



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 January 2026

by **Paul T Hocking BA MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Y9507/C/23/3331030

Land at Hucksholt Farm, Compton, Chichester, West Sussex PO18 9NS

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Chris North against an enforcement notice issued by South Downs National Park Authority.
 - The notice was issued on 5 September 2023.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is: Without planning permission, the material change of use of the land to the stationing of a mobile home for the purposes of human habitation.
 - The requirements of the notice are: (i) Discontinue the use of the Land for the stationing of a mobile home for the purposes of human habitation; and, (ii) Remove the mobile home from the Land.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is six months.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the ground set out in section 174(2)(b) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
-

Summary of Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld with corrections.

Preliminary Matter

2. The appeal was scheduled to be heard by means of a Hearing. The appellant has however withdrawn the ground (a) and (g) appeals and the parties have agreed that the appeal is suitable to be determined by means of written representations. I have no reason to disagree and so the appeal will proceed by this means on ground (b) only.

The Enforcement Notice

3. The notice has been issued on the basis the breach occurred within the last 4 years, when it should have been issued based on the breach having occurred within the last 10 years. This does not automatically render the notice a nullity and injustice to the parties would not arise from correcting the notice. I also note the appellant has confirmed that no appeal on ground (d) would be pursued either way.

The ground (b) appeal

4. For the ground (b) appeal to succeed the onus is on the appellant to demonstrate, on the balance of probabilities, that the alleged breach of planning control has not occurred as a matter of fact.
5. It is said that the appellant owns some 860 acres of land. The notice alleges a material change of use of a small parcel of land to a residential use, and which includes some woodland, ponds and two barns. It also encompasses a very small section of track/bridleway, but the notice plan can be corrected to exclude this without causing injustice to the parties.

6. Whilst it is said the mobile home is occupied by an agricultural worker on the farm, there is very little evidence that a residential use of land would be incidental to an agricultural use. During my site visit it was also clear the land the subject of the notice was largely demarcated by physical features on the ground, including tracks, one of the barns and hardstandings. Whilst there was then some fencing enclosing a very small area of land to the front of the mobile home, this did not allow for the parking of a vehicle or other activities that might reasonably be expected with the residential use. There was then some evidence of domestic paraphernalia in the vicinity of the ponds.
7. Whilst there are barns of agricultural origins, the appellant asserts that one of these was last used for equestrian purposes. There is however very little evidence concerning an equestrian use or indeed a non-residential use of the land the subject of the notice to which I can afford significant weight, such as a sworn statement. Whilst my site visit only represents a snapshot in time, it was also evident the barns were not presently in active agricultural or equestrian use as they were empty. This was the same for the remainder of the site, with little evidence of, for example, cultivation, in contrast to surrounding agricultural land. On the balance of probabilities, there is accordingly very little evidence of a mixed use when the notice was issued.
8. As a matter of fact and degree, the notice therefore identifies a separate and distinct area occupied for a substantially different and unrelated purpose, being a residential use, to that of the larger farm holding.
9. Given the residential use itself is not disputed, the appeal on ground (b) therefore only succeeds to a very limited extent.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal overall should not succeed. I shall therefore uphold the enforcement notice with corrections.

Formal Decision

11. It is directed that the enforcement notice be corrected by:
 - substituting the words ‘10 years’ within section 4 of the notice
 - substituting the plan attached to this decision for the one attached to the notice
12. Subject to these corrections the appeal is dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld.

Paul T Hocking

INSPECTOR



The Planning Inspectorate

Plan

This is the plan referred to in the decision dated: 28 January 2026

by Paul T Hocking BA MSc MRTPI

Land at Hucksholt Farm, Compton, Chichester, West Sussex PO18 9NS

Reference: APP/Y9507/C/23/3331030

Scale: DO NOT SCALE

