

**Chichester District Council**

**Planning Committee**

**Wednesday 04 December 2019**

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

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

**Between 17-Oct-2019 and 19-Nov-2019**

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

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

\* - Committee level decision.

**1. NEW APPEALS (Lodged)**

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<u>18/02204/ELD</u> Birdham Parish  Case Officer: Dan Power	Kellys Farm Bell Lane Birdham PO20 7HY - Erection of a building and use as a dwellinghouse
<b>Written Representation</b>	
<u>17/00011/CONBC</u> Funtington Parish  Case Officer: Tara Lang	Land South Of The Stables Newells Lane West Ashling West Sussex - Appeal against Enforcement Notice FU/71
<b>Informal Hearing</b>	

<b>Reference/Procedure</b>	<b>Proposal</b>
<u>17/00104/CONBC</u> Plaistow And Ifold Parish  Case Officer: Sue Payne	Burgau Barn Plaistow Road Ifold Loxwood Billingshurst West Sussex RH14 0TZ - Appeal against
<b>Written Representation</b>	
<u>18/01685/FUL</u> Plaistow And Ifold Parish  Case Officer: James Gellini	Burgau Barn Plaistow Road Ifold Loxwood RH14 0TZ - Retrospective single storey side extension.
<b>Written Representation</b>	
<u>19/00716/DOM</u> Plaistow And Ifold Parish  Case Officer: James Gellini	Sunnydene The Drive Ifold Loxwood RH14 0TE - Retrospective replacement hedge, fencing and gates.
<b>Householder Appeal</b>	

## 2. DECISIONS MADE

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<u>18/03320/FUL</u> Chichester Parish  Case Officer: Robert Sims	23 Lavant Road Chichester PO19 5RA - Redevelopment of the site with a terrace of 2 no. 4-bed and 2 no. 3-bed dwellings, parking, landscaping and associated works.
<b>Written Representation</b>	
<b>Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED</b>	
<p>“...The appeal proposal would replace a generous detached building with an oppressive, dominant development that would stretch almost the entire width of the site and significantly erode its open character. ... The cramped, highly contrived layout of the proposal would be entirely out of place with the generous detached, carefully spaced properties that create the fundamental residential character of this area. Whilst there are larger developments within the immediate and wider area, these developments do not justify a proposal that would be so detrimental to the character of this individual site and to the wider character of the area. Moreover, a number of the more substantial developments have been sympathetically landscaped to ensure a more gentle impact on the street. The scale and mass of the building proposed would leave very little space for a positive landscaping scheme and as such the harm of the overall building could not be mitigated. ...”</p>	
<u>19/00767/DOM</u> Chichester Parish  Case Officer: William Price	8 Parchment Street Chichester PO19 3DA - Erection of single storey rear extension.
<b>Written Representation</b>	
<b>Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED</b>	
<p>“...The layout would place the gutter and eaves of the addition in close proximity but above the flint boundary wall and would detract from the expression of that wall as a boundary. The long roof plane would appear out of balance with the roof forms of the houses and the insertion of rooflights would draw attention to the bulk of the addition and introduce a discordant feature on the listed building and within the conservation area. Turning to the risk identified by the Council of the new north-east wall damaging the flint boundary wall, the details are lacking and although conditions could be used to require clarification, it is not possible to be certain what those details may be and the extent that they might visually affect the presentation of the wall or physically harm its integrity....However, the harm identified by the presence of the roof as designed so close to the wall and being a discordant feature together with the rooflights mean that resolution of the finer detail of the wall-to-roof junction would not overcome the other failings. The design of the addition would cause harm to the significance of the listed building and in this highly visible location would fail to preserve either the character or the appearance of the Chichester Conservation Area. ...”</p>	

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<u>19/00768/LBC</u> Chichester Parish	8 Parchment Street Chichester PO19 3DA - Erection of single storey rear extension.
Case Officer: William Price	
<b>Written Representation</b>	
<b>Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED</b>	
<p>“... The layout would place the gutter and eaves of the addition in close proximity but above the flint boundary wall and would detract from the expression of that wall as a boundary. The long roof plane would appear out of balance with the roof forms of the houses and the insertion of rooflights would draw attention to the bulk of the addition and introduce a discordant feature on the listed building and within the conservation area. Turning to the risk identified by the Council of the new north-east wall damaging the flint boundary wall. The details are lacking and although conditions could be used to require clarification, it is not possible to be certain what those details may be and the extent that they might visually affect the presentation of the wall or physically harm its integrity. ... However, the harm identified by the presence of the roof as designed so close to the wall and being a discordant feature together with the rooflights mean that resolution of the finer detail of the wall-to-roof junction would not overcome the failings. The design of the addition would cause harm to the significance of the listed building and in this highly visible location would fail to preserve either the character or the appearance of the Chichester Conservation Area. ..”</p>	
<u>18/03126/FUL</u> Donnington Parish	Louene 34 Birdham Road Donnington PO19 8TD - 1 no. dwelling and associated work.
Case Officer: Robert Sims	
<b>Written Representation</b>	
<b>Appeal Decision: APPEAL ALLOWED</b>	
<p>“...In policy terms, the site lies within designated countryside, outside of the Settlement Boundary for Chichester. This boundary lies a short distance (approximately 25 m at its closest point) to the east. ... The proposal is for an open market dwelling. There is no suggestion that such development requires a countryside location, or that it is specifically intended to meet an essential local rural need. There would therefore be conflict with CLP Policies 2 and 45 and the spatial strategy of the local plan. A grant of planning permission would only be justified where material considerations indicate that a decision should be made otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. ... I conclude that there would be no material harm to the character or appearance of the area. There would be no conflict with CLP Policies 33, 45 and 48, insofar as these seek to promote highest standards of design which have regard to the character of the surrounding area and the local context. ... The site is served by a footway which provides pedestrian access to the parish hall, a small supermarket and employment opportunities within a local business park. There are bus stops nearby, from which frequent services operate to the Witterings and Chichester. The railway station is on the bus route but is also within cycle range. Therefore, I find that</p>	

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<b>Appeal Decision: APPEAL ALLOWED - Continued</b>	
the site is sustainably located in relation to the services and facilities of Stockbridge and Chichester as a whole. ... Although the proposal's contribution to overall housing supply would be modest, it would nonetheless be beneficial. The weight that I attach to this consideration is increased greatly by the fact that the site is previously developed land, well related to the settlement and in a sustainable location. ... The planning system is plan led; the Framework makes clear that where a planning application conflicts with an up-to-date development plan, permission should not usually be granted. However, the particular circumstances of this case are such that there are material considerations to outweigh the policy conflict arising from the location of the site outside of the settlement boundary. The proposal would constitute sustainable development, and this justifies a grant of planning permission."	
<b>18/00402/FUL</b> Funtington Parish  Case Officer: Caitlin Boddy	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.
<b>Public Inquiry</b>	
<b>Appeal Decision: APPEAL ALLOWED</b>	
"...The appeal is allowed ... The criteria by which sites will be assessed predate the publication of the PPTS and have some divergence from it. ... Policy 36 is not therefore wholly consistent with the PPTS. In any event, because the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable sites it is difficult to reach any conclusion other than that this policy is out of date. ... The area has no designation and has no features which set it aside from the ordinary such that it can be regarded as a valued landscape. ... my observations led me to conclude that the loss of tranquility resulting from the noise and proximity of the A27 to the south has a greater influence on the character of the area than the presence of traveller sites. I consider that the locality has no more than a moderate sensitivity to change. ... PPTS recognises that it will not always be possible to accommodate traveller sites within or on the edge of settlements. It is clear that sites away from existing settlements are to be strictly limited, but the definition of what might be 'away' is lacking. It is a matter of judgement. In this case the proximity of West Ashling (which I deal with more fully below) means that this site cannot be regarded as being away from an existing settlement for the purposes of PPTS. I am satisfied that the impact on the character of the area would be limited. ... In visual terms the site is well screened and this could be augmented by landscaping. The imposition of appropriate conditions would assist in assimilating the site into its surroundings. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed development would not be unacceptably harmful to the character or appearance of the	

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<b>Appeal Decision: APPEAL ALLOWED - Continued</b>	
	<p>locality. ... There are of course many factors which would define a community but I note in particular that West Ashling has a school, village hall and pub. It seems reasonable to me to suggest that site residents would normally look towards West Ashling as the community hub. There are no paved footways leading towards either Hambrook or Funtington from the vicinity of the site. The likelihood of these 2 settlements being perceived as part of the settled community are therefore diminished. ... Taking the scattered dwellings identified to the north of the A27, adding to them Edith Cottages and at least the western part of West Ashling, the settled community can therefore be seen to be relatively extensive both in numerical terms and in area. The pitches to be provided on the appeal site would be of minor significance however assessed. There would be a relatively modest number of residents and in my judgement this addition to the locality would not dominate the settled community. ... it would be possible to impose a condition to ensure that any drainage facilities and water treatment on site does not compromise water quality. ... I am satisfied that the proposed development would not be harmful to highway safety. ... Refusal of the proposal would interfere with their Article 8 rights. I do not accept that because they are not currently resident on the site those rights should not be considered. The best interests of the children are a primary consideration and the provision of a stable home for spending time with their respective parents is a matter of agreed importance. Interference with their human rights would not be proportionate, with particular reference to the best interests of those children. ... I have determined above that the most important policy in play, Policy 36, is out of date and not wholly consistent with the NPPF. Any conflict with it must attract limited weight. But in this case I find no conflict with it in any event. The proposal also accords with the principles espoused in Policies 45 and 48. There is limited conflict with Policy 2 as I set out above. Taken together I am satisfied that the proposed development accords with the development plan as a whole and can therefore be regarded as sustainable development. It is not necessary in these circumstances to invoke the tilted balance even though the most important policy for determining the appeal is out of date. Had I done so the result would have been the same since any adverse impacts would not clearly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal. ...”</p>

<b>Reference/Procedure</b>	<b>Proposal</b>
<u>18/03326/FUL</u> Selsey Parish  Case Officer: Robert Sims	17-19 Seal Road Selsey PO20 0HW - Alterations and conversion of main property into 7 no. flats and alterations and conversion of the former owners accommodation into a self contained bungalow with associated access, parking, bin and cycle storage.
<b>Written Representation</b>	
<b>Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED</b>	
“The proposal would extend the main building at two storey height across the rear. This would introduce two new first floor windows and continuing the ridge height of the highest part of the roof. This substantially extended two storey height would be approximately 10m from the front elevation of the existing bungalow and for its full width..... This height, extent and proximity would have a significant overbearing impact on the future occupants of the bungalow despite the roof slope away from the bungalow. The significant scale of the proposal compared to the modest single storey nature of the bungalow would also be visually oppressive and have a significant enclosing effect.....This overall design would direct all outlook from the living spaces of the unit into the front of the bungalow. This would be from an elevated position. Given the distances, elevation, size of the windows and use of the rooms within the main building this would produce a significant level of overlooking.....the proposal would result in harm to the living conditions of future occupiers of the bungalow.”□	
* <u>18/02925/FUL</u> Sidlesham Parish  Case Officer: Maria Tomlinson	Land South Of Telephone Exchange Selsey Road Sidlesham West Sussex - Proposed private stable block and associated hard standing. New access to the highway.
<b>Written Representation</b>	
<b>Appeal Decision: APPEAL ALLOWED</b>	
“ The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for proposed private stable block and associated hardstanding. ... The appeal results from the Council’s failure to determine the application within the prescribed period. No formal decision on the application has been made, as jurisdiction was transferred from the Local Planning Authority once the appeal was formally accepted by the Inspectorate. The application was however referred to the Chichester District Planning Committee, who resolved not to contest the appeal. ... The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area. ... The proposal would be sited within proximity to the telephone exchange building and other residential properties located on the western side of Selsey Road which, it is considered that the scale and design of the proposed building would not detract from the character and appearance of the surrounding area. ... The stables would however be constructed at some distance away from the Grade II Listed Building. No concerns have been raised by the Council in that particular regards, and I see no justification to disagree with that approach. ... The local Highway Authority is satisfied that the development would not unacceptably prejudice highway safety, and there are no reasons for me to take a different view. ... The site lies within an area of low risk of river flooding and is not exposed to risks of pluvial flooding, but the FRA nevertheless	

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<b>Appeal Decision: APPEAL ALLOWED - Continued</b>	
<p>indicates that the site is at Medium risk of groundwater flooding. Therefore, ground investigations would be required to determine the winter groundwater level and the soil permeability. This can be secured by a suitably worded condition. ... Conditions requiring further details of materials, boundary treatments, soft and hard landscaping are considered necessary to safeguard the character and appearance of the area. Conditions relating to renewable energy sources and hard surfacing are considered necessary in the interests of sustainability, and to prevent unacceptable levels of water run-off. ... A condition requiring the submission of a scheme for the disposal of waste is also attached to prevent pollution, which should include a preclusion of the burning of waste on site. ... To protect the living conditions of neighbouring residents, I shall impose conditions restricting the use of the site and external lighting within the plot. It is also necessary to attach a condition which would provide a mechanism to deal with potential contamination to preserve the environment and the health and safety of future occupiers. ...”</p>	
<u>18/02976/FUL</u> Southbourne Parish  Case Officer: Robert Sims  <b>Written Representation</b>	Lumley Mill Lumley Road Southbourne PO10 8AQ - Proposed 1 no. dwelling and garage on foundations of the Old Mill.
<b>Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED</b>	
<p>“...The appeal site comprises a grassed area which lies in an area of countryside with a few scattered houses to the south of the A27 and to the north of a railway line and the village of Hermitage. ... The appellants stress that the proposal seeks to enhance the setting of Mill House by replacing an old building which was the sole reason why the settlement was established. However, it appears to me from all of the evidence provided that while the Mill House, the Old Mill and malthouse had the historical significance of a functional group, this significance was fundamentally changed some 90 years ago with the demolition of the Old Mill and malthouse. It is significant that at the time</p>	

**Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED - continued**

that Lumley Mill was listed in 1972, the appeal site appears to have been free from buildings and the space would have been likely to have contributed to the open setting of Lumley Mill and its appreciation, particularly from the public right of way which adjoins the appeal site.

... Therefore, at best, the proposal only seeks to re-establish a relatively minor part of the collection of the historical components which formed the mill complex some time ago. I share the Council's concern that the actual design of the building proposed has a lovely domestic form. The loss of the open area would now significantly harm the setting of Lumley Mill itself as would the form of the design of the new building put forward. The proposal would significantly harm and not conserve or enhance the setting of this listed building.

Great weight has to be placed on this finding. I have found that while the effect on protected species on site can be dealt with by a condition, the effect on the wider habitat of the CLHSPA has not been resolved. ... It has not been shown that the development is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh the identified harm. I conclude that the other considerations do not clearly outweigh the conflict with the development plan and conflict with the guidance in the NPPF over the conservation of the heritage asset. ... "

**18/03234/FUL**

West Wittering Parish

Case Officer: Caitlin Boddy

Edelsten Cottage 2 Marine Drive West Wittering PO20 8HE - Demolition of single dwelling house and construction of development comprising 4 no. 2-bed flats, new access and associated works.

**Written Representation****Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED**

"...The proposal would step forward of the existing building line and extend significantly to the rear. This would result in a building of significant scale and bulk despite maintaining a crown roof design. It would also extend significantly above the main roof height of the neighbouring flat roof frontage building to the east. This height, scale and massing would be harmfully incongruous within the limited height of the surrounding buildings. This would be exacerbated by the positioning in front of the neighbouring property making the proposal even more prominent in the streetscene. ...the increase in height above the neighbouring frontage building would result in a building out of scale within the street and harmfully at odds with the general scaling down of buildings towards the adjacent open space. Further emphasis would be drawn to this height by the irregular spacing and positioning of the proposed roof windows. ...the positioning of the proposal to the front of the site and the cluster of trees screening part of the site means that the proposal will be seen more in the context of the lower scale Marine Drive and it would appear harmful to this character. The proposal would therefore harm the character and appearance of the area. ... there is no substantive evidence before me to demonstrate that protected species are not active in the area or that the building is not suitable to support species. ... I am unable to conclude that the proposal would not result in harm to the biodiversity value of the site or specifically protected species. ... "

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<u>18/02630/DOC</u> Westbourne Parish	Westbourne House North Street Westbourne Emsworth West Sussex PO10 8SN - Discharge of condition 3 and 4 from planning permission WE/17/02789/LBC.
Case Officer: Calum Thomas	Linked to <u>18/02631/DOC</u>
<b>Written Representation</b>	
<b>Appeal Decision: APPEAL ALLOWED</b>	
<p>“...I allow the appeal and approve the details of windows and glazing submitted attached to the planning permission for change of use of stables and outbuildings to storage, home office and artist’s studio, Ref WE/17/02788/DOM. ... In both appeals the main issue is the effect of the proposals on the architectural or historic significance of the Grade II* Listed Building and the character and appearance of the Westbourne Conservation Area. ... within the curtilage of the listed Westbourne House..... the architecturally most sensitive windows (WG02, WG03 and WG04 again) would not be double-glazed, while WG01 is of limited significance and would, along with WG05 and WF01 be new frames in any event. ... the use of slim-profile double-glazed units would not cause harm, although allowing the use of the building and the upgrading of its thermal performance adds weight to the finding that the window details as submitted pursuant to Condition 3) are acceptable, preserve the significance of the Grade II* listed building and the character and appearance of the Westbourne Conservation Area. ...”</p>	

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<u>18/02631/DOC</u> Westbourne Parish  Case Officer: Calum Thomas	Westbourne House North Street Westbourne Emsworth West Sussex PO10 8SN - Discharge of condition 3 and 4 from planning permission WE/17/02788/DOM.
<b>Written Representation</b>	Linked to <u>18/02630/DOC</u>
<b>Appeal Decision: APPEAL ALLOWED</b>	
As Above	

### 3. CURRENT APPEALS

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<u>17/00061/CONENG</u> Birdham Parish  Case Officer: Emma Kierans  <b>Written Representation</b>	Land North Of Cowdry Nursery Sidlesham Lane Birdham West Sussex - Appeal against BI/40
<u>19/00046/CONCOU</u> Birdham Parish  Case Officer: Steven Pattie  <b>Written Representation</b>	Kellys Farm Bell Lane Birdham Chichester West Sussex PO20 7HY - Appeal against BI/46
<u>19/00196/FUL</u> Bosham Parish  Case Officer: Dan Power  <b>Written Representation</b>	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.
<u>19/00350/LBC</u> Donnington Parish  Case Officer: Maria Tomlinson  <b>Written Representation</b>	Hardings Farm Selsey Road Donnington Chichester West Sussex PO20 7PU - Replacement of 8 no. windows to North, East and South Elevations (like for like).
<u>19/01036/OUT</u> East Wittering And Bracklesham Parish  Case Officer: Maria Tomlinson  <b>Written Representation</b>	Land To North Of 20 Wessex Avenue East Wittering Chichester West Sussex PO20 8NP - Outline planning application some matters reserved (access) - Erection of 1 no bungalow.

<b>Reference/Procedure</b>	<b>Proposal</b>
<u>18/00323/CONHI</u> Funtington Parish  Case Officer: Sue Payne	West Stoke Farm House Downs Road West Stoke Funtington Chichester West Sussex PO18 9BQ - Appeal against HH/22
<b>Written Representation</b>	
<u>18/00187/CONMHC</u> North Mundham Parish  Case Officer: Tara Lang	Fisher Granary Fisher Lane South Mundham Chichester West Sussex PO20 1ND - Appeal against NM/29  Linked to <u>19/00405/FUL</u>
<b>Written Representation</b>	
<u>19/00405/FUL</u> North Mundham Parish  Case Officer: Dan Power	Fisher Granary Fisher Lane South Mundham PO20 1ND - Use of land for the stationing of a caravan for use as a holiday let.  Linked to <u>18/00187/CONMHC</u>
<b>Written Representation</b>	
<u>19/00269/FUL</u> Oving Parish  Case Officer: Maria Tomlinson	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.
<b>Written Representation</b>	
<u>18/00088/CONAGR</u> Plaistow And Ifold Parish  Case Officer: Shona Archer	Crouchlands Farm Rickmans Lane Plaistow Billingshurst West Sussex RH14 0LE - Appeal against PS/67
<b>Written Representation</b>	

<b>Reference/Procedure</b>	<b>Proposal</b>
<u>18/00088/CONAGR</u> Plaistow And Ifold Parish  Case Officer: Shona Archer	Crouchlands Farm Rickmans Lane Plaistow Billingshurst West Sussex RH14 0LE - Appeal against PS/66
<b>Written Representation</b>	
<u>18/00088/CONAGR</u> Plaistow And Ifold Parish  Case Officer: Shona Archer	Crouchlands Farm Rickmans Lane Plaistow Billingshurst West Sussex RH14 0LE - Appeal against PS/65
<b>Written Representation</b>	
<u>18/03255/FUL</u> Selsey Parish  Case Officer: James Gellini	Land Adjacent To 71 West Street Selsey Chichester West Sussex PO20 9AG - Erection of 1 no. 2 bed bungalow - resubmission of SY/18/02197/FUL.
<b>Written Representation</b>	
<u>18/00005/CONAGR</u> Sidlesham Parish  Case Officer: Sue Payne	Greenwood Group Highleigh Nurseries Highleigh Road Sidlesham Chichester West Sussex PO20 7NR - Appeal against SI/70
<b>Written Representation</b>	
<u>18/00389/CONCOU</u> Southbourne Parish  Case Officer: Steven Pattie	1 Green Acre Inlands Road Nutbourne Chichester West Sussex PO18 8RJ - Appeal against SB/117
<b>Written Representation</b>	

<b>Reference/Procedure</b>	<b>Proposal</b>
<u>18/03145/OUT</u> Southbourne Parish  Case Officer: Jeremy Bushell	Land North Of Cooks Lane Southbourne Hampshire - Outline application with all matters reserved except Access for the erection of 199 dwellings and associated development.
<b>Public Inquiry</b> <b>21/01/2020 –</b> <b>24/01/2020</b> Chichester City Council North Street Chichester PO19 1LQ	
<u>18/03428/FUL</u> Southbourne Parish  Case Officer: Caitlin Boddy	Field South Of 230 Main Road Southbourne Hampshire - Material change of use of the land for stationing of caravans for residential occupation for single pitch Gypsy site with facilitating development (hard standing and utility building).
<b>Informal Hearing</b>	
<u>17/00333/CONMHC</u> Westbourne Parish  Case Officer: Tara Lang	Home Paddock Stables Hambrook Hill North Hambrook West Sussex - Appeal against WE/44
<b>Informal Hearing</b> <b>05/11/2019 10:00:00</b> Fishbourne Centre	
<u>18/02003/FUL</u> Westhampnett Parish  Case Officer: Dan Power	Greylies Claypit Lane Westhampnett PO18 0NU - Demolition of existing garage, construction of additional dwelling and associated works, subdividing plot.
<b>Written Representation</b>	

#### **4. VARIATIONS TO SECTION 106 AGREEMENTS**

**None.**

#### **5. CALLED-IN APPLICATIONS**

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Stage</b>

## **6. COURT AND OTHER MATTERS**

<b>Injunctions</b>		
<b>Site</b>	<b>Breach</b>	<b>Stage</b>
Birdham, Land North West of Premier Park	Various breaches of Enforcement Notices: unauthorized development; use of land for stationing of caravans, installation of cables, utilities etc.	All papers in support of application for an Injunction should be lodged at the High Court on Monday 25 November 2019 which will then give a date for the hearing.

<b>Court Hearings</b>		
<b>Site</b>	<b>Matter</b>	<b>Stage</b>

<b>Prosecutions</b>		
<b>Site</b>	<b>Breach</b>	<b>Stage</b>
2a Crane Street, Chichester	Display of unauthorized advertisement	At court yesterday 20 November: Guilty plea entered. Sentence: £113 Fine and costs to the Council of £400.

## **7. POLICY MATTERS**