



Appeal Decisions

Inquiry held on 25 & 26 January 2018

Site visits made on 7 November 2017 & 26 January 2018

by Tim Belcher FCII, LLB (Hons), Solicitor (Non-Practising)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 March 2018

Appeal A - Ref: APP/J2210/C/16/3165735

Appeal B - Ref: APP/J2210/C/16/3165873 & 874

Land north of Marley Lane, Kingston, Canterbury, CT4 6JJ

- Appeals A & B are made under Section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991 ("the 1990 Act").
- Appeal A is made by Steven Reeves against an Enforcement Notice ("the Enforcement Notice") issued by Canterbury City Council ("the Council").
- Appeal B is made by Ronald Reeves and Eileen Reeves against the Enforcement Notice. The Enforcement Notice is numbered ENF/12/00136/MP and was issued on 15 November 2016.
- The breaches of planning control as alleged in the Enforcement Notice are:
 - 1) Without planning permission the Material Change of Use of the Land; to include:
 - i) A material change of use of the Land to include a mixed use for residential use and a landscaping / tree surgeon business with associated land use and activities to include:
 - ii) The stationing of a caravan on the Land for residential accommodation;
 - iii) The stationing of a touring caravan on the Land used in association with ii) above;
 - iv) The use of a storage container on the Land;
 - v) The erection of a tent on the Land in which to store plant and equipment associated with the business use; and
 - vi) The parking and storage of vehicles on the Land associated with the business use.
 - 2) Without planning permission, associated operational development to the material change of use of the Land to include:
 - i) The erection of a timber log cabin on the Land together with its foundations and base; and the associated operational development of the construction of steps and the formation of new paths and accesses to the timber log cabin and to the caravan;
 - ii) The engineering operation to laying drainage pipework to the timber log cabin;
 - iii) The installation of a gas tank and laying of a hard surface as its base;
 - iv) The erection of a knitting shed.
- The requirements of the Enforcement Notice are:
 - 1) Cease the use of the land for a mixed use for residential use and for a landscaping / tree surgeon business.
 - 2) Cease the use of the timber log cabin for residential accommodation.
 - 3) Remove the timber log cabin from the land and remove any resultant demolition materials from the land.
 - 4) Break up and remove the concrete base on which the timber log cabin was built. Break up and remove any foundations that have been laid to the land on which the timber log cabin has been built.
 - 5) Dig up and remove any pipework that has been laid to provide services to the timber log cabin and remove them from the land; after which the land should be reinstated to the level of the adjacent land by infilling with soil and to re-seed with grass seed.
 - 6) Cease the use of any caravan that is stationed on the land for its use as residential accommodation.
 - 7) Remove the caravan from the land that is stationed on the land for residential

accommodation.

- 9) Remove the caravan from the land that is stationed on the land for storage purposes as an ancillary use to the residential use of the land.
 - 10) Break up and remove the hardstanding laid to the land to create an access to the timber log cabin together with the steps leading up to it. Remove all paths and hard-surfaces leading to both the caravan and the timber log cabin and remove the resultant demolition materials from the land.
 - 11) Remove the shipping container from the land.
 - 12) Remove the tent from the land which is used for the storage of plant, equipment, machinery and the parking and storage of vehicles.
 - 13) Remove all plant, machinery and equipment from the land that is in use in association with the tree surgery and landscaping business.
 - 14) Remove all vehicles from the land that are used in association with the residential use of the land.
 - 15) Remove the surface gas tank from the land and then break up any hard-surface that has been laid as its base; and remove the resultant demolition materials from the land.
 - 16) Remove the knitting shed and its base from the land.
- The period for compliance with requirements:
 - a) 11), 12), 13), & 16) is 6-months.
 - b) 1), 2), 3), 4), 5), 6), 7), 8), 9), 10), 14) and 15) is 12-months.
 - Appeal A is proceeding on the grounds set out in Section 174(2)(a), (d) & (g) of the 1990 Act.
 - Appeal B are proceeding on the grounds set out in Section 174(2)(d) & (g) of the 1990 Act.

Summary of Decision: The appeals are dismissed. The Enforcement Notice is upheld with corrections and variations.

Procedural Matters - Appeals A & B

1. The Ground (e) appeal (Appeal B only) was withdrawn at the commencement of the Inquiry.
2. All oral evidence at the Inquiry was given on oath.
3. In paragraph 3. 1) i) of the Enforcement Notice it states, "A material change of use of the Land to include...". These words repeat what is stated in paragraph 3. 1) and are therefore unnecessary and confusing and should be deleted.
4. In paragraph 3. 2) ii) of the Enforcement Notice it states, "The engineering operation to laying...". The word "to" needs to be deleted and the word "of" needs to be substituted.
5. I consider that the corrections and variations explained above can be made without injustice to either party.
6. The onus of proof in respect of the Ground (d) appeals rests with the Appellants. They have to prove their case on the balance of probabilities.
7. The Council confirmed that the Enforcement Notice did not seek to remove the flight of about ten steps that are located close to the common boundary which divides the Appeal Site from Marley Wood Bungalow.

Terminology Used in this Appeal Decision - Appeals A & B

8. In this Appeal Decision I will refer to:
 - a) The land to which the Enforcement Notice relates as "the Appeal Site".

- b) Ronald Reeves as "Ronald".
- c) Eileen Reeves as "Eileen".
- d) Steven Reeves as "Steven".
- e) Kevin Reeves as "Kevin".
- f) Miranda Reeves as "Miranda".
- g) Ronald, Eileen and Steven collectively as "the Appellants".
- h) The land which Eileen initially acquired in 1977 as "the Initial Land Holding".
- i) The dwelling-house that was within the Initial Land Holding as "the Derelict Dwelling-House".
- j) An agreement dated 1 March 1979¹ made between Eileen and Ronald relating to part of the Appeal Site as "the Agreement".
- k) The planning permission (Council Reference CA/85/82/KIN) dated 6 March 1985 for the demolition of the Derelict Dwelling-House and the erection of a new dwelling-house as "the 1985 Planning Permission".
- l) The dwelling-house to the west of the Appeal Site currently owned by Kevin and Miranda and built in part by Ronald on the Initial Land Holding pursuant to the 1985 Planning Permission as "Marley Wood Bungalow".
- m) The landscaping/tree surgeon business run by Steven as "Steven's Business".
- n) A yard currently used in part by Steven in connection with Steven's Business to the west of Marley Wood Bungalow as "Steven's Yard".
- o) The tent used for storage of plant and equipment associated with Steven's Business as "the Tent".
- p) The Log Cabin together with its foundations and base as "the Log Cabin".
- q) The construction of steps and the formation of paths /accesses to the Log Cabin as "the Steps, Paths and Accesses to the Log Cabin".
- r) The construction of paths /accesses to the Tin Caravan as "the Paths and Accesses to the Tin Caravan".
- s) The caravan used as residential accommodation as "the Tin Caravan".
- t) The touring caravan used in association with the Tin Caravan as "the Touring Caravan".
- u) The storage container as "the Container".
- v) The LPG Gas Tank and its base as "the Gas Tank".
- w) The knitting shed as "the Knitting Shed".

¹ Document 1

- x) The Enforcement Notice (Material Change of Use)² dated 19 November 2015 relating to the Appeal Site and other land as "the 2015 Material Change of Use Enforcement Notice".
- y) The Enforcement Notice (Operational Development)³ dated 19 November 2015 relating to the Appeal Site and other land as "the 2015 Operational Development Enforcement Notice".
- z) I will refer to the 2015 Material Change of Use Enforcement Notice and the 2015 Operational Development Enforcement Notice jointly as "the 2015 Enforcement Notices".

Relevant Background Matters - Appeals A & B

9. The Appeal Site is in the open countryside within the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty ("the AONB").
10. Eileen purchased the Initial Land Holding in about 1977. In total the Initial Land Holding comprised about nine acres. Ronald stated that when they first moved on to the Initial Land Holding he and Eileen lived in separate caravans on part of the land which he thought was part of the Appeal Site.
11. Prior to the purchase Eileen and Ronald were separated. By March 1979 Eileen agreed that Ronald should have exclusive use of part of the land within the Initial Land Holding as is evidenced by the Agreement. The plan attached to the Agreement is hand drawn and not accurate but in very broad terms it represents the Appeal Site.
12. Eileen and Ronald's initial intention was to renovate the Derelict Dwelling-House which could then be used as a family home.
13. Ronald claims that he ran a tree felling / landscaping business and also a car repair business from unspecified locations within the Initial Land Holding. He also explained that he was a master builder.
14. In about 1983 or 1984 Ronald erected a summerhouse and pergola on the Appeal Site.
15. Also in or about 1984 Ronald carried out building works leading to the conversion of what I understand was a cowshed and which is now known as The Barn. The Barn was within the Initial Land Holding. Ronald stated that Eileen and the children lived in The Barn from about 1984. He lived in a caravan in an unspecified location within the Initial Land Holding whilst he was carrying out the building works to The Barn.
16. In January 1985 Eileen applied for the 1985 Planning Permission. The land adjoining the application site (which includes part of the Appeal Site) was described as a smallholding. The application form states that there were between 5 and 15 dairy cows on the smallholding.
17. In 1986 there was a fire in The Barn which partially destroyed it.
18. Prior to October 1987 Ronald explained that he was carrying out building/renovation works to the Derelict Dwelling-House whilst living in a

² Document 14

³ Document 13

- caravan again in an unspecified location somewhere within the Initial Land Holding.
19. The Great Storm which occurred in mid-October 1987 resulted in damage to the renovation works carried out to the Derelict Dwelling-House. Ronald explained, amongst other things, that the re-constructed chimney stack within the Derelict Dwelling-House was destroyed. It was this event that resulted in a decision to implement the 1985 Planning Permission.
 20. At some point between May and December 2004 the Tin Caravan was stationed on the Appeal Site in the approximate position that it occupied when the Enforcement Notice was issued.
 21. Ronald finished working on Marley Wood Bungalow in 2007 or 2008.
 22. The Gas Tank was installed in 2009. The Gas Tank initially provided gas to the Tin Caravan. When the Log Cabin was erected the Gas Tank was connected to it and also remained connected to the Tin Caravan.
 23. Marley Wood Bungalow was sold by Eileen to Kevin and Miranda in January 2012.
 24. The Log Cabin was substantially completed by late August 2012.
 25. On 19 November 2015 the Council issued the 2015 Material Change of Use Enforcement Notice and the 2015 Operational Development Enforcement Notice.
 26. On about 22 December 2015 the 2015 Material Change of Use Enforcement Notice and the 2015 Operational Development Enforcement Notice were withdrawn by the Council.

Matters That Are Agreed - Appeals A & B

27. The Appellants accept that the:
 - a) Stationing of the Touring Caravan on the Appeal Site which is used ancillary to the residential use of the Tin Caravan is not a lawful use of the Appeal Site;
 - b) Use of the Container and the use of the Tent in connection with the Steven's Business are not lawful uses of the Appeal Site, and
 - c) Erection of the Knitting Shed was not lawful operational development.Accordingly, the Appellants do not claim that the Ground (d) appeal applies to any of these matters.
28. Steven has lodged the Ground (a) against the Enforcement Notice. His appeal on Ground (a) relates only to the continued use of the Tin Caravan for residential purposes. Steven agrees that granting planning permission for this use would be contrary to the Development Plan for the area. He seeks planning permission based on his personal circumstances only. Steven was in the Army and was injured whilst carrying out his duties in Afghanistan.
29. Ronald agreed at the Inquiry that he was not a gypsy. Neither Steven nor Eileen claimed a gypsy status. There is no evidence before me that any of the Appellants are gypsies or travellers.

What Are The Relevant Immunity Dates for the breaches of planning control alleged in the Enforcement Notice? - Appeals A & B

30. I have explained that the Council issued and then withdrew the 2015 Enforcement Notices. The 2015 Material Change of Use Enforcement Notice alleged, amongst other things:
- a) The residential use of the Log Cabin, and
 - b) The stationing of the Tin Caravan for residential accommodation.
31. The residential use of the Log Cabin would have been immune from enforcement action if it had commenced on or before 19 November 2011.
32. The residential use of the Tin Caravan would have been immune from enforcement action if the breach of planning control in relation to that use had commenced on or before 19 November 2005.
33. The 2015 Operational Development Enforcement Notice alleged, amongst other things, the:
- a) Erection of the Log Cabin, and
 - b) The laying of the drainage pipework to the Log Cabin.
34. The operational development referred to above would have been immune from enforcement action if it had been substantially completed on or before 19 November 2011.
35. Section 171B(4) of the 1990 Act explains that a Local Planning Authority can take enforcement action in respect of any breach of planning control, if during the period of four years ending with that action being taken the Local Planning Authority have taken or purported to take enforcement action in respect of that breach.
36. I consider that the Enforcement Notice benefits from the statutory provision referred to above in respect of those matters which were alleged as breaches of planning control in the 2015 Enforcement Notices. I have had regard to the judicial authority set out by the Court of Appeal in *Jarmain -v- Secretary of State for the Environment and Another*) and I consider that my approach in this case is consistent with that authority.
37. The 2015 Enforcement Notices do not allege any breach of planning control relating to:
- a) Steven's Business,
 - b) the parking and storage of vehicles on the Appeal Site associated with Steven's Business,
 - c) the construction of the Steps, Paths and Accesses to the Log Cabin,
 - d) the construction of the Paths and Accesses to the Tin Caravan, or
 - e) The installation of the Gas Tank.

Accordingly the immunity dates for a) & b) above is 15 November 2006 and for c), d) and e) above is 15 November 2012.

Reasons - Ground (d) that at the date when the Enforcement Notice was issued, no enforcement action could be taken in respect of any breach of planning control which may be constituted by those matters - Appeals A & B

The Tin Caravan - Appeals A & B

38. I have explained above when the Tin Caravan arrived at the Appeal Site.
39. I have also explained that Ronald's residential use of the Tin Caravan was whilst carrying out works to The Barn and later at Marley Wood Bungalow and that these works only ceased in 2007/8.
40. Part 4 of Schedule 2 of the General Permitted Development Order permits the provision on land of moveable structures required temporarily in connection with and for the duration of operations being carried out on that land or adjoining that land ("the Part 4 Permitted Development Rights").
41. Accordingly, on the basis of all the evidence adduced in this case, it is my assessment that up until 2007/8 the residential use of the Tin Caravan would have been permitted development by virtue of Part 4 Permitted Development Rights.
42. I have explained above that the breach of planning control arising from the residential use of the Tin Caravan would have been immune from enforcement action if it had commenced on or before 19 November 2005. The unauthorised residential use did not commence until 2006/7.
43. Accordingly, the Ground (d) appeal against the residential use of the Tin Caravan fails.

Steven's Business Use of the Appeal Site and the Parking and Storage of Vehicles on the Appeal Site Associated with Steven's Business - Appeals A & B

44. Ronald explained that he had carried on a landscaping business from an unspecified area within the Initial Land Holding. The evidence relating as to when that landscaping use by Ronald commenced and finished was not sufficient or precise.
45. Steven lived in a house in Dunkirk, Faversham until the early summer of 2008.
46. In evidence Steven stated that his business did not begin at the Appeal Site until 2008/2009. I am aware of the letter from the NFU Mutual dated 21 January 2002 addressed to Steven at Marley Wood Bungalow setting out details of insurance cover Public Liability and Tools. However, this does not indicate to me that the Appeal Site was being used for Steven's Business.
47. An aerial photograph taken by the occupiers of The Barn in April 2011 ("the April 2011 Photo") was submitted to the Inquiry. There is no indication from analysing the April 2011 Photo of Steven's Business use or the parking or storage of associated vehicles being carried out on the Appeal Site at that time.
48. Alan Palmer, an occupier of The Barn, also gave evidence at the Inquiry and he confirmed that in April 2011 Steven's Business was carried on from Steven's Yard and not the Appeal Site.

49. I am also aware of the Council's aerial photograph dated 2008. This photograph, like the April 2011 Photo does not show any signs of Steven's Business or the parking or storage of associated vehicles.
50. On the balance of probabilities I consider that Steven's Business and the parking or storage of associated vehicles commenced after 15 November 2005. Accordingly, the Ground (d) appeal in relation to these matters fails.

The Log Cabin including the Laying of Drainage Pipework and the Formation and the Steps, Paths and Accesses to the Log Cabin - Appeals A & B

51. I have explained above that it is agreed between the Appellants and the Council that the Log Cabin was substantially complete by late August 2012.
52. The Log Cabin would have been immune from enforcement action if it was substantially complete by 19 November 2011.
53. The Laying of the drainage pipework is part and parcel of the building operations resulting in the erection of the Log Cabin and there is no evidence that these building operations are immune from enforcement action.
54. The aerial photograph dated 2012 shows Appeal Site at a time when building works leading to the erection of the Log Cabin were underway. There are tracks providing access to the Log Cabin but there is no evidence before me that the Steps, Paths and Accesses to the Log Cabin were substantially complete by the 19 November 2011.
55. I therefore conclude that the Appellants' appeal of Ground (d) in relation to these matters must fail.

The Gas Tank - Appeals A & B

56. I have explained above what the purposes of the Gas Tank were. The Council accept that the Gas Tank was installed before April 2011 which was more than four years before the Enforcement Notice was issued.
57. However, the Gas Tank was installed for the initial purpose of providing gas for the residents of the Tin Caravan and then latterly for the occupiers of the Log Cabin. I have explained above that neither of those developments are lawful.
58. I consider that the Gas Tank was installed solely for the purpose of facilitating the residential use of the Tin Caravan and the Log Cabin. The removal of the Gas Tank is necessary so as to restore that part of the Appeal Site where it was been installed to its condition before the residential use occurred. I consider that the removal of the Gas Tank which harms the AONB is proportionate. None of the Appellants have suggested what the Gas Tank would be used for in connection within its lawful agricultural use if the Gas Tank were to remain.
59. I therefore conclude that the Ground (d) appeal in relation to the Gas Tank must fail.

The Paths and Accesses to the Tin Caravan - Appeals A & B

60. It is clear from the 2008 aerial photograph provided by the Council and the April 2011 Photo that there was a path/access in existence which led to the Tin Caravan.

61. I consider that the operational development that needed to be carried out to create this path/access was substantially complete prior to the 15 November 2012.
62. I therefore conclude that the Ground (d) appeal against this path/access to the Tin Caravan should succeed.
63. To give effect to my decision I will correct paragraph 3. 2) i) of the Enforcement Notice by deleting the words, "and to the caravan".
64. Consequently, paragraph 5. 10) of the Enforcement Notice needs to be corrected by deleting the words, "both the caravan and".

Reasons - Ground (a) and the deemed planning application – that in respect of the breach of planning control which may be constituted by the matters stated in the Enforcement Notice planning permission ought to be granted – Appeal A

65. The Development Plan for the area includes Policies SP4, HD4, LB1 and LB2 of Canterbury District Local Plan ("the Local Plan") adopted in 2017. The Local Plan is in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.
66. I have also been referred to Policies SD1, SD2 and SD3 of Kent Downs AONB Management Plan 2014-2019 ("the Management Plan").
67. It was agreed at the Inquiry that the stationing of the Tin Caravan on the Appeal Site and its residential use is inappropriate housing development in open countryside and the AONB. Further, no evidence was given on behalf of Steven that the uses arising from Steven's Business were policy compliant. The Council demonstrated that they were not.
68. In my assessment the Tin Caravan and Steven's Business uses clearly have a detrimental visual impact on the AONB and thus fail to conserve the natural beauty of the AONB. Neither the stationing of the Tin Caravan nor the uses associated with Steven's Business are designed to enhance the character of the AONB.
69. I therefore conclude that the retention of the Tin Caravan and the continuation of Steven's Business uses would be contrary to the Local Plan as a whole and would fail to support the objectives of the Management Plan.
70. It is argued that Steven's personal circumstances are such that he should be allowed to continue with his residential occupation of the Tin Caravan. Steven is a veteran of the Army who had to leave on medical grounds following an incident that damaged his hearing and balance whilst serving his country in Afghanistan.
71. I can understand that he may have problems if he had to move to a noisy environment. I also understand that his medical condition means that it can be difficult to sleep and that where he currently lives allows him access to a quiet environment both day and night. Steven has received medical treatment to try and help with the disabilities he is suffering from but is currently not receiving any on-going medical treatments.
72. Whilst I have personal sympathy for Steven I do not consider that these matters outweigh the significant harm caused to the AONB by the continuing presence of the Tin Caravan.

73. Further, having seen the extent of Steven's Yard together with the buildings/containers therein, and noted the claimed residential use within that Yard I do not consider that the use of the Appeal Site for the storage of vehicles, materials and equipment used in connection with Steven's Business is necessary. It seems to me that it would be less secure to have Steven's Business uses within the Appeal Site given that I have reached the conclusion that the residential uses within the Appeal Site are unlawful and will have to cease in accordance with the Enforcement Notice. I am aware of the theft of some of the equipment used in connection with Steven's Business from Steven's Yard but that is not a justification which outweighs the serious harm to the AONB which arises from Steven's Business uses within the Appeal Site.

Reasons - Ground (g) that the period specified in the Enforcement Notice falls short of what should reasonably be allowed - Appeals A & B.

74. The Enforcement Notice provides compliance periods of 6 or 12 months depending on the requirement.
75. Steven's Business is generally carried out on land within a 30 miles radius of the Appeal Site. Steven's Yard is large and can easily accommodate the vehicles, plant and equipment used in connection with Steven's Business.
76. Steven explained that he needed two years within which to comply with the Enforcement Notice. However, Steven is not the owner of the Appeal Site or the Tin Caravan. He needs to find alternative accommodation but could continue to run his Business from his Yard.
77. Ronald and Eileen have said that they need five years to secure compliance due to their age and limited means. No evidence regarding lack of financial means was produced to the Inquiry. Ronald agreed that the steps specified in the Enforcement Notice could physically be carried out within the compliance periods provided. No evidence was presented that there were no alternative dwellings available for Ronald and Eileen to move to. They confirmed in correspondence with the Council that they had not sought assistance from the housing providers in the area or sought any alternative housing.
78. I was provided with a list of medications that have been prescribed to Ronald. However, there was no medical or other evidence before me that Ronald and Eileen could not secure compliance with the Enforcement Notice within the timescales provided or which would justify longer compliance periods.
79. In these circumstances I conclude that the periods for compliance specified in the Enforcement Notice do not fall short of what should reasonably be allowed. Accordingly, the appeal on Ground (g) fails.

Human Rights Act 1998 - Appeal A

80. I have had regard to Article 8 and Article 1 of The First Protocol of the European Convention on Human Rights as incorporated by the Human Rights Act 1998
81. Article 8 explains that everyone has the right to respect for, amongst other things, his home. The enforcement action interferes with Steven's home.
82. It is accepted that this interference is in accordance with the law. I consider that the interference is also necessary in this democratic society in the

interests of the economic wellbeing of the country. The enforcement action is taken to protect the AONB from harmful development. Many people, including overseas visitors, visit the countryside and AONB because of the enjoyment this brings including the enjoyment derived from seeing its natural beauty. If development such as that enforced against was allowed and repeated it would in my judgement interfere with the enjoyment which is derived from visiting the countryside and AONB and this would have negative impact on the economic wellbeing of the country.

83. I have also had regard to Article 1 of the First Protocol which explains that everyone is entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of their possessions and that no one shall be deprived of their possessions except in the public interest. However, Article 1 goes on to explain that this does not impair the right of the State to control the use of property in accordance with the general interest.
84. I have explained why the enforcement action has been taken in this case. I consider, in all the circumstances surrounding this case, that the action is proportionate and that there is no interference with Article 1 of The First Protocol.

Overall Conclusion – Appeals A & B

85. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should not succeed. I shall uphold the Enforcement Notice with corrections and variations and refuse to grant planning permission on the deemed application.

Decision – Appeals A & B

86. It is directed that the Enforcement Notice be corrected and varied by:
- a) The deletion of the words, "A material change of use of the Land to include a" and the substitution with the word "A" in paragraph 3. 1) i).
 - b) The deletion of the words, "and to the caravan" in paragraph 3. 2) i).
 - c) The deletion of the word, "to" after the word "operation" and the substitution of the word "of" in paragraph 3. 2) ii).
 - d) The deletion of the words, "both the caravan and" in paragraph 5. 10).

Subject to these corrections and variations the appeal is dismissed and the Enforcement Notice is upheld, and planning permission is refused on the application deemed to have been made under Section 177(5) of the 1990 Act.

Tim Belcher

Inspector

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANTS

Paul Tapsell of Counsel He called:	Instructed by Ratcliffes (Solicitors)
Ronald Reeves	Appellant
David Foster	Local Resident
Kevin Reeves	Appellants' Son/Brother
Steven Reeves	Appellant

FOR CANTERBURY CITY COUNCIL

Giles Atkinson of Counsel He called:	Instructed by the Council's Solicitor
David Bloom MA Diploma in Town Planning	Planning Enforcement Officer

INTERESTED PARTIES

Alan Palmer	Local Resident
-------------	----------------

DOCUMENTS

- Document 1 - The Agreement.
- Document 2 - Facsimile Cover Sheet dated 22 October 2007 from Captain Cameron to Steven.
- Document 3 - Rent Book - May Cottage - Tenancy Commencing 2 June 2008.
- Document 4 - Letter dated 10 March 2009 from Gaby Hardwicke (Solicitors) to Steven.
- Document 5 - Letter dated 5 August 2009 from Gaby Hardwicke (Solicitors) to Steven.
- Document 6 - Form MOD 2020A dated 8 March 2011.
- Document 7 - Planning Application Form dated 8 May 2012 - Applicant: Steven - Site: The Wood Yard, Marley Lane.
- Document 8 - Receipt - Steven - £335 - paid by Debit Card
- Document 9 - E-mail dated 21 June 2012 from Nicola Hughes to Development Management.
- Document 10 - Letter dated 27 June 2012 from Steven to the Council's Chief Executive.
- Document 11 - Letter from the Council dated 4 November 2015 to Eileen.

- Document 12 – Letter from the Council dated 11 November 2015 to Miss Kingston.
- Document 13 – Enforcement Notice (Operational Development) dated 19 November 2015.
- Document 14 – Enforcement Notice (Material Change of Use) dated 19 November 2015.
- Document 15 – Letter dated 12 January 2016 from Council to Ronald.
- Document 16 – Letter from the Council to Eileen dated 15 January 2015 (incorrect date) should have been 2016.
- Document 17 – Letter from the Council to Ronald dated 22 January 2016.
- Document 18 – Annotated Aerial Photograph prepared by the Council.