

Chichester District Council

Planning Committee

Wednesday 10 July 2019

Report of the Director Of Planning and Environment Services Schedule of Planning Appeals, Court and Policy Matters Between 16-May-2019 and 21-Jun-2019

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

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

* - Committee level decision.

1. NEW APPEALS (Lodged)

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
19/00269/FUL Oving Parish Case Officer: Maria Tomlinson Written Representation	Merston Drier Barn Marsh Lane Merston Oving West Sussex - Change of use from agriculture to a mixed use comprising of agricultural storage and the storage of up to 10 vintage cars.
19/01106/PLD Sidlesham Parish Case Officer: Caitlin Boddy Written Representation	62 Street End Lane Sidlesham PO20 7RG - Proposed lawful development certificate for all or any of those operations specified in the attached schedule of proposed works within the site edged red on the location plan (TQRQM18256171349316).

2. DECISIONS MADE

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p data-bbox="197 342 405 376">18/01983/FUL</p> <p data-bbox="197 383 416 416">Birdham Parish</p> <p data-bbox="197 479 584 512">Case Officer: Caitlin Boddy</p> <p data-bbox="197 573 552 607">Written Representation</p>	<p data-bbox="638 342 1453 450">Yendor Farm Hundredsteddle Lane Birdham PO20 7BL - Demolition of buildings and replacement with 4no. mobile holiday homes.</p>
<p data-bbox="552 656 1137 689">Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED</p>	
<p data-bbox="178 692 1489 1055">The appeal is dismissed. ... The appeal proposal would result in the provision of four units of tourism accommodation with associated economic benefits as part of a rural diversification scheme. It would also preserve the rural and tranquil character of the area and avoid conflict with Policies 1 and 4 of the NP, and Local Plan Policies 47 and 48 of the NP. The effects on the SPA could also be adequately mitigated in accordance with Local Plan Policy 50. ... However, these factors do not outweigh the conflict with Policies 13 and 15 of the NP, and Policies 30 and 45 of the Local Plan in respect of the rural location of the proposal, which has not been adequately justified. The proposal conflicts with the Development Plan as a whole and with national policies. There are no material considerations that outweigh this conflict. ... As such, for the reasons set out above, the appeal is dismissed.</p>	

<p>* 18/00798/FUL Chichester Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Maria Tomlinson</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>28 Melbourne Road Chichester PO19 7ND - Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 2 no. dwellings.</p>
<p>Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED</p>	
<p>I see the redevelopment of the site with a two storey building as having the potential to improve the appearance of the local street scene. ... However.....</p> <p>Bringing together my conclusions on the main issues I have found that the scale and mass of new building proposed in the redevelopment of the site with two houses would result in the proposal having a cramped and imposing appearance which would harm the character of the street scene and conflict with the relevant policy in the development plan. Nevertheless, the proposal would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of existing properties, and the occupiers of the new houses would have reasonable living conditions. Neither has harm to highway safety or traffic congestion been demonstrated ... Overall, I find that because of the adverse effects under the environmental dimension the scheme conflicts with the NPPF when this is read as a whole. The benefits of the redevelopment put forward do not outweigh the adverse effects and therefore the other considerations which arise do not outweigh the conflict with the development plan. This indicates that planning permission should not be granted.</p>	

<p>18/02459/FUL Chichester Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: James Gellini</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>26 The Pitcroft Chichester PO19 6XB - Two storey side extension onto existing property to form 2 bedroom dwelling onto side of existing terrace property.</p>
<p>Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED</p>	
<p>the area is characterised by a strong sense of uniformity and harmony. ... I conclude that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area ... It is the appellant's intention to live in the dwelling proposed. As such its internal space would be consistent with his needs. Nevertheless it is the function of planning to consider the acceptability of development in the public interest; at some point others would become occupants ... the internal floorspace proposed would be 60 square metres. That is significantly below the 70sqm minimum that would be required by the Government's Technical housing standards: nationally described space standard (March 2015) ... the proposal would in my view result in unduly cramped and inadequate internal space for comfortable residential use ... the approach to mitigating ecological effects, as set out above, has been established at a strategic level with reference to that wider context. It has been formulated such that development should contribute, in proportion, to its likely impacts. There is nothing before me to indicate that development elsewhere failed to make appropriate provision. ... the proposal would have an adverse effect on the ecological integrity of the SPA</p>	

<p>18/03046/DOM Chichester Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: William Price</p> <p>Householder Appeal</p>	<p>57 Westgate Chichester West Sussex PO19 3EZ - 3 no. replacement windows.</p>
<p>Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED</p>	
<p>... Each case must be assessed on its own merits, and the fact that uPVC windows have been installed elsewhere within the terrace, does not render the proposal before me as automatically acceptable. ... uPVC is not a traditional material and there is a cruder attention to detail in units made from it; for example a gap can be seen where the glazing bars meet the top and bottom rails and overall there is a greater depth of window in section than would be the case for single glazed replacements. Furthermore, such windows lack the finely detailed glazing bars and texture that one experiences when inspecting the surface of painted timber through grain and brush marks. ... I therefore consider that the installation of uPVC replacement windows would be inappropriate within the site's historic context; and that the design of the windows would fail to preserve the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposal would also give rise to harm to the setting of nearby Listed Buildings. ...</p>	
<p>18/01191/FUL Chidham & Hambrook Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Caitlin Boddy</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Little Oaks The Bridleway Newells Lane West Ashling Chichester West Sussex PO18 8DF - Continued stationing of a Gypsy/Traveller's mobile home.</p>
<p>Appeal Decision: APPEAL ALLOWED</p>	
<p>From all of this evidence, it is clear to me that Mr and Mrs Tobitt identify themselves as Travellers ... I find that the appellants meet the definition of gypsies or travellers ... I find that the proposal accords with the detailed criteria set out in Policy 36 and as such it is form of development that is consistent with the development strategy applying in CLP Policy 2. ... the mobile home and its residential trappings are not prominent in the landscape and visually it only has a very limited impact locally including when seen from the bridleway. ... consider that the harm to the landscape character of the area is local and limited. ... It appears to me that in compliance with Policy 36 there is an assumption that a proposal may have an effect on the general rural landscape of the area as criterion 4 of the policy restricts proposals within 'nationally designated areas of landscape' which does not include the appeal site. A proposal compliant with Policy 36 should therefore be seen as similar to ones under Policy 45 for exceptional forms of development which requires a countryside location. As such there would be compliance with the overall development strategy set out in CLP Policy 2.</p>	

<p>18/02620/FUL Chidham & Hambrook Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Maria Tomlinson</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Building North Of 1 Chidham Lane Chidham PO18 8TL - Change of use from telephone exchange to holiday let, single storey front and rear extensions, 2 no. dormers with internal and external alterations.</p>
<p>Appeal Decision: APPEAL ALLOWED</p>	
<p>The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area. ... I acknowledge that the proposal would result in a building with a quirky and idiosyncratic form. Nevertheless the materials to be used and architectural detailing is not without precedent nearby; such a form would arguably reflect the complexity of how older buildings are re-used and evolve over time (as opposed to an attempted replica or replacement). ... Moreover I have set out above how the exchange is recessed from the building line, well set-back from Chidham Lane and the A259, and partially obscured by trees and vegetation between it and those carriageways. I am therefore not of the view that any appreciable landscape harm would result, including in relation to the Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty ('AONB') in which the appeal site falls. ... For the above reasons I conclude that the proposal would integrate appropriately with its surroundings in respect of character and appearance. Accordingly no conflict arises with the relevant provisions of the development plan policies or elements of the NPPF cited in paragraphs 12 and 13 above</p>	

<p><u>17/00391/CONDWE</u> Earnley Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Shona Archer</p> <p>Public Inquiry 08/10/2019 10:00:00 Chichester District Council East Pallant House PO19 1TY</p>	<p>Dragon Nursery Third Avenue Batchmere West Sussex - Appeal against E/31</p>
<p>Appeal Decision: APPEAL WITHDRAWN</p>	
<p>Please treat this email as formal confirmation that the two appeals have hereby been withdrawn</p>	
<p><u>17/02842/FUL</u> Earnley Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Fjola Stevens</p> <p>Public Inquiry 08/10/2019 10:00:00 Chichester District Council East Pallant House PO19 1TY</p>	<p>Dragon Nursery Third Avenue Batchmere West Sussex - 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, 40 no. 300W PV panels and roof lanterns.</p>
<p>Appeal Decision: APPEAL WITHDRAWN</p>	
<p>Please treat this email as formal confirmation that the two appeals have hereby been withdrawn</p>	

<p>* 17/03547/FUL East Wittering And Bracklesham Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Caitlin Boddy</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Land East Of 10 Downview Close East Wittering PO20 8NS - Construction of 1 no. 3 bedroom detached dwelling and 2 no. semi-detached, 3 bedroom dwellings.</p>
<p>Appeal Decision: APPEAL ALLOWED</p>	
<p>Either side of Downview Close along the B2179 properties are set closer to the road in regular plots, without as generous spacing between them as between Nos 10 and 11. ... In that context the creation of three dwellings would, in my view, have little substantive effect. The dwellings proposed would be broadly aligned with the principal elevations of neighbouring properties, thereby maintaining spaciousness resulting from the open space between them and Stocks Lane. ... result in an approximate gap between the proposed dwellings of around 8.8 metres. That remains relatively generous compared to the prevailing arrangement of properties described above. It would also still allow for views, albeit less expansive, of the playing fields and distant countryside from vantage points around Downview Close and Stocks Lane. Although of limited weight, it is also noteworthy that, aside from being essentially open, the untended nature of the elements of the appeal site does not contribute positively to the character of the area. ... I acknowledge that the proposal would have some effect on openness in this location. However for the above reasons given the specific nature of the development proposed and its surrounding context, I am not of the view that would be so significant as to be incongruous or unacceptable. I therefore conclude that the proposal would integrate appropriately with the character and appearance of the area, in accordance with the relevant provisions of LP policy33 and elements of NPPF paragraph 127.</p>	

<p>18/02359/OUT East Wittering And Bracklesham Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: James Gellini</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Land North Of Anstey East Bracklesham Drive Bracklesham PO20 8JW - Construction of 1 no. 2 bedroom bungalow.</p>
Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED	
<p>Notwithstanding that the proposal is in outline, LP policy 33 requires that new residential development respects the character of the surrounding area, including in relation to layout and density ... Despite the variety described above, there are nevertheless some common characteristics here ... broadly consistent narrow rectilinear plots remains readily apparent. ... uniform pattern of development ... Despite the presence of outbuildings, that nevertheless lends the area a characteristic openness. Outbuildings are, typically, utilitarian or functional in aesthetic and are generally more modest than a dwelling would likely need to be to afford ... reasonable standards of accommodation. They therefore generally appear incidental or ancillary to host properties. ... Nevertheless, in my view, they are very much exceptions to the prevailing spacious character along the Drive. ... the proposal would inevitably introduce an incongruous layout of development relative to the prevailing pattern and level of density.. ... it has not been demonstrated that a dwelling could be created at the appeal site which would integrate appropriately with the character and appearance of the area.</p>	

<p>17/03521/FUL Plaistow And Ifold Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Caitlin Boddy</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Nell Ball Farm Dunsfold Road Plaistow RH14 0BF - Egg packing building, machinery store, sheep lairage, pig building, manure structure, farm shop/office/storage and processing buildings and associated parking and hard-standing.</p>
<p>Appeal Decision: APPEAL ALLOWED</p>	
<p>... it is clear from the limited sizes of the shop and raw meat preparation room that the business venture in Building A would be small scale. Compared with the farm's overall size and extent of other agricultural activities it would be ancillary in nature. ... Building A would not be isolated ... It would provide employment opportunities ... community facility for local people ... A countryside location would therefore be justified for the activities within Building A and would not be contrary to the principles of sustainable development. ... My findings are that there is sufficient evidence to demonstrate the need for Building B. ... the current appeal proposal does not seek permission for the retention of this central hard-standing area. ... All buildings would be modest in scale and constructed in timber and materials suitable for this rural setting. ... the concrete hard-standing around some of these would be limited in extent and appropriate to servicing needs. ... The proposal would thereby have a minimal impact on the landscape and rural character of the area ... My findings are that the proposal would not be an isolated or unsustainable form of development but that it would be appropriate to its rural location. ... The proposal would enable an appropriate diversification of the present agricultural enterprise with buildings suitably located within the site without harm to the rural landscape character of the area.</p>	

<p>18/01353/PA3Q Sidlesham Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Maria Tomlinson</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Butskiln Street End Road Sidlesham Chichester West Sussex PO20 7QD - Notification for Prior Approval for a Proposed Change of Use of Agricultural Building to 2 no. dwellinghouses (Class C3) and for associated development.</p>
---	--

Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED

The main issue is: • whether the proposal under Class Q.1(i)(i) would consist of building operations that exceed those permitted as reasonably necessary for the building to function as a dwellinghouse..... Whilst in its current form the glasshouse has a solid wall and roof, these are almost entirely glazed. The steel frame may be structurally sound enough to support these elements, but beyond that, there is nothing that makes the structure suitable for conversion to residential use. The glazed walls would be removed to pare the structure back to the steel frame. The element of the building that would be reused would essentially be its skeletal structure, albeit only parts thereof..... The appellant claims that the walls will be 'infilled' with vertical timber cladding and new glazing with insulation between the outer wall and new inner wall. The terms 'infilling' and 'cladding' presuppose that there are existing gaps or something onto which cladding can be affixed, when in fact new external walls would be constructed in their entirety, save for the aforementioned section of plinth. In respect of the roof, the appellants' statement suggests the existing roof will be retained and 'clad' but contradicts this elsewhere by saying that new purlins are required, which goes beyond retaining and cladding the existing roof..... I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not comply with Class Q, as the building operations clearly exceed those

<p>17/02260/FUL Westhampnett Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: James Gellini</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Land South Of Madgwick Lane Westhampnett Chichester West Sussex - Temporary residency for 5 yrs provision of mobile home.</p>
<p>Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED</p>	
<p>... Whilst the Council therefore accepts that the need for the mobile home on site is proven, it is nonetheless concerned about the impact on living conditions arising from its location ... Goodwood Aerodrome is to the north. The site is approximately 450m from Goodwood Motor Circuit and from the nearest runway at the Aerodrome. The impact of aircraft noise on living conditions has to be balanced against the accepted need for a temporary dwelling. The NPSE recognises the need for such an approach. The PNR concludes that the overall mitigation of noise within the mobile home would be satisfactory ... The appellant has experience of the days when noise levels are at their peak and is prepared to tolerate this in the interests of horse welfare. As the proposal is for a limited period of up to five years, it is unlikely that any person other than the appellant would live on the site.... The temporary permission sought would also enable the Council to consider any future proposal for residential development in the light of circumstances at that time. ... I conclude that the proposal would not adequately mitigate the potential recreational impacts on the nearby SPA ...</p>	

<p>18/00539/LBC Westhampnett Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Maria Tomlinson</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>33 The Sadlers Westhampnett Chichester West Sussex PO18 0PR - Replacement front entrance door including 2 no. french windows and 2 no. lounge bay windows.</p>
<p>Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED</p>	
<p>The main issue in this case is whether the proposed works would preserve the special interest of the grade II listed building ... From the details available to me, including the listing description, I consider that the significance and special interest of the appeal listed building is largely derived from its age, form, fabric and architectural features. ... Windows and doors are often among the most prominent features and an integral part of the design of traditional buildings and can be indicators of when the building was constructed. Even though the fenestration to be replaced has little historical value it has moderate aesthetic value as, in my experience, its design is a good replica of that found in similar buildings of this age. ... the applied external glazing bars, presumably formed of timber and chamfered, would not convincingly replicate the nib and putty profile of traditional fixtures. Moreover, the 'sandwiched' bars would be evident behind the applied bars, and, the continuous plane of the front glass of the sealed unit would also be clearly discernible, along with the register of the second pane beneath, behind the pattern of the applied wood. The separating bead around the margin of the unit would also be readily discernible, further revealing the modern technical fabrication of the whole. ... Taking into account all of the above the proposed works would fail to preserve the special interest of the listed building contrary to the expectations of the Act..... The appellant highlights the need for energy conservation within fenestration. Whilst this matter, may reasonably be considered a public benefit it has not been demonstrated that such an improvement could not be achieved through alternative means, so avoiding the harm identified to the designated heritage asset. As such, I consider that little weight can be given to this modest benefit</p>	

3. CURRENT APPEALS

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p><u>17/00061/CONENG</u> Birdham Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Emma Kierans</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Land North Of Cowdry Nursery Sidlesham Lane Birdham West Sussex - Appeal against BI/40</p>
<p><u>19/00196/FUL</u> Bosham Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Caitlin Boddy</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>By-The-Brook Bosham Lane Bosham PO18 8HG - Demolish 1 no. existing dwelling and erect 2 no. 2 bed dwellings and 1 no. 3 bed dwelling.</p>
<p><u>15/00018/CONBC</u> Chichester Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Shona Archer</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Wildwood 30 Southgate Chichester West Sussex PO19 1DP - Appeal against CC/143</p>
<p>* <u>18/02818/FUL</u> Chichester Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: James Gellini</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>22 Peacock Close Chichester PO19 6YD - Change of use of a 6-bedroom house (Class C4) to a 7-bedroom House of Multiple Occupancy (Sui Generis) for a maximum of 7 professionals.</p>

<p><u>14/00292/CONBC</u> Chidham & Hambrook Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Shona Archer</p> <p>Informal Hearing</p>	<p>Paddock View Drift Lane Bosham Chichester West Sussex PO18 8PR - Appeal against CH/55</p>
<p><u>17/00852/FUL</u> Chidham & Hambrook Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Caitlin Boddy</p> <p>Informal Hearing</p>	<p>Paddock View Drift Lane Bosham Chichester PO18 8PR - Variation of condition 2 from planning permission CH/12/01036/FUL, appeal ref APP/L3815/A/12/2179869. To make the permission permanent.</p>
<p><u>17/00374/CONCOM</u> Donnington Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Shona Archer</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Southend Farm Selsey Road Donnington Chichester West Sussex PO20 7PS - Appeal against D/8</p>
<p><u>17/02563/DOM</u> Fernhurst Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: James Gellini</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Stedlands Farm Bell Vale Lane Fernhurst GU27 3DJ - Proposed two storey rear extension.</p>

<p>17/02564/LBC Fernhurst Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: James Gellini</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Stedlands Farm Bell Vale Lane Fernhurst GU27 3DJ - Proposed two storey rear extension.</p>
<p>18/00323/CONHI Funtington Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Sue Payne</p> <p>Householder Appeal</p>	<p>West Stoke Farm House Downs Road West Stoke Funtington Chichester West Sussex PO18 9BQ - Appeal against HH/22</p>
<p>18/00402/FUL Funtington Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Caitlin Boddy</p> <p>Public Inquiry</p>	<p>Field West Of Beachlands Nursery Newells Lane West Ashling West Sussex - The use of land for the stationing of caravans for residential purposes, together with the formation of hardstanding and utility/dayrooms ancillary to that use.</p>
<p>18/01578/FUL Loxwood Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Robert Sims</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Land East Of Lady Lea House Brewhurst Lane Loxwood RH14 0RJ - Demolition of storage outbuilding and erection of detached three bedroom dwelling.</p>

<p>17/02640/FUL Sidlesham Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Claire Coles</p> <p>Informal Hearing</p>	<p>Land At Junction Of Keynor Lane And Selsey Road Sidlesham West Sussex - Change of use of land from agricultural land for stationing of caravans for residential purposes by 3 no. gypsy-traveller families, with associated utility building, hard standing, widened gateway, landscaping and access.</p>
<p>18/01173/FUL Sidlesham Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Claire Coles</p> <p>Informal Hearing</p>	<p>Land South Of Recreation Grounds At Junction Of Keynor Lane Sidlesham West Sussex - Change of use of land from agricultural land for stationing of caravans for residential purposes by 3 gypsy-traveller families with facilitating development (utility buildings, hard standing, widened gateway, septic tank and landscaping).</p>
<p>18/01581/FUL Sidlesham Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Maria Tomlinson</p> <p>Householder Appeal</p>	<p>Land North Of Swan Cottage Selsey Road Sidlesham West Sussex - Provision of new access and vehicle gates.</p>
<p>18/02692/PLD Sidlesham Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Caitlin Boddy</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>62 Street End Lane Sidlesham PO20 7RG - All or any development as permitted by Schedule 2 Part 1 Development within the curtilage of a dwelling house of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended now or in the future).</p>

<p>19/00084/TPA Sidlesham Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Henry Whitby</p> <p>Informal Hearing</p>	<p>35 Chalk Lane Sidlesham Chichester West Sussex PO20 7LW - Fell 1 no. Black Poplar tree (T3). Reduce crown widths/spreads to 5m and heights down to 15m, sever ivy and remove deadwood on 2 no. Black Poplar trees (T4 and T5) and 1 no. Black Poplar tree (quoted as T1 - northern tree, within Group, G3). All 4 no. trees are subject to SI/86/00938/TPO.</p>
<p>17/02735/FUL Southbourne Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: James Gellini</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Timber Cottage Lumley Road Southbourne PO10 8AF - Demolition of existing bungalow and double garage and erection of 2 no. 3 bed chalet bungalows.</p>
<p>18/00808/FUL Tangmere Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Steve Harris</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Land West Of Little Paddocks City Fields Way Tangmere West Sussex - Erection of 39 dwellings, open space, landscaping and access road.</p>
<p>18/03121/DOC West Wittering Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Calum Thomas</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Rife Cottage Piggery Hall Lane West Wittering Chichester West Sussex PO20 8PZ - Discharge of condition 3 from planning permission WW/17/02506/DOM - schedule of materials.</p>

<p><u>18/03332/DOM</u> West Wittering Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Maria Tomlinson</p> <p>Householder Appeal</p>	<p>33 Marine Drive West Wittering PO20 8HQ - Proposed loft conversion and two storey side extension and widening of existing drop kerb.</p>
<p><u>17/00333/CONMHC</u> Westbourne Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Tara Lang</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Home Paddock Stables Hambrook Hill North Hambrook West Sussex - Appeal against WE/44</p>
<p><u>17/00403/CONENG</u> Westbourne Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Shona Archer</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Land South West Of Racton View Marlpit Lane Hambrook Westbourne West Sussex - Appeal against erection of walls and gates over 1m in height adjacent to the highway. WE/46</p>

4. VARIATIONS TO SECTION 106 AGREEMENTS

18/02350/OBG: Land North Of Main Road And West Of Inland Road, Southbourne

The proposed amendments to the S106 agreement related to the detailed provisions of the mortgagee in possession obligations. The amendment was proposed to bring the wording in line with updated National Housing Federation recommended clauses, which CDC now use as standard. The updated wording would allow the Registered Provider to achieve the maximum possible value when securing affordable housing finance. The proposals do not change the approved proportion, mix and tenure of affordable dwellings secured under the S.106. The variation facilitates the ability/viability of registered providers to continue to deliver affordable housing in the District.

CDC Housing supports the proposed changes. Southbourne Parish Council raised no objections.

The S106 deed of variation was completed on 12 June 2019.

5. CALLED-IN APPLICATIONS

Reference	Proposal	Stage

6. COURT AND OTHER MATTERS

High Court		
Site	Matter	Stage
Chaswood, Main Road, Bosham	Appellant's challenge of Inspector's decision letter dated 25 th February 2019.	Application for permission to proceed with claim refused on 13 th June 2019.

Court of Appeal Hearings		
Site	Matter	Stage
Breach Avenue, Southbourne	Council's challenge of the Inspector's decision letter.	Court of Appeal Hearing set for Tuesday 23 rd July 2019.

Prosecutions		
Site	Breach	Stage

7. POLICY MATTERS