as an annexe. ... The ancillary nature of the approved use could be further clarified by imposition of a suitably worded condition which could be reasonably enforced ... whether or not plot severance would be practical or desirable in practice, and despite the fact that the accommodation would be 'self-contained', any subsequent material change in the approved use of the building would require planning permission ... irrespective of what the combined floor area of the barn and proposed annexe would be, they have the capacity to serve differing ancillary functions ... Whilst I acknowledge the Inspector's findings, these do not alter my view ... The Council's officer report screened out any likely significant effects on the integrity of the SPA which might arise from recreational disturbance. This was on the basis that the annexe would not constitute a new self-contained residential unit. This however contradicted the Council's broader finding that a separate dwelling would be formed. ... I have lastly imposed a condition restricting occupation solely for purposes ancillary to Merston Cottage in order to clarify the nature of approved use. ...</p>	

<p>17/03428/FUL Westbourne Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Caitlin Boddy</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Land North Of The Grange Woodmancote Lane Woodmancote Emsworth West Sussex - Construction of 1 no. agricultural barn, 1 no. poly tunnel and 2 no. fish tanks.</p>
<p>Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED</p>	
<p>... The appeal is dismissed. ... I am of the opinion that the proposed development would be for agricultural purposes, which the appellant states would be to derive a profit and to diversify operations. ... views from this path is a factor in assessing the visual impact. ... the structures would be at least partially visible from some distant views due to them being set towards the top of this sloping field. I am not convinced that further planting would be effective in reducing the prominence of the proposed development, particularly the larger storage barn. ... Regarding the polytunnel, this is of a size that would not have a significant visual impact within this rural setting. ... However, the proposed barn would be approximately 23m in length and 6.4m wide, and approximately 4m to the ridge. Whilst the barn would have a rural/agricultural appearance, with sustainable timber to be used, it would be a large and prominent structure within the rural landscape, even if it would cover a small proportion of the overall site. Its prominence would be more pronounced as the barn would not visually relate to any existing farmstead or other similar building complex. ... this is a relatively small agricultural site, being a single field, which does not currently have much in the way of agricultural activity taking place. ... based on the evidence submitted (including the lists of items that could be stored), there is insufficient justification before me for the barn of the size proposed. ... there is not the substantive evidence to explain why there needs to be a barn of the size proposed, commensurate with the agricultural need as explained by the appellant. ... the proposal would not accord with Policy 45 of the Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029, as this requires agricultural buildings to have a minimal impact to the landscape and rural character of the area. ... due to the harm to the character and appearance of the area the appeal should be dismissed. ...</p>	

3. CURRENT APPEALS

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p><u>17/00061/CONENG</u> Birdham Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Emma Kierans</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Land North Of Cowdry Nursery Sidlesham Lane Birdham West Sussex - Appeal against BI/40</p>
<p><u>18/01983/FUL</u> Birdham Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Caitlin Boddy</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Yendor Farm Hundredsteddle Lane Birdham PO20 7BL - Demolition of buildings and replacement with 4no. mobile holiday homes.</p>
<p><u>19/00196/FUL</u> Bosham Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Caitlin Boddy</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>By-The-Brook Bosham Lane Bosham PO18 8HG - Demolish 1 no. existing dwelling and erect 2 no. 2 bed dwellings and 1 no. 3 bed dwelling.</p>
<p><u>15/00018/CONBC</u> Chichester Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Shona Archer</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Wildwood 30 Southgate Chichester West Sussex PO19 1DP - Appeal against CC/143</p>
<p>* <u>18/00798/FUL</u> Chichester Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Maria Tomlinson</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>28 Melbourne Road Chichester PO19 7ND - Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 2 no. dwellings.</p>

<p>18/02459/FUL Chichester Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: James Gellini</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>26 The Pitcroft Chichester PO19 6XB - Two storey side extension onto existing property to form 2 bedroom dwelling onto side of existing terrace property.</p>
<p>* 18/02818/FUL Chichester Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: James Gellini</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>22 Peacock Close Chichester PO19 6YD - Change of use of a 6-bedroom house (Class C4) to a 7-bedroom House of Multiple Occupancy (Sui Generis) for a maximum of 7 professionals.</p>
<p>18/03046/DOM Chichester Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: William Price</p> <p>Householder Appeal</p>	<p>57 Westgate Chichester West Sussex PO19 3EZ - 3 no. replacement windows.</p>
<p>14/00292/CONBC Chidham & Hambrook Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Shona Archer</p> <p>Informal Hearing</p>	<p>Paddock View Drift Lane Bosham Chichester West Sussex PO18 8PR - Appeal against CH/55</p>
<p>17/00852/FUL Chidham & Hambrook Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Caitlin Boddy</p> <p>Informal Hearing</p>	<p>Paddock View Drift Lane Bosham Chichester PO18 8PR - Variation of condition 2 from planning permission CH/12/01036/FUL, appeal ref APP/L3815/A/12/2179869. To make the permission permanent.</p>

<p>18/01191/FUL Chidham & Hambrook Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Caitlin Boddy</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Little Oaks The Bridleway Newells Lane West Ashling Chichester West Sussex PO18 8DF - Continued stationing of a Gypsy/Traveller's mobile home.</p>
<p>18/02620/FUL Chidham & Hambrook Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Maria Tomlinson</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Building North Of 1 Chidham Lane Chidham PO18 8TL - Change of use from telephone exchange to holiday let, single storey front and rear extensions, 2 no. dormers with internal and external alterations.</p>
<p>17/00374/CONCOM Donnington Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Shona Archer</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Southend Farm Selsey Road Donnington Chichester West Sussex PO20 7PS - Appeal against D/8</p>
<p>* 17/03547/FUL East Wittering And Bracklesham Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Caitlin Boddy</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Land East Of 10 Downview Close East Wittering PO20 8NS - Construction of 1 no. 3 bedroom detached dwelling and 2 no. semi-detached, 3 bedroom dwellings.</p>
<p>18/02359/OUT East Wittering And Bracklesham Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: James Gellini</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Land North Of Anstey East Bracklesham Drive Bracklesham PO20 8JW - Construction of 1 no. 2 bedroom bungalow.</p>

<p>17/02563/DOM Fernhurst Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: James Gellini</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Stedlands Farm Bell Vale Lane Fernhurst GU27 3DJ - Proposed two storey rear extension.</p>
<p>17/02564/LBC Fernhurst Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: James Gellini</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Stedlands Farm Bell Vale Lane Fernhurst GU27 3DJ - Proposed two storey rear extension.</p>
<p>18/00402/FUL Funtington Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Caitlin Boddy</p> <p>Public Inquiry</p>	<p>Field West Of Beachlands Nursery Newells Lane West Ashling West Sussex - The use of land for the stationing of caravans for residential purposes, together with the formation of hardstanding and utility/dayrooms ancillary to that use.</p>
<p>18/01578/FUL Loxwood Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Robert Sims</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Land East Of Lady Lea House Brewhurst Lane Loxwood RH14 0RJ - Demolition of storage outbuilding and erection of detached three bedroom dwelling.</p>
<p>17/03521/FUL Plaistow And Ifold Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Caitlin Boddy</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Nell Ball Farm Dunsfold Road Plaistow RH14 0BF - Egg packing building, machinery store, sheep lairage, pig building, manure structure, farm shop/office/storage and processing buildings and associated parking and hard-standing.</p>

<p>17/02640/FUL Sidlesham Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Claire Coles</p> <p>Informal Hearing</p>	<p>Land At Junction Of Keynor Lane And Selsey Road Sidlesham West Sussex - Change of use of land from agricultural land for stationing of caravans for residential purposes by 3 no. gypsy-traveller families, with associated utility building, hard standing, widened gateway, landscaping and access.</p>
<p>18/01173/FUL Sidlesham Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Claire Coles</p> <p>Informal Hearing</p>	<p>Land South Of Recreation Grounds At Junction Of Keynor Lane Sidlesham West Sussex - Change of use of land from agricultural land for stationing of caravans for residential purposes by 3 gypsy-traveller families with facilitating development (utility buildings, hard standing, widened gateway, septic tank and landscaping).</p>
<p>18/01353/PA3Q Sidlesham Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Maria Tomlinson</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Butskiln Street End Road Sidlesham Chichester West Sussex PO20 7QD - Notification for Prior Approval for a Proposed Change of Use of Agricultural Building to 2 no. dwellinghouses (Class C3) and for associated development.</p>
<p>18/01581/FUL Sidlesham Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Maria Tomlinson</p> <p>Householder Appeal</p>	<p>Land North Of Swan Cottage Selsey Road Sidlesham West Sussex - Provision of new access and vehicle gates.</p>
<p>17/02735/FUL Southbourne Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: James Gellini</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Timber Cottage Lumley Road Southbourne PO10 8AF - Demolition of existing bungalow and double garage and erection of 2 no. 3 bed chalet bungalows.</p>

<p>18/00808/FUL Tangmere Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Steve Harris</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Land West Of Little Paddocks City Fields Way Tangmere West Sussex - Erection of 39 dwellings, open space, landscaping and access road.</p>
<p>18/03332/DOM West Wittering Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Maria Tomlinson</p> <p>Householder Appeal</p>	<p>33 Marine Drive West Wittering PO20 8HQ - Proposed loft conversion and two storey side extension and widening of existing drop kerb.</p>
<p>17/00403/CONENG Westbourne Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Shona Archer</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Land South West Of Racton View Marlpit Lane Hambrook Westbourne West Sussex - Appeal against erection of walls and gates over 1m in height adjacent to the highway. WE/46</p>
<p>17/02260/FUL Westhampnett Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: James Gellini</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Land South Of Madgwick Lane Westhampnett Chichester West Sussex - Temporary residency for 5 yrs provision of mobile home.</p>
<p>18/00539/LBC Westhampnett Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Maria Tomlinson</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>33 The Sadlers Westhampnett Chichester West Sussex PO18 0PR - Replacement front entrance door including 2 no. french windows and 2 no. lounge bay windows.</p>

<p>19/00084/TPA Sidlesham Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Henry Whitby</p> <p>Informal Hearing</p>	<p>35 Chalk Lane Sidlesham Chichester West Sussex PO20 7LW - Fell 1 no. Black Poplar tree (T3). Reduce crown widths/spreads to 5m and heights down to 15m, sever ivy and remove deadwood on 2 no. Black Poplar trees (T4 and T5) and 1 no. Black Poplar tree (quoted as T1 - northern tree, within Group, G3). All 4 no. trees are subject to SI/86/00938/TPO.</p>
---	--

4. VARIATIONS TO SECTION 106 AGREEMENTS

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