
Site Address:	Land adj. Mandai, St Peters Road, Hayling Island, PO11 ORT		
Proposal:	Application for lawful development certificate relating to existing use of land as leisure plot.		
Application No:	APP/14/00999	Expiry Date:	20/11/2014
Applicant:	Mr Stanley	Team:	Team 1
Agent:	Mr K Oliver	Case Officer:	Stephen Andrews
	The Town Planning Experts		
Ward:	Hayling East		

Recommendation: **REFUSE A CERTIFICATE OF LAWFUL USE**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The site is located to the south of the residential curtilage of the dwellinghouse known as Mandai. Mandai is one of a linear form of residential properties, made up of detached dwellings, to the north of the site. To the west and south of the appeal site are open agricultural fields. St Peters Road runs along the eastern boundary of the site, beyond which is additional agricultural land.
- 1.2 The site is enclosed by mature planting to all boundaries, with the addition of timber fencing between the boundary of Mandai and the appeal site. The site also benefits from vehicular access onto St Peters Road in the south-east corner of the site.
- 1.3 There are two touring caravans on the site, one in the north-east corner and the second more centrally positioned. In addition to the touring caravans there is a Wendy house, used for play; an enclosed hot tub; a timber shed like structure containing a shower, toilet and washing machine; CCTV; a blue storage container with building equipment inside to the far west of the site, with skips in front; a white box transit van; a compound area to the far east of the site housing the electric and water connection; decked area in front of the central caravan and additional hardstandings.
- 1.4 The site is located outside of the settlement boundary within a rural setting.

2 Planning History

- 2.1 05/60059/000
Outline application for construction of a chalet bungalow with/without shared access

Planning permission refused - 24 May 2005
Appeal Dismissed - 02 March 2006 - APP/X1735/A/05/1192877
High Court Challenge - Withdrawn - 11/07/2006

3 Enforcement History

- 3.1 08/73262/000/CMP
Enforcement enquiry in respect of alleged unauthorised access being created on to St Peters Road.

Following a site visit by the enforcement team on 26/06/2008 no breach of planning control was identified as the works related to an established access. No further action was taken.

3.2 08/73262/001/CMP

Alleged unauthorised work to land.

Entrance area behind gate blocked with broken roofing tiles/driveway access apparently part dug towards back of site and earth piled up/brash and soil in pile behind fence/kerbing stones at top of field.

Mr Stanley (owner) rang and stated he was enjoying the benefit of the garden of Mandai.

Enforcement case closed - 15/09/2008

3.3 13/00262/CMP

Alleged unauthorised use of land.

A site visit was undertaken on 28/03/2014 in respect of the above breach.

Following the officer site visit a Planning Contravention Notice (PCN) was served on the registered owner (Mr Stanley) - 16/05/2014

Mr Stanley completed and returned the PCN dated - 21/05/2014

Following the return of the PCN the Council began investigations in to the history of the site and entered in to discussions with Mr Stanley regarding the use and the planning status of the land. The Council advised Mr Stanley that there appeared to be a breach of planning control and if continued an enforcement notice would be served.

Mr Stanley eventually sought professional advice and a meeting was held at the Council offices on 12th August 2014 with Mr Stanley, Ms Hardy and their planning agent Mr Oliver. They were advised that as it stood there was no evidence to suggest the use was lawful and that an enforcement notice would be issued. It was agreed to meet on site to record the use and operational development at that time. The site visit was undertaken 19/09/2014.

Following the 19/09/2014 site visit an enforcement notice was served under paragraph (a) of Section 171A(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991), dated 23/09/2014.

The enforcement notice required the following actions to be undertaken within 3 months of the effective date of the notice (27/10/2014):

- Permanently remove the two mobile caravans from the land.
- Permanently remove all vehicles parked and stored on the land.
- Permanently remove the storage container from the land.
- Permanently remove all associated and ancillary development and paraphernalia from the land and re-instate to its original grassed state; the items to be removed to include CCTV installation; hardstandings and patios; hot tub; timber shed; decking; chimnea and skips

Following the service of this notice Mr Stanley lodged an appeal on ground (d) - the enforcement notice was issued too late to take enforcement action and ground (g) - the time given to comply in the notice is too short. The appeal is to be determined by Public Inquiry, scheduled date 19 May 2015. Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/C/14/2226702

4 Proposal

- 4.1 The applicant has submitted various information in support of a lawful development certificate (LDC) application in an effort to show that a leisure use of the site, distinct from the dwelling which the land once served (Mandai), has occurred for more than 10 years. In addition it is claimed that the operational development associated with the change of use has occurred in excess of four years.

5 Policy Considerations

- 5.1 There are no policy implications in considering applications of this nature.

6 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

- 6.1 The Council's coastal team have provided aerial photos flown:
2005 aerial photo flown between 01/11/2005 and 02/11/2005
2008 aerial photo flown between 21/07/2008 and 22/07/2008
2010 aerial photo flown between 08/10/2010 and 09/10/2010
2013 aerial photo flown between 26/06/2013 and 21/08/2013

7 Community Involvement

- 7.1 This application was publicised in accordance with the Council's Code of Practice for Publicity of Planning Applications approved at minute 207/6/92 (as amended), as a result of which the following publicity was undertaken:

Number of neighbour notification letters sent: 2

Number of site notices: None

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable

7.2 Summary of Representation:

North East Hayling Residents Association

Whilst making one comment that the land was used as a vineyard by Mrs Cunningham, until she sold it less than 10 years ago, we understand that the present users have set up and established a use which is under discussion. We generally would have no problem with an application for a dwelling on this site, if that would help rationalise the situation, however there would be some concern if a commercial use was applied for, or appeared. If it is approved in its current format, can there be a condition on no commercial use, and would this be something that the planning department would agree with?

8 Planning Considerations

- 8.1 In order to grant a Certificate of Lawfulness for the use of the site as a leisure plot, the Council would have to be satisfied that, on the balance of probability, the use of the site had been carried out, for an unbroken period of at least ten years prior to the date of the application. It is therefore considered that the main issue arising from the application is:

- (i) The quality of the available evidence

8.2 Evidence Provided by the Applicant:

Statutory Declaration from Mr Laurence William Stanley
Statutory Declaration from Ms Nicola Sonia Hardy
Statutory Declaration from Mr Lee McGowan
Supporting letters from:
Laurence Stanley and Nicola Hardy
Christine Frankum
Mrs J Lound
Paul Elverson
Lee Mc Gowan (Shamrock Gardening Services)
Sarah Hardy and Alan Benham
Sylvia and Michael Hardy
Time Line for the use and ownership of the site - provided by 'The Town Planning Experts'
Documents:
B1 - Conveyance 1945
B2 - Statement by A W Isaac
B3 - Conveyances 1983
B4 - Letter H Hickman & Son
B5 - Sale particulars
B6 - Water installed 2006
B7 - Electricity installed 2006
B8 - Container bought 2009

8.3 Council's own Evidence:

The Council has had regard to the following documents and information in support of its assessment of this lawful development certificate application:

- (a) Aerial photographs from 2000, 2002, 2005, 2008, 2010 and 2013
- (b) Photographs taken of the site on the 28/03/2014 and 19/09/2014
- (c) Planning application 05/60059/000 and supporting correspondence
- (d) Planning appeal APP/X1735/A/05/1192877 and associated documentation
- (e) Enforcement case 08/73262/000/CMP and associated documentation
- (f) Enforcement case 08/73262/001/CMP and associated documentation
- (g) Planning Contravention Notice (PCN) dated 16 May 2014 completed by Mr Stanley

8.4 Evidence from Case Officer site visit:

- 8.5 Two visits were undertaken prior to the submission of the Lawful Development Certificate Application. The first 28 March 2014 and the second 19 September 2014.
- 8.6 At both visits the site was being used for leisure purposes. This was also confirmed by Mr Stanley. The operational development on site, appeared to support the leisure use.
- 8.7 The operational development had been expanded and continued between the two officer visits and on the second visit one of the caravans had been removed. Officer's were told that the owner had taken it on holiday.

- 8.8 The evidence from the site visit did not confirm the length of time the use or operational development had been in place, other than that completed between the two visits.

9 Assessment

- 9.1 Having regard to the aerial photos provided by the Council's Coastal Team it is considered that there is no conclusive evidence of a leisure plot for the site. The 2005 aerial photo, flown between 1st November 2005 and 2 November 2005 shows the siting of a caravan and what appears to be the markings of a fire. Apart from these two features the site has no other discernible structures or features. The site remains grass covered and bounded by trees/hedging.
- 9.2 The aerial photo flown between 21 July 2008 and 22 July 2008 shows that the area used as a possible fire remains whilst the caravan on site is no longer present. There also appears to be initial ground works close to the existing access for the site. The site continues to be covered by grass and bounded by trees/hedging. It is pertinent to note that the aerial photos flown in July follow an enforcement officer visit to the site alleging the creation of an unauthorised access on 26 June 2008. At this time, following the officer visit, it was assessed that the access was existing and the associated works did not constitute a breach of planning control. No additional unauthorised activity was reported or noted, which would be consistent with the aerial photos flown the following month which show no additional activity or structures on the site.
- 9.3 It is noted that the applicant has submitted a letter and invoice dated 17/07/2008 claiming that the caravan was not present at this time because it was being serviced. It is nonetheless significant that during the months of June and July 2008 the evidence would suggest that the land had no discernible use or recorded breach of planning control, with the 2008 aerial photo clearly depicting a grassed area bounded by mature planting, with no visible structures at this time.
- 9.4 The above evidence therefore conflicts with the information provided by Mr Stanley in his completed PCN dated 21st May 2014. In response to section B - Material Operation Details, question 11, Mr Stanley states that the bases for the caravans were created in the summer of 2006 yet the bases are not shown on site in the 2008 aerial photo. The available evidence does not confirm the presence of the hard surfaces for the caravans until the 2010 aerial photo flown between the 8th and 9th October 2010.
- 9.5 The 2010 aerial photograph is considered to be a good benchmark to work to in respect of identifying the operational development carried out on the site and the siting of the various structures and vehicles now present on site. This is because we know the aerial photo was flown between the 8th and 9th October 2010, with an enforcement notice served by the Council for the various development and operations being served on 23rd September 2014. It is considered this provides an initial four year period to base an assessment of the assertions made by the applicant in the submitted Lawful Development Certificate application.
- 9.6 The 2010 aerial photograph appears to show a storage container at the far western edge of the identified site. To the east of the suspected storage container appear to be two skips that seem to be screened by timber fencing erected in a dog leg style. A hedge row is located at the mid point of the site. To the right of the hedge and hard up to the northern boundary is a touring caravan. There does not appear to be an area of

hardstanding for this caravan. In the north-east corner of the site is a second touring caravan which appears to be sat on an area of hardstanding. To the south of this second caravan is an enclosed area (referred to as a compound). The area is enclosed by timber fencing with a box transit van sat within the compound area. The photograph indicates that there has been movement along the southern boundary but there is no strong evidence to indicate a permanent area of hardstanding.

- 9.7 There is no other discernible evidence to show any further areas of hardstanding, structures or vehicles at this time.
- 9.8 In respect of the use of the land a planning application was made by Mr Stanley; received by Havant Borough Council 8th March 2005. The application was accompanied by a cover letter from Mr Stanley's acting agent Mr John Organ of PWP Architects, dated 7th March 2005. The letter referred to various deeds submitted supporting the point that the land identified to the south of Mandai was part of the garden to Mandai. He then states that *"As existing garden land, we consider it to be 'previously developed land' and thus would ask you to accept it as a windfall housing site."* He goes on to say that *"Although part of the land appears to have the benefit of a vehicular right of way, the difference in levels and lack of sight lines preclude its use as an access onto St Peter's Road."*
- 9.9 The above letter provides clear conflicting evidence with that currently put forward in respect of the use of the land. More significantly the evidence conflicts with that given by and relied upon by Mr Stanley in 2005. No reference is made by Mr Stanley's agent to a leisure use of the land.
- 9.10 It is significant that in the 2005 planning application and subsequent appeal, when describing the site the applicant, Council and appeal Inspector at no time refer to the site as a leisure plot. In addition at no point is there reference to a caravan on the site or use of a caravan on site for an alternative use; including leisure.
- 9.11 In respect of a description of the site in 2005 it is considered that the appeal Inspector provides the best workable description in paragraph 6 of his decision notice: *"Although conceding that the appeal site is not in a built-up area, the appellants feel that due to its being at the end of a row of dwellings, it cannot really be considered physically to be in the countryside. In my view, whilst it is indeed next to an area of housing, the site has far more in common with the surrounding countryside than the built environment. It is clearly separated from the adjoining house, Mandai by mature hedging, whilst there are open fields on its other side and to its rear, as well as opposite the site, on the east side of the road. I am not persuaded, therefore, that the site should not be considered to be part of the countryside."*
- 9.12 It is asserted that the appeal Inspector's decision dated 2nd March 2006 provides a good basis to assess the use and character of the site at that time. The evidence would therefore define the site as countryside when visited by the planning Inspector on 31st January 2006.
- 9.13 The applicant's agent in the LDC application asserts that the site has had a leisure use for some 30 years and that a caravan has been on site for a period well over 10 years. In respect of the siting of a caravan the aerial photographs flown by the Council's Coastal Team would show that a caravan has appeared on site. However, the photos and its siting do not define its use. With the land formerly being tied to Mandai it is considered that the siting of a caravan within a residential curtilage, would not necessarily amount to a material change of use and would not confirm that it was

being sited for anything more than storage in an ancillary capacity. The applicant does not provide any meaningful evidence to suggest there was any other use or purpose for the caravan.

- 9.14 It is noted that in the appeal decision of 2006 that the Inspector asserts that the land is separated physically by hedging from Mandai, which alters its use and character to that of countryside. No reference is made by the applicant, Council or Inspector at this time of the siting of a caravan or a use for a caravan or associated with a caravan. In fact it is only aerial photographs that confirm the presence of a caravan in November 2005 and prior to this period. It is possible that the caravan was being moved on and off the site and was not present during the Council and appeal visits to the site, which could explain the lack of reference. This would also suggest that there was not necessarily a permanent siting of a caravan or clear alternative use, as alleged.
- 9.15 The ownership of the site and link of the land to Mandai is considered to represent clear possibilities of change in the lawful use and siting of a caravan and does not, as the applicant suggests, confirm that a caravan has been present on the site for a period of 10 years or more and used for a leisure use.
- 9.16 On this latter point it is pertinent to note that Mr Stanley, in the 2005 application submitted to the Council on 8th March 2005, completed Certificate B serving notice on the owner of the land to the south of Mandai, Mr P. Cunningham of Old Forge, 66a Havant Road, Hayling Island, PO11 0PY (notice served 7th March 2005). It is only the appeal submission, dated 29th October 2005 that indicates Mr Cunningham no longer owns the site, with the owners at that time identified as Mr Laurence Stanley, Mr Michael Hardy and Mrs Sylvia Hardy. The difference in ownership is considered to further challenge the lawful use of the site at that time.
- 9.17 Mr Stanley's hand written grounds of appeal, following the refusal of the 2005 application, begins on page 4 by saying *"Although strictly speaking this plot of land is not in a built up area...we feel that it is not out in the countryside...This plot has always been separated from the open countryside and this can be proved that it was originally part of the garden of the house next door "Mandai"*. Mr Stanley reaffirms the fact that the land was originally part of the garden of "Mandai" on page 5 (response to policy H10) of his statement.
- 9.18 Page 8 of Mr Stanley's statement states that *"Before we invested in this piece of land we approached Havant Council and asked why the original planing application was refused 25 years ago...Since then a great deal of development has been granted planning permission, we have looked into this..."*
- 9.19 Mr Stanley goes on to say *"Also a letter from Susan Organ (whose letter I have enclosed a copy of) ex head of planning for Havant Borough Council, stating that there is a possibility for development as a windfall site, prior to us buying the plot of land. Mrs Organ was also working in connection with the estate agent as their local planning officer."* He then concludes his grounds of appeal stating *"Going on this evidence we decided to invest our life savings into this land in hope for a more fulfilling family life for us and our children."*
- 9.20 The letter written to Mrs Cunningham, from Susan Organ (Chartered Town Planner), dated 21st May 2002 (referred to above) states in paragraph 2 *"Garden land counts as "previously developed land" for the purposes of Government advice on the provision of housing (PPG3), whereas agricultural land does not. The Government advises Local Authorities that "Windfall Sites", previously developed sites that unexpectedly become*

available for housing, should be allowed for in their housing forecast, and the draft Borough-Wide Local plan does include a figure for these unexpected sites." Mrs Organ's letter concludes by saying *"There might be a chance of an application, or more likely an appeal, being successful as a windfall site".*

- 9.21 A letter to Mr LLoyd (Planning Inspectorate) dated 2nd January 2006 and written by Mr Stanley states *"Having spoken to a planning consultant his advice to us was if we actually owned the property next door it would probably be possible for us to get planning permission for a granny annex as the plot forms part of the original gardens. What I find hard to understand is how permission won't be granted to us because the garden has been sectioned off and sold to us."*
- 9.22 The evidence within Mr Stanley's appeal submission would clearly indicate that the land was purchased in the hope that it would be considered as a 'Windfall Site' on the premise that it met with the definition of previously developed land at that time; PPG3 including garden land within previously developed land. At no point does Mr Stanley or his agent claim that the land is being used for leisure purposes at this time or that this is the intended use or reason for the purchase.
- 9.23 Further disparity over the claims for the use of the site as a leisure plot comes from the information relied on by the applicant, provided by Hugh Hickman & Son. Hugh Hickman & Son were the agents charged with the sale of the land to the south of Mandai in 2004. On offer, as described by the agents was *"this delightful plot of land situated in this most sought after rural area at Northney...the boundaries are enclosed by hedges on all sides"* The site particulars go on to say that *"This plot is offered for sale without planning permission but with some potential in the future."* The agents also offer an opinion on the site potential obtained from a Chartered Town Planner and available for inspection at their office. Of interest is the accompanying photo of the land plot which shows it as overgrown grass land with natural screening. There is no indication or reference to any use, including leisure. Clarification was provided by Peter Hickman in a letter dated 30th July 2014, following a request from Mr Stanley, that there was at that time a caravan on site. Mr Hickman stating *"I believe the date I sold the land to you was around July 2004...I can confirm that on the land at that time was an old caravan which by the look of it at that time had been there for many years."* The recollection from Mr Hickman would not appear to suggest that there was a use associated with the caravan at that time or in fact that it was suitable for any use. All that can be confirmed is the presence of a caravan, which is consistent with the aerial photographs.
- 9.24 Statutory declaration made by Nicola Sonia Hardy, point 3 states that *"We had seen the land (edged red on the attached plan) on numerous occasions with its caravan. We understood the field was used by the owners as a leisure site."* In point 4 it is recalled that *"We couldn't believe our luck when we saw the For Sale sign."* Nicola Hardy then recalls specifically asking the then owners as to what the purpose of the land was to which the response claimed was *"a peaceful retreat to relax and stay at weekends."* This account is replicated by Laurence William Stanley in his statutory declaration at points 3 and 4.
- 9.25 In point 7 of Nicola Hardy's and Laurence Stanley's declarations they state that the caravan on site was then used *"to make tea and use the toilet."*
- 9.26 At point 10 it is made clear that *"We do not live on the land, we visit at weekends and holidays."*

- 9.27 At point 5 of Nicola Hardy's declaration she states *"My parents, Sylvia and Michael Hardy, and my partner, Laurence Stanley, purchased the land through Hugh Hickman estate agents on Hayling Island in September 2004."* The time of purchase is agreed by Laurence Stanley under point 5 of his declaration.
- 9.28 Other than the time of purchase no other dates are specifically relied upon or offered by Nicola Hardy or Laurence Stanley in their declarations.
- 9.29 The third declaration submitted is from Lee McGowan of Shamrock Garden Services, 266 Locksway Road, Southsea. However, there is no business record for Shamrock Garden Services (the only identifiable business with this name being based in Aberdeen). Instead Mr McGowan is registered at this address and operating as L M Roofing Contractors.
- 9.30 Mr McGowan asserts in point 4 of the declaration that *"Mrs Cunningham told me the land had been used for Leisure purposes and she owned a caravan that was situated on the land adjacent to her son's property."*
- 9.31 At point 5 Mr McGowan states *"Over the last 12 years I have called upon the land and done various jobs relating to the land for Mr Stanley who has owned the land for over 10 years."* At point 9 of his declaration he states *"Mr Stanley purchased the land back in July 2004."*
- 9.32 At point 8 Mr McGowan claims that *"The land that Mr Stanley now owns was because of me telling him that the land was for sale, having spoken to Mrs Cunningham, who told me that the land was up for sale."*
- 9.33 There are slight discrepancies between the declarations made by Nicola Hardy and Laurence Stanley and that provided by Lee McGowan, including the date of purchase. Further there is a lack of actual dates or time periods in respect of how the site has been used and when. In addition the declarations are not consistent with other evidence supplied by Mr Stanley; particularly in support of the planning application and subsequent appeal made in 2005. The reliability of these documents is therefore somewhat limited and there is a clear absence of any meaningful evidence in support of the claim that the land has been used as a leisure plot in excess of 10 years.
- 9.34 On the 16th May 2014 the Council served a Planning Contravention Notice (PCN) on Mr Laurence, William Stanley of 5 Harrow Way, Waterloooville. Mr Laurence Stanley completed the PCN and returned it to the Council, dated 21st May 2014.
- 9.35 Mr Stanley confirmed that he was the sole owner of the land identified and that it was being used by him and immediate family at weekends from spring to autumn only. In answer to question 5 of the PCN he confirmed that the land was being used for gardening and leisure and that the date that use began was 30th September 2004.
- 9.36 Again much of the recollections of Mr Stanley in the use and development of the site over the years are inconsistent with previous information he has supplied to the Council and the aerial photographs provided by the Council's Coastal Team. It would appear that the recollections made in support of the Lawful Development Certificate application by the various parties are in a bid to support the period of 10 years to benefit from immunity from enforcement action; particularly following the Council's service of an enforcement notice to address the breach of planning control.
- 9.37 Having regard to the evidence supplied by the applicant and the Council's own

evidence the information is clearly conflicting and inconclusive and in parts disingenuous. The evidence Mr Stanley relied on in support of his 2005 planning application and subsequent appeal for example clearly does not support the use of the site as a leisure plot. Further neither the Council or the Planning Inspector at this time refer to the use of the site as a leisure plot or make reference to a leisure use. Therefore there is no evidence to support the claims made by Mr Stanley that this was the case prior to 2005 and the early part of 2006. A period of 10 years or more for a leisure use cannot therefore be established at this time, which would mean that the Lawful Development Certificate application would fail on this evidence alone. As referred to above the Inspector considered that the site had more in common with the adjacent countryside at that time, further confirming a lack of use or operation on the site at this time.

- 9.38 Based on the evidence supplied by the applicant and the Council's own evidence it is maintained that the applicant cannot demonstrate that the site has been used as a leisure plot for a period of 10 years or more. In addition the operational development referred to has not been on site for a period of four years or more, from the date of service of the enforcement notice. As such the applicant has not satisfied the Council that the operational development and use of the site has been in existence for a period of time that would allow for immunity from enforcement action. A Lawful Development Certificate cannot therefore be issued.

10 Conclusion

- 10.1 Having regard to the above information the applicant has failed to prove that, on the balance of probability, the land south of Mandai, St Peters Road, Hayling Island, PO11 0RT, has been continuously occupied as a leisure plot for a period of 10 years or more. In addition the applicant has failed to prove that the operational development associated with the leisure use has been on site for a period of four years or more.
- 10.2 In light of the conflicting evidence, which casts significant doubt on the validity of the documents provided by the Applicant, a Certificate of Lawfulness cannot be issued.

11 RECOMMENDATION:

Havant Borough Council, as Local Planning Authority, **REFUSES** to certify that on the date of the application (24 September 2014) the development described in the First Schedule to this certificate in respect of land described in the Second Schedule and red on the location plan (Ordnance Survey 0100031673) submitted in connection with the application was lawful within the meaning of section 191 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) for the following reason:

Based on the information supplied by the applicant and having regard to the Council's own evidence, the applicant has failed to prove that, on the balance of probability, the land south of Mandai, St Peters Road, Hayling Island, PO11 0RT, has been continuously occupied as a leisure plot for a period of 10 years or more. In addition the applicant has failed to prove that the operational development associated with the leisure use has been on site for a period of four years or more.

The conflicting evidence casts significant doubt on the validity of the documents provided by the Applicant and as such a Certificate of Lawfulness cannot be issued.

FIRST SCHEDULE:

This certificate relates to the following development:

Use of land as leisure plot (sui-generis) and associated operational development and uses.

SECOND SCHEDULE: _

Land south of Mandai, St Peters Road, Hayling Island, PO11 ORT as shown edged in red on the submitted location plans that accompanied the letters of support.