

APPEALS BY OWNERS AND OCCUPIERS OF CAROUSEL PARK

PROOF OF EVIDENCE

Of Mr. Patrick Stokes Plot 5A, Carousel Park

**regarding three Enforcement Notices served by Winchester City
Council**

at Carousel Park, Basingstoke Road, Micheldever, Winchester

August 2023

WS Ref:	J004151
LPA Ref:	None
PINS Ref:	APP/L1765/C/22/3296767

- 1.1 I am Patrick Stokes of Plot 5A Carousel Park. I am giving this statement in support of the appeals lodged by others at the site.
- 1.2 I can confirm that, as an owner and occupier of Plot 5A Carousel Park on 01 March 2022 that **I did not** receive a copy of any enforcement notice. No copy of the Enforcement Notice titled EN1 or EN2 were served on my person, or my property.
- 1.3 I was not aware that the Notice would effect my property, as I did not receive a copy. Had I been aware, I would have progressed an appeal, but instead, due to the shortcomings of the Council, I am reliant upon the other parties involved in the site. I am advised that in order to succeed the Notice must be quashed, as I cannot seek Planning Permission having not been able to appeal, due to lack of service.
- 1.4 I am advised that the failure of service results in significant prejudice to myself and those occupying Plot 5A. I also speak on behalf of Plot 5B, who like me, were not served a copy of the Notice.
- 1.5 To provide context on the impact of this, I set out the personal circumstances of those occupying Plot 5A, and Plot 5B.
- 1.6 Plot 5A is occupied by myself, Patrick Stokes, and my wife Lorraine Doyle. Lorraine suffers with COPD, Rheumatism, and experienced heart failure. As a result, she has inflammation in her heart which needs to be monitored regularly.
- 1.7 We reside on Plot 5A with our 3 children, Child A (17), Child B (12), and Child C (2). I work with horses, and undertake roofing and power washing.
- 1.8 Plot 5B is occupied by my brother Alfonse Stokes and his wife Mary, and their newborn child Child D.
- 1.9 Alfonse also accommodates our mum and dad, Anne and Patrick Stokes (59 and 71). Anne suffers with diabetes.
- 1.10 If the appeals are dismissed, or only Ground (a) appeals are successful, we would be required to vacate the site due to the LPA's shortcomings in service of the Notice. I would have appealed had I known the Notice affected myself, and had it been served on me.

1.11 The consequences of the appeals being dismissed for us are significant. We were not served a copy of the Notice, and so were not aware that it affected us. Instead, we have only become aware of this fact from others on the site, such as those on Plot 4, who did not appeal the Notice supposedly served on them, and now face the consequences. Had the Notice been served on us, we would have appealed, and we would have sought planning permission for our plot, as the others on site have.