Recommendation Report for Planning Permission

REF NOS: P/108/19/CLP, P/109/19/CLP & P/110/19/CLP.

LOCATION: Newlands Nursery, Pagham Road, PO20 1LL

PROPOSAL: Application for Certificate of Lawful Development Certificate for a Proposed Use - Use of caravan site for Spring/Summer/Autumn seasonal workers.

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION

The applicant, "Cre8 Property Ltd", has submitted three applications each seeking confirmation that occupation of the site by residential caravans for a particular agricultural season is permitted development. The following is a summary of the proposals:

	P/108/19/CLP	**P/109/19/CLP**	**P/110/19/CLP**
Proposed Season	Spring Bedding Plant Season	Summer Bedding Plant Season	Autumn Bedding Plant Season & separate Strawberry Season
Length of Season	31 January to 31 March (2 months)	01 April to 31 July (4 months)	01 August to 30 November (4 months)
Number of Caravans	20 caravans	31 caravans	25 caravans
Number of Workers	100	161	130

The supporting drawings show the layout of caravan pitches with 20 shown for the Spring season, 31 for the Summer season and 25 for the Autumn season (so a maximum of 31). The drawings also all show the provision of a new access road into the site, an on-site turning area, a new foul treatment plant and sewer connections. The plans do not detail whether the caravans will be sited on bases or whether electric connections will also be provided but it is assumed that these would be required.

SITE AREA

0.77 hectares.

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY

N/A.

TOPOGRAPHY

Predominantly flat but slopes slightly in a southerly direction away from the adjacent glasshouse to a ditch alongside the track.

TREES

Line of small trees and hedging with some mature trees interspersed along the southern edge of the site, some over the ditch.

BOUNDARY TREATMENT

As above for the southern boundary. The eastern boundary is a post & rail fence with agricultural land beyond.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS

Grassed land with a large two storey glasshouse structure immediately adjacent to the north. A telegraph wire crosses the site with at least one pole. The site narrows at the western end and a vehicular access would come in from here. There is also a pedestrian access onto the adjacent farm track to the south at this point.

CHARACTER OF LOCALITY

The site forms part of a large horticultural nursery site which comprises three separate glasshouses, a large loading yard/parking area, reservoir and ancillary buildings. It is accessed from the B2166 Lagness/Pagham Road. Just south of this access is a farm track leading to Park Farm, but which also serves 4 dwellings which share boundaries with the nursery site. The site has boundaries with the nursery (of which it is a part) and with agricultural land to the east. There is further agricultural land beyond the road to the south.

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

P/78/19/CLP	Lawful development certificate for the proposed seasonal use as a caravan site for the accommodation of seasonal workers.	Withdrawn 13/09/19
P/38/19/PL	Year-round retention of seasonal workers accommodation.	Withdrawn 26/06/19
P/89/05/	Demolition of existing glasshouses and construction of replacement glasshouse, extension to existing glasshouse and provision of hardstanding as overflow parking area	Approved with Conditions 24/10/05

COMMENTS OF PLANNING HISTORY

P/38/19/PL sought permission to retain the caravans on the site for two additional months of the year. This was on the basis that 10 months occupation would be permitted development. It was withdrawn following a request by the Local Planning Authority for the applicant to submit a Certificate of Lawfulness application to confirm that the 10-month seasonal accommodation is indeed permitted development.

P/78/19/CLP was subsequently submitted but withdrawn due to concerns raised that a 10-month season would not meet the definition of a “particular season”.

P/89/05 is referred to by the Parish Council and by some objectors. It is noted that condition 3 provides protection to the existing northern boundary planting. Furthermore, condition 4 states that the glasshouses shall not be internally illuminated between the hours of 2100 and 0700 the following day, except for essential maintenance or emergency purposes. However, these restrictions do not apply to the land around the glasshouse. It is also noted that there were no conditions imposed regarding working hours or the numbers of people employed at the site.

SUMMARY OF REPS RECEIVED

PAGHAM PARISH COUNCIL: Object for the following reasons:

(a) Insufficient information regarding the working arrangements involving other sites;
(b) Number of people to be on the site compared to restrictions imposed by P/89/05;
(c) Operation is to be 24 hours, but lighting is restricted to 7am to 9pm and P/89/05 allowed for only standard day working; and
(d) Need consideration of increase in workers on the Pagham Road, the inappropriateness of a development on this scale on the neighbouring properties, waste management and details of utility provision;

Also request an Article 4 Direction to remove the permitted development rights for this site to protect local amenity, the highway network and the safety of workers.

LOCAL RESIDENTS/INTEREST GROUPS:

A total of 33 objections have been logged for P/109/19/CLP and P/110/19/CLP whilst 35 have been logged for P/108/19/CLP. These raise the following concerns:

(1) Applicant has no intention to remove caravans at the end of each season as they say only when practically possible therefore not permitted development;
(2) Likely that no caravans would be removed in December as planning enforcement would take a month to take effect;
(3) Site would only be empty during December;
(4) Applicant intends to bus workers put to other sites;
(5) No case law provided to support assertion that different sites in same ownership are all in the same occupation;
(6) Permanent infrastructure is not allowed by permitted development;
(7) West Lancashire Appeal from 2002 ruled that caravans only allowed during single crop season;
(8) Assume the Council is aware of the Supplementary Planning Guidance “Accommodation for Seasonal Agricultural Workers” (November 2004);
(9) Planning permission P/89/05 does not allow for seasonal workers caravans;
(10) Planning permission P/89/05 does not allow for shift work on site;

(11) Land was originally set aside for wildlife by P/89/05 / harm to wildlife using the site;
(12) Request that permitted development rights are withdrawn by Article 4;
(13) No pre-application community consultation;
(14) Applicant is already converting care homes locally to provide accommodation therefore no need for caravans;
(15) No need for so many workers as glasshouses are fully automated;
(16) Developer must also comply with Environment Agency rules;
(17) Lack of security measures will cause conflict with local residents;
(18) Light & noise pollution;
(19) Harm to character of the area;
(20) Harm to amenity of existing residents;
(21) No sewage/drainage facilities, services or water supply;
(22) Will lead to littering of local roads & fields;
(23) Impact on the Pagham SSSI;
(24) Site is not sustainable as infrequent bus service and no cycle lanes;
(25) Site lies in curtilage of a residential property;
(26) Pagham Road is unsafe therefore this will result in increased accidents involving pedestrians;
(27) Workers likely to end up as hired gangs or modern slaves; and
(28) Caravan will not be big enough for 6 people.

SPECIALIST OBJECTIONS:

Some of the residents have also instructed a rural planning consultant to submit an objection. This sets out the following:

- Not clear that the actual site is in agricultural use therefore may fail the first criteria;
- Caravans are proposed for three continuous seasons therefore not a particular season;
- Additional infrastructure is required for which no planning permission is sought;
- Para 9.10 of the Brierley decision states that a caravan site is not solely defined by the presence of caravans but by surface infrastructure which will remain, and this prevents the site from returning to an agricultural use;
- There is no detailed description of development in section 8 of the application form so unclear what is proposed on the site; and
- Applicant is a property company and has no clear interest in any agricultural activity.

OFFICERS COMMENTS ON REPS

PAGHAM PARISH COUNCIL:

Item (a) will be considered in the report's conclusions.

(b) This is discussed in the Planning History section above.
(c) As (b).

(d) As set out below in respect of the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance, the local planning authority is only able to consider the permitted development rights and relevant case law, it cannot consider the planning merits of the case.

The request for an article 4 is noted and the Head of Planning has responded separately on this matter.

LOCAL RESIDENTS/INTEREST GROUPS:

(1) This is considered in the report's conclusions;
(2) There is be two months of non-occupation therefore there will be time for an enforcement notice to take effect;
(3) Noted however, the site would also be empty throughout January;
(4) Whilst it is accepted that the previous applications stated that this would be the case, the current applications do not, and the local planning authority can only consider the content of the applications that are currently to be determined;
(5) Noted however, the current applications state that the workers will all be employed on this site;
(6) This is considered in the report's conclusions;
(7) Noted however a copy of this appeal has not been provided and it has not been possible to locate this through planning resources;
(8) It has been identified that this document applies only to the West Lancashire district therefore has no bearing on decisions in Arun;
(9) This is discussed in the Planning History section above;
(10) As (9);
(11) This planning permission has been checked and it does not contain any controls on how this land was to be used. It should also be noted that there is separate legislation in place to protect wildlife (The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981) and any damage to wildlife habitat or to particular species could be enforced separately under that Act (the Police would enforce this);
(12) See above under response to the Parish Council;
(13) This is not a requirement of the Permitted Development Rights applicable to this proposed development;
(14) Noted but the Local Planning Authority cannot consider the question of need;
(15) As (14);
(16) Noted but this is not matter that the Local Planning Authority can consider;
(17) As (16);
(18) As (16);
(19) As (16);
(20) As (16);
(21) As (16);
(22) As (16);
(23) As (16);
(24) As (16);
(25) The site does not lie in a residential curtilage;
(26) As (16);
(27) As (16); and
(28) As (16).

SPECIALIST OBJECTIONS:

These comments are all noted, and the Brierley decision referred to is analysed in the case law section of the report's conclusions. In respect of the applicant not being involved in agriculture, it is has become clear that the applicant is a subsidiary of a larger parent company which includes as its other subsidiaries, Newlands Nursery, a recruitment company and others.

It is acknowledged that the application form does not adequately describe the proposed development and indeed omits to mention items of operational development that are nevertheless shown on the drawings (roads, hardstandings, a foul treatment plant & sewer connections).

SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS RESPONSES

The Council has sought advice from its legal department, and they consider that these applications should be refused firstly on the basis that the criterion of use shall be discontinued, and all caravans shall be removed as soon as reasonably practicable is not satisfied. Secondly, that there is insufficient information regarding whether the operations are within the same occupation. They also consider that the supporting statements contradict themselves as to whether the farm workers will be working on this specific site or on multiple sites.

OFFICERS COMMENTS ON CONSULTATIONS

The applicant has stated that the contradiction in the three statements is because the statements refer to both a theoretical situation and to the intent of the applicant. For example, the statements make an argument that land in the same occupation can include land elsewhere also in the ownership of the applicant. However, the Statements then go on to state that the current applications only seeks accommodation for workers employed on the Newlands Nursery site.

LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Section 192 of the Town and country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) states:

(1) if any person wishes to ascertain whether -

a. any proposed use of buildings or other land; or
b. any operations proposed to be carried out in, on, over or under land would be lawful, they may make an application for the purpose to the Local Planning Authority specifying the land and describing the use or operations in question.

(2) If, on an application under this section, the Local Planning Authority are provided with information satisfying them that the use or operations described in the application would be lawful if instituted or begun at the time of the application, they shall issue a certificate to that effect, and in any other case they shall refuse the application

(3) A certificate under this section shall -

a. specify the land to which it relates;
b. describe the use or operations in question
c. give the reasons for determining the use or operations to be lawful; and
d. specify the date of the application for the certificate

(4) The lawfulness of any use or operations for which a certificate is in force under this section shall be conclusively presumed unless there is a material change, before the use is instituted or the operations are begun, in any of the matters relevant to determining such lawfulness.

The Planning Practice Guidance ("PPG") states:

“What information must accompany an application for a lawful development certificate?

Article 39 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 specifies the contents of an application and how it must be submitted. The application must be accompanied by sufficient factual information/evidence for a local planning authority to decide the application, along with the relevant application fee. Application forms can be obtained from the local planning authority and can be completed by the applicant or someone working on their behalf. An application needs to describe precisely what is being applied for (not simply the use class) and the land to which the application relates. Without sufficient or precise information, a local planning information may be justified in refusing a certificate.” (paragraph: 005, reference ID: 17c-005-20140306).

And:

“Who is responsible for providing sufficient information to support an application?

The applicant is responsible for providing sufficient information to support an application, although a local planning authority always needs to co-operate with an applicant who is seeking information that the authority may hold about the planning status of the land. A local planning authority is entitled to canvass evidence if it so wishes before determining the application. If a local planning authority obtains evidence, this needs to be shared with the applicant who needs to have the opportunity to comment on it and possibly produce counter evidence.

In the case of applications for proposed development, an applicant needs to describe the proposal with sufficient clarity and precision to enable a local planning authority to understand exactly what is involved.” (paragraph: 006, reference ID: 17c-006-20140306)

And:

“How is an application for a lawful development certificate determined?

A Local Planning Authority needs to consider whether, on the facts of the case and relevant planning law, the specific matter is or would be lawful. Planning merits are not relevant at any stage in this particular application or appeal process.

In determining an application for a prospective development under section 192 a Local Planning Authority needs to ask, 'if this proposed change of use had occurred, or if this proposed operation had commenced, on the application date, would it have been lawful for planning purposes?'

A Local Planning Authority may choose to issue a lawful development certificate for a different description from that applied for, as an alternative to refusing a certificate altogether. It is, however, advisable to seek the applicant's agreement to any amendment before issuing the certificate. A refusal is not necessarily conclusive that something is not lawful, it may mean that to date insufficient evidence has been presented." (paragraph: 009, reference ID: 17c-009-20140306)

CONCLUSIONS

The Proposal

Each application proposes a temporary caravan site as per the following table:

	P/108/19/CLP	**P/109/19/CLP**	**P/110/19/CLP**
Proposed Season	Spring Bedding Plant Season	Summer Bedding Plant Season	Autumn Bedding Plant Season & separate Strawberry Season
Length of Season	31 January to 31 March (2 months)	01 April to 31 July (4 months)	01 August to 30 November (4 months)
Number of Caravans	20 caravans	31 caravans	25 caravans
Number of Workers	100	161	130

As such, the site would only be vacant in December and January. However, it is also clear from the supporting information that there will be a new access into the site, an on-site turning area, a new foul treatment plant and sewer connections between this and the caravans. The plans do not detail whether the caravans will be sited on bases or whether electric connections will also be provided but it is assumed that these would be required. It has to be assumed that this physical infrastructure would not be removed at the end of each season.

Relevant Permitted Development Rights

The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Order) England 2015 ("GDPO") as amended makes provision for seasonal workers accommodation for agricultural operations. Schedule 2, Part 5 states:

"Permitted development

A The use of land, other than a building, as a caravan site in the circumstances referred to in paragraph A 2.

A.1 Development is permitted by Class A subject to the condition that the use is discontinued when the circumstances specified in paragraph A.2 cease to exist, and all caravans on the site are removed as soon as reasonably practicable.

A.2 The circumstances mentioned in Class A are those specified in paragraphs 2 to 10 of Schedule 1 to the 1960 Act (cease where a caravan site licence is not required) but in relation to those mentioned in paragraph 10 do not include use for winter sports."

The Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 as amended prohibits the use of land as a caravan site without a 'site licence' but no such licence is required for use in the circumstances set out in Schedule 1. The relevant section is paragraph 7 which states:

"…… a site licence shall not be required for the use of land as a caravan site of agricultural land for the accommodation during a particular season of a person or persons employed in farming operations on land in the same occupation."

As such, there are four criteria to be met to attract the permitted development rights:

1. The site is agricultural land and the persons occupying the caravans are undertaking 'farming operations';
2. the use shall be discontinued…. and all caravans on the site shall be removed as soon as reasonably practicable;
3. the use of the accommodation is during a 'particular season; and
4. whether their operations are within 'the same occupation'.

<u>Relevant Case Law</u>

The following decisions are all considered to be relevant to this determination:

(1) Hall Hunter Partnership, R (on the application of) v First Secretary of State & Waverley BC (Administrative Court ref CO/215/2005).

This was a High Court decision of two enforcement notice appeals concerning a change of use of land from agriculture to the stationing of caravans with associated operational development for the accommodation of agricultural workers. Part of the challenge was that the Appeal Inspector had erred in not concluding that the seasonal workers caravans were permitted development. The site in question (Tuesley Farm, Milford, Godalming) was occupied by workers between February and late November/early December primarily engaged in soft fruit production.

There was no issue with the first criteria but in respect of the second, Mr Justice Sullivan ~~(the 'judge')~~ endorsed the Inspector's comments and concluded that it was a matter of fact and degree that the use as a caravan site would not be discontinued as it would not lose the characteristic of a caravan site merely

because the caravans are removed for the time being as all the necessary infrastructure (noted to be pathways, drainage, electrical & water supplies) would remain.

In respect of the third criteria, Mr Justice Sullivan endorsed the comments of the Appeal Inspector that 9 to 10 months of caravan occupation would be distinctly different from that envisaged by the courts embracing the period of hop-gathering or potato-picking and that this is too broad a period within a year to comprise a 'particular season.

In respect of the fourth criteria, Mr Justice Sullivan again endorsed the comments of the Appeal Inspector that the percentage of time workers were at different sites (17%) was not insignificant and was of such a quantity as to amount to a material factor. The Inspector had also stated that the occupiers of the caravans were not employed in farming operations in the 'same occupation.'

(2) Call in decision by the Secretary of State (SoS) concerning land at Brierley Court Farm, Leominster, Herefordshire, HR6 0NU (decision issued 11/04/07). This relates to five separate but linked appeals (appeal refs APP/W1850/A/04 … 1158013, 1158014, 1159320, 1159321 & 1159322).

This concerned a new sewage treatment & pumping station, an amenity building, toilet buildings and site works for a seasonal workers caravan site of 300 units. Paragraphs 18-24 of the decision letter are concerned with the permitted development rights and whether the associated seasonal workers use would be permitted development.

At paragraph 20, the SoS notes that it is not simply a case of removing caravans from the site but whether after removal there is no longer the appearance of a caravan site. In this case, the SoS noted the presence of access roads, hardstandings and buildings and ruled that the use of land as a caravan site would not be discontinued and the land not returned to agriculture. The SoS also noted the applicant's suggestion that the site could still be grazed by animals but considered that this would not alter the character of the land as a caravan site.

At paragraph 21, the SoS stated that a season of 7 or 8 months is too broad a period to comprise a particular season as it is not sufficiently temporary to compare with seasonal activities such as hop gathering or potato picking. The SoS went on to dismiss the applicant's suggestion that the 7/8-month period is actually comprised of several particular overlapping crop seasons for different varieties of strawberry. The SoS stated that as the caravan occupation does not change throughout the 7/8-month period, it is necessary to consider the soft fruit season as a whole.

At paragraph 22, the SoS stated that the ownership of other sites is not the same as land in same occupation.

(3) Appeal Decision ref APP/W1525/X16/3144903 concerning Victoria Farm, West Hanningfield, Chelmsford, CM2 8UE (23/08/16).

This was an appeal of a Lawful Development Certificate which concerned the occupation of a single caravan by a farm worker and proposed two separate seasons of 3 & 4 months (October to late December & January to late March/April). The Inspector ruled that two seasons is not a particular season and that if combined into one season of 6-7 months, would not be sufficiently temporary to be seasonal. The Inspector also stated that the terminology in the permitted development rights clearly envisages a temporary use of land.

This appeal decision also refers to various enforcement appeal decisions which Chelmsford City Council had put forward to support their argument that a season of more than 6 months does not amount to a particular season. The decision also refers to Vale of White Horse DC v Mirmalek-Sani (1993) which states that year-round occupation of a caravan is not a particular season.

In summary, in respect of the second criteria, it is not just necessary to remove the caravans to discontinue the use as the infrastructure remains and thus so does the character of a caravan site. It is also noted that in the case of the Hall Hunter decision, the level of on-site infrastructure is very similar to that required on the Newlands Nursery site.

In respect of the third criteria, the case law suggests that a season of longer than 6 or 7 months is too broad to be particular and that the intention of the law was to cover a very particular crop season. Also, in the case of the Chelmsford appeal decision, that two seasons do not equate to a particular season. In respect of the fourth criteria, it is clear that other sites owned by the caravan site owner are not considered to be within the same occupation.

<u>Analysis</u>

This analysis now proceeds to assess the proposals against the four criteria set out within the permitted development rights identified above.

First Criteria

There is no question that the persons to be accommodated at the site are to be employed in farming operations. Section 336 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 defines agriculture as including horticulture, fruit and seed growing.

It is noted that the rural planning consultant appointed by the local residents does not consider there to be sufficient evidence that the land on which the caravans will be sited is agricultural. However, the land is clearly owned and associated with the glasshouses and the Councils legal department advise no issue with this. Therefore, there is no dispute with this criterion for any of the three applications.

Second Criteria

The applicant states that the caravans will be removed as soon as is practical after the end of each season but only when the caravans are not required for a particular season. Therefore, the applicant is proposing not to remove any caravans at the end of the Spring season and instead bring a further 11 on site to cater for the Summer season requirement. At the end of the Summer season, 6 caravans would be removed to leave 25 for the Autumn season. The applicant then states that all 25 caravans would be removed at the end of the Autumn season.

The criterion is quite clear that all caravans should be removed at the end of each particular season and therefore the proposals fail this aspect. Furthermore, it is clear that the caravan site itself will not be discontinued between seasons as the physical infrastructure will remain. It has to also be accepted that the physical infrastructure would not be removed at the end of the Autumn season as it would not be an efficient use of resources to restore the land only to re-create a caravan site two months later. Therefore, the character of the land as a Caravan site would remain in between seasons.

Therefore, it is concluded that all three proposals fail the second criteria.

It should be noted here that in order for a proposed seasonal agricultural workers caravan site to be considered as permitted development it must meet all four of the stated criteria and therefore it is not necessary to consider the other two criteria. However, for completeness, this report does go on to consider these.

Third Criteria

The applicant has submitted three separate applications each concerning a *particular* season. However, in effect, the seasons will overlap (with no days in between the Spring & Summer and Summer & Autumn season) and therefore, the intent of the three applications is to occupy the site continuously for 10 months of the year.

The GDPO clearly envisaged a temporary use of land and this is also borne out by the case law presented above. In particular, the Chelmsford appeal decision confirmed that two seasons is not a particular season and that if combined into one season of 6-7 months, would not be sufficiently temporary to be seasonal.

There is an argument however that if the Summer application was omitted from the equation that the Spring and Autumn applications could then be accepted as particular seasons.

However, equally, there is an argument that none of the seasons are *particular* as they all concern bedding plants (excepting the Autumn season which also concerns Strawberries). In the Brierley decision, the SoS ruled that it was not appropriate to consider several particular overlapping crop seasons for different varieties of strawberry and that it is necessary to consider the soft fruit season as a whole. It could therefore be argued that the bedding plant season should be considered as whole.

It is also noted that although the applicant has applied for three different seasons, the planning history clearly demonstrates that the applicant's original goal was to continuously occupy the site from January 31st until November 30th.

Fourth Criteria

The applicant states that the proposals only seek accommodation for workers employed on the Newlands Nursery site and not any other sites in the same ownership. Although this was not the case with the previous applications (when it was stated that the agricultural workers occupying Newlands Nursery would be engaged in work on the Newlands Site for an average of 85 to 90% of their daily working time) and although doubt is expressed by local residents as to the employment needs of Newlands, these applications have to be assessed on the facts of the case as presented.

Furthermore, the applicant's evidence is considered to have greater weight than the anecdotal evidence presented by objectors. It is also noted that the rural planning consultant employed by some of the residents does not query the employment requirements of Newlands Nursery.

It is considered to be clear that the workers accommodated on the site will be solely employed at the Newlands Nursery site and therefore, the fourth criteria is satisfied.

Other Matters

Paragraph 005 (reference ID 17c-005-20140306) of the Planning Practice Guidance states that applicants must describe precisely what is being applied for and that without sufficient or precise information, a local planning authority may be justified in refusing a certificate. Furthermore, paragraph 006 (reference ID 17c-006-20140306) stats that in the case of applications for proposed development, an applicant needs to describe the proposal with sufficient clarity and precision to enable a local planning authority to understand exactly what is involved.

It is clear that in each of the three applications, the application form does not completely describe the proposed development and omits to mention the items of operational development that are shown on the drawings (roads, hardstandings, a foul treatment plant & sewer connections). It is also not clear as to whether additional infrastructure would be required (such as caravan hardstandings, pathways and electric & water supplies). Finally, there is a question as to whether such physical infrastructure would need planning permission in their own right and the applicant provides no information to satisfy this.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that all three applications be refused but for slightly different reasons as set out below in the following "CLE HEADER" boxes:

CLE HEADER

P/108/19/CLP	The Arun District Council hereby certify that on 13-11-2019, the

	development described in the First Schedule to this certificate in respect of the land specified in the Second Schedule to this certificate and edged in black on the plan attached to this certificate, would not be lawful within the meaning of section 192 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) as the caravan site would not be discontinued at the end of the season and on the basis that there is insufficient information presented in respect of the required physical infrastructure to determine whether this is permitted development in its own right.
P/109/19/CLP	The Arun District Council hereby certify that on 13-11-2019, the development described in the First Schedule to this certificate in respect of the land specified in the Second Schedule to this certificate and edged in black on the plan attached to this certificate, would not be lawful within the meaning of section 192 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) as the caravan site would not be discontinued at the end of the season, as the season would overlap with two other seasons & therefore cannot be considered as a particular season and also on the basis that there is insufficient information presented in respect of the required physical infrastructure to determine whether this is permitted development in its own right.
P/110/19/CLP	The Arun District Council hereby certify that on 13-11-2019, the development described in the First Schedule to this certificate in respect of the land specified in the Second Schedule to this certificate and edged in black on the plan attached to this certificate, would not be lawful within the meaning of section 192 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) as the caravan site would not be discontinued at the end of the season and on the basis that there is insufficient information presented in respect of the required physical infrastructure to determine whether this is permitted development in its own right.

EXTENT OF USE

P/108/19/CLP	EXTENT OF USE: Use as a seasonal caravan site by 20 caravans during the period 31 January until 31 March.
P/109/19/CLP	EXTENT OF USE: Use as a seasonal caravan site by 31 caravans during the period 01 April until 31 July.
P/110/19/CLP	EXTENT OF USE: Use as a seasonal caravan site by 25 caravans during the period 01 August until 30 November.

FIRST SCHEDULE

P/108/19/CLP	FIRST SCHEDULE: The development proposed is a seasonal agricultural workers caravan site as shown on the submitted drawings: 0119-SP-001 Rev B "Site Location Plan PROPOSED SPRING"; 0119-SP-002 Rev A "Site Plan PROPOSED SPRING"; and 0119-SP-003 "Access to Main Road PROPOSED SPRING" as received on the 13th November 2019.
P/109/19/CLP	FIRST SCHEDULE: The development proposed is a seasonal agricultural workers caravan site as shown on the submitted drawings: 0119-SU-001 Rev B "Site Location Plan PROPOSED SUMMER"; 0119-SU-002 Rev A "Site Plan PROPOSED SUMMER"; and 0119-SU-003 "Access to Main Road PROPOSED SUMMER" as received on the 13th November 2019.
P/110/19/CLP	FIRST SCHEDULE: The development proposed is a seasonal agricultural workers caravan site as shown on the submitted drawings: 0119-AU-001 Rev B "Site Location Plan PROPOSED AUTUMN"; 0119-AU-002 Rev A "Site Plan PROPOSED AUTUMN"; and 0119-AU-003 "Access to Main Road PROPOSED AUTUMN" as received on the 13th November 2019.

SECOND SCHEDULE

P/108/19/CLP	SECOND SCHEDULE: Land to the south side of the large glasshouse at Newlands Nursery, Pagham Road, PO20 1LL
P/109/19/CLP	SECOND SCHEDULE: Land to the south side of the large glasshouse at Newlands Nursery, Pagham Road, PO20 1LL
P/110/19/CLP	SECOND SCHEDULE: Land to the south side of the large glasshouse at Newlands Nursery, Pagham Road, PO20 1LL