

Chichester District Council

Planning Committee

Wednesday 06 May 2020

Report of the Director Of Planning and Environment Services

Schedule of Planning Appeals, Court and Policy Matters

Between 19-Feb 2020 and 15-Apr-2020

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>19/01240/FUL</u> Loxwood Parish Case Officer: Jeremy Bushell Public Inquiry	Land South West Of Guidford Road Loxwood West Sussex - Demolition of existing dwelling and the erection of 50 dwellings to include 35 private units and 15 affordable units, creation of proposed vehicular access, internal roads and footpaths, car parking, sustainable drainage system, open space with associated landscaping and amenity space.
<u>19/00141/CONHH</u> Oving Parish Case Officer: Emma Kierans Written Representation	Oakham Farmhouse Church Lane Oving Chichester West Sussex PO20 2BT - Appeal against a fence in excess of 1 metre in height erected adjacent to the highway, subject to Enforcement Notice O/30.

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p data-bbox="197 230 485 297"><u>19/01859/FUL</u> Southbourne Parish</p> <p data-bbox="197 365 616 398">Case Officer: Calum Thomas</p> <p data-bbox="197 461 552 495">Written Representation</p>	<p data-bbox="639 230 1487 297">Land Rear Of Mayfield Prinsted Lane Prinsted Southbourne PO10 8HS - 1 no. dwelling.</p>
<p data-bbox="197 566 464 633"><u>19/00070/CONHH</u> Tangmere Parish</p> <p data-bbox="197 701 552 734">Case Officer: Sue Payne</p> <p data-bbox="197 797 552 831">Written Representation</p>	<p data-bbox="639 566 1469 701">12A Nettleton Avenue Tangmere Chichester West Sussex PO20 2HZ - Appeal against a fence in excess of 1m in height adjacent to highway – the subject of Enforcement Notice TG/24</p>
<p data-bbox="197 880 512 947"><u>16/00251/CONBC</u> West Wittering Parish</p> <p data-bbox="197 992 584 1025">Case Officer: Steven Pattie</p> <p data-bbox="197 1088 552 1122">Written Representation</p>	<p data-bbox="639 880 1469 1014">Land East Of Brook House Pound Road West Wittering Chichester West Sussex PO20 8AJ - Appeal against breach of condition 2 to 13/02676/DOM - use of outbuilding subject to Enforcement Notice WW/49.</p>
<p data-bbox="197 1171 488 1238"><u>19/00117/CONMHC</u> Westbourne Parish</p> <p data-bbox="197 1305 584 1339">Case Officer: Steven Pattie</p> <p data-bbox="197 1402 456 1435">Informal Hearing</p>	<p data-bbox="639 1171 1469 1305">Land North Of The Grange Woodmancote Lane Woodmancote Emsworth Hampshire - Appeal against stationing of 2 mobile homes (see permission 19/00606/FUL) and subject to Enforcement Notice WE/47.</p>

2. DECISIONS MADE

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p><u>19/00740/DOM</u> Appledram Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: William Price</p> <p>Householder Appeal</p>	<p>Ferndale 133 Birdham Road Appledram PO20 7DY - Retrospective erection of 6ft featherboard fence and gates. Additional trees to be planted.</p>
<p>Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED</p>	
<p>“... The appeal is dismissed. ... The appeal site lies outside the designated settlement boundary, within a ribbon of residential properties on one side of Birdham Road. The residential site frontages are generally open and soft-landscaped, reflecting their rural location, fronting onto fields, and include low brick walls, hedging and shrubs. The site frontage is visually prominent within the street scene. The tall close boarded fence and gates run for a considerable distance, extending across the whole width of the site. It gives the site a closed-in and hard front boundary, which is at odds with, and harmful to, the prevailing open and soft-landscaped character of the residential frontages in this part of the road. I am not persuaded that additional mature shrub or tree planting in front of the site would overcome the harm that I have identified. I therefore conclude that the development harms the character and appearance of the area and conflicts with Policies 33, 45 and 48 of the Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014 – 2029 (2015). These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure that new development in the countryside meets the highest standards of design, including siting, scale, height, materials and detailed design, and that it respects, and where possible enhances, the character of the surrounding area and site. For similar reasons, the proposal would also be contrary to Policies of the Framework which seek to secure high quality design as set out in Chapter 12. ... Other Matters - I have had regard to the appellant’s reason for seeking the appeal proposal..... However, the appeal scheme is not the only means of ensuring that the appellant’s children and dogs are contained within the site. Therefore, this matter does not outweigh the harm I have identified in respect of the main issue. ...I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed. ...”</p>	
<p><u>19/00304/FUL</u> Chidham & Hambrook Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Caitlin Boddy</p> <p>Informal Hearing</p>	<p>Plot A Pond Farm Newells Lane West Ashling Chichester West Sussex PO18 8DF - Proposed travellers caravan site consisting of 2 no. pitches for 2 no. mobile homes, 2 no. touring caravan, boundary treatment and car parking. Retention of existing shed and stables.</p>
<p>Appeal Decision: APPEAL WITHDRAWN</p>	
<p>Withdrawn</p>	

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p data-bbox="196 230 616 297"><u>19/00542/FUL</u> Chidham & Hambrook Parish</p> <p data-bbox="196 365 587 398">Case Officer: Daniel Power</p> <p data-bbox="196 454 456 499">Informal Hearing</p>	<p data-bbox="639 230 1479 376">Plot F Pond Farm Newells Lane West Ashling Chichester West Sussex PO18 8DF - Use of land as a gypsy and travellers caravan site consisting of 1 no. pitch containing 1 no. mobile home and 1 no. touring caravan.</p>
Appeal Decision: APPEAL WITHDRAWN	
Withdrawn	
<p data-bbox="196 678 616 745"><u>19/02416/DOM</u> Chidham & Hambrook Parish</p> <p data-bbox="196 813 587 846">Case Officer: William Price</p> <p data-bbox="196 902 512 947">Householder Appeal</p>	<p data-bbox="639 678 1433 790">Hollies Broad Road Hambrook Chidham PO18 8RF - Proposed ground floor rear extension with first floor rear extension over and a double garage.</p>
Appeal Decision: APPEAL PART ALLOWED, PART DISMISSED	
<p data-bbox="180 1048 1487 1626">“The appeal is (i) dismissed as regards the proposed double garage and (ii) allowed with planning permission granted in respect of the front porch; conversion of the existing garage to living accommodation; ground floor rear extension with a first floor rear extension over, at Hollies, Broad Road, Hambrook, Chichester ... In my view this open and green part of the plot that results from the set back of the host dwelling makes a significant contribution to the spacious and semirural character of this part of Broad Road. This suggests that the principle of any ancillary building forward of the house is unlikely to be acceptable. The grounds of appeal refer to an example of another garage in a nearby front garden and argue that as a result of relatively recent developments there are different building lines along sections of Broad Road. However, I consider that rather than undermine the Council’s case, these examples serve to reinforce the benefits of not compromising the building line at the appeal property. And even if I am wrong in terms of the unacceptability of the principle of a forward siting, I concur with the Council’s view that the building’s frontage of 7.5 metres so close to the highway and the garage’s maximum height of over 5 metres would result in a building that would inevitably draw the eye as being too large for its context and incongruous in its siting. ... “□</p>	

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p data-bbox="197 230 485 338">19/00731/DOM East Wittering And Bracklesham Parish</p> <p data-bbox="197 365 612 398">Case Officer: Calum Thomas</p> <p data-bbox="197 461 512 495">Householder Appeal</p>	<p data-bbox="639 230 1382 297">5 Charlmead East Wittering PO20 8DN - Creation of habitable space at first floor level.</p>
<p data-bbox="549 533 1134 566">Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED</p>	
<p data-bbox="180 573 1487 1697">“The appeal is dismissed. The appeal property is a detached hipped roof bungalow in a private road within a residential estate. ...Charlmead is characterised by detached bungalows, elongated footprint, ...long, narrow, plots ...original bungalows have been alteredextending the appeal property to provide first floor living accommodation, in principle, would not be out of keeping ...The appeal property already has a contemporary appearance ...a contemporary design style is not inappropriate ...Notwithstanding the above, the proposal would replace the original hipped roof with a box-shaped roof that bears no resemblance to the original roof form characteristic of this part of Charlmead. ...the three large floor-to-ceiling windows would be significantly larger than the double doors and small window below. ...roof ‘overhang’ would also emphasise the top- heavy design ...The wide horizontal design ...would be at odds with the positioning and vertical design of the ground floor doors below, and the side elevations of the extension would be large, solid, and virtually devoid of features of interest, apart from a single high- level window. These factors serve to emphasise the incongruous design of the proposal in relation to the ground floor. The appellant has drawn my attention to a variety of different architectural ... However, these developments do not persuade me to come to an alternative view ...the proposed first floor extension would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the wider surrounding area. ...I do not consider that there would be a materially harmful impact on the privacy of the occupiers of the neighbouring property to the west of the site arising from the proposed rear elevation first floor windows. ...I conclude that the proposal would not result in a materially harmful impact on the privacy of the occupiers of No.6 Charlmead. ...the site lies within Flood Zones 2 and 3...application did not include a flood risk assessment ...The appellant’s statement of case includes an extract from the Environment Agency Flood Risk Map suggesting that the site lies within Flood Zone 1. ...I have not referred this matter back to the main parties to determine whether or not the proposal accords with CLP Policy 42. ...The appellant has sought pre-application advice from the Council. Whilst the changes to the scheme have been noted, this does not alter my findings ...I have noted the accessible location of the site within the settlement boundary, the support for the proposal from the occupier of the neighbouring property, and that the Parish Council has raised no objection...these matters do not overcome the harm...”</p>	

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p data-bbox="196 230 403 297"><u>19/00269/FUL</u> Oving Parish</p> <p data-bbox="196 365 478 432">Case Officer: Maria Tomlinson</p> <p data-bbox="196 454 555 499">Written Representation</p>	<p data-bbox="639 230 1461 365">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.</p>
<p data-bbox="555 510 1129 544">Appeal Decision: APPEAL ALLOWED</p>	
<p data-bbox="180 555 1490 1507">“The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the change of use from agriculture to a mixed use comprising of agricultural storage and the storage of up to 10 vintage cars. The proposal is a farm diversification scheme to use the barn for a mixed use comprising the storage of up to 10 vintage cars in addition to agricultural storage. The Council’s strategy with respect to the location of new development in the countryside is set out in Policies 2, 45 and 46 of the Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014 – 2029 (CLP), which are broadly consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) aims of promoting sustainable development in rural areas and building a strong, competitive economy. I find that the proposal comprises a form of development which is supported by these policies and the objectives of the Framework to support a rural economy, and that, there is no requirement for the appellant to demonstrate that the proposal requires a countryside location and that there are no other suitable alternative sites within the settlement boundary or adjacent to it. ... During my site inspection, I observed that the road from the nearest bus stops on the A259 means that it would not be unreasonable to expect that persons storing their cars at the site would travel to the site via bus. I also observed that there is a cycleway/footway adjacent to the A259, and there are railway stations at Chichester and Bognor Regis, the appeal proposal would provide a suitable location for the mixed use comprising agricultural storage and the storage of vintage vehicles, having regard to the reliance on private motor vehicles and local and national planning policy in respect of development within the countryside. As such, the proposal would accord with Polices 2, 8 and 46 of the CLP. ... The proposal would also accord with policies within the Framework which require significant weight to be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity. ... Whilst I have found the amount of vehicle storage not to be harmful, any increase above this, or change to a different type of storage, would need to be assessed against relevant local and national planning policies ... ”</p>	
<p data-bbox="180 1507 435 1541">COSTS DECISION</p>	
<p data-bbox="180 1541 1490 1946">“...The applicant’s case is that the Council’s reason for refusal was unreasonable, having regard to the merits of the scheme and its compliance with local and national planning policies. As such, the applicant asserts that the delay caused by the appeal has resulted in a delay in implementing an acceptable scheme. The applicant states that the Council has failed to produce evidence to substantiate the reason for refusal, and has made inaccurate assertions about the harm that would result from the proposal which are unsupported by objective analysis. ... The reason for refusal as set out in the decision notice is complete, precise, specific and relevant to the application. It also clearly sets out the policies of the CLP against which the Council considers the proposal would be in conflict. The refusal reason has been adequately substantiated by the Council. ... I find that the Council has reasonable concerns about</p>	

Appeal Decision: APPEAL ALLOWED - continued

the impact of the development, which justifies its decision. ... detailed consideration of the scheme against the criteria of Policy 46 would not undermine the Council's view that the proposal is unsustainable. Whilst no objection was raised ... on grounds of highway safety, the Planning Officer Report and Statement of Case adequately explains the Council's concerns with respect to the location of the site in respect of accessibility ... I acknowledge that the CLP contains a number of policies.... which support economic growth, including within rural areas and that the Framework places significant weight on the need to support economic growth and productivity. However, whilst such policies are not included within the refusal reason, the Council ...weigh the economic contribution of the scheme in the sustainable development 'planning balance'. Therefore, the Council has not acted unreasonably in this regard. Accordingly, I do not consider that the Council failed to properly evaluate the application or consider the merits of the scheme and therefore the appeal could not have been avoided. I have found that the Council had reasonable concerns about the impact of the proposed development which justified its decision. The appellant had to address those concerns in any event. ..."

19/00716/DOM

Plaistow And Ifold Parish

Case Officer: William Price

Written Representation

Sunnydene The Drive Ifold Loxwood RH14 0TE -
Retrospective replacement hedge, fencing and gates.

Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED

"...In contrast, the fence represents a more formal, higher, harder and more solid form of boundary treatment than that prevailing along The Drive. The small gaps between the boards would not substantially reduce its solidity and would only really be noticeable when directly in front of the fence. Although the appeal property is visible over it, it is constructed of sustainably sourced timber and is described as purposely-designed, the fence is incongruous in and detracts from the street scene of the area. Whilst a hedge of native species has been planted in front of the fence, it will take some time for this to mature and significantly soften or screen the fence. Furthermore, the hedge that I observed was not substantial, which would limit its ability to soften or screen the fence...."

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p data-bbox="196 230 485 297"><u>18/03428/FUL</u> Southbourne Parish</p> <p data-bbox="196 365 587 398">Case Officer: Daniel Power</p> <p data-bbox="196 454 456 499">Informal Hearing</p>	<p data-bbox="639 230 1487 376">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).</p>
<p data-bbox="549 539 1134 577">Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED</p>	
<p data-bbox="180 577 1461 1821">"... The proposal ... would result in an incongruous domestic appearance to the site, jarringly out of keeping with prevailing character... therefore ...the scheme would result in significant harm to the natural beauty of the AONB. ...The proposal therefore conflicts with the relevant provisions of NP policy 7, LP policies 36 and 43 and of NPPF paragraph 172... those policies seek to at least conserve landscape and scenic beauty, the latter indicating that 'great weight' should be accorded to that objective. ...Given the relationship of pitch provision to forecast demand in the 2012GTAA, the number of applications and appeals in play,13 and demand for public provision, in my view the GTAA2018 indication that 94 pitches will be required to 2036 is likely an under-estimation. Therefore the extent of shortfall relative to a robust 5YLS requirement in line with PPTS2015 paragraph 10 is likely substantial, with the Council's latest Local Development Scheme indicating that the submission of a new plan for the District incorporating traveller pitch allocations is only intended to be submitted for examination in mid-2022. There is evidence of significant unmet need for traveller sites in Chichester, an imbalance which is likely to persist for some time. Allowing the appeal would not only be beneficial in redressing that imbalance in a limited way, but also to the appellants who, in their own words, are advancing in years. ... it is reasonable to describe the pitch requirements in LP policy 36 as out-of-date. ... NPPF paragraph 11.d) sets out how decisions should be approached where 'the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date' ... In this instance LP policy 43and NP policy 7, both concerning the AONB, are of equal relevance as LP policy 36. Those are all, in my view, policies which are most important for determiningthe appeal the pitch requirement in LP 36 is based on superseded evidence the existence of greater need at a District level than forecast supply does not outweigh the harm that would result to the AONB. The proposal would have modest benefits in terms of supply and result in clear and specific harm. The adverse effect to landscape character would remain considerable even were the life of the permission limited by way of temporary condition. Moreover, as reflected by the appeal at Nutbourne in 2013, there are degrees of sensitivity within protected landscapes. ... Whilst the proposal would have certain benefits, in my view those benefits are insufficient to overcome the harm that would result or to justify a temporary or personal permission no other material considerations are sufficient to outweigh my finding in the main issue as to the unacceptability of the development proposed. Whilst bearing in mind the need to eliminate discrimination and promote equality of opportunity, in my view the effects of dismissing the scheme on the appellants are necessary and proportionate "</p>	

3. CURRENT APPEALS

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p><u>18/00393/CONHH</u> Appledram Parish Case Officer: Emma Kierans</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Ferndale 133 Birdham Road Appledram Chichester West Sussex PO20 7DY - Appeal against Enforcement Notice AP/5</p>
<p><u>18/02204/ELD</u> Birdham Parish Case Officer: Shona Archer</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Kellys Farm Bell Lane Birdham PO20 7HY - Erection of a building and use as a dwellinghouse</p>
<p><u>19/00046/CONCOU</u> Birdham Parish Case Officer: Steven Pattie</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Kellys Farm Bell Lane Birdham Chichester West Sussex PO20 7HY - Appeal against BI/46</p>
<p><u>19/00845/FUL</u> Birdham Parish Case Officer: Daniel Power</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Common Piece Main Road Birdham West Sussex - Use of land for the stationing of a static caravan.</p>
<p><u>19/01352/DOM</u> Bosham Parish Case Officer: Oliver Naish</p> <p>Householder Appeal</p>	<p>The Old Town Hall Bosham Lane Bosham PO18 8HY - Construction of an outdoor swimming pool.</p>
<p><u>19/01721/FUL</u> Bosham Parish Case Officer: Maria Tomlinson</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Land South East Of Church Farm Old Park Lane Bosham West Sussex - Change of use of land for the stationing of 3 no. shepherd huts to be used as tourist accommodation.</p>

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p><u>19/02328/DOM</u> Chichester Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Rebecca Perris</p> <p>Householder Appeal</p>	<p>9 Newlands Lane Chichester PO19 3AT - Proposed loft conversion with rear dormer.</p>
<p><u>19/00765/FUL</u> Chidham & Hambrook Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Daniel Power</p> <p>Informal Hearing</p>	<p>Plot C Pond Farm Newells Lane West Ashling Chichester West Sussex PO18 8DF - To use land as a Travellers caravan site consisting of 1 no. mobile home and 1 no. touring caravan with associated development.</p>
<p><u>17/00371/CONCOM</u> Donnington Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Tara Lang</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Donnington Manor Farm Selsey Road Donnington Chichester West Sussex PO20 7PL - Appeal against D/9</p>
<p><u>19/00350/LBC</u> Donnington Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Maria Tomlinson</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Hardings Farm Selsey Road Donnington Chichester West Sussex PO20 7PU - Replacement of 8 no. windows to North, East and South Elevations (like for like).</p>
<p><u>16/00320/CONCOU</u> Earnley Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Steven Pattie</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Witsend Nursery Third Avenue Batchmere Chichester West Sussex PO20 7LB - Appeal against E/32</p>
<p><u>19/02407/PA3Q</u> Earnley Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Maria Tomlinson</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Land South Of 102A First Avenue Almodington Batchmere Chichester West Sussex PO20 7LQ - Notification for Prior Approval for a proposed change of use of agricultural buildings to 4no. dwellinghouses (Class C3).</p>
<p><u>17/00310/CONCOU</u> Funtington Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Tara Lang</p> <p>Informal Hearing</p>	<p>Cutmill Depot Newells Lane West Ashling Chichester West Sussex PO18 8DE - Appeal against FU/67</p>

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p><u>18/00323/CONHI</u> Funtington Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Sue Payne</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>West Stoke Farm House Downs Road West Stoke Funtington Chichester West Sussex PO18 9BQ - Appeal against HH/22</p>
<p><u>18/00675/FUL</u> Funtington Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Caitlin Boddy</p> <p>Informal Hearing</p>	<p>Cutmill Depot Newells Lane West Ashling Chichester West Sussex PO18 8DE - Retrospective change use of land to include the retention/stationing of a mobile home on the eastern part of the site.</p>
<p><u>18/00676/FUL</u> Funtington Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Caitlin Boddy</p> <p>Informal Hearing</p>	<p>Cutmill Depot Newells Lane West Ashling Chichester West Sussex PO18 8DE - Retrospective erection of boundary wall in excess of 1m in height adjacent to highway.</p>
<p><u>19/01400/FUL</u> Loxwood Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: William Price</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Moore's Cottage Loxwood Road Alfold Bars Loxwood Billingshurst West Sussex RH14 0QS - Erection of a detached dwelling following demolition of free-standing garage.</p>
<p><u>16/00325/CONCOM</u> North Mundham Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Shona Archer</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>6 Oakdene Gardens North Mundham Chichester West Sussex PO20 1AQ - Appeal against NM/28</p>
<p><u>18/00187/CONMHC</u> North Mundham Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Tara Lang</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Fisher Granary Fisher Lane South Mundham Chichester West Sussex PO20 1ND - Appeal against NM/29</p>
<p><u>19/00405/FUL</u> North Mundham Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Caitlin Boddy</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Fisher Granary Fisher Lane South Mundham PO20 1ND - Use of land for the stationing of a caravan for use as a holiday let.</p>

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p><u>19/01838/DOM</u> North Mundham Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: William Price</p> <p>Householder Appeal</p>	<p>Birches 1 The Hermitage North Mundham PO20 1LE - Retrospective removal of a hedge (2.4m high and 1.8m deep) and erection of a 1.8m wooden fence.</p>
<p><u>17/00104/CONBC</u> Plaistow And Ifold Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Sue Payne</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Burgau Barn Plaistow Road Ifold Loxwood Billingshurst West Sussex RH14 0TZ - Appeal against Enforcement Notice PS/68 and planning permission refusal for 18/01685/FUL.</p>
<p><u>18/01685/FUL</u> Plaistow And Ifold Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Daniel Power</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Burgau Barn Plaistow Road Ifold Loxwood RH14 0TZ - Retrospective single storey side extension.</p>
<p><u>19/02449/DOM</u> Plaistow And Ifold Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Vicki Baker</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>The Coach House Oak Lane Shillinglee Plaistow GU8 4SQ - Remove 2 no. single garage doors, install 1 no. double door, decrease the opening and increase bricks flanks to each side of the door.</p>
<p><u>19/00088/CONHH</u> Sidlesham Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Sue Payne</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Red Barn Selsey Road Sidlesham Chichester West Sussex PO20 7NE - Without planning permission the erection of a building in a ancient woodland subject to Enforcement Notice SI/73</p>
<p><u>19/01103/LBC</u> Sidlesham Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Maria Tomlinson</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Highleigh Farmhouse Highleigh Road Sidlesham PO20 7NR - Installation of replacement windows to match existing.</p>

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p><u>19/01425/DOM</u> Sidlesham Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Oliver Naish</p> <p>Householder Appeal</p>	<p>36 Manhood Lane Sidlesham Chichester West Sussex PO20 7LT - Retrospective application for single storey rear extension.</p>
<p><u>18/00389/CONCOU</u> Southbourne Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Steven Pattie</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>1 Green Acre Inlands Road Nutbourne Chichester West Sussex PO18 8RJ - Appeal against SB/117</p>
<p><u>18/00100/CONCOU</u> West Itchenor Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Steven Pattie</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Northshore Yacht Limited The Street Itchenor Chichester West Sussex PO20 7AY - Appeal against WI/16</p>
<p>* <u>18/02708/DOM</u> West Wittering Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Daniel Power</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Dolphins Rookwood Lane West Wittering Chichester West Sussex PO20 8QH - Proposed steps down through garden to a 1.5 metre long tunnel beneath public footpath rising through to another set of steps to the foreshore garden.</p>
<p>* <u>19/01622/FUL</u> West Wittering Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: Daniel Power</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Surbitonia 45 Howard Avenue West Wittering PO20 8EX - Demolition of an existing bungalow with a garage and erection of 2 no. replacement two storey dwellings with separate access and parking.</p>
<p><u>19/02302/DOM</u> West Wittering Parish</p> <p>Case Officer: William Price</p> <p>Householder Appeal</p>	<p>Chislehurst 53 Marine Drive West Wittering PO20 8HQ - Rear extension, loft conversion and new staircase enclosure pod.</p>

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<p data-bbox="197 230 488 300"><u>13/00163/CONWST</u> Westbourne Parish</p> <p data-bbox="197 327 592 356">Case Officer: Shona Archer</p> <p data-bbox="197 398 411 432">Public Inquiry</p>	<p data-bbox="639 230 1382 336">The Old Army Camp Cemetery Lane Woodmancote Westbourne West Sussex - Appeal against WE/40, WE/41, WE/42 and WE/43</p> <p data-bbox="639 380 879 414">4 Linked appeals</p>
<p data-bbox="197 456 571 526"><u>19/02126/FUL</u> Wisborough Green Parish</p> <p data-bbox="197 566 587 595">Case Officer: Daniel Power</p> <p data-bbox="197 638 552 672">Written Representation</p>	<p data-bbox="639 456 1442 600">Goose Cottage Durbans Road Wisborough Green RH14 0DG - Change of use of 1 no. existing timber clad store room into 1 no. new dwelling. Removal of temporary tent garage and replacement with 1 no. timber clad garage.</p>

4. VARIATIONS TO SECTION 106 AGREEMENTS

None.

5. CALLED-IN APPLICATIONS

Reference	Proposal	Stage

6. COURT AND OTHER MATTERS

Injunctions		
Site	Breach	Stage
Land North West of Birdham Farm, Chichester	Of Enforcement Notices. Injunction Application lodged by CDC at the High Court	Temporary Injunction ordered by the High Court on 13 March not to bring any new caravans on site or carry out any new development without the permission of the Council. Awaiting Court Order with Directions for both parties as to the lodging of the defendants' evidence, the Council's response to it and Final Hearing date.

High Court Hearings		
Site	Matter	Stage
23 Southgate, Chichester (The Vestry)	Challenge to issue of planning permission dated 9 th December 2019	Consent Order has been signed on behalf of the Council but the interested party, Sussex Inns Limited, have filed grounds for defence and permission of the court to proceed with the claim has been granted. Hearing date is awaited.

Prosecutions		
Site	Breach	Stage

7. POLICY MATTERS