

# Public Document Pack

## JOHN WARD

Director of Corporate Services

Contact: Fiona Baker on 01243 534609

Email: fbaker@chichester.gov.uk

East Pallant House

1 East Pallant

Chichester

West Sussex

PO19 1TY

Tel: 01243 785166

www.chichester.gov.uk



A meeting of **Planning Committee** will be held in Committee Rooms, East Pallant House on **Wednesday 5 January 2022 at 9.30 am** (subject to government guidance)

MEMBERS: Mrs C Purnell (Chairman), Rev J H Bowden (Vice-Chairman),  
Mr G Barrett, Mr B Brisbane, Mr R Briscoe, Mrs J Fowler,  
Mrs D Johnson, Mr G McAra, Mr S Oakley, Mr H Potter, Mr D Rodgers,  
Mrs S Sharp and Mr P Wilding

## SUPPLEMENT TO AGENDA

- 2 **Approval of Minutes** (Pages 1 - 18)  
The minutes relate to the meeting of the Planning Committee on 8 December 2021.
- 9 **South Downs National Park Authority Schedule of Planning Appeals, Court and Policy Matters** (Pages 19 - 27)  
The Planning Committee will consider the monthly schedule updating the position with regard to planning appeals, litigation and recent planning policy publications or pronouncements.

This page is intentionally left blank



Minutes of the meeting of the **Planning Committee** held in Committee Rooms, East Pallant House on Wednesday 8 December 2021 at 9.30 am

**Members Present:** Mrs C Purnell (Chairman), Rev J H Bowden (Vice-Chairman), Mr G Barrett, Mr B Brisbane, Mrs J Fowler, Mrs D Johnson, Mr G McAra, Mr S Oakley, Mr H Potter, Mr D Rodgers, Mrs S Sharp and Mr P Wilding

**Members not present:** Mr R Briscoe

**In attendance by invitation:**

**Officers present:** Mr T Ayling (Divisional Manager for Planning Policy), Miss J Bell (Development Manager (Majors and Business)), Mr J Bushell (Principal Planning Officer), Miss N Golding (Principal Solicitor), Mr M Mew (Principal Planning Officer), Mr D Price (Principal Planning Officer), Mrs F Stevens (Development Manager (Applications)), Miss G Stevens (Planning Policy Officer), Mr T Whitty (Divisional Manager for Development Management) and Mrs F Baker (Democratic Services Officer)

## 145 **Chairman's Announcements**

The Chairman welcomed everyone present to the meeting and read out the emergency evacuation procedure.

Apologies were received from Roy Briscoe.

## 146 **Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 3 November 2021 were agreed as a true and accurate record.

## 147 **Urgent Items**

There were no urgent items.

## 148 **Declarations of Interests**

Mr Barrett declared a personal interest in;

- Agenda Item 6 - BI/20/02066/OUT – as the Chichester District Council external appointment to Chichester Harbour Conservancy

- Agenda Item 9 – BO/20/03326/FUL – as the Chichester District Council external appointment to Chichester Harbour Conservancy

Rev. John-Henry Bowden

- Agenda Item 10 - CC/21/00841/FUL – as the Chichester District Council external appointment to the Goodwood Aerodrome Committee

Mrs Johnson declared a personal interest in;

- Agenda Item 6 - BI/20/02066/OUT – as a member of West Sussex County Council and a member of Selsey Town Council
- Agenda Item 9 – BO/20/03326/FUL – as a member of West Sussex County Council
- Agenda item 11 – KD/20/00457/COU – as a member of West Sussex County Council

Mr Oakley declared a personal interest in;

- Agenda Item 6 - BI/20/02066/OUT – as a member of West Sussex County Council
- Agenda Item 9 – BO/20/03326/FUL – as a member of West Sussex County Council
- Agenda item 11 – KD/20/00457/COU – as a member of West Sussex County Council

Mrs Purnell declared a personal interest in;

- Agenda Item 6 - BI/20/02066/OUT – as a member of Selsey Town Council

Mrs Sharp declared a personal interest in;

- Agenda Item 6 - BI/20/02066/OUT – as a member of West Sussex County Council
- Agenda Item 9 – BO/20/03326/FUL – as a member of West Sussex County Council
- Agenda item 11 – KD/20/00457/COU – as a member of West Sussex County Council

## 149 **Housing Land Supply Update Report**

Mr Ayling and Miss Stevens presented the report to the Committee. Miss Stevens introduced the report, she explained that the previous land supply position concluded, that as of April 2020 the Council had a 4.3 year housing supply. In response the Council brought forward an Interim Position Statement that was approved by the Planning Committee in June 2020.

Mis Stevens explained that West Sussex County Council undertake the monitoring of housing development for Chichester District Council (and other West Sussex authorities). The data provided by WSCC has been used as the basis for the latest land supply position.

Miss Stevens informed the Committee that Lambert Smith Hamilton had been appointed to undertake a Critical Friend Review of the 5YHLS report, and to review the evidence in respect of the windfall allowance; as well as the lead-on and build-out rates of residential development sites. She drew their attention to Appendix 1 of the report which set out the full review.

Based on the most recent data, Miss Stevens informed the Committee that the Council, as of 1 April 2021, is able to demonstrate at least 5.3 years of housing land supply.

Mr Ayling took the Committee through section 6 of the report. He explained that the findings to be tested at appeal and Members will be kept informed of the outcome of the examinations and how they impact upon the five-year housing land supply.

Mr Ayling drew Member's attention to paragraph 6.4 of the report, he highlighted that although there is a current five-year housing land supply (5YHLS) it is important that to maintain this position going forward with planning applications considered if the benefits indicate it should be permitted. The five-year housing land supply statement has immediate effect and will apply to current appeals, it means the tilted balance no longer applies.

Mr Ayling informed the Committee that there was a typo in the recommendation which should read as follows '*...set out in para 6.4 of the report*'.

The Committee received representations from;  
Cllr Tony Colling – Loxwood Parish Council

In response to comments made in the public representation; Mr Ayling acknowledged that the Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan had being stalled by the water neutrality issue affecting the area. However, he reminded the Committee the same issue also applied to all planning applications and other Neighbourhood Plans within the area. He clarified that the Development Plan is the basis for all planning applications and referred to paragraph 6.3 of the report. In addition, Mr Whitty advised that whilst the Committee do not have to apply the tilted balance in their consideration, they should remain mindful to the future and maintaining a five-year housing land supply.

On behalf of the Committee Mrs Purnell thanked all officers for their work on the Five-Year Housing Land Supply Statement.

With regards to the A27 and the number of new homes that can be supported in the future; Mr Ayling explained that the 5YHLS is assessed through the Standard Method. A different figure to the 5YHLS will be put forward as part of the Local Plan, however, this figure would not be applicable until the Local Plan has been fully adopted.

On the issue of the windfall allowance included within the statement; Mr Ayling informed the Committee that part of the work LSH had undertaken in the Critical Friend Review, was to assess the methodology the Council had used in calculating the statement and how that information was presented. From this work they advised

that there were a number of elements the Council should consider amending, including;

- Windfall allowance; Mr Ayling explained that these are unplanned sites that come forward, the Council has always included an allowance for small windfall sites (10 dwellings or less), however, following the work undertaken by LSH they have concluded that there is sufficient evidence for allow a larger allowance to be included. As a result, the windfall element included within the statement is larger than in previous statements.
- Rate of delivery and lead in times; Mr Ayling explained that there was no significant difference in the figures calculated, however the work undertaken by LSH meant that they were better evidenced.

In addition, Mr Ayling informed the Committee, that planning decisions taken over the previous year had also been considered, including the Tangmere development which had been approved by the Committee at a meeting on 21 March 2021.

On the matter of lead in times, Mr Ayling clarified that this means the time from when an application receives full permission (either a full application or an Outline and then Reserved Matters) and the permission is then issued along with the signed S106 agreement.

With regards to delivery rates on sites; Mr Ayling clarified that delivery rates are considered as a whole, therefore larger sites such as Whitehouse Farm where there a number of developers, will have a higher delivery rate, when compared to smaller sites.

On the matter of how much weight can be attached to Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan; Mr Whitty informed the Committee that it was currently at 'Reg 14' which means officers are unable to apply any significant weight to the policies currently contained within the Neighbourhood Plan. He reassured members that officers do not see the Interim Position Statement (IPS) as a 'green light' to development, it is a useful a tool for assessing the benefits which might be brought forward by development.

On the issue of whether the 5YHLS has any implications to the Duty to Cooperate; Mr Ayling informed the Committee that officers had sought legal opinion regarding this and received very clear advice that the Duty to Cooperate and the 5YHLS are very separate matters until the time when the figure for the Local Plan is agreed.

In a vote the Committee agreed to the report recommendation to **note the housing land supply update and the approach to housing applications as set out in para. 6.4 of the report.**

Recommendation; **That the Committee notes the housing land supply update and the approach to housing applications as set out in para. 6.4 of the report.**

## **Lane Birdham, Chichester West Sussex PO20 7HY**

Bushell presented the report to the Committee. He drew their attention to the Agenda Update Sheet which included additional comments from; Birdham Parish Council, Selsey Town Council, and a further third-party comment; as well as a further reason for refusal.

Mr Bushell explained that the application had been deferred at the Planning Committee on 8 September 2021 for the five reasons recorded within the minutes of the meeting and set out within the report (page 64). With regards to the attendance of a representative from WSCC Highways Mr Bushell explained that unfortunately the WSCC representative had to offer apologies.

Mr Bushell outlined the current policy context and explained that the Council has now moved back to a Plan-led approach when considering applications. He explained that since the last Committee Meeting the Council had published its new Five-Year Housing Land Supply (5YHLS) Statement and could demonstrate a 5.3-year supply. As a result, the officer recommendation had changed from permit (at the September Committee) to refuse, full reasons for the change in the recommendation were detailed in full within the report. In summary, because the Council could demonstrate a 5YHLS the application of the Tilted Balance in favour of development is no longer required and the planning balance is tilted back towards a plan-led approach. Mr Bushell informed the Committee that this approach had been adopted by the Planning Inspector in dismissing a previous appeal on the same site in 2018.

Mr Bushell highlighted the site location to the Committee and explained that the site adjoined the Birdham settlement boundary and was 150m north of the Somerley conservation site. He informed the Committee that the entire site was located within Floodzone 1.

Mr Bushell outlined the three land parcels located within the development site, as well as the proposed access arrangements. He informed the Committee that the proposal was for a mix of 73 houses, flats, and some bungalows, which gives a net density of around 27 dwellings per hectare, along with an employment building and retail unit. There would be a foul water pumping station, which would have a holding tank facility for up to 48 hours.

Mr Bushell confirmed that since the September Committee the applicant had included the 3m maintenance buffer required for drainage ditches on the north, west and south boundaries. However, as detailed in the Agenda Update Sheet, it had not been clarified whether the buffer achieved the required level space for maintenance purposes. The Drainage Engineer had been consulted and due to the lack of clarity on this issue it was not possible to confirm whether the overall quantum of development could be accommodated on the site and as such this matter was included as a further reason for refusal of the application.

Mr Bushell informed the Committee that foul water from the site would drain to the Sidlesham Waste Water Treatment works, via the Pinks Lane pumping station. Since September the Committee report had been updated to provide further

information on foul drainage, Mr Bushell drew the Committee's attention to paragraph 8.20 of the report and introduced Mrs Mayall from Southern Water who was in attendance to help answer any questions regarding foul water drainage.

In summary Mr Bushell concluded that due to the Council now having a 5.3-year housing land supply, paragraph 11d of the NPPF no longer applied. The loss of Bellfield Nursery was considered contrary to the Birdham Neighbourhood Plan Policy 23. In revaluating the application since the September Committee in light of the revised five-year housing land supply position officers had no reason to reach a different decision to that reached by the Appeal Inspector in 2018 and therefore the recommendation was to refuse.

The Committee received representations from;  
Cllr Timothy Firmston – Birdham Parish Council  
Cllr Pieter Montyn – West Sussex County Council Member  
Dr Carolyn Cobbold – Objector (statement read by Mrs Fiona Baker)  
Dr Jill Sutcliffe – Objector (statement read by Mrs Fiona Baker)  
Mr Paul Knappett – Applicant

Officers along with Mr Kevin Bown and Mr David Bowie from National Highways, and Mrs Charlotte Mayall from Southern Water responded to Members comments and questions as follows;

On the issue of infiltration into the sewage network; Mrs Mayall acknowledged the comments made. She confirmed that the infiltration was a recognised issue within the catchment and referred to the response provided as part of the Environmental Information request within the Committee report, which confirmed that an electroscan survey is due to be carried out on the network in January (subject to groundwater conditions). The investigation work in January will look at 6.5km of pipework in Birdham and a further 5km of pipe with the Itchenor catchment area.

Mrs Mayall informed the Committee of the sources of infiltration and, explained how it was affected seasonally by high groundwater within the winter months, as well as surface water after rainfall.

Mrs Mayall informed the Committee how planning applications are assessed at Southern Water and explained that applications are assessed by a team of Hydraulic Modellers who indicate in the response to the planning application whether there is available capacity within the network for the proposed development. With regards to this application, Mrs Mayall told the Committee that there was not currently capacity within the network.

Mrs Mayall explained that the Hydraulic Modelling does not consider infiltration when assessing applications, this is because the matters are separate issues that are not caused by development.

On the matter of surface water infiltration into the foul sewer network; Mrs Mayall agreed that this was a major issue, not just in Birdham but within many of Southern Water's catchment area. She explained that it had been calculated that if surface



water could be removed from the foul network then there would be a reduction of around 40% in pollution incidents, for example through CSO spills. Sustainable drainage is the most effective way forward to help mitigate the issue of surface water entering the network.

On the matter of capacity on the A27 and developing a mitigating scheme; Mr Bown informed Committee that several schemes had been designed and costed, with developer contributions being collected, these had been brought forward through the Adopted Local Plan. He confirmed that from the work undertaken on the emerging Local Plan, National Highways were content to seek developer contributions towards the originally planned schemes.

With regards to the Roads Investment Strategy (RIS) Pipeline Study; Mr Bown confirmed that National Highways, CDC and WSCC were engaged in the study and providing feedback as to what should be looked at and what needs should be considered. Mr Bown cautioned that there is a balance between the expectations set in the emerging Local Plan and what is brought forward through RIS. However, he assured the Committee that as with both RIS 1 and RIS 2 if a more suitable scheme is brought forward through RIS 3 then developer contributions could be used towards that scheme.

Mr Bown informed the Committee that National Highways, at this time, are content to continue following the current SPD, which applies to seeking financial contributions for all sites over 10 dwellings.

With regards to when mitigation measures may be required, Mr Bown, explained that from the evidence gathered to date the junctions at Bognor and Fishbourne roundabouts will require improvements by 2026.

On the issue of highway safety on the A27; Mr Bowie acknowledged that development would increase congestion on the network, however, this does not mean that there will be an adverse impact in terms of safety. He explained that monitoring the impact to safety on the network was done by reviewing historical evidence and undertaking annual checks. Mr Bowie referred to the Stockbridge Roundabout (which this development would impact), he informed the Committee that as a roundabout it had a very good safety record, particularly when compared to the Bognor or Fishbourne roundabouts. Presently, there are approximately two personal injury accidents a year occurring at Stockbridge roundabout, and it is unlikely that the proposed development would impact the junction enough to change the safety risk.

On the matter of how much assurance can be given to the foul drainage works being completed; Mr Whitty advised the Committee that they had received information from Southern Water, who as the statutory provider had confirmed that they were aware of the issue and were undertaking works to try and resolve the matter.

On the issue of Clappers Lane and how it differed from this application; Mr Whitty explained the main difference was that Southern Water at the time had not developed a project plan to deal with the issue of infiltration and were unable to advise when they would be in a position to address the problem, therefore there was

a much greater level of uncertainty (which was supported by Southern Water) and as a consequence it was included as a reason for refusal in the Clappers Lane application.

On the matter of the surface water drainage ditches; Mr Bushell advised the Committee that given there is an ongoing issue with high ground water levels in the area, any permission granted would need to safeguard access to the ditches to ensure they could be suitably maintained. From the information received officers felt there was not enough detail to provide the necessary assurance.

With regards to the width of the buffer; Mr Bushell explained that the 3m measurement was taken from the rear of the garden fence (of the proposed dwellings) to the top edge of the ditch. The width is essential as it must be able to accommodate the type of vehicle required to maintain the ditches. In addition, the provision of the 3m buffer will have an impact upon the quantum of development and the proposed number of dwellings would need to be reduced to accommodate the buffer.

With regards to landscaping, Mr Bushell explained that the site was already well screened, particularly on the south and west boundaries and this would provide satisfactory screening to the site and proposed development (as acknowledged by the Planning Inspector at the Appeal).

On the matter of how much of the perimeter landscaping was in the applicant's control; Mr Bushell reminded the Committee that landscaping was a Reserved Matter and did not form part of the consideration for this application.

On the matter of local highways, Mr Bushell drew the Committee's attention to paragraph 6.11 (page 74 of the report) which set out the additional comments received from WSCC Highways following the September Committee Meeting.

On the issue of the investigation work being undertaken by Southern Water; Mrs Mayall clarified that the electroscanning was the starting point and would provide a picture of what is going on underground. From that a plan will be developed, Mrs Mayall stressed that Southern Water were committed to addressing the issues within the area, however, she was unable to say how long any remedial work would take.

With regards to developer contributions collected by National Highways, Mr Bown informed the Committee that the Council's SPD does allow for developer contributions to be taken on all developments over 10 dwellings. He explained that if this application were to be permitted it would generate a contribution of around £230,000.

With regards to the impact on capacity, Mr Bown explained that designs are developed with a theoretical impact on capacity, considering the requirements of the Local Plan, as well as headroom to accommodate potential windfall sites.

On the issue of accident investigation, Mr Bowie informed the Committee that National Highways are required to investigate all accidents that occur on their network. These are reviewed and fed into a prioritisation programme.

On the matter of a response to the education concerns; Mr Bushell drew the Committee's attention to paragraph 6.14 (page 75) which confirmed that there was capacity to accommodate any required school places if the development were permitted.

On the issue of biodiversity loss being included as a reason for refusal; Mr Bushell advised that this would not be possible as it would be difficult to defend at appeal. The Environment Bill had only received Royal Assent on 9 November and there was still a requirement for secondary legislation before Biodiversity Net Gain was expected to be an issue that the Council would need to consider requiring from developments. This was not anticipated until winter 2023.

With regards to other issues being considered by National Highways; Mr Bown assured the Committee that National Highways do take into consideration factors such as road congestion alongside safety. Current evidence demonstrates that congestion along the A27 does not require any immediate action, however, should the situation change measures such as Grampion conditions can be applied.

Following the debate Mr Barrett proposed the following reasons for inclusion within the Committee refusal;

- 1) The Committee is concerned that it does not have enough information at this time to understand the available capacity in the waste water network.
- 2) The Committee are concerned that with this application the known employment space on the site is being replaced with only potential employment space. As a point of note, Mr Whitty advised the Committee against this proposal due to lack of evidence.

On the advice of Ms Golding, the proposals were voted on separately.

The Committee moved to vote on the second of Mr Barrett's proposals, this did not receive a seconder and was dismissed.

The Committee moved to vote on the first of Mr Barrett's proposals, Mr Oakley seconded this proposal. Following a vote, the committee agreed to include the additional foul water drainage reason for refusal;

In a vote the Committee agreed to the report recommendation to **refuse**.

Recommendation; **refuse** for the reasons listed in the report plus the additional reasons listed below and agreed by the Committee.

*\*Members took a ten-minute break*

*\*Mr McAra left the meeting at 12pm.*

151 **LX/21/02054/FUL - Land South West Of Guildford Road Loxwood West Sussex**

Mr Bushell presented the report to the Committee. He drew their attention to the Agenda Update sheet which included a correction to paragraph 8.9.

Mr Bushell explained that the application was to vary the wording of Condition 6 of planning application LX/20/01481/FUL, the principle of development for 50 dwellings was already established. The variation related to the disposal of foul water from the development site.

Mr Bushell highlighted the site location and approved layout.

He explained that the reason for the variation request is in relation to the first part of Condition 6. The applicant considers that it is unreasonable for the Council to impose a condition that prevents any development commencing on site, when the foul drainage issue only becomes a material consideration upon occupation of the first dwelling, also the requirement for the off-site drainage improvements are dependent on the timetable of the statutory provider (Southern Water) over which the developer has no control.

Mr Bushell informed the Committee that officers had reviewed the Condition and were concerned that it may be unlawful or 'ultra vires', as it depends on a development being carried out to the satisfaction of a third party when the decision on this matter should be the Planning Authority's. Officers had consulted with Southern Water and it was proposed that the condition be varied as set out in the report.

Mr Bushell explained that the proposed variation to the condition would allow for general construction work, unrelated to the drainage works, to commence on site and the trigger point for provision of the offsite foul drainage system to service the development would move from pre-commencement to pre-occupation. If the Statutory Provider has not completed the required off-site works by the time the first dwelling is ready for occupation detailed interim on-site foul drainage measures including temporary storage would need to be submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority and implemented on site. Mr Bushell confirmed that Southern Water had no objection to the variation of condition 6.

The Committee received representations from;  
Cllr Tony Colling – Loxwood Parish Council  
Mrs Katie Martin – Agent

Officers responded to Members comments and questions as follows;

With regards to how long interim measures might be in place; Mr Bushell explained the purpose of the condition is to ensure, that following first occupation, on-site interim measures were in place whilst Southern Water undertake completion of the necessary offsite works. In addition, Mrs Mayall informed the Committee that the

interim measures were included within the condition as a backstop to enable development to go ahead. If housing is delivered and ready for occupation before the agreed 24-month period, the developer will take responsibility for managing the interim measures. Mrs Mayall informed the Committee of the Loxwood growth scheme, funding for the scheme has been secured to identify the preferred solution for growth within the catchment area and engineers were currently working up a design. Mrs Mayall was unable to provide a timetable for the works.

On the issue of a service layby for any on-site interim solution; Mr Bushell confirmed that a layby was already permitted on the approved plans as part of an electricity sub station, but this was no longer required. If the layby needed to be longer or wider than approved for it to accommodate a tanker, then officers would need to consider if this were a material matter or not.

On the issue of whether the current condition is illegal; Mr Whitty confirmed that the Condition was not illegal.

In a vote the Committee agreed the report recommendation to **permit**.

Recommendation; **permit** subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.

152 **LX/21/02477/ADV - Land South West Of Guildford Road Loxwood West Sussex**

Mr Mew presented the report to the Committee. He drew their attention to the Update Sheet which set out an addendum to the report, clarifying that the applicant should read Stonewater.

Mr Mew highlighted the location of where the proposed sign would be located.

He informed the Committee that in response to the Parish Council's objection the wording on the sign has been amended to say '50 houses including Affordable Homes ...'

The Committee received the following representations;  
Cllr Tony Colling – Loxwood Parish Council  
Mrs Katie Martin – Agent

Officers responded to members comments and questions as follows;

On the matter of whether planning permission was required for further housing to be provided as affordable than set out in the S106; Mr Whitty explained that all housing falls within the same use class (C3). Through the S106, the planning permission can only ensure that the minimum requirements of the local plan are secured. Should further permitted housing be provided as affordable, this was not a matter that the permission would, or should, have control.

In a vote the Committee agreed to the report recommendation to **permit**.

Recommendation; **permit** subject to the following conditions and informatives.

*\*Members took an 30 minute lunch break*

153 **BO/20/03326/FUL - Five Elms Stumps Lane Bosham PO18 8QJ**

Mr Mew presented the report to the Committee. He drew their attention to the Agenda Update Sheet which included; an addendum to the plan on page 125, an addendum to the report at paragraphs 2.1 and 2.2 and an amendment to Condition 11.

Mr Mew outlined the site location and explained that the application site was located within the settlement boundary of Bosham and within the Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

He explained that there was an extant permission for a replacement dwelling and garage already on the site (BO/18/00806/FUL). This application seeks planning permission to demolish the existing property and replace it with a two storey house and integrated garage.

Mr Mew outlined the proposed elevations and highlighted to the Committee that it was important to note that this application would be 5cm taller than the extant scheme.

The Committee received representations from;

Mr Jeremy Button – Objector

Mr Mark Hayman – Applicant

Cllr Adrian Moss – Ward Member

Cllr Penny Plant – Ward Member (statement read out by Cllr Adrian Moss)

Officers responded to members comments and questions as follows;

With regards to concerns raised regarding potential surface water run off into the neighbouring pumping station; Mr Mew explained that there were a number of measures included within the application to mitigate run off and reduce the risk of flooding to the property including a green roof. He informed the Committee that the Drainage Engineer had reviewed the application and found the mitigation measures to be acceptable. Condition 4 of the report is included to ensure appropriate drainage measures are in place.

With regards to the difference in height that the structure needs to be raised in comparison to the extant permission; Mr Mew explained that the existing permission had a finished floor level of 4.4m AOD, this application has a finished floor level of 4.5m AOD, so there would be a 10cm difference. In addition, Mr Whitty explained that the mass of the building would be greater than the extant permission, however it is a contemporary design.

On the matter of the roof terrace and potential overlooking; Mr Mew confirmed that this issue was secured through Condition 12 of the report.

With regards to light spillage into neighbouring properties; Mr Mew informed the Committee that Condition 24 of the report addressed this issue and stated that no external illumination shall be provided other than what has been approved. He explained that this was to protect both wildlife and the character of the area.

On the matter of retrofitting the property as oppose to redeveloping; Mr Mew explained that due to the location of the property and the flood risk at the site it was more appropriate to redevelop. He drew the Committee's attention to paragraph 8.30 (p.142) of the report which detailed the Sustainable Design and Construction approach being applied at the site.

On the matter of window heights and the overlooking onto neighbouring properties: Mr Mew informed the Committee that this was secured through a condition withdrawing permitted development rights. The nearest property is 10.8m away and it is not felt that there would be an unacceptable relationship with neighbouring properties.

In a vote the Committee agreed to the report recommendation to **permit**.

Recommendation; **permit** subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.

*\*Members took a ten minute break.*

154 **CC/21/00841/FUL - Telecommunications Site 1498802, Whitehouse Farm, Old Broyle Farm, Chichester, West Broyle PO19 3PH**

Mr Mew presented the report to the Committee. He explained that the site was an existing telecommunications site located within the Whitehouse Farm development site. The impact from the site is mitigated by an existing mature tree line and whilst it is currently sited in a rural location, Mr Mew reminded members that there was an extant permission on the surrounding farm land as part of the Whitehouse Farm development.

He acknowledged that there had been concerns from the City Council in their response regarding the height of the mast and confirmed that there would be minimal increase in the height. However, he did explain that there would be an increase in the massing of the bulk of the antenna which would have a diameter of 2.65m. He confirmed that there was room within the enclosure to accommodate the new mast.

The Committee received representations from;

Mr Michael Doyle – Agent (statement read by Mrs Fiona Baker)

On the matter of possible health implications resulting from the mast; Mr Whitty acknowledged members concerns, however, he explained that health effects from such development are not a material planning consideration. Applicants for such a development are required to submit an assurance document, which Mr Whitty confirmed the applicant had done and did meet the required guidelines.

With regards to provision being made for this type within the GDPO; Ms Stevens confirmed that new provisions had been made, however, the fallback position was that there was a telecommunications mast already on site.

Following a vote the Committee agreed to the report recommendation to **permit**.

Recommendation; **permit**; subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.

*\*Members took a five minute break*

*\*Mrs Fowler left the meeting at 1.15pm*

*\*Mr Oakley left the meeting at 2pm*

155 **KD/20/00457/COU - Herons Farm Village Road Kirdford RH14 0ND**

Mr Price introduced the report to the Committee. He outlined the site location and explained that property was accessed by a single-track lane which was shared by the Foresters Pub and six other dwellings. He explained that the application sought permission for a change of use for the applicant to develop a Wellness Centre in the Sussex Barn on a part-time basis, as well as permission for Bed and Breakfast accommodation to be provided in association with that use. He confirmed that there would be no physical changes to either building.

Mr Price drew the Committee's attention to the Agenda update sheet which included an addendum to the plan on page 163; an addendum to the report at paragraph 8.13; further Officer Comment in respect of paragraph 8.13 and an addendum to the recommendation on page 175; which should read as '**Delegate to Officers**' and an amendment to Condition 6.

Representations were received from;

Cllr Tony Piedade – Kirdford Parish Council

Mr Anthony Brooks – Objector (statement read by Mrs Fiona Baker)

Mrs Meanock – Supporter

Cllr Adrian Moss – speaking on behalf of Ward Member Gareth Evans

Ms Lucy Connor - applicant

Officers responded to Members comments and questions;

On the issue of permitting the application on a temporary basis; Mr Price confirmed that this was a feasible option but advised that if the Committee were minded to accept the application on a temporary basis then they should defer the application and bring it back to Committee. In addition, Mr Whitty advised that if the Committee



were minded impose a temporary condition this must be reasonable as the authority may face costs if an unreasonable impact is caused to the applicant.

On the issue of the property being used as an Airbnb property; Mr Whitty confirmed that so long as the property was being occupied as a single dwelling it can be advertised for Airbnb.

On the matter of water neutrality, Mr Whitty confirmed that the correct approach had been taken by officers when considering the application. He explained that it was not felt the application has any material impact as the potential water use at the property and associated buildings is already established and could be significant.

With regards to how water usage is monitored; Mr Whitty explained that Natural England prepare the methodology that predicts water demand, however, it cannot be fixed to individual usage.

On the matter of electric car charging points; Mr Price confirmed that there were electric vehicle charging points on site, he was unaware of any further ecological enhancements.

Following a vote the Committee dismissed the report recommendation to Permit.

Mr Barrett proposed that the application be deferred, so that officers can negotiate a temporary application with the applicant, and to seek greater clarity on the access lane and water usage at the site. The proposal was seconded by Mr Potter.

In a vote the Committee agreed to **defer**; the application for the reasons set out by Mr Barrett in his proposal.

Recommendation; **defer**; to allow officers to negotiate a temporary application with the applicant, and to seek greater clarity on the access lane and water usage at the site.

*\*Mrs Sharp left the meeting at 3.20pm*

156 **WI/21/02059/DOM - Mulberry Cottage Shipton Green Lane West Itchenor PO20 7BZ**

Ms Stevens presented the report to the Committee. She drew the Committee's attention to the Agenda Update which included additional information from the client, as well as a further officer comment.

Ms Stevens outlined the site location and highlighted where the proposed development was sited. She explained that the site was located outside a

settlement boundary in but was within the AONB area of Chichester Harbour. As a point of for the Committee Ms Stevens clarified that whilst reference had been made to the development being in a 'dark sky' area, unlike the South Downs National Park, this was not a designated dark sky area.

Ms Stevens highlighted the proposed elevations of the development and informed the Committee that timberboarding would be used in the construction of the development.

Ms Stevens informed the Committee that there had been a previous appeal on the site, however this was very old, having taken place in 2004. She explained that apart from the appeal being considered when Planning Policy was different, the appeal was for a separate residential dwelling, whereas this application is for an ancillary building to the main dwelling.

She informed the Committee that officers considered the relationship with neighbouring to be acceptable, with a minimum distance of 10m between the proposed development and neighbouring property.

The Committee received representations from;

Cllr Alastair Spencer – West Itchenor Parish Council  
Mr Roger Jackson – Objector  
Mr Brett Moor – Agent  
Cllr Elizabeth Hamilton – CDC Ward Member

Officers' responded to Members questions and comments as follows;

On the matter of further comments from the Harbour Conservancy regarding their holding objection; Ms Stevens explained that they had not been reconsulted following the negotiations with the applicant to reduce the depth of the development.

With regards to vehicular access to the garage; Ms Stevens confirmed that the access would be created over what was currently lawn. She agreed that a condition could be included within the permission which required that the new access be constructed from a permeable material to mitigate any adverse impact from surface water.

With regards to the retention of the beech hedge referenced within the Harbour Conservancy representation; Ms Stevens confirmed that a condition could be included to secure the retention of the beech hedge.

On the matter of the location of the property; Ms Stevens confirmed that the development location was as shown in the presentation and would be set back from the main dwelling.

With regards to any potential disruption to natural light at neighbouring properties; Ms Stevens informed the Committee that officers had considered the issue and believed that the development would not cause an unacceptable relationship with the neighbouring properties.

With regards to the height of the proposed development and the impact on the street scene; Ms Stevens clarified that the maximum height of the building would be 5.9m (2.4m at eaves), it is not felt that the development will have a significant impact on the local area. In addition she explained that even if the trees behind the development were not there the development would still be unlikely to cause a material impact to the street scene.

Ms Stevens explained the streetscene shows the height of the proposal to be 5.9m however officers cannot guarantee that the streetscene is a surveyed plan, and reliance should be placed on the elevations and block plan rather than the streetscene.

On the matter of the property being used for 'Airbnb'; Ms Stevens confirmed that this was not a material consideration.

Mr Whitty advised given officers cannot verify that the streetscene is a surveyed streetscene that members base decision on the elevations and photos they have seen.

In a vote the Committee agreed to the report recommendation to **permit**, with the inclusion of the additional conditions to retain the beech hedge and construct the new driveway from a permeable surface.

Recommendation; **permit** subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report plus the additional conditions agreed.

*\*Mr Oakley rejoined the meeting at 3.22pm.*

157 **Chichester District Council Schedule of Planning Appeals, Court and Policy Matters**

Ms Golding drew the Committee's attention to the Agenda Update Sheet, which provided a High Court update on the site of Land at Bethwines Farm and South of Ivy Lodge.

The Committee agreed to note the item.

158 **South Downs National Park Authority Schedule of Planning Appeals, Court and Policy Matters**

The Committee agreed to note the item.

159 **Consideration of any late items as follows:**

There were no late items.

160 **Exclusion of the Press and Public**

There were no part two items.

The meeting ended at 4.06 pm

---

CHAIRMAN

---

Date:

## South Downs National Park

### Planning Committee

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

#### Schedule of Planning Appeals, Court and Policy Matters

**Date between 17.11.21 and 14.12.21**

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.

## 2, DECIDED

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p><u>SDNP/20/01960/LIS</u></p> <p>Harting Parish Council</p> <p>Case Officer: Rebecca Perris</p> <p><b>Written Representation</b></p>	<p>Ffowlers Bucke, The Street South Harting GU31 5QB - Replacement windows to the front elevation and like for like replacement roof tiles.</p>
<b>Appeal Decision: APPEAL ALLOWED</b>	
<p>"...I consider that the current windows are non-historic windows which were inserted in the 1970's when the front façade was extensively remodelled. Furthermore, I observed on site that the secondary glazing which has been installed in a number of windows is visually very prominent and given its depth results in a noticeable double reflection. ... I acknowledge that double glazed units can have a thicker and heavier appearance than single glazing and can require unsympathetic alterations to frames and glazing bars to accommodate the additional weight and thickness of the double-glazed units. However, because the proposal would use slimline double-glazed units, I consider that there would be limited visual effect on the bulk and detail of the proposed windows and whilst there would be some double reflection this would be far less noticeable than that caused by the current secondary glazing. ... The proposed two pane window design and the use of slimline double-glazed units would enable the removal of the visually prominent secondary glazing and would introduce a window design that would reflect the design of windows elsewhere in the Conservation Area. ... The Council have cited a number of appeal decisions as setting precedent for refusing the use of double glazing. However, I consider that the circumstances for these appeals differ to the appeal site and as a result they do not lead me to a different view in this case. ..."</p>	

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p data-bbox="108 185 411 219"><u>SDNP/20/05128/FUL</u></p> <p data-bbox="108 259 483 327">Stedham with Iping Parish Council</p> <p data-bbox="108 367 480 400">Case Officer: Louise Kent</p> <p data-bbox="108 441 464 474"><b>Written Representation</b></p>	<p data-bbox="552 185 1302 253">The Old Dairy Mill Lane Stedham GU29 0PR - New agricultural barn.</p>
<b>Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED</b>	
<p data-bbox="108 521 1420 1971">"...Policy SD39 relate to siting and design, the proposed building would be a large modern agricultural storage shed. Whilst it would thus bear no relation to the more traditional agricultural structures which characterise the broader landscape of the National Park, examples of which cluster towards the northwest, its siting in the corner of the field would also lack a close relationship with other buildings. In this regard there would be no obvious physical or visual relationship between the building and a few cylindrical concrete structures located on a sewerage works towards the south of the site. In order to reduce the extent of resulting intrusion into the open landscape, a green roof and bunding are proposed. The type of green roof intended is unclear, but it is apparent that this would provide the building with an unusual appearance. The bund would itself appear as a wholly alien feature within the existing sloping terrain of the field, and this would be the case whether or not it was planted. In each regard therefore, the proposed measures would serve to highlight rather than mitigate the intrusive presence of the building. In the absence of these trees, it is likely that the building would be clearly exposed to view from the public footpath along the river. Within the field itself, and particularly from higher ground toward the northwest, the intrusion caused by the building and associated landscaping would otherwise be obvious. In view of my findings above the development would not conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the National Park. ... The agricultural activity claimed to generate a need for the proposed building is the production of hay. Excluding those parts of the field which contain trees, its productive area is relatively small, and it is further reduced by perimeter mowing and the open-air storage of machinery and implements. ... Evidence has also been provided of proof of ownership. Here I have little reason to doubt that the machinery and implements are or have been used in the field at various points in the past, albeit some more recently than others. It is also apparent that storage under cover would be beneficial. The machinery and implements in question are however of varied size, and most are reasonably compact. In this regard I acknowledge that the height of the proposed building has been dictated by that of the appellant's tractor, and that this would facilitate access. However, it is far from clear that this would be essential in relation to all parts of the building, and all of the machinery and implements which could be hooked to the tractor. In this regard the scale of the proposed building appears excessive. The extent to which the area designated for storage of hay would correlate with the volume of hay yielded by the field is additionally unknown in the absence of any figures. Moreover, at the time of my visit I saw no evidence that a hay crop had actually been produced this summer. Indeed, though the appellant reports that the crop is stored outdoors wrapped in plastic, and that this caters for a peak winter demand, I observed no such bales within the field or anywhere else within the blue line area. As the stated need for indoor storage of hay provides one of the key reasons for the proposed building, the apparent absence of the crop casts some doubt on the nature of need, as too on the nature of the hay making enterprise which ultimately generates it. ... the evidence before me is insufficient to clearly establish the full nature of the agricultural need for the building, both in terms of the operation generating it, and</p>	

**Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED  
- continued**

minimum space requirements. That being so, I cannot be satisfied that there is a need for a building of the size, dimensions or type proposed. Even had I found otherwise, this would not directly justify the intrusive siting, design and landscaping proposed. Either way therefore, the failure of the scheme to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the National Park would be unacceptable. ... fail to conserve and enhance natural beauty of the National Park, and that the adverse effect would not be justified by need. The development would therefore conflict with Policies SD4 and SD5 of the Local Plan, which each seek to secure development sensitive to landscape character, and Policies SD25 and SD39 of the Local Plan as considered above. ... Nonetheless, one of the items to be stored within the building would be a bale wrapper. It is also indicated that haylage would be produced according to demand. The claimed environmental benefits of not using plastic wrap are therefore open to doubt, and more so given uncertainty relating to the summer crop. As such they do not attract weight in favour of the scheme. ..."

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p data-bbox="108 181 440 219"><u>SDNP/20/03482/APNB</u></p> <p data-bbox="108 255 475 293">Lurgashall Parish Council</p> <p data-bbox="108 329 376 400">Case Officer: John Saunders</p> <p data-bbox="108 436 464 474"><b>Written Representation</b></p>	<p data-bbox="552 181 1326 253">Land to The North of Blind Lane Blind Lane Lurgashall West Sussex - 2 no. agricultural barns.</p>
<b>Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED</b>	
<p data-bbox="108 517 1420 1937">"...Class A, Part 6, Schedule 2 of the 2015 GPDO establishes permitted development rights for the carrying out on agricultural land comprised in an agricultural unit of 5 hectares in area of a) works for the erection, extension or alteration of a building; or b) any excavation or engineering operations, which are reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture within that unit. ... Paragraph A.2 (1)(a) confirms that development is permitted with the condition that where the development is carried out within 400 metres of the curtilage of a protected building, the building, structure, excavation or works resulting from the development are not used for the accommodation of livestock except in the circumstances described in paragraph D.1(3) of Part 6. Paragraph D.1(3) confirms that the circumstances referred to above are a) that no other suitable building or structure, 400 metres or more from the curtilage of a protected building, is available to accommodate the livestock; and b)(i) that the need to accommodate the livestock arises from quarantine requirements, or an emergency due to another building or structure in which the livestock could otherwise be accommodated being unavailable because it has been damaged or destroyed by fire, flood or storm; or (ii) in the case of animals normally kept out of doors, they require temporary accommodation in a building or other structure because they are sick or giving birth or newly born, or to provide shelter against extreme weather conditions. The proposed location for the barns is within 400 metres of a protected building, and the original application form categorically states that the proposed building would be used to house livestock. This matter was subsequently clarified on a revised drawing to confirm that the proposed barns would be used as emergency shelters in adverse weather conditions, storage of animal feeds, bedding etc. and agricultural equipment. ... the appellant is of the view that the proposal should benefit from the circumstances identified within Paragraph D.1(3) and that the buildings would provide the temporary accommodation for the reasons referred to in D.1(3)(b)(ii). ... Paragraph D.1(3) is an important element of the permitted development right as it provides a degree of flexibility in how buildings are used. However, in my judgement, this flexibility should not be used as the regular interpretation of Part 6, Class A. It seems to me that the interpretation in Paragraph D.1(3) provides a form of insurance policy which enables buildings to be used in this manner in unusual circumstances. ... My interpretation is that Paragraph D.1(3) provides flexibility in how buildings may be used in the future where circumstances dictate. It should not be used as a means to justify the location of new buildings because this would be in direct conflict with the specific permitted development right. Accordingly, in my view, the permitted development right is not designed to enable buildings to be erected for these specific reasons, rather that when circumstances dictate, a building allowed under the permitted development right could be used for this purpose. ... I am satisfied that Paragraph D.1(3) does not provide justification for the proposal. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would not represent permitted development under Schedule 2, Part 6, Class A of the 2015 GPDO. ..."</p>	



Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p data-bbox="108 181 400 219"><u>SDNP/20/01960/LIS</u></p> <p data-bbox="108 255 443 293">Cocking Parish Council</p> <p data-bbox="108 329 437 400">Case Officer: Charlotte Cranmer</p> <p data-bbox="108 436 464 474"><b>Written Representation</b></p>	<p data-bbox="552 181 1385 293">Longmeadow Bell Lane Cocking GU29 0HU - Erection of 1 no. detached dwelling with associated garaging and associated surface parking.</p>
<b>Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED</b>	
<p data-bbox="92 517 1415 622">“...there are 2 appeals on this site which relate to 2 different schemes. I have considered each on its individual merits, however, in order to avoid duplication, I have dealt with the appeals together, except where otherwise indicated. ...</p> <p data-bbox="92 622 400 660">The main issues are:</p> <ul data-bbox="92 660 1415 943" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the effect of the developments on the integrity of the Arun Valley Special Area Conservation, Special Protection Area, and Ramsar Site (collectively the Arun Valley sites);</li> <li>• in relation to Appeal B, the effect of the development on the living conditions of occupants of 8 High Meadow with regard to outlook and privacy; and</li> <li>• the effect of the developments on the character and appearance of the area, including the natural beauty and cultural heritage of the South Downs National Park (the National Park).</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="92 943 1415 1406"><i>Arun Valley sites</i> - The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (the Habitats Regulations) states that before deciding to grant planning permission for a project which is likely to have a significant effect on a European site, either alone, or in combination with other plans or projects, and which is not directly connected with or necessary to the management of that site, a competent authority must make an Appropriate Assessment of the implications of the plan or project for that site in view of its conservation objectives. ... absence of any imperative reasons of overriding public interest for the developments to proceed, allowing either appeal would be contrary to the Habitats Regulations. ... In view of my findings above, I conclude that the developments subject of both Appeal A and Appeal B would have a likely adverse effect on the integrity of the Arun Valley sites. This would conflict with the Habitats Regulations and Policy SD9 of the South Downs Local Plan 2019 (the Local Plan) which seeks to secure development in accordance with them.</p> <p data-bbox="92 1406 1415 1998"><i>Living conditions (Appeal B)</i> - The site forms part of the garden of Longmeadow and lies immediately towards the north of the modestly sized plot on which No 8 is located. The latter tapers towards its west, or back garden end, and given a steep fall in ground levels it mostly stands at a lower level than the site. ... Unit 2 would present a long 2-storey side elevation to the boundary. The development would as such have a significant physical and visual presence when viewed from within both No 8 and its garden. This would be amplified by the tapering shape of the plot, by falling ground levels, and by the fact that built form would occupy much of the space on the north side of the boundary. The resulting effects of physical overbearing would be somewhat oppressive, and would not be meaningfully balanced by the otherwise open outlook that would continue to exist towards the south. ... Unit 2 would be screened by a high hedge ... However, ... it would not be wholly effective in concealing the height, solid mass and physical form of Unit 2. The long-term retention of such a hedge cannot in any case be wholly guaranteed. A hedge would not therefore remove or adequately mitigate the effects of overbearing identified above, which would in consequence cause unacceptable harm to the outlook of occupants of No 8. ... in the scheme subject of Appeal A ... the dwelling would stand further to the north. The components of the dwelling closest to the boundary with No 8</p>	

**Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED  
- continued**

would also be single storey. The effects of the developments would therefore differ, and here I share the Authority's view that these effects would not be unacceptable in relation to Appeal A. ... No unacceptable harm to the privacy of occupants of No 8, or for that matter Unit 2, would therefore arise. For the reasons outlined above I conclude that whilst the development subject of Appeal B would not have an unacceptable effect on the privacy of occupants of No 8, its effects in relation to outlook would be unacceptable. ... *Character and appearance* - The size of the 2 small dwellings subject of Appeal B would relate poorly to the prevailing pattern. Though the size of the plots would nonetheless be comparable with that of No 8 to the south, the close proximity of the rear elevation of Unit 2 to that of No 8 would be atypical viewed in context. The uneasy nature of the resulting relationship would be further emphasised by physical overbearing. ... the development would appear unduly cramped. Its resulting incongruous appearance relative to its setting would not be altered by the use of vernacular materials. The single detached dwelling subject of Appeal A would relate more directly to the prevailing pattern. Its overall dimensions and massing would appear greater than that of some other nearby dwellings, but its footprint and form would be relatively compact. The size of the plot would otherwise fall at or above the higher end of the range found within High Meadow, and would be broadly comparable with those of other detached dwellings found on the north side of Bell Lane further towards the east. ... Taking these points together, the development would not appear cramped when considered either individually or in relation to other nearby developments. It would indeed fit reasonably well within the broader pattern. 22. The Authority additionally states that the dwelling subject of Appeal A would compete with the building of which Longmeadow forms part. This it has identified as a non-designated heritage asset, ... The building and its plot have therefore been partly absorbed and altered by later residential development. The developments subject of both appeals would continue this process, and to this end the Authority raised no objection on grounds of effects on setting. ... . Dwellings located on the north side of Bell Lane generally stand at a much higher level than the lane itself. The same would be true in relation to the dwellings subject of both appeals. This would ultimately highlight the cramped nature of the scheme subject of Appeal B. However, the physical and visual presence of the dwelling subject of Appeal A would not appear unusual. ... The site is located within the National Park within which there is a statutory duty to have regard to the purposes of its designation. ... given the limited nature of the view and the distance involved it is highly unlikely that the dwellings would stand out within their setting. The developments subject of both appeals would therefore conserve the landscape and scenic beauty of the National Park. ... In view of my findings in relation to the non-designated heritage asset, I find that the cultural heritage of the National Park would be conserved. ... For the reasons outlined above I conclude that the development subject of Appeal A would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area, including the natural beauty and cultural heritage of the National Park. ... The effects of the development subject of Appeal B on the character and appearance of the area would however be unacceptable. In this regard the scheme would again conflict with Policy ... The proposed dwellings would be constructed in an accessible location within the defined settlement. Both schemes would contribute towards the general need for new housing, Appeal B more so than Appeal A. In neither regard however would the associated social and economic benefits outweigh the harm I have identified above. The developments subject of Appeal A and Appeal B would have an unacceptable effect on the Arun Valley sites. That subject of Appeal B would also otherwise have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of occupants of No 8 and the character and appearance of the area. In both regards the appeals conflict with development plan. ... I conclude that both Appeal A and Appeal B should be dismissed."

### 3. CURRENT APPEALS

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p><u>SDNP/20/01635/LDP</u> West Lavington Parish Council Case Officer: Derek Price</p> <p><b>Informal Hearing</b></p>	<p>Kennels Farm Selham Road West Lavington Midhurst West Sussex GU29 0AU - Proposed use of buildings at Kennels Farm as Estate Maintenance yard including a joinery workshop, painters workshop, stores and offices.</p>
<p><u>SDNP/21/00587/HOUS</u> Northchapel Parish Council Case Officer: Beverley Stubbington</p> <p><b>Householder Appeal</b></p>	<p>7 Luffs Meadow Northchapel Petworth West Sussex GU28 9HN - Retention of home office (retrospective).</p>
<p><u>SDNP/21/04110/LDE</u> Lynchmere Parish Council Case Officer: Louise Kent</p> <p><b>Written Representation</b></p>	<p>1 Stone Pit Cottages Marley Combe Road Camelsdale Linchmere GU27 3SP - Existing lawful development - rear garden cabin.</p>
<p><u>SDNP/20/04533/HOUS</u> Fittleworth Parish Council Parish Case Officer: Beverley Stubbington</p> <p><b>Householder Appeal</b></p>	<p>Dunrovin Limbourne Lane Fittleworth RH20 1HR - Erection of a two storey rear extension and front porch with associated roof works and installation of tile hanging at the first floor level.</p>
<p><u>SDNP/20/03967/HOUS</u> West Lavington Parish Council Case Officer: Beverley Stubbington</p> <p><b>Written Representation</b></p>	<p>Hill View Cocking Causeway Cocking GU29 9QG - Replace an existing outbuilding within the curtilage of Hill View with a detached annexe.</p>

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p><u>SDNP/20/02935/CND</u> Harting Parish Council</p> <p>Case Officer: Derek Price</p> <p><b>Informal Hearing</b></p>	<p>Three Cornered Piece East Harting Hollow Road East Harting West Sussex GU31 5JJ - Change of use to a mixed use of the land comprising the keeping and grazing of horses and a gypsy and traveller site for one family. (Variation of conditions 1, 2, 3 and 4 of planning permission SDNP/16/06318/FUL- To make the permission permanent,non personal to increase the number of mobile homes by one to change the layout.)</p>
<p><u>SDNP/20/05361/FUL</u> Duncton Parish Council Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Beverley Stubbington</p> <p><b>Written Representation</b></p>	<p>Laudacre Cottage Beechwood Lane Duncton GU28 0NA - Replacement dwelling, garage and associated works (amendments to design approved under SDNP/16/01733/FUL).</p>
<p><u>SDNP/21/00350/HOUS</u> Petworth Town Council Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Jenna Shore</p> <p><b>Householder Appeal</b></p>	<p>Leith House Angel Street Petworth GU28 0BG - Proposed domestic ancillary outbuilding.</p>
<p><u>SDNP/21/00278/HOUS</u> Petworth Town Council Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Jenna Shore</p> <p><b>Householder Appeal</b></p>	<p>Leith House Angel Street Petworth GU28 0BG - Demolition of an existing double garage and alterations and extensions to existing dwelling.</p>
<p><u>SDNP/20/04081/FUL</u> Petworth Town Council Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Beverley Stubbington</p> <p><b>Written Representation</b></p>	<p>The Grove Inn Grove Lane Petworth GU28 0HY - Change of use to 1 no. dwelling and replacement garaging and associated alterations.</p>

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<u>SDNP/20/04726/HOUS</u> Lodsworth Parish Council  Case Officer: Beverley Stubbington  <b>Householder Appeal</b>	St Peters Well Vicarage Lane Lodsworth GU28 9DF - New timber-framed four-bay garage, brick retaining wall and relocation of existing oil tank.
<u>SDNP/18/00609/BRECO</u> Rogate Parish Council  Case Officer: Steven Pattie  <b>Written Representation</b>	Land South of Harting Combe House Sandy Lane Rake Rogate West Sussex - Appeal against Enforcement Notice RG/37
<u>SDNP/19/00386/COU</u> Fittleworth Parish Council  Case Officer: Sue Payne  <b>Written Representation</b>	Douglaslake Farm Little Bognor Road Fittleworth Pulborough West Sussex RH20 1JS - Appeal against FT/11

#### 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

This page is intentionally left blank