

Chichester District Council

Planning Committee

Wednesday 24 May 2017

Report of the Head of Planning Services

Schedule of Planning Appeals, Court and Policy Matters

This report updates Planning Committee members on current appeals and other matters. It would be of assistance if specific questions on individual cases could be directed to officers in advance of the meeting.

Note for public viewing via Chichester District Council web site To read each file in detail, including the full appeal decision when it is issued, click on the reference number (NB certain enforcement cases are not open for public inspection, but you will be able to see the key papers via the automatic link to the Planning Inspectorate).

- WR – Written Representation Appeal
- H – Hearing
- I – Inquiry
- FT – Fast Track (Householder/Commercial Appeals)
- () – Case Officer Initials
- * – Committee level decision

1. NEW APPEALS

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
SDNP/17/00030/APNB Bepton WR (R Grosso Macpherson)	Padwicks Farm, Whites Lane, Bepton, GU29 0LY - Agricultural storage building.
SDNP/16/05456/HOUS Bury WR (J Shore)	Hollow Farm, The Street, Bury, Pulborough, West Sussex RH20 1PA - Construction of outdoor swimming pool and associated changing room building.
CC/16/03484/FUL WR (C Boddy)	18 Lavant Road, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 5RG - Demolition of existing property and construction of 3 no. dwellings, with associated access, parking and landscaping.

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
CC/16/03755/DOM WR (P Hunt)	42 Guilden Road, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 7LA - Demolition of existing side extension and rear conservatory, erection of side two storey extension and rear single storey extension.
CC/16/03916/ADV WR (P Hunt)	The Chantry, 27 - 28 Southgate, Chichester, West Sussex PO19 1ES - 1 no. illuminated fascia sign, 2 no. menu signs, 1 no. non-illuminated projection sign and 2 no. written logo signs. 6 no. flood lights and 2 no. lanterns.
SDNP/16/05784/FUL WR (R Grosso Macpherson)	Ashurst, Lickfold Road, Fernhurst, GU27 3JB - Replacement dwelling including realigned driveway.
SDNP/16/05918/HOUS Graffham FT (B Stubbington)	Summerfield Cottage, Graffham Street, Graffham, GU28 0NP – Proposed new driveway with off road parking.
SDNP/16/00425/FUL Lodsworth WR (J Shore)	Old Bakehouse, Surrey Road, Lickfold, Lurgashall, Petworth, West Sussex, GU28 9DX - Replacement dwelling.
SDNP/16/00204/OPDEV Midhurst WR (S Archer)	Flat 2, Thomond House, North Street, Midhurst, GU29 9DJ – Formation of door opening.
NM/16/03884/OUT WR (Fjola Stevens)	The Pine Place, Lagness Road, Runcton, PO20 1AQ – Outline Application for 4 no. dwelling houses and associated works.
SB/16/00176/CONCOU WR (R Ballam/E Kierans)	Land East Of Inlands Road, Inlands Road, Nutbourne, West Sussex - Change of use of land - stationing of containers, paving materials, sheds and play area. LINKED TO SB/16/02811/FUL
SB/16/02811/FUL WR (R Ballam/E Kierans)	Land East Of Inlands Road, Inlands Road, Nutbourne, West Sussex - Siting of metal shipping container for storage of agricultural equipment and animal feeds. LINK TO SB/16/00176/CONCOU
WH/16/02827/FUL WR (C Boddy)	Maudlin Mill, Sidengreen Lane, Maudlin, Westhampnett, Chichester, West Sussex, PO18 0QU - Construction of a workshop with first floor office.

2. DECISIONS RECEIVED

Reference/Decision	
SDNP/14/04865/FUL I (D Price) BURY APPEAL DISMISSED	Land North of Junction with B2138 Bury Road Bury West Sussex – Change of use from agricultural land to a Gypsy and Traveller’s site. Linked to SDNP/15/00336/COU
<p>Appeal A Ref: APP/Y9507/C/15/3132202 - The appeal succeeds in part on ground (g) but is otherwise dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld with corrections and a variation.</p> <p>Appeal B Ref: APP/Y9507/W/15/3019486 - The appeal is dismissed.</p> <p>"... The appellants sought to introduce a ground (b) appeal at a late stage of the Inquiry. From the evidence before me ...I am satisfied that the breach alleged by the Council in its notice had occurred at the time it served the notice...As such, the appeal under ground (b) fails. ...The sites clearly lie within the countryside and are separated from the linear and scattered residential properties that are located on the eastern side of the A29 opposite...The developments in both appeals would be in direct contrast with the rural character of the area and would be an alien feature in the locality...In my assessment the developments would not preserve or enhance the natural beauty of the National Park.... Sustainability - The Framework provides an overall presumption in favour of sustainable development. PPTS requires local planning authorities to ensure that traveller sites are sustainable economically, socially and environmentally...I do not find that the sites are located in a sustainable location in respect of accessibility to services and facilities...Having regard to sustainability considerations set out in PPTS, the sites are located in open countryside where development should be very strictly controlled. The developments would not promote peaceful and integrated coexistence between the sites and the local community as the sites are divorced from the settlements and the local community. I have little evidence before me that it is essential for Mr Stanley to be based at these sites for his work related activities or...reduces his need for long distance travelling...I find that the sites are not sustainable either environmentally, socially or economically and fail to accord with national policy in this regard. Highway Safety - The Council...maintained that safe access could not be achieved by cyclists...I am satisfied that the access arrangements onto the link road provide satisfactory visibility and turning to enable vehicles, including those towing caravans and horse trailers, to enter and exit safely. The A29 is a busy main road...The appellants use Turners Garage and Charlies Farm Shop for shopping and in my view accessing both on foot would result in an unacceptable conflict between vehicles and pedestrians on this stretch of road...I conclude that the developments would result in an unacceptable hazard to pedestrians using the A29 to the south of the appeal sites... Other Material Considerations Need - The Council's position is that the relevant study for the area in which the sites are located is the Coastal West Sussex Authorities Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment Update Report, December 2014 (GTTSAA)...The approach taken in this case considers a very small part of the overall local planning authority area. As such it would appear that the need figures provided are not necessarily based on the best available evidence... However, I have also had regard to the Written Ministerial Statement dated 22 July 2015 that those falling under the definition of a traveller cannot rely on the lack of a five year supply of deliverable housing sites to show the relevant policies for the supply of housing are not</p>	

Reference/Decision Continued

up to date. I am satisfied that the statement represents a material consideration following the judgement and should be given appropriate weight.

COSTS DECISION

"Costs application in relation to Appeal A Ref: APP/Y9507/C/15/3132202 and Costs application in relation to Appeal B Ref: APP/Y9507/W/15/3019486

The application for an award of costs is refused.

... it appears to me in this case that the Council originally raised highway concerns that were clearly substantiated in its decision notice and officer report and following expert highway advice. It subsequently reviewed its position on highway matters prior to the Inquiry...and was satisfied through discussions with the appellant's highway expert that some matters could be overcome with conditions. I do not find that this was an unreasonable position to take and it did not provide evidence to the Inquiry in respect of the withdrawn matters. Notwithstanding the withdrawal of this part of the Council's case...the Rule 6 party, the Bury Gate Neighbourhood Group (BGNG) continued to raise highway safety concerns in relation to visibility in the vicinity of the appeal sites...it was at the appellant's discretion whether a highway expert should be employed to give evidence to the Inquiry in this respect. The appellant chose to do so and given the concerns of the BGNG I do not find this to amount to unreasonable or wasted expense.... Turning to the second element of the reason for refusal. ... I also acknowledge the appellant's contention that locational sustainability was a new reason for refusal introduced at appeal. However, whilst the reason for refusal in the Council's decision notice in respect of Appeal B...clearly references "suitable" access for all people and refers to paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework)...National planning policy in relation to gypsy and traveller sites considers sustainability... is not necessarily limited to the immediate confines of the site itself but can consider the wider implications on accessibility. The provision of evidence on such matters by the Council should not therefore have been a surprise to the appellant...the appellant was aware that the Council was raising an objection on sustainability grounds...and responded accordingly in his evidence... the appellant would have been required to provide evidence in this respect irrespective of the Council's position in this regard...No matters raised alter my conclusion that unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense, as described in the PPG, has not been demonstrated".

[SDNP/15/00336/COU](#)
BURY
I (R Hawks)
APPEAL DISMISSED,
ENFORCEMENT
NOTICE UPHELD WITH
CORRECTIONS

Land North of Junction with B2138 Bury Road Bury West
Sussex - Stationing of two caravans for human habitation.
Appeal against enforcement notice
Linked to [SDNP/14/04865/FUL](#)

Decision as above

Reference/Decision	
CC/16/03777/DOM FT (H Chowdhury) DISMISSED	8 Caledonian Road, Chichester, PO19 7PH – Replacement single storey rear extension.
<p>"... The sense of space and outlook for No. 7 home is relatively tight as things presently stand. The significant height, even allowing for the pitch sloping away, its length and its proximity the development proposed would further reduce these aspects to an unacceptable level. There would be a marked reduction of residential amenity enjoyed by occupiers of No 7. The scheme would be overbearing and lead to an excessive blinkering effect. The development would appear over-large and fail to be suitably subservient to the present property and the extensive rear facing ground floor glazing would not represent suitably subtle or well designed fenestration."</p>	
LM/16/03653/DOM FT (J Cross) DISMISSED	20 Sturt Avenue, Camelsdale, Linchmere – Replacement garage and home office, linked to the existing detached house.
<p>"... Although, the extension would be set back it would still appear as a prominent feature within the street scene as houses in the area are highly visible along the road in any event. The large area of tile hanging would be excessive in comparison to the main dwelling and the general small scale nature of this feature found in the street. The pitch of the roof would be unrelated to that of the main roof and would draw the eye. The mass and bulk of the extension would be significant in comparison to the scale and proportions of the existing dwelling"</p>	
LX/15/00498/ELD I (C Boddy) ALLOWED	Beech Farm, Roundstreet Common, Loxwood, Wisborough Green, West Sussex, RH14 0AN. - The siting of a mobile home for the purposes of human habitation independently to Beech Farm House
<p>"... At the Inquiry, the Council confirmed that following the receipt of further evidence from the appellant during the course of the appeal, it no longer contested the appeal. Notwithstanding the Council's position, remit for the appeal remains with the Secretary of State... Given the uncontested nature of the appeal, no cross-examination of witnesses took place... 'Ancillary' denotes some kind of use that is not expected to be found as an integral part of the residential use of the dwelling. In contrast, the word 'additional' indicates a use which is part and parcel of the residential use of the main dwelling as primary accommodation. In this particular case, there is no basis to conclude that the mobile home provided ancillary residential accommodation to Beech Farmhouse. ... The mobile home is a considerable distance away from the farmhouse, outside its curtilage and where the boundary treatment and access road provide clear demarcation between the areas of occupation. There is no visual connection between them. There can be no doubt that there is physical separation between the farmhouse and the land on which the mobile home is stationed. It is common ground that since 2002 the present mobile home continued to exist in the same location. The mobile home has the appearance of a chalet style caravan. ... evidence is required from 16 February 2005. ... At some point in 1991 or 1992, Mrs Harris moved into the mobile home which she used as her sole residence. ... From the outset, the mobile home had its own separate electric and water supplies and telephone connection with fitted central heating using bottled gas.</p>	

Reference/Decision

All utility bills were paid by Mrs Harris' father until the appellant moved into the mobile home in early 2003 who then took over responsibility for the bills. At no point was rent paid by Amanda or James Harris. According to the appellant's testimony, the mobile home was used independently of the farmhouse throughout his occupation. ... They lived as a family in the mobile home until moving into a flat on the farm in January 2006. Two copy tenancy agreements have been provided; one to Ryan Crumley and the other to Dan Birchall. Both documents are unsigned. However, first hand evidence was given by those tenants under oath to the Inquiry. Neither tenant worked or helped out at the farm or farmhouse. The tenancies provide strong evidence of independent residential use of the mobile home from January 2006 until February 2015 when the LDC application was made. If a 10 year period is to be shown, it is the receding period between February 2005 and January 2006 which needs to be analysed in more detail given the family link that existed at that time between the two areas in residential use. ... Having a family connection may increase the likelihood of a mobile home being used together with the house because the relationship invokes familiarity and social ties to facilitate such an arrangement. ... It does not automatically follow though that is what happened in this case. The evidence as a whole must be considered. Much has been made by the appellant in the written evidence of the deterioration in Amanda Harris' relationship with her father and other personal matters affecting her life. Personal issues could be reason why there was a change in how the mobile home was used, but does not prove that the change occurred. ... The events captured suggest family life was being carried on at the mobile home, but they do not demonstrate that it was used independently of the farmhouse. ... The most compelling evidence is the sworn testimony of witnesses describing the use of the mobile home. Amanda Harris explained that once she became pregnant she ceased working at the farm and never returned or helped out following the birth of her child in July 2004. By that time, she had limited dealings with her father due to their strained personal relationship. As the mobile home was fully equipped for day-to-day living, there was no dependency upon the farmhouse. Meals were never taken there and the respective occupants did not socialise together nor was childcare ever provided at the house. In 2009, the farmhouse was sold off and Mrs Harris' father transferred the remaining land and buildings in his ownership to Mr and Mrs Harris. ... Based on the evidence provided, I am satisfied that on the balance of probabilities, the appellant has proved that the land has been in continuous use for the siting of a mobile home as a separate unit of residential accommodation from Beech Farmhouse for at least ten years before the date on which the LDC application was made. ... The parties disagree on how the boundaries should be drawn for the purposes of the certificate. ... the grass have The appearance of lawn associated with the mobile home, its location is conducive to a domestic use. At the time of my visit there was a washing line crossing part of the grass, tied between the mobile home and a telegraph pole. There was also a bird feeder to the side rear and garden storage containers behind the mobile home. It was difficult to tell how long these might have been present and whether refuse bins have always been kept in one corner of the grassed land nearest to the access. However, an electricity meter box attached to wooden posts towards the back of the grassed area looked to have been present for some years judging by its condition. ... Furthermore, there is nothing to contradict the appellant's evidence that the land behind the mobile home was used as part of its garden. ... I conclude that the land in residential use for the requisite 10 year period was, on the balance of probabilities, the area identified by the appellant. ...

Reference/Decision

COST DECISION

Application A for an award of costs is allowed in the terms set out below.

Application B for an award of costs is refused.

"... When the LDC application was originally submitted, it was supported by signed and dated witness statements from the appellant and two tenants who subsequently occupied the mobile home. The statements confirmed that those individuals lived in the mobile home between specified dates. However, each statement said "The Log Cabin2 is a separate dwelling from Beech Farm", without making any reference to the use. Just because they are separate dwellings does not mean the mobile home was occupied as a separate unit of accommodation. It is the use of land which is the key factor. If the witnesses meant to refer to how they occupied the mobile home, it is not what they said and cannot be inferred. Even if the words were capable of interpretation to mean the mobile home is "occupied as" a separate dwelling, the use of the word "is" in the present tense still raises uncertainty. It does not mean that the mobile home was used independently throughout each period of occupation. The way the statements are framed lacks sufficient detail to be clear if a material change of use had occurred which was immune from enforcement action. Thus, the witness statements are imprecise and ambiguous. Had they been expressed in clearer terms then statements might have sufficed to enable a LDC to be granted. As it was, the information within the witness statements was not enough to demonstrate independent use for the requisite 10 year period. The Council rightly sought clarification. When presented with such unclear statements, the Council had every reason to enquire about the occupancy by Mr and Mrs Harris. That is particularly so when a family connection to the farmhouse was known to exist in 2002 because of details in the 2003 LDC application. Without exploring the basis of the new application it was unclear if the use only a year on when Mr Harris' occupation commenced was in different terms. The approach taken by the Council was not a case of applying planning judgement, but clarifying what was being claimed in circumstances where the evidence presented was less than clear. When no clarification was forthcoming apart from the submission of a bank statement and bills of limited evidential value, the Council had no option but to refuse to issue a LDC. The burden of proof upon the appellant had not at that time been discharged due to the ambiguity in the witness evidence. To my mind, the Council officer's assessment was simply stating that the mobile home was capable of being used as additional accommodation to the main dwelling i.e. in the same way as it had before. The mobile home had not been moved and so rather than being speculative, I consider it to be a legitimate point in circumstances where there was an inadequacy of evidence of actual use. The Council's decision was justified. In arriving at its decision, the Council had written to the appellant twice to invite clarification and allowed several weeks for information to be provided. Indeed, the appellant's agent did not query the need for further information but indicated that more supporting information would be available. In making the appeal, the appellant wrote "Further evidence will be submitted in addition to that already put forward to prove on balance of probabilities that the mobile home has been in continuous residential use independent of Beech Farm House since 2003". That information was eventually produced around the time of the extended deadline for the submission of proofs of evidence. Having reviewed that evidence, the Council decided not to contest the appeal. The additional information subsequently produced included tenancy agreements and more detailed witness statements, plus a statement from

Reference/Decision	
<p>Mrs Harris. If the information provided in this appeal had been made available when requested by the Council then the appeal could have been avoided. That is evident from the Council's decision not to contest the appeal following its receipt. It was unreasonable for the appellant to leave it so late in the day before producing information to clarify the application which had been requested repeatedly and should have been capable of easy compilation. Application A - I therefore find that unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense, as described in the PPG, has been demonstrated and that a full award of costs is justified. Application B - I therefore find that unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense, as described in the PPG, has not been demonstrated. ..."</p>	
<p>SY/16/02694/FUL WR (M Tomlinson) DISMISSED</p>	<p>47 Gainsborough Drive, Selsey, PO20 0HG - 1 no. dwelling.</p>
<p>"... The proposed plot would be narrow and the two storeys of the proposed attached dwelling would largely fill that plot width. The proposed dwelling would be visible in the approach over the open plan gardens and bungalows, including the adjacent bungalow with small rear garden fronting Landseer Drive to which it would be in close proximity. This would result in the building being prominent in views along Gainsborough Drive and appearing cramped on the site, dominating the adjacent bungalow. ... In order to provide a more gradual transition from the existing two storey house to bungalows adjacent, the proposed pitched roof would be lower than the existing. However, there would be a flat roof over the projecting two storey front element that would be prominent on the front of the building and would appear incongruous within the surrounding development, where two storey buildings have pitched roofs. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed new dwelling would harm the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area. As such, it would be contrary to Policies 33 and 47 of the Chichester Local Plan (LP) and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) that seek to ensure new development meets the highest standards of design and that they recognise, respect and enhance the local distinctiveness and character of the area. The bungalow at 53 Landseer Drive backs onto the proposed dwelling at 47 Gainsborough Drive and has a small rear garden dividing that bungalow from the property. To the rear of that property is a small flat roofed extension that further reduces the size of that garden, with a flat roofed garage to the side of the rear garden and adjacent to the proposed dwelling. The proposed dwelling would bring two storey built development significantly closer to the boundary with that neighbouring bungalow over a full two floors. Whilst the ridge of the proposed dwelling would be lower than that on the existing dwelling, the eaves would remain at the same level such that the proposed dwelling would dominate the rear garden of that neighbouring property. The proximity, height and bulk of the proposed dwelling would result in it being overbearing and oppressive on the rear of the neighbouring bungalow and its garden. ... For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed new dwelling would have a harmful effect on the outlook of occupiers of the neighbouring dwelling at 53 Landseer Drive, such that it would significantly harm their living conditions. As such, the proposed development would be contrary to Policy 33 of the LP and the Framework that seek to ensure development does not cause harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. ... I note that the appellant has suggested they would seek to address this matter in a future planning application, however no legal agreement or other means to secure the appropriate contribution has been supplied with this appeal. For the above reasons I</p>	

Reference/Decision	
<p>conclude that, in the absence of an appropriate planning obligation, the development would harm the Pagham Harbour SPA. As such, the development is contrary to Policy 51 of the LP, the SPD and the Framework that seek to protect the SPA from development that would affect its integrity. I note that the proposed dwelling would contribute in a small way toward the need for new dwellings in this area and small infill development can provide a positive and delicate approach to the provision of new housing. The proposed dwelling would meet relevant standards for new homes and the Council do not object to the proposed access and parking and I see no reason to disagree with their conclusions in this regard. However, these matters are not sufficient to outweigh the harm I have found of the proposed new dwelling on the character and appearance of the area, the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and the effect of the development on the SPA. ..."</p>	
<p>SDNP/16/05247/HOUS STEDHAM FT (R Macpherson) DISMISSED</p>	<p>Russetts, The Alley, Stedham – Proposed front dormer window.</p>
<p>"... The scheme proposed would be a major alteration to the cat slide roof's shape and form. This new addition would dominate this side of the building, bear no relationship to what lay below at ground level, and even look out of scale to the main house. It would appear ungainly and top heavy; there would be a lack of sympathy with the existing building design. There would be no sense of subordination to this part of the house and too much of the cat slide roof would be lost. The design has taken little in the way of cues from the property's front elevation or its surroundings. There is a great variety of roof forms found locally but almost without exception dormers and other elements at upper level display subtlety. This whole composition would lack suitable subservience and would be jarring on the eye; it would detract from the aesthetics and character of the property itself and the wider area. This dormer, of gable end scale, would simply look too large relative the roof and it would appear most ungainly..."</p>	

3. OUTSTANDING APPEALS

Reference/Status	Proposal
<p>BI/15/00139/CONSH PI (S Archer) Adjourned until 22.05.17 CDC Committee Room 2</p>	<p>Land North West Of Premier Business Park, Birdham Road Birdham, West Sussex – Access track, hardstanding and fencing. Linked to BI/15/01288/FUL and BI/15/00194/CONTRV</p>
<p>BI/15/00194/CONTRV PI (S Archer) Adjourned until 22.05.17 CDC Committee Room 2</p>	<p>Land North West of Premier Business Park Birdham Road Birdham, West Sussex - Use of land as a Traveller Site. Linked to BI/15/01288/FUL and BI/15/00139/CONSH</p>

Reference/Status	Proposal
BI/15/01288/FUL PI (S Archer) Adjourned until 22.05.17 CDC Committee Room 2	Land north west of Premier Business Park, Birdham Road Birdham, West Sussex PO20 7BU - Proposed single pitch site including the provision of a utility building for settled gypsy accommodation together with existing stables. Linked to BI/15/00194/CONTRV and BI/15/00139/CONSH
SDNP/16/02175/FUL BURY WR (B Stubbington) In Progress	Timberley Farm Bury Common Bury Pulborough West Sussex RH20 1NP - Widen existing farm entrance.
SDNP/16/04313/FUL BURY WR (L Kent) In Progress	Highfield 161 Bury Road Bury Pulborough West Sussex RH20 1NL - Erection of replacement dwelling - revised scheme to that granted under SDNP/15/05945/FUL.
SDNP/16/05456/HOUS BURY WR (J Shore) In Progress	Hollow Farm The Street Bury Pulborough West Sussex RH20 1PA - Construction of outdoor swimming pool and associated changing room building.
CC/16/02363/FUL WR (C Boddy) In Progress	34 Ormonde Avenue Chichester PO19 7UX - Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 3 no. dwellings, with associated access, parking and landscaping.
CH/14/00399/CONMHC H (R Hawks) Hearing to be held on 6 June – Assembly Rooms Chichester City Council	Cockleberry Farm, Main Road, Bosham, West Sussex, PO18 8PN - Appeal against the stationing of 2 mobile homes (in livery yard) for purposes of human habitation. LINKED TO CH/16/01902/PA3P
CH/16/01902/PA3P H (M Tomlinson) Hearing to be held on 6 June – Assembly Rooms Chichester City Council	Cockleberry Farm, Main Road, Bosham, West Sussex, PO18 8PN - Part 3 Class P application for prior approval - Proposed change of use of 3 no. B8 storage buildings to 3 no. dwellings. Revised application further to CH/15/02290/PA3P. LINKED TO CH/14/00399/CONMHC

Reference/Status	Proposal
E/16/01459/FUL WR (C Bartlett) In Progress	Dragon Nursery, Third Avenue, Earnley, West Sussex, PO20 7LB - Erection of 1 no. custom/self build dwelling - Alternative to dwelling permitted by virtue of Class P Prior Approval for Change of Use from Class B8 (Storage) to Class C3 (Dwellinghouse) under E/15/04244/PA3P. Linked to E/16/02914/FUL
E/16/02914/FUL WR (C Bartlett) In Progress	Dragon Nursery, Third Avenue, Batchmere, West Sussex, PO20 7LB - Erection of 1 no. custom/self build dwelling - Replicating change of use to dwelling permitted by virtue of Class P Prior Approval for Change of Use from Class B8 (Storage) to Class C3 (Dwellinghouse) under E/15/04244/PA3P but with false pitch roof and roof lanterns. Linked to E/16/01459/FUL
SDNP/15/03654/FUL Elsted & Treyford WR (D Price) Awaiting Decision	Elsted Road Bridge, Fitzhall Road, Elsted, West Sussex - Infill single span bridge with stone and foam concrete to provide long-term structural support to the bridge. Form new embankments to sides of bridge and drainage pipes laid at ground level.
SDNP/14/00448/COU Lurgashall WR (S Pattie) In Progress	Northurst Farm Dial Green Lane Lurgashall Petworth West Sussex GU28 9HA - Extension of residential curtilage.
SDNP/15/00361/COU Lurgashall H (R Hawks) Hearing to be held 10am 12 July at Chichester District Council	Old Hearne Farm, Jays Lane, Lurgashall, Haslemere, West Sussex, GU27 3BL - Without planning permission, the erection of a building and laying of a stone pavement. Linked with SDNP/16/04559/FUL
SDNP/16/04559/FUL Lurgashall H (J Shore) Hearing to be held 10am 12 July at Chichester District Council	Old Hearne Farm, Jays Lane, Lurgashall, Haslemere West Sussex, GU27 3BL - Retention of the east barn and its immediate surroundings for mixed agricultural and equestrian purposes. Linked with SDNP/15/00361/COU
NM/15/00375/CONCOU I (R Hawks) In Progress	Land North Of Fisher Common Nursery Fisher Lane North Mundham West Sussex - Change of use of barn to residential.

Reference/Status	Proposal
<p>O/16/02254/OUT I (J Bushell) Public Inquiry to be held 6 & 7 June – WSCC at 10am 13 & 16 June – Chichester Park Hotel at 10am 14 June – Vicars Hall at 10am 15 June – Oving Jubilee Village Hall at 10am</p>	<p>Land To The South Of Oving Road/B2144, Shopwhyke West Sussex - Outline application for the development of the site to provide 100 no. dwellings (use class C3), with an associated access, parking, outdoor space, landscaping and infrastructure.</p>
<p>PS/13/00015/CONCOU I (R Hawks) Inquiry to be held on 12, 24 & 25 May 2017 at Brinsbury College, Pulborough</p>	<p>Crouchlands Farm, Rickmans Lane, Plaistow, Billingshurst West Sussex, RH14 0LE. Use of anaerobic digestion tanks and equipment for importation of waste and export of biomethane. Construction of a digestate lagoon without planning permission. Appeal against enforcement notice. Linked to s78 appeal against refusal of planning permission by WSCC.</p>
<p>SY/16/02196/FUL WR (P Hunt) In Progress</p>	<p>Arun Posts Southern Road Selsey Chichester West Sussex PO20 0BD - Change of use of existing ancillary outbuilding to a 2 bedroom dwelling with external alterations, formation of a projecting front gable and new access</p>
<p>SB/16/00757/FUL WR (C Bartlett) In Progress</p>	<p>Thornham House, Prinsted Lane, Prinsted, Southbourne PO10 8HS - Retrospective erection of a tennis court (siting). Changes to boundary of the property and siting from originally approved application 13/03928/FUL.</p>
<p>WE/15/00363/CONBC H (R Hawks) Hearing to be held on 16 May – City Council</p>	<p>The Woodlands, Marlpit Lane, Hambrook, Westbourne, Emsworth, West Sussex, PO10 8EQ - Breach of condition 2 to 12/00559/FUL - occupation agricultural. LINKED TO WE/15/03965/FUL</p>
<p>WE/15/03965/FUL H (C Boddy) Hearing to be held on 16 May – City Council</p>	<p>The Woodlands, Marlpit Lane, Hambrook, Westbourne, Emsworth, West Sussex, PO10 8EQ - Retention of 1 no. mobile home to serve the dual purpose of providing a single travelling show persons pitch and a single Gypsy pitch. LINKED TO WE/15/00363/CONBC</p>
Reference/Status	Proposal

Reference/Status	Proposal
WE/16/00565/FUL WR (C Boddy) In Progress	Land West Of Jubilee Wood Hambrook Hill North Hambrook West Sussex - Agricultural building, compound and access track.
WE/16/01218/OUT WR (C Boddy) In Progress	Land At Mill Lane Westbourne Emsworth West Sussex PO10 8RT - Construction of 3 no. dwellings.

4. VARIATIONS TO SECTION 106 AGREEMENTS
NONE

5. CALLED-IN APPLICATIONS

Reference	Proposal	Stage
NONE		

6. COURT AND OTHER MATTERS

Injunctions		
Site	Breach	Stage
Birdham Farm	Breach of Enforcement Notices and Stop Notices	Court action is being held in abeyance pending the outcome of the appeal/public inquiry process (see above).

Prosecutions		
Site	Breach	Stage
Barn North of Hunston Dairy Farm	Breach of Condition Notice	Court date awaited.
37 North Street, Midhurst	Breach of Enforcement Notice	Court date: Worthing Magistrates on 2 June at 10:00am

7. POLICY MATTERS

NONE