

**Chichester District Council
Planning Committee**

Wednesday 15 May 2024

Report of the Director Of Planning and Environment Services

Schedule of Planning Appeals, Court and Policy Matters

between 28-03-2024 - 23-04-2024

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 website.

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>23/01750/DOC</u>	
Bosham Parish Case Officer: Alicia Snook Other	Ham Farm Main Road Bosham Chichester West Sussex PO18 8EH Discharge of Condition 4 (Surface Water Drainage Scheme) 5 (CEMP) and 6 (SUDs) from planning permission BO/20/01288/FUL
<u>23/00196/FUL</u>	
East Wittering And Bracklesham Parish Case Officer: Sascha Haigh Written Representation	1 & 2 Azara Parade Bracklesham Lane Bracklesham West Sussex PO20 8HP Demolition of existing units (A3 and A1 use) and erection of a two storey mixed use building with E(a) use on ground floor and 2 no. dwellings on 1st floor.
<u>21/03554/FUL</u>	
Westbourne Parish Case Officer: Martin Mew Written Representation	Land North Of The Grange Woodmancote Lane Woodmancote Emsworth Hampshire Retrospective siting of a temporary agricultural workers mobile home (for a period of 3 years) to provide living accommodation for an essential agricultural worker.

2. DECISIONS MADE

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<u>22/02995/FUL</u>	
<p>East Wittering And Bracklesham Parish Case Officer: Sascha Haigh Written Representation</p>	<p>Northside The Parade East Wittering Chichester West Sussex PO20 8BL</p> <p>Redevelopment to provide 2 no. commercial units, 5 no. one-bedroom flats and 2 no. two bedroom flats and 1 no. three-bedroom flats above.</p>
<p>Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED</p>	
<p>In the absence of a suitable mechanism to secure the necessary financial contribution. This would bring the proposal into conflict with LP Policy 50.... there is a significant degree of variance in the style and height of buildings on the northern side of Cakeham Road. I do not therefore consider this to be a location where new development must adhere to the physical dimensions of other nearby buildings. The increase in ridge height over Tesco Express would be fairly modest particularly when one considers the top floor would be recessed from the front edge of the building. Overall given the proposed building's design credentials, coupled with the negative contribution made by the existing building on the appeal site, I find the development would enhance the character and appearance of the area. It would thus accord with LP Policy 33 and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). I am satisfied that future residents would have good access to local parks and publicly accessible outdoor space. The second reason for refusal relates to the loss of the existing toilet and storage facilities the Appellant has responded by confirming that such facilities would be provided on the ground floor units once end users have been identified. I am therefore satisfied that these matters could be addressed by a suitably worded planning condition. While I note National Highways' support for Policy T1, until such time as the Council's approach has been endorsed through the local plan process, I am not persuaded that the highway contribution would satisfy the relevant tests for planning conditions set out in paragraph 56 of the NPPF. Accordingly, the absence of a planning obligation securing the highway contribution is not a matter that weighs against the appeal.</p>	

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
22/00438/FUL	
<p>Hunston Parish Case Officer: Emma Kierans Written Representation</p>	<p>Grist Farm Pagham Road Roundabout Hunston West Sussex PO20 1JL</p> <p>Stationing of a mobile home as ancillary accommodation in connection with Grist Farmhouse (part retrospective).</p>
<p>Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED</p>	
<p>The development proposed is stationing of a mobile home as ancillary accommodation in connection with Grist Farmhouse. The main issues are whether the proposal would meet an essential need for accommodation within the countryside and the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, I find, on this issue, that the Appellant has failed to demonstrate that no suitable accommodation exists or could be made available, either by adaptation or extension, and that the retention of the mobile home conflicts with part 2 of policy 37 of the CLP and as such with the aims and objectives of policies 2 and 45 of the CLP, as well as the relevant policies of the Framework. Accordingly, I conclude that the mobile home results in harm to the character and appearance of this countryside area contrary to policies 2, 33, 37 and 45 of the CLP, and the corresponding policies of the Framework. For the reasons given above and having taken all the matters raised into account I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.</p>	

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
21/03448/OUT	
<p>North Mundham Parish Case Officer: Alicia Snook Informal Hearings</p>	<p>Land At Streamside Farm North West Of Tumble Cottage Lagness Road Runcton West Sussex PO20 1LD</p> <p>Outline application (with all matters reserved except Access) for the development of up to 30 dwellings; provision of public open space/play area; landscaping; and modification of existing access.</p>
Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED	
<p>Since the appeal was lodged a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been published. The parties have had the opportunity to submit comments on the Framework and it was discussed at the hearing. The appeal has been considered in light of the Framework. Even so, the site lies between an open field and stream to the east and playing fields beyond the belt of trees to the west. Therefore, it is in a recognisable open gap between Runcton and North Mundham and to the north of Lagness Road. This land is not recognised as being of landscape value but it has an intrinsic character and beauty that is distinct from the built up extents of the villages and the large glasshouses and agricultural businesses in the wider area. The appeal site makes a significant contribution to the rural aspects of the locality. The introduction of up to 30 dwellings with associated infrastructure, lighting and domestic activities would result in a marked change in the appearance and character of the site. The replacement of the barns and paddocks by housing would undermine the rural nature of the land. The plans show the dwellings would be located towards the western part of the site and so behind the line of trees along the roadside. However, these trees are not within the appeal site and so the appellant is not in a position to secure their retention. In any event, vegetation cannot be relied upon to screen the houses indefinitely. The introduction of the houses and associated infrastructure would be perceived as an encroachment of built development into the countryside. The development would abut open land on either side and so it would not visually or physically integrate with either North Mundham or Runcton. Consequently, the housing would not be perceived as a logical expansion of either of the villages and so, in these regards, it would be incongruous. For these reasons, I conclude the development would harm the character and appearance of the area. In these regards, it would be contrary to LP policies 33, 47 and 48. Amongst other things, these look to ensure development recognises and respects local character. I note the point that any new housing is likely to affect the appearance of a site and its surroundings. However, the identified harm attracts significant weight given the permanent loss of part of the countryside and subsequent detriment to its intrinsic character and beauty... The site is outside of any settlement boundaries as defined in the LP. Under LP policies 2 and 45, development within such areas is restricted to that which requires a countryside location, meets an essential rural need or supports rural diversification. The proposed development would not comply with any of these identified exceptions and so it would be contrary to the LP policies. For the above reasons, I conclude the development would be in an unsuitable location having regard to the development strategy set out in LP policies 2 and 45. However, the harm caused by this conflict with LP policies is tempered by the proposal's compliance with the Framework's provisions on the location of rural housing and sustainable transport. Therefore, I find no direct conflict with these policies... The Environment Agency (EA) flood map for planning submitted at the hearing shows the appeal site is entirely in flood zone 1 and so has a low probability of flooding. However, this relates only to flooding from rivers and the sea. Furthermore, a consultation response from West Sussex County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority indicates the appeal site is at high risk of</p>	

Groundwater flooding. No evidence is before me that contradicts this advice. I am unable to conclude that the ST has been met. As such, there is uncertainty as to whether the development would avoid buildings on land subject to flooding. I conclude the proposal would be unacceptable having regard to flood risk and it would be contrary to paragraph 168 of the Framework in these regards. The appellant refers to 3 recent appeal decisions to support their case. The local planning policy context relating to highway infrastructure contributions has not changed since the issuing of these decisions. Each of the Inspectors highlight that ELP policy T1 and the draft SPD have not been tested under formal examination and they have not been adopted. As such, to use these as a basis for calculating the required highway contribution would go against the PPG advice that policies for planning obligations should be set out in plans and examined in public. I find no reason to disagree with the previous Inspectors' views and comments on this issue. Within this context, I find the appropriate level of contribution towards A27 enhancement works is as set out in the adopted SPD. As such, the circumstances at paragraph 11(d)(i) exist and so the presumption in favor of granting planning permission at 11(d) of the Framework is not engaged. The appeal development would have several benefits that attract significant weight overall. However, the proposal would be contrary to the LP policies that relate to the first 2 main issues and also it would be at odds with the provisions of the Framework on flood risk. The collective harm that would be caused in these regards is the overriding factor. The benefits of the development even when considered together would be of insufficient weight to justify granting planning permission contrary to the LP and the Framework.

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
23/00188/FUL	
<p>Oving Parish Case Officer: Jeremy Bushell Written Representation</p>	<p>Land Off Longacre Way Chichester West Sussex PO20 2EJ</p> <p>Erection of apartment building (87 units), including Class E floor space, with associated car parking, bike stores, landscaping and utilising existing access.</p>
Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED	
<p>The main issues are: the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area; whether the proposal would make an appropriate contribution toward highway improvements, including a travel plan; and whether the proposal would provide adequate public amenity space and equipped play space. Character and appearance - the surrounding area is characterised by a mix of uses and buildings of varied scale and design. Whilst the appeal site is quite constrained in size, it provides a transition between the denser development of the urban centre and the suburban character of the predominantly residential development. Furthermore, the site fronts onto Longacre Way where the prevailing pattern of development creates a sense of enclosure but backs onto a verdant, spacious area surrounding a lake. The appeal site is characterised by the transition between different areas of the wider Shopwyke development. The proposed U-shaped building with the proliferation of parking spaces toward the centre of the site fails to address Longacre Way in a similar manner to surrounding development. Large sections of the building would be set further back from the road than neighbouring development which would disrupt the sense of enclosure. The proposed set back would be much larger than the adjacent apartment complex. Also, the proposed parking area, sited in the space between the building and the road, would be a semi-private space, unlike the public space in front of the commercial units. Moreover, large surface car parks are not a common feature within the street scene along Longacre Way. For these reasons, the proposed building would appear incongruous. The form of the building would appear as a visual barrier restricting views across the site to and from the verdant open space around the lake to the rear of the site. Furthermore, the design alongside the scale, massing, and siting of the proposed building in proximity to the open space would disrupt the spacious character of that area due to the siting of the proposed building, the blank façade on the side of the neighbouring apartment block would be prominent in mid-distance views along Longacre Way. The façade would appear stark and have a harmful effect on the character of the area. Additionally, the proposed class E use would be sited away from nearby commercial, and community uses and closer to neighbouring houses, this would confuse the legibility of the area. These aspects of the design, alone and in combination, demonstrate how the proposal fails to respect the character of the surrounding area. Overall, the proposal would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would be contrary to Policy 33 of the Local Plan which indicates that permission will be granted where it can be demonstrated that proposals meet the highest standards of design, and they respect and, where possible, enhance the character of the area. The proposal would also be contrary to paragraph 131 and 135 of the NPPF. These paragraphs indicate that the creation of beautiful places is fundamental to what the planning process should achieve and that decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character. The proposal would also be contrary to paragraphs 41, 43, 53, and 66 of the National Design Guide [which] indicate that well-designed new development responds positively to the features of the surrounding context beyond the site boundary; is integrated into its wider surroundings; and is influenced by the characteristics of the existing built form; built form is determined by good urban design principles that combine layout, form, and scale. Highway improvements - a contribution which is more than the level set out in the 2016 SPD is not in my view justified.</p>	

Furthermore, this proposed contribution would fail to meet the Regulation 122 tests, and would not be in accordance with paragraph 57 of the Framework, as it would not be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development the proposed contribution of £227,505 set out in the UU is not in accordance with the 2016 SPD. The proposed contribution would also fail to meet the Regulation 122 tests and would not be in accordance with paragraph 57 of the Framework, for the same reasons as the proposed S106 contribution... it would be contrary to LP Policy 9. Open space and equipped play space - Overall, given the substantial provision of both public amenity space and equipped play space in the surrounding area, I conclude that the proposal would provide adequate public amenity space and, in this instance a lack of provision of equipped play space is acceptable. Conclusion - The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it.

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
21/01697/PA3Q	
<p>Plaistow And Ifold Parish Case Officer: Rebecca Perris</p> <p>Written Representation</p>	<p>Premier Treecare & Conservation Ltd Oxencroft Ifold Bridge Lane Ifold Loxwood Billingshurst West Sussex RH14 0UJ</p> <p>Prior notification for the change of use of agricultural buildings to 1 no. dwelling (C3 Use Class) with alterations to fenestration.</p>
Appeal Decision: APPEAL DISMISSED	
<p>The appeal is dismissed. Whether the building would satisfy the requirements of Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England) Order 2015 (as amended)(the GPDO); and the effect on the Arun Valley SPA, SAC and RAMSAR with particular regards to water neutrality. Class Q permits a change of use of a building and any land within its curtilage from a use as an agricultural building to a use falling within Class C3(dwellinghouses) of the Schedule to the Use Classes Order. For the purposes of Part 3, “agricultural building” means a building (excluding a dwellinghouse) used for agriculture and which is so used for the purposes of a trade or business; and “agricultural use” refers to such uses. Development is not permitted by Class Q if the site was not used solely for an agricultural use as part of an established agricultural unit (i) on 20th March 2013, in the case of a building which was in use before that date but was not in use on that date, when it was last in use in the case of a site which was brought into use after 20th March 2013, for a period of at least 10 years before the date development under Class Q begins. The main thrust of the appellant’s case is that there has been no change of use of the building and it remains agricultural. The building was being used to store various items, such as hay, wood, a fridge freezer, tools, and an oven . Section 336 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 “agriculture” includes horticulture, fruit growing, seed growing, dairy farming, the breeding and keeping of livestock (including any creature kept for the production of food, wool, skins or fur, or for the purpose of its use in the farming of land), the use of land as grazing land, meadow land, osier land, market gardens and nursery grounds, and the use of land for woodlands where that use is ancillary to the farming of land for other agricultural purposes, and “agricultural” shall be construed accordingly. While the photographs show a building was present prior to 2013, it is not possible to determine from the aerial photographs how the building and associated land was being used at that time. It is not clear when the CHP was applied for, or the livestock that have been located at the site. Furthermore, there is no detail regarding the hay which has been produced. It is therefore not clear whether the land and building were used for the purposes of a trade or business. A statutory declaration, signed by the previous owner of the site, states throughout their ownership of the property, it has been used for agricultural and agricultural storage purposes and since around 2013. Statutory declaration, signed by the owner of a business located opposite the appeal site, states they have engaged the aforementioned agricultural contractor from his, then, yard which was at the appeal property and that the appeal building was used solely for the running of the agricultural contractor’s agricultural business in 2013. Evidence points towards the appeal site having been used as an agricultural contractor’s yard on 20 March 2013. Agricultural contractor will usually visit other landholdings and carry out specialised, seasonal or temporary services to farmers. Such activities do not constitute an agricultural use, nor can these activities be considered as ordinarily and reasonably incidental to agriculture, since the storage activities are likely to be carried out on a different planning unit to the agricultural activities. Council advises a Planning Contravention Notice was completed for the site on 15 February 2021</p>	

Premier Tree Care and Conservation own the site and have done since November 2019. A number of interested parties also suggest the appeal site has been used as a forestry business and for tree surgery work. The storage of machinery and other items used in association with a tree surgery business would not constitute an agricultural use so permitted development rights under Class Q would not apply. The appellant has not explained in sufficient detail the nature of the activities which have been carried out at the site. From the evidence provided, it seems unlikely the appeal building was used solely for an agricultural use as part of an established agricultural unit on 20 March 2013. Ambiguity as to how the building has been used since that time. Consequently, it has not been shown that the proposed development is development which would be permitted by Class Q of the GPDO. However, I do not have full details of the schemes referred to and, while they may be physically similar to the appeal building, it is not clear whether the circumstances surrounding their use are comparable. Water Neutrality A Regulation 77 application may be submitted and approved after prior approval is given for the development. However, the appellant has applied for a determination as to whether prior approval is required, not under Regulation 77 of the CHSR. While the requirements of both the prior approval process and Regulation 77 must be met before the development can be lawfully begun, it does not follow that the prior approval must be dismissed. Nevertheless, for the reasons given above, I find the proposed development does not meet the limitations set out within Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q of the GPDO and so the appeal must fail. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
23/01114/FUL	
<p>Selsey Parish Case Officer: Calum Thomas Written Representation</p>	<p>Cranleigh 36 Park Lane Selsey Chichester West Sussex PO20 0HE</p> <p>Demolition of existing and erection of 1 no. replacement dwelling.</p>
Appeal Decision: APPEAL ALLOWED	
<p>The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing and erection of 1 no. replacement dwelling at 36 Park Lane, Selsey, PO20 0HE. The appeal property is located on the northern side of Park Lane on the outskirts of Selsey. The Council's Officer's Report states that a replacement dwelling, can be considered acceptable in principle, as it does not result in an increase in the number of dwellings in the countryside. Compliance with Policy 45 therefore turns on whether the appeal proposal is for a replacement dwelling...As is made clear in the Officer's Report, the Council's concerns were based entirely upon the design of the dwelling. The first overarching point is that the plans do not show that two dwellings are to be formed and, in that sense, they support the description of development. Nonetheless, I share some of the Council's concerns particularly in relation to the two front entrances. This strikes me as a particularly unusual design feature. Although no medical details have been provided, one would have thought a shared entrance would make more sense for someone with a disability. It is also difficult to understand why two WCs are required within the western wing if that area is intended for the Appellants' son. I concur with the Council that it would be relatively easy to convert the house into two separate units but that does not mean it would happen or is even likely to happen. I appreciate the Council was not helped by the Applicant. The application as submitted made no reference to the personal circumstances of the Appellants set out above. That was a curious omission and to some extent the Appellants have used the appeal process to evolve the scheme with new information that was not before the Council when it made its decision. Overall, I can understand perfectly well how the Council came to the view it did based on the submitted details. However, despite my uneasiness over elements of the proposed layout, I cannot say with any degree of certainty whether it was or remains the Appellants' intention to split the property...Accordingly, it would not conflict with the aims and objectives of LP Policy 45. According to the Appellants, the proposed asymmetrical pitched roof is designed to maximise solar energy capture. However, that explanation is somewhat counter-intuitive when one considers the elongated roof slope would be north rather than south-facing. Nonetheless, the asymmetrical nature of the roof would not be apparent in public views of the building from Park Lane. I find the Council's concerns about the fenestration, facing/roofing materials and detailing to be overplayed. The house would undoubtedly appear different to its neighbours, however, it would simply add to the already eclectic mix of building styles in the area. Finally, in terms of its proportions, I do not agree that the roof or dwelling would span the majority of the plot's width. I am satisfied that any harm to bats, should they be found to be present, would be satisfactorily mitigated by condition 4.</p>	

3. IN PROGRESS

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<u>22/01918/FUL</u>	
Birdham Parish Case Officer: Sascha Haigh Written Representation	Birdham Straight House Main Road Birdham West Sussex PO20 7HS Removal of single storey sunroom to existing house and construction of 5 no. two storey houses together with garages, parking and revised access arrangements.
<u>22/02502/FUL</u>	
Bosham Parish Case Officer: Sascha Haigh Written Representation	Land North Of Southfield House Delling Lane Bosham West Sussex PO18 8NN Change of use of poultry buildings to form 1 no. new dwelling, including partial demolition of existing garage, landscaping and associated works.
<u>22/03202/FUL</u>	
Chichester Parish Case Officer: Rebecca Perris Written Representation	2 The Gardens College Lane Chichester West Sussex PO19 6PF Construction of building for student accommodation.
<u>23/00555/DOM</u>	
Chichester Parish Case Officer: Eleanor Midlane-Ward Fast Track Appeal	28 Cavendish Street Chichester West Sussex PO19 3BS Partial demolition of existing ground floor rear extension and erection of additional ground floor rear extension, with various alterations including replacement of cement render with lime based render and associated roof works. Alterations to boundary treatment and replacement of bi-fold gate with sliding gate.
<u>23/01914/ADV</u>	
Chichester Parish Case Officer: Eleanor Midlane-Ward Fast Track Appeal	Land South Of Halfords Unit A3 Barnfield Drive Chichester West Sussex PO19 7AG Erection of 1 no. digital advertisement display hoarding (D-Poster), internally illuminated.
<u>21/00323/CONMHC</u>	
Chidham & Hambrook Parish Case Officer: Andrew George Informal Hearings 17-Sep-2024	Churchers Copse Barn Hambrook Hill South Hambrook Chidham Chichester West Sussex PO18 8UJ Appeal against CH/59

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<u>23/00209/OPEDEV</u>	
Chidham & Hambrook Parish Case Officer: Andrew George Informal Hearings 17-Sep-2024	Churchers Copse Barn Hambrook Hill South Hambrook Chidham Chichester West Sussex PO18 8UJ Appeal against CH/60
<u>23/00089/ELD</u>	
Earnley Parish Case Officer: Emma Kierans Written Representation	Batchmere Lodge 95 First Avenue Almodington Earnley West Sussex PO20 7LQ Existing lawful development certificate for the change of use of building to dwelling.
<u>23/00117/FUL</u>	
Earnley Parish Case Officer: Emma Kierans Written Representation	Cheraw Nursery 134 Almodington Lane Almodington Earnley West Sussex PO20 7JR Demolition of 2 no. outbuildings and existing stables and erection of 1 no. dwelling.
<u>23/00788/FUL</u>	
Earnley Parish Case Officer: Emma Kierans Written Representation	Outbuilding South Of 101 First Avenue First Avenue Almodington Batchmere West Sussex Construction of detached workshop building along with associated hard standing, fence and landscaping.
<u>23/01373/FUL</u>	
Earnley Parish Case Officer: Eleanor Midlane-Ward Written Representation	Land Rear Of 114 Second Avenue Batchmere Chichester West Sussex PO20 7LF Retrospective application for 1 no. tennis court and associated fencing.
<u>23/02147/DOM</u>	
Earnley Parish Case Officer: Emma Kierans Written Representation	Tykes Farm Barn Somerley Lane Earnley East Wittering Chichester West Sussex PO20 7JB Erection of detached garage and store.

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<u>22/00304/CONHH</u>	
Earnley Parish Case Officer: Mr Michael Coates-Evans Written Representation	Tykes Farm Barn Somerley Lane Earnley East Wittering Chichester West Sussex PO20 7JB Appeal against E/37
<u>* 22/02214/FULEIA</u>	
East Wittering And Bracklesham Parish Case Officer: Jane Thatcher Public Inquiry	Stubcroft Farm Stubcroft Lane East Wittering Chichester West Sussex PO20 8PJ Erection of 280 no. residential dwellings (including affordable housing), associated highway and landscape works, open space and flexible retail and community floorspace (Use Classes E and F).
<u>* 22/02235/OUTEIA</u>	
East Wittering And Bracklesham Parish Case Officer: Jane Thatcher	Land At Stubcroft Farm Stubcroft Lane East Wittering Chichester West Sussex PO20 8PJ Outline application (with all matters reserved except for Access) for the construction of sheltered living accommodation.
<u>22/02444/FUL</u>	
East Wittering And Bracklesham Parish Case Officer: Emma Kierans Informal Hearings	1 Field Maple South Of Tranjoeen Bracklesham Lane Bracklesham Bay West Sussex Use of land as a single private travelling showperson's site.
<u>23/01064/FUL</u>	
East Wittering And Bracklesham Parish Case Officer: Emma Kierans Informal Hearings	Land South Of Tranjoeen Bracklesham Lane Bracklesham Bay West Sussex PO20 7JE Change of use of land as a travellers caravan site consisting of 3 no. pitches and associated development.
<u>23/01504/FUL</u>	
East Wittering And Bracklesham Parish Case Officer: Emma Kierans Informal Hearings	Land South Of 1 Field Maple Bracklesham Lane Chichester Bracklesham PO20 7JE Change of use of land as proposed single travelling showperson site.

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<u>23/00237/CONCOU</u>	
East Wittering And Bracklesham Parish Case Officer: Andrew George Informal Hearings	Land Adjacent Of Tranjoeen Bracklesham Lane Bracklesham Bay West Sussex Appeal against EW/53
<u>23/00031/CONHH</u>	
East Wittering And Bracklesham Parish Case Officer: Mr Michael Coates-Evans Written Representation	Casa Jano 6 Beech Avenue Bracklesham Bay Chichester West Sussex PO20 8HU Appeal against EW/52
<u>22/02542/FUL</u>	
Fishbourne Parish Case Officer: Calum Thomas Written Representation	Land North Of Godwin Way Fishbourne West Sussex The development of 4 no. new dwellings (3 no. 3-beds and 1 no. 2 beds) including the provision of a new vehicular access onto Blackboy Lane, a new pedestrian crossing on Blackboy Lane, parking, landscaping and all other associated works.
<u>20/00005/CONMHC</u>	
Hunston Parish Case Officer: Sue Payne Written Representation	Grist Farm Hunston Chichester West Sussex PO20 1JL Appeal against HN/31
<u>19/01400/FUL</u>	
Loxwood Parish Case Officer: Martin Mew Written Representation	Moore's Cottage Loxwood Road Alfold Bars Loxwood Billingshurst West Sussex RH14 0QS Erection of a detached dwelling following demolition of free-standing garage.
<u>22/01216/FUL</u>	
Loxwood Parish Case Officer: Sascha Haigh Written Representation	Loxwood Hall Guildford Road Loxwood West Sussex RH14 0QP Erection of dwelling with associated parking, landscaping and ancillary structures.

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<u>22/01565/ELD</u>	
Loxwood Parish Case Officer: Emma Kierans Informal Hearings 12-Sep-2024	Loxwood Farm Brewhurst Lane Loxwood West Sussex RH14 0RJ Existing lawful development use of land as garden curtilage.
<u>22/02372/FUL</u>	
Loxwood Parish Case Officer: Sascha Haigh Written Representation	Old School House Vicarage Hill Loxwood West Sussex RH14 0RG Demolition of the Old School House. Construction of 3 no. dwellings with car parking and alterations to vehicle access.
<u>23/00815/FUL</u>	
Loxwood Parish Case Officer: Vicki Baker Written Representation	Land At Loxwood Hall West Guildford Road Loxwood Billingshurst West Sussex RH14 0QP Erection of a detached dwelling.
<u>22/00198/CONCOU</u>	
Loxwood Parish Case Officer: Sue Payne Informal Hearings 12-Sep-2024 CDC East Pallant House 1 East Pallant, Chichester, PO19 1TY	Loxwood Farm Brewhurst Lane Loxwood Billingshurst West Sussex RH14 0RJ Appeal against LX/23
<u>22/00185/CONENG</u>	
North Mundham Parish Case Officer: Sue Payne Informal Hearings	Land Adjacent To The Spinney Pagham Road Runcton West Sussex Appeal against NM/30
<u>22/02194/ELD</u>	
Plaistow And Ifold Parish Case Officer: Sascha Haigh Written Representation	The Coach House Oak Lane Shillinglee Plaistow West Sussex GU8 4SQ Existing lawful development certificate for the change of use of agricultural land to mixed use of business activities and private amenity land applicable for sui generis status.
<u>22/02314/FUL</u>	
Plaistow And Ifold Parish Case Officer: Sascha Haigh Written Representation	Shamba The Ride Ifold Loxwood RH14 0TQ Demolition of existing bungalow and redevelopment of 2 no. residential units.

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<u>23/02682/ELD</u>	
Plaistow And Ifold Parish Case Officer: Freya Divey Written Representation	Land To The North Of Coach House Oak Lane Shillinglee Plaistow Godalming West Sussex GU8 4SQ Existing lawful development - use of land for private amenity, storage and business use.
<u>23/02691/ELD</u>	
Plaistow And Ifold Parish Case Officer: Sascha Haigh Written Representation	Land North Of The Coach House Oak Lane Shillinglee Plaistow Godalming West Sussex GU8 4SQ Existing lawful development certificate for the erection of a building.
<u>23/02738/PLD</u>	
Plaistow And Ifold Parish Case Officer: Freya Divey Written Representation	Land To The North Of The Coach House Oak Lane Shillinglee Plaistow Godalming West Sussex GU8 4SQ Replacement shed.
<u>22/02871/FUL</u>	
Selsey Parish Case Officer: Sascha Haigh Written Representation	107 East Beach Road Selsey Chichester West Sussex PO20 0EZ Demolition of existing 1 no. dwelling and replacement with 1 no. new dwelling.
<u>23/00456/FUL</u>	
Sidlesham Parish Case Officer: Emma Kierans Written Representation	Willow & Deanhome Nursery 41-42 Keynor Lane Sidlesham Chichester West Sussex PO20 7NL Change of use of land to mixed storage use comprising of general storage (Use Class B8) and storage of builders materials/scaffolding (Sui Generis) within fenced compounds (part retrospective).
<u>23/00978/FUL</u>	
Sidlesham Parish Case Officer: Rebecca Perris Written Representation	Land Northeast Of The Honey House Chalder Lane Sidlesham West Sussex Erection of 1 no. additional dwelling.
<u>22/01005/FUL</u>	
Southbourne Parish Case Officer: Freya Divey Written Representation	The Sussex Brewery 36 Main Road Southbourne West Sussex PO10 8AU Partial demolition, conversion, and alterations of the detached outbuilding adjacent to the public house to create a 3-bedroom chalet bungalow with associated parking and landscaping.

Reference/Procedure	Proposal
<u>22/01477/FUL</u>	
Southbourne Parish Case Officer: Martin Mew Written Representation	Gatehouse Inlands Road Nutbourne West Sussex PO18 8RJ Demolition of existing dwelling, replace with 5 no. flats, new access, parking, landscaping and associated works.
<u>23/00207/CONHI</u>	
Southbourne Parish Case Officer: Sue Payne Written Representation	Kia Ora Main Road Nutbourne Chichester West Sussex PO18 8RT Appeal against the Council's decision not to issue a remedial notice
<u>23/00732/DOM</u>	
West Itchenor Parish Case Officer: Vicki Baker Fast Track Appeal	Oldfield House Itchenor Road West Itchenor Chichester West Sussex PO20 7AB Single storey rear extension to existing garage/annexe.
<u>22/00154/CONHI</u>	
West Itchenor Parish Case Officer: Sue Payne Written Representation	Russett Cottage Itchenor Road West Itchenor Chichester West Sussex PO20 7DD Appeal against the Council's decision not to issue a remedial notice
<u>22/02390/FUL</u>	
Westbourne Parish Case Officer: Emma Kierans Written Representation	Jubilee Wood Hambrook Hill North Hambrook Westbourne West Sussex PO18 8UL Change of use of land from agricultural to Class B8 for the storage of caravans and motor homes.
<u>23/00076/CONCOU</u>	
Westbourne Parish Case Officer: Andrew George Written Representation	Southleigh Park Estate The Woodlands Marlpit Lane Hambrook Westbourne Emsworth West Sussex PO10 8EQ Appeal against WE/60
<u>23/00076/CONCOU</u>	
Westbourne Parish Case Officer: Andrew George Written Representation	Southleigh Park Estate The Woodlands Marlpit Lane Hambrook Westbourne Emsworth West Sussex PO10 8EQ Appeal against WE/61
<u>22/02281/COU</u>	
Westhampnett Parish Case Officer: Vicki Baker Written Representation	Pampas Cottage Claypit Lane Westhampnett West Sussex PO18 0NU Change use of garage and workshop to guest/letting house.

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
Land South of the Stables, Hambrook	Enforcement Notice	29 April: Pre-Trial Hearing at Portsmouth Crown Court (as Defendant elected trial at crown court). Defendant confirmed Not Guilty plea. Trial fixed for 29 August 2024 at Portsmouth Crown Court for 1 day.
Land at Long Acres, Chidham	Enforcement Notice	First hearing at Worthing Magistrates' Court on 13 May.
Land West of Farmfield Nurseries, Hunston	Of Enforcement Notice	Trial at Worthing Magistrates' Court on 22 May
82A Fletchers Lane, Sidlesham	Of Enforcement Notice	Trial at Worthing Magistrates' Court on 27 June

Crouchlands – Lagoon 3, Loxwood	Of Enforcement Notice	Defendant found guilty previously. He appealed conviction and sentence of the magistrates' court. Waiting for a date at the crown court.
------------------------------------	-----------------------	--

7. POLICY MATTERS