

# Chichester District Council Planning Committee

Wednesday 04 October 2023

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

### Appeals, Court and Policy Matters

between 16-08-2023 - 12-09-2023

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
<a href="#"><u>22/02654/COU</u></a>	
Selsey Parish Case Officer: Emma Kierans Written Representation	87 Hillfield Road Selsey West Sussex PO20 0LH  Change use of land to site a Burger van.
<a href="#"><u>22/02995/FUL</u></a>	
East Wittering And Bracklesham Parish Case Officer: Sascha Haigh Written Representation	Northside The Parade East Wittering Chichester West Sussex PO20 8BL  Redevelopment to provide 2 no. commercial units, 5 no. one bedroom flats and 2 no. two bedroom flats and 1 no. three bedroom flats above.
<a href="#"><u>22/03202/FUL</u></a>	
Chichester Parish Case Officer: Rebecca Perris Written Representation	2 The Gardens College Lane Chichester West Sussex PO19 6PF  Construction of building for student accommodation.

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<a href="#"><u>23/00978/FUL</u></a>	
<p><b>Sidlesham Parish</b>  <b>Case Officer: Calum Thomas</b>  <b>Written Representation</b></p>	<p>Land North East Of The Honey House Chalder Lane Sidlesham West Sussex</p> <p>Erection of 1 no. additional dwelling.</p>
<a href="#"><u>23/01114/FUL</u></a>	
<p><b>Selsey Parish</b>  <b>Case Officer: Calum Thomas</b>  <b>Written Representation</b></p>	<p>Cranleigh36 Park Lane Selsey Chichester West Sussex PO20 0HE</p> <p>Demolition of existing and erection of 1 no. replacement dwelling.</p>
<a href="#"><u>22/02871/FUL</u></a>	
<p><b>Selsey Parish</b>  <b>Case Officer: Sascha Haigh</b>  <b>Written Representation</b></p>	<p>107 East Beach Road Selsey Chichester West Sussex PO20 0EZ</p> <p>Demolition of existing 1 no. dwelling and replacement 1 no. new dwelling.</p>

## 2. DECISIONS MADE

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<a href="#">20/03320/OUTEIA</a>	
<p><b>Chidham &amp; Hambrook Parish</b>  <b>Case Officer: Jane Thatcher</b>  <b>Public Inquiry</b>  <b>24-Jul-2023</b>  <b>Emsworth Baptist Church</b>  <b>North Street Emsworth</b>  <b>PO10 7BY</b></p>	<p>Land East Of Broad RoadBroad RoadNutbourneWest Sussex</p> <p>Outline planning application (with all matters reserved except access) for up to 132 dwellings and provision of associated infrastructure.</p>
<p><b>Appeal Decision: APPEAL ALLOWED</b></p>	
<p>"... the LP is now more than 5 years old and so the local housing need falls to be considered against the Government's standard methodology. ... there is no dispute that the Council is unable to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites against the local housing need. The housing supply and distribution policies are therefore out-of-date and, regardless of whether the "basket" of most important policies for determining the application are also out-of-date, paragraph 11d) of the Framework applies by virtue of Footnote 8. ... Whilst the emerging plan is progressing it is still at a relatively early stage in the adoption process, which is anticipated to be mid-2024. At the moment there is no certainty that its provisions will not change, including the minimum of 300 dwellings to be allocated through a review of the NP for the service settlement. The emerging LP can only be given very limited weight. The housing policies in the development plan clearly do not address current housing needs and policy 2, which sets out the housing provision for the plan period is out-of-date. So too are the aforementioned housing policies 4, 5 and 45 in the LP and policy LP1 in the NP. In such circumstances, Policy 1 in the LP makes statutory provision by reflecting the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). In this case there are policies in the Framework relating to Habitats sites and an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty that are engaged. It is only if these are not offended that the "tilted balance" is engaged. ... . It should be said that the Council has sought a pro-active approach in seeking to address its housing shortfall through the publication of an Interim Position Statement for Housing (the IPS). ... In my opinion this is an important material consideration that should be afforded significant weight. ... I do not consider that the appeal proposals either individually or together would result in the coalescence of settlements. Any harm to the AONB through development in its setting would be relatively insignificant. The proposals would therefore not conflict with policy 43 in the LP or policy 2 in the Management Plan in this regard. The change to the landscape arising from the appeal developments would affect a relatively contained area of landscape between two infrastructure corridors, the village of Nutbourne East and the settled development along the A259 and Drift Lane. Nevertheless, there would be significant harm to the landscape resource even in the longer term in all scenarios. The visual envelope is very restricted, which means that the effects would be localised.</p>	

.. Overall, I conclude that the proposals would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and how people would experience it. The proposals would therefore conflict with policy 48 in the LP, policy EM3 in the NP. ... I conclude that there would be no adverse effect on ecology, including in relation to protected species, European sites or ecological connectivity. There would be a net gain to biodiversity and this would be significant. These conclusions relate to the appeal developments both individually and together. The proposed developments would therefore be in accordance with policies 49 and 50 in the LP and policies EM2 and EM3 in the NP in these respects and there would be no conflict with the Framework in this regard. ... I conclude that satisfactory provision can be made for the treatment of sewage arising from the proposed developments and that there would be no conflict with development plan policy or the Framework in this respect. ... The Council can therefore demonstrate a deliverable housing land supply of some 4.4 years, which amounts to a deficit of around 418 dwellings. ... Whilst Appeal A adjoins Nutbourne East, Appeal B is not contiguous with an identified settlement boundary and would not be so even if both developments were to be built, in my opinion. The Appellant refers to the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, which identifies the site as a whole with an indicative capacity of 300 dwellings. However, this is a technical exercise to inform the emerging LP and, in any event, the Appellant made clear the two sites are being promoted separately and not as a single identity. Criterion 5 includes a requirement for no adverse impact on landscape character and this would be contravened for the reasons I have given. I do not consider that the other criteria would be significantly breached either because they would not apply to the outline proposals or for the reasons I have given elsewhere in my reasoning. ... Both sites would be within walking and cycling distance of the village facilities, including the railway station. Trains stop hourly and provide services to Chichester, Southbourne and Emsworth with connections to London, Brighton, Portsmouth and Southampton. There are footways along Broad Road and the A259 and there are bus stops on that road close to the Broad Road and Drift Lane junctions. The 700 bus runs along this corridor and there is an hourly service between Portsmouth and Chichester and beyond. The No 56 service is infrequent but it provides a service to and from Bourne Community College. Both Section 106 Agreements would secure a financial contribution for real time information boards at the nearest east and west bound bus stops. The provision of such information would make bus travel a more attractive option for some people. ... It is of course accepted that many journeys would be undertaken by car as happens with the existing population. This is not a large urban area and it is unreasonable to expect that the new residents would be able to meet all their needs by public transport, cycling or on foot. The Framework itself points out that opportunities to maximise sustainable travel solutions will vary between urban and rural areas. In this case the sites are reasonably accessible and new occupiers would have the choice to undertake some journeys sustainably. ... The Parish Council raised concerns about the effect on the parking area along the eastern side of Broad Road, which is used by those living in Broad Meadow with no on-site parking. In order to provide the access and keep the required visibility splays clear it was estimated that there would be a loss of about 10 spaces. Whilst provision would be reduced there would still be off-site parking space along this side of the road. ... There was local criticism about the traffic modelling, including that the traffic flows along the A259 had been underestimated. It was pointed out that traffic diverts onto this route if the A27 is affected by accidents or closures, and I have no doubt that this is the case. However, the Framework makes it clear that development should only be prevented on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety or the cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

Existing commitments and future traffic growth have been taken into account and I have insufficient evidence to convince me that the high bar extolled in the Framework would be reached. West Sussex County Council is the statutory authority responsible for the safety of road users on the local highway network. There is no reason to surmise that it has exercised its duties other than in a responsible manner when assessing the highway impact that would arise from the proposed appeal developments. ... I am satisfied that the loss of high quality agricultural land in this case would be justified having regard to the social and economic benefits arising from the new housing. There is no evidence that the housing shortfall could be adequately addressed on lower quality agricultural land and so policy 48 would not be offended in this respect. For similar reasons there would be no conflict with the Framework in this regard. ... The appeal developments would deliver 132 dwellings in the case of Appeal A and 68 dwellings in the case of Appeal B. The Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites in accordance with the requirements of national policy. For the reasons I have given, I consider that it has a 4.4 year supply and therefore a deficit of 418 dwellings. The proposed developments are in outline form and there would need to be time for reserved matters to be approved and pre commencement conditions discharged. The Appellant is a housebuilder and from the evidence it seems likely that there would be at least two years of housebuilding towards the latter part of the housing trajectory. It is considered that each scheme would make a valuable contribution towards reducing the housing shortfall. I afford this benefit substantial weight. Chichester District has a very serious affordable housing need. The Council does not have a good record of affordable housing provision and so the position deteriorates year on year. The situation is compounded by the fact that house prices are very high, and many people cannot afford to enter the private housing market. Whether or not the Parish itself has a need for affordable homes, the District most certainly does and it is this level that is the most relevant. A total of 30% of the homes would be affordable, amounting to 40 dwellings in the case of Appeal A and 21 dwellings in the case of appeal B. The mix and tenure proposed would meet local needs. Each scheme would make an important contribution towards addressing affordable housing need. I afford this benefit very substantial weight. ... The benefits are of considerable importance and as an overall package I conclude that they can be given substantial weight in favour of each of the appeal developments. ... For the reasons I have given there would be no significant adverse impact on the South Downs National Park, the AONB or European sites. ... The tilted balance in paragraph 11d)ii) is therefore engaged. ... there would be adverse impacts that would weigh significantly against both of the appeal proposals. However, in my judgement these would be insufficient to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the substantial benefits, when assessed against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole. ... I have considered all other matters raised in the representations and at the inquiry. However, I have found nothing to alter my conclusion that both Appeal A and Appeal B should succeed."

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<a href="#"><u>20/03321/OUTEIA</u></a>	
<p><b>Chidham &amp; Hambrook Parish</b>  <b>Case Officer: Jane Thatcher</b>  <b>Public Inquiry</b>  <b>24-Jul-2023</b>  <b>Emsworth Baptist Church</b>  <b>North Street Emsworth</b>  <b>PO10 7BY</b></p>	<p>Land North Of A259 Flat Farm Main Road Chidham West Sussex</p> <p>Outline planning application (with all matters reserved except access) for up to 68 no. dwellings and provision of associated infrastructure.</p>
<b>Appeal Decision: APPEAL ALLOWED</b>	
<p>AS ABOVE.</p>	

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<a href="#"><u>20/03378/OUT</u></a>	
<p><b>Chidham &amp; Hambrook Parish</b>  <b>Case Officer: Andrew Robbins</b>  <b>Informal Hearings</b>  <b>25-Jul-2023</b>  <b>Chichester District Council</b>  <b>East Pallant House PO19</b>  <b>1TY</b></p>	<p>Land At Flat Farm Hambrook West Sussex PO18 8FT</p> <p>Outline Planning Permission With Some Matters Reserved (Access) - Erection of 30 dwellings comprising 21 market and 9 affordable homes, access and associated works including the provision of swales.</p>
<p><b>Appeal Decision: APPEAL ALLOWED</b></p>	
<p>The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of 30 dwellings comprising 21 market and 9 affordable homes, access and associated works including the provision of swales, at Land at Flat Farm, Broad Road, Hambrook, West Sussex, PO18 8SH, .. . The main issue is whether contributions towards mitigating the effect of additional trips on the operation of the A27 should be calculated with reference to adopted or emerging policy.... The development would result in increased use of the local highways, including the A27, which suffers from congestion... The Planning Practice Guidance (the PPG) makes clear that policies for planning obligations should be set out in plans and examined in public. It additionally states that it is not appropriate for plan-makers to set out new formulaic approaches to planning obligations in supplementary planning documents or supporting evidence base documents, as these would not be subject to examination. The approach advocated by the Council therefore directly conflicts with that set out in the PPG. .... I conclude that a contribution towards mitigating the effect of additional trips on the operation of the A27 should be calculated with reference to adopted policy, and that the development would thus be compliant. ...</p>	

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<a href="#">21/02361/FUL</a>	
<p><b>Chidham &amp; Hambrook Parish</b>  <b>Case Officer: Jane Thatcher</b>  <b>Written Representation</b></p>	<p>Cockleberry Farm Main Road Bosham Chichester West Sussex PO18 8PN</p> <p>Demolition of existing warehouse buildings, B8 container storage, residential caravans/park homes and stables and the erection of 9 no. dwellings and associated works including landscaping and access alterations.</p>
<b>Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED</b>	
<p>"The main issue in this appeal is whether the proposal would result in the unjustified loss of an existing employment site...I am not satisfied that the appellant has demonstrated that part of the site is no longer required, or is unlikely to be re-used or redeveloped, for suitable employment uses. The proposal would, therefore, result in the unjustified loss of an existing employment site, contrary to LP Policy 26 which aims to retain existing employment sites to safeguard their contribution to the local economy. It is also contrary to Policy LP1 of the Chidham &amp; Hambrook Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan September 2016. This policy supports residential development on small windfall sites, subject to the suitability of the site judged against the development plan taken as a whole, including therefore LP Policy 26. As such, there is no conflict between these development plan policies in this case, noting that the legal opinion that I have been referred to as suggesting otherwise did not concern LP Policy 26...the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the setting of the AONB or therefore detract from the landscape or scenic beauty of the AONB...The proposal would be a significant distance from the LB, behind a belt of intervening trees and some buildings, so not interject into or erode the mainly open immediate setting of the LB or interfere with the way in which the LB is experienced. Consequently, there would be no harm to the significance of the LB and this neutral effect would preserve the LB...The site is in Flood Zone 1 so not at significant risk of flooding. Subject to conditions the proposal would be acceptable in details including layout, siting, design and external appearance, and having regard to the living conditions of existing occupiers of nearby dwellings and future occupiers; also, in means of access and traffic generation. The absence of harm in these respects is a neutral factor in my decision...The main parties agree that the Council cannot currently demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites, with a 4.74-year supply. Consequently, the development plan policies most important for determining the appeal are out-of-date and Framework paragraph 11(d) is therefore engaged. The starting point is that planning permission should be granted...The Council did not object in principle to the location of the proposed dwellings in the countryside, outside of the AONB, and they would be accessible by modes of transport other than the private car, including to local facilities and services. The proposal would make effective use of previously-developed 'brownfield' land to help meet identified needs for housing and small windfall sites can often be built out quickly. This would be aligned with objectives of the Framework to significantly boost the supply of homes. The development would bring about employment at construction stage and generate a Community Infrastructure Levy payment as well as Council Tax and New Homes Bonus receipts and also result in landscape and biodiversity enhancements. While notable these modest social, economic and environmental benefits from a net gain of 5 dwellings have moderate weight in favour of the proposal...On the other hand, the development plan seeks to achieve effective use of the existing stock of employment land. Despite the housing land supply position, this aim is broadly consistent with objectives of the Framework to support economic growth taking account of local business needs, opportunities for development and locational requirements, including all types of</p>	



businesses in rural areas by conversion of existing buildings or well-designed new buildings. The loss of employment use would be small in this case in relation to overall employment in the Council's District. Nonetheless, unjustified redevelopment of the site would be at odds with these local and national planning policies. Once developed for housing, and in the absence of any evidence to the contrary about relocation, these employment buildings or land resource at the site and jobs would be permanently lost. In my view, these economic considerations therefore have significant weight against the proposal...In this appeal the application of policies in the Framework that protect some areas or assets of particular importance (the AONB and the LB) do not provide a clear reason for refusing the development. As the competent authority in this appeal, it would ordinarily be necessary for me to undertake Appropriate Assessment with respect to the SPA. However, I consider that the adverse impacts of granting planning permission in the circumstances outlined above would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole. Consequently, the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply in this case...Since I intend to dismiss the appeal, even if the proposal did not adversely affect the integrity of the SPA, so not provide a clear reason for refusing the development in this respect, there is no need for me to consider the SPA any further because it would not affect my decision or alter the outcome of the appeal...The proposal does not accord with the development plan taken as a whole and conflicts with relevant provisions of the Framework. There are no other material considerations which override these findings. Consequently, for the reasons given above the proposal is unacceptable and the appeal does not therefore succeed."

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<a href="#"><u>22/01960/DOM</u></a>	
<p><b>West Wittering Parish</b>  <b>Case Officer: Emma</b>  <b>Kierans</b>  <b>Fast Track Appeal</b></p>	<p>White Gates 44 Marine Drive West Wittering West  Sussex PO20 8HQ</p> <p>First floor balcony to flat roof on south elevation; full height timber privacy screens to east and west flanks. Glass canopy over side access door and rear access door.</p>
<b>Appeal Decision: APPEAL - NO FURTHER ACTION</b>	
All required documentation was not received by the Planning Inspectorate within the time period. No further action to be taken.	

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<a href="#">22/02269/DOM</a>	
<b>Westhampnett Parish</b> <b>Case Officer: Freya Divey</b> <b>Fast Track Appeal</b>	Pampas Cottage Claypit Lane Westhampnett West Sussex PO18 0NU Front boundary wall and gates.
<b>Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED</b>	
<p>"The appeal is dismissed. ... character and appearance of the street scene. ... 1.7 m high fence with hedge in front and 1.5 m high gates across the frontage of Pampas Cottage ... low-density residential neighbourhood ... semi-rural in character ... set well back ... lowstone walls with hedges behind, some taller walls and fences, hedges, and beyond the appeal property, low picket fences with and without hedges. ... proposed 1.7 m high timber fence with hedge in front would not appear out of place provided the hedging was of suitable species. ... the lane is also characterised by the series of open drives leading to the individual properties, ... In this context the proposal for a wide timber vehicle gate, post box, pedestrian gate and fence panel, all 1.5 m tall and constructed of horizontal natural oak slats, would appear as a visually intrusive, unduly prominent and insensitive feature in the street scene. The result would be an overly hard, urban and defensive frontage in a predominantly informal, verdant country lane. ... appellant argues ... fallback position ... to erect a lower height fence and gate should be taken into account ... increased height of the gate at 1.5 m would be significant and greatly increase the visual impact of the proposal. ... For these reasons the proposal would significantly harm the character and appearance of the street scene contrary to Policy 48 of the Chichester Local Plan Key Policies 2014-29. This seeks to ensure development sensitively contributes to its setting and maintains the individual identity of settlements. Policy 33 is not relevant as it relates to new residential development and replacement dwellings. ... suggested that refusal of the application would interfere with the appellant's right to a private and family life under the Human Rights Act. ... taking account of the fallback position any interference would be minor and both proportionate and necessary ... The proposal is put forward to enhance the privacy, wellbeing, security and safety of the appellant but these benefits are significantly outweighed by the harm that would result to the character and appearance of the street scene. Having regard to the above the appeal should be dismissed."</p>	

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<a href="#">21/03135/FUL</a>	
<p><b>Wisborough Green Parish</b>  <b>Case Officer: Calum Thomas</b>  <b>Written Representation</b></p>	<p>Land Adjacent To 1 Newfields Newpound  Wisborough Green RH14 0AX</p> <p>Change use of land to private gypsy and traveller caravan site consisting of 1 no. pitch.</p>
<b>Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED</b>	
<p>The appeal is dismissed...The appeal site falls outside the settlement boundary of Wisborough Green and within land designated as countryside...Policy 45 of the CLP permits development within the countryside that 'requires a countryside location' and 'meets the essential, small scale, and local need which cannot be met within or immediately adjacent to existing settlements'...However, I do not afford material adverse weight to conflict with policy 45 of the CLP as this planning application should be determined against the criteria in policy 36 of the CLP...It is clear from the above that policy 36 of the CLP does not specifically exclude Gypsy and Traveller pitches in the countryside...However, sites must be 'close to' identified settlements with local services and facilities. While 'close to' is not defined in the CLP, in my judgement the appeal site is a significant distance from a settlement with local services and facilities ...The appeal site is surrounded by a scattering of existing buildings, but there is not the range of facilities, amenities, and services for this area to be defined as a settlement...Consequently, it could not reasonably be said that the appeal site has 'good access' to local services in the nearest settlements. While cycling from the appeal site to Wisborough Green or Billingshurst may occasionally be possible, this is not likely to be frequently contemplated given the width of the roads, and hence conflict with vehicles, and the absence of streetlights...The evidence is that public transport and pedestrian access to nearby settlements is very poor...I find that the proposal would conflict with criterion 1 of policy 36 of the CLP. In addition to the above, there would be conflict with Policy H of the Government's Planning Policy for Travellers Sites 2015 (PPTS)... The evidence is that there is therefore a significant unmet need for Gypsy and Traveller sites in the district based on the GTAA 2022....Until a new development plan has been examined and adopted, the evidence is that the CLP will not provide a suitable strategy and/or enough allocations to meet the required need over the remaining plan period. Indeed, until this point unmet need will be required from windfall sites. ...An absence of personal circumstances or details about who would occupy the appeal site does not change this finding....I therefore conclude that while no personal circumstances or information concerning occupancy of the site has been submitted by the appellant, these are not matters which in themselves weigh against allowing the proposal....The evidence is that the appeal site falls within the Sussex North Water Supply Zone ... the evidence is that some water supply is sourced from groundwater abstraction and that this is having some adverse effects on the integrity of the Arun Valley Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site.....Considering the information that is before me, the proposal would both on its own and in combination with other projects, be likely to have significant effects on the protected sites arising from water abstraction due to increased demand from one or more resident...In the absence of appropriate mitigation, I find that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the integrity of the SAC, SPA and Ramsar site..... Therefore, the proposal would not accord with the biodiversity requirements of policy 49 of the CLP, paragraph 180 of the Framework and the Regulations...The proposal would on its own and in combination with other projects cause harm to the integrity of the SAC, SPA and Ramsar site. This is a matter to which I afford significant adverse weight in decision making terms....</p>	

....I conclude that the development would not accord with the development plan for the area taken as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed...

### 3. IN PROGRESS

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
* <a href="#"><u>21/01830/OUT</u></a>	
<b>Birdham Parish</b> <b>Case Officer: Andrew Robbins</b>  <b>Public Inquiry</b> <b>12-Sep-2023</b> <b>Oaklands Pavilion</b>	Land Off Main Road Birdham Chichester West Sussex PO20 7HU  Outline planning application for up to 150 dwellings (including 30% affordable housing) with community park, public open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage system (SuDS) and vehicular access point. All matters reserved except for means of access.
* <a href="#"><u>21/00571/FUL</u></a>	
<b>Bosham Parish</b> <b>Case Officer: Jeremy Bushell</b>  <b>Public Inquiry</b> <b>03-Oct-2023</b> <b>Emsworth Baptist Church</b> <b>North Street Emsworth</b> <b>PO10 7BY</b>	Land North Of Highgrove Farm Main Road Bosham West Sussex  Construction of 300 dwellings (including 90 affordable dwellings), community hall, public open space, associated works and 2 no. accesses from the A259 (one temporary for construction).
<a href="#"><u>20/00040/CONENG</u></a>	
<b>Chichester Parish</b> <b>Case Officer: Mr Michael Coates-Evans</b>  <b>Written Representation</b>	Land North West Of Newbridge Farm Salthill Road Fishbourne West Sussex  Appeal against CC/154
* <a href="#"><u>21/02303/OUT</u></a>	
<b>Chidham &amp; Hambrook Parish</b> <b>Case Officer: Calum Thomas</b>  <b>Written Representation</b>	Caravan And Camping Site Orchard Farm Drift Lane Bosham Chichester West Sussex PO18 8PP  Outline Application (with all matter reserved accept Access) for the demolition of caravan repair building, cessation of use of land for caravan storage and removal of hardstandings and erection of 1no 4bed, 3no 3 bed, 4no 2bed and 1no 1 bed bungalows.
<a href="#"><u>22/01819/DOM</u></a>	
<b>Donnington Parish</b> <b>Case Officer: Rebecca Perris</b>  <b>Fast Track Appeal</b>	Herongate 53 Grosvenor Road Donnington PO19 8RT  Demolition of existing garage and conservatory. New single storey rear extension and first floor extension and new roof.

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<a href="#"><u>23/00770/DOM</u></a>	
<b>Donnington Parish</b> <b>Case Officer: Rebecca Perris</b> <b>Fast Track Appeal</b>	Herongate53 Grosvenor Road Donnington Chichester West Sussex PO19 8RT  Demolition of existing garage and conservatory. New single storey rear extension. First floor extension and new roof.
<a href="#"><u>22/02589/DOM</u></a>	
<b>Earnley Parish</b> <b>Case Officer: Emma Kierans</b> <b>Fast Track Appeal</b>	Sandalwood Almodington Lane Almodington Earnley West Sussex PO20 7JX  Proposed two storey rear and first floor side extension and associated alterations.
<a href="#"><u>22/01366/FUL</u></a>	
<b>East Wittering And Bracklesham Parish</b> <b>Case Officer: Calum Thomas</b> <b>Written Representation</b>	Land To Rear Of Co-Op Store Bracklesham Lane Bracklesham Bay West Sussex  1 no. detached dwelling (plot 1).
<a href="#"><u>22/01367/FUL</u></a>	
<b>East Wittering And Bracklesham Parish</b> <b>Case Officer: Calum Thomas</b> <b>Written Representation</b>	Land To Rear Of Co-Op Store Bracklesham Lane Bracklesham Bay West Sussex  1 no. dwelling.
<a href="#"><u>22/02398/DOM</u></a>	
<b>Hunston Parish</b> <b>Case Officer: Emma Kierans</b> <b>Written Representation</b>	Bremere House Selsey Road Hunston West Sussex PO20 1AU  Extension to existing double garage to form larger outbuilding with ancillary accommodation.
<a href="#"><u>21/02428/FUL</u></a>	
<b>Linchmere Parish</b> <b>Case Officer: Calum Thomas</b> <b>Written Representation</b>	Land North Of 1 To 16 Sturt Avenue Camelsdale Linchmere West Sussex GU27 3SJ  9 no. new dwelling houses and 9 no. carports/studios with associated access, infrastructure, parking and landscaping.

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<a href="#"><u>22/01593/FUL</u></a>	
<b>Linchmere Parish</b> <b>Case Officer: Calum Thomas</b> <b>Written Representation</b>	Land North Of 1 To 16 Sturt Avenue Camelsdale Linchmere West Sussex GU27 3SJ  New bridge access.
<a href="#"><u>19/01400/FUL</u></a>	
<b>Loxwood Parish</b> <b>Case Officer: Martin Mew</b> <b>Written Representation</b>	Moores Cottage Loxwood Road Alfold Bars Loxwood Billingshurst West Sussex RH14 0QS  Erection of a detached dwelling following demolition of free-standing garage.
<a href="#"><u>* 21/02849/FUL</u></a>	
<b>Loxwood Parish</b> <b>Case Officer: Calum Thomas</b> <b>Written Representation</b>	Land South West Of Willets Way Willetts Way Loxwood West Sussex  5 no. residential dwellings, vehicular and pedestrian access and hard and soft landscaping.
<a href="#"><u>22/00470/PA3Q</u></a>	
<b>Loxwood Parish</b> <b>Case Officer: Sascha Haigh</b> <b>Written Representation</b>	Mill House Farm Drungewick Lane Loxwood Billingshurst West Sussex RH14 0RS  Proposed change of use from agricultural buildings to 4 dwellings - (C3 Use class); Class Q (a).
<a href="#"><u>22/00637/PA3Q</u></a>	
<b>Loxwood Parish</b> <b>Case Officer: Sascha Haigh</b> <b>Written Representation</b>	Mill House Farm Drungewick Lane Loxwood Billingshurst West Sussex RH14 0RS  Proposed change of use from agricultural building to 1 dwelling - (C3 Use class).
<a href="#"><u>22/01565/ELD</u></a>	
<b>Loxwood Parish</b> <b>Case Officer: Emma Kierans</b> <b>Informal Hearings</b>	Loxwood Farm Brewhurst Lane Loxwood West Sussex RH14 0RJ  Existing lawful development use of land as garden curtilage.
<a href="#"><u>22/00185/CONENG</u></a>	
<b>North Mundham Parish</b> <b>Case Officer: Sue Payne</b> <b>Written Representation</b>	Land Adjacent To The Spinney Pagham Road Runcton West Sussex  Appeal against NM/30



Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<a href="#"><u>22/01003/FUL</u></a>	
<b>Oving Parish</b> <b>Case Officer: Joanne Prichard</b> <b>Written Representation</b>	Littlemead Business Centre, S & R Interiors Limited Tangmere Road Tangmere West Sussex PO20 2EU  Two storey rear extension employing class uses E(g)(iii) and B8 Ground Floor with ancillary offices on first floor
<a href="#"><u>21/01697/PA3Q</u></a>	
<b>Plaistow And Ifold Parish</b> <b>Case Officer: Rebecca Perris</b> <b>Written Representation</b>	Premier Treecare & Conservation Ltd Oxencroft Ifold Bridge Lane Ifold Loxwood Billingshurst West Sussex RH14 0UJ  Prior notification for the change of use of agricultural buildings to 1 no. dwelling (C3 Use Class) with alterations
<a href="#"><u>20/00414/CONHH</u></a>	
<b>Plaistow And Ifold Parish</b> <b>Case Officer: Sue Payne</b> <b>Public Inquiry</b> <b>19-Feb-2024</b> <b>Chichester District Council</b> <b>East Pallant House PO19 1TY</b>	Oxencroft Ifold Bridge Lanefold Loxwood Billingshurst West Sussex RH14 0UJ Appeal against Enforcement Notice PS/71.
<a href="#"><u>22/01038/PA3Q</u></a>	
<b>Sidlesham Parish</b> <b>Case Officer: Sascha Haigh</b> <b>Written Representation</b>	Butskiln Street End Road Sidlesham Chichester West Sussex PO20 7QD  Change of use of agricultural building to form 1 no. dwelling (Use Class C3) and associated operational development.
<a href="#"><u>20/02077/FUL</u></a>	
<b>Southbourne Parish</b> <b>Case Officer: Martin Mew</b> <b>Written Representation</b>	Marina Farm Thorney Road Southbourne Emsworth Hampshire PO10 8BZ  Redevelopment of previously developed land. Removal of existing 5 no. buildings. Proposed 1 no. dwelling.
<a href="#"><u>* 22/01283/FULEIA</u></a>	
<b>Southbourne Parish</b> <b>Case Officer: Jane Thatcher</b> <b>Public Inquiry</b> <b>11-Jul-2023</b> <b>Emsworth Baptist Church</b> <b>North Street Emsworth PO10 7BY</b>	G And R Harris Main Road Nutbourne Chichester West Sussex PO18 8RL  Demolition and mixed use development comprising 103 no. dwellings and a Childrens' Nursery, together with associated access, parking, landscaping (including provision of wildlife corridor) and associated works.
<a href="#"><u>19/00103/CONCOU</u></a>	
<b>Southbourne Parish</b> <b>Case Officer: Mr Michael Coates-Evans</b> <b>Written Representation</b>	Thornham Marina Thornham Lane Southbourne Emsworth Hampshire PO10 8DD  Appeal against SB/124

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
* <a href="#"><u>22/01283/FULEIA</u></a>	
<b>Southbourne Parish</b> <b>Case Officer: Jane Thatcher</b>  <b>Public Inquiry</b> <b>11-Jul-2023</b> <b>Emsworth Baptist Church</b> <b>North Street Emsworth</b> <b>PO10 7BY</b>	G And R Harris Main Road Nutbourne Chichester West Sussex PO18 8RL  Demolition and mixed use development comprising 103 no. dwellings and a Childrens' Nursery, together with associated access, parking, landscaping (including provision of wildlife corridor) and associated works.
<a href="#"><u>19/00103/CONCOU</u></a>	
<b>Southbourne Parish</b> <b>Case Officer: Mr Michael Coates-Evans</b>  <b>Written Representation</b>	Thornham Marina Thornham Lane Southbourne Emsworth Hampshire PO10 8DD  Appeal against SB/124
<a href="#"><u>21/00051/FUL</u></a>	
<b>Westbourne Parish</b> <b>Case Officer: Calum Thomas</b>  <b>Written Representation</b>	The Stables Cemetery Lane Woodmancote Westbourne PO10 8QB  Increase number of permitted caravans from 1 no. static and 1 no. tourer to 2 no. static and 2 no. tourers and retention of stable block.
<a href="#"><u>23/00076/CONCOU</u></a>	
<b>Westbourne Parish</b> <b>Case Officer: Andrew George</b>  <b>Written Representation</b>	Southleigh Park Estate The Woodlands Marlpit Lane Hambrook Westbourne Emsworth West Sussex PO10 8EQ  Appeal against WE/61
<a href="#"><u>19/00176/CONT</u></a>	
<b>Westbourne Parish</b> <b>Case Officer: Shona Archer</b>  <b>Fast Track Appeal</b>	4 The Paddocks Common Road Hambrook Westbourne Chichester West Sussex PO18 8UP  Appeal against Enforcement Notice WE/55 - removal of TPO'd trees without an application for tree works.
<a href="#"><u>23/00076/CONCOU</u></a>	
<b>Westbourne Parish</b> <b>Case Officer: Andrew George</b>  <b>Written Representation</b>	Southleigh Park Estate The Woodlands Marlpit Lane Hambrook Westbourne Emsworth West Sussex PO10 8EQ  Appeal against WE/60

#### 4. VARIATIONS TO SECTION 106 AGREEMENTS

#### 5. CALLED-IN APPLICATIONS

Reference	Proposal	Stage

#### 6. COURT AND OTHER MATTERS

Injunctions		
Site	Breach	Stage
Birdham Site	Of 4 Enforcement Notices	Contempt of court proceedings at the High Court. Next and final hearing on 20 & 21 December.

Court Hearings		
Site	Matter	Stage

Prosecutions		
Site	Breach	Stage
Crouchlands, Lagoon 3	Of Enforcement Notice	Not Guilty plea entered. Trial on 25 January.
Land South of the Stables, Hambrook	Of Enforcement Notice	Matter adjourned previously due to planning application lodged. Permission refused. Hearing adjourned to 2 January for plea to be entered.
Farmfield Nurseries	Of Enforcement Notices x 2	Not Guilty plea entered. Trial date to be confirmed by the court as the current one clashes with another hearing.

82a Fletchers Lane	Of Enforcement Notice	Matter adjourned as all 3 Defendants did not attend. New hearing for plea to be entered on 28 November.
--------------------	-----------------------	---

## 7. POLICY MATTERS