

Objection to Application DC/26/1134

Variation of Condition 4 of DC/11/1176 - All Weather Riding Arena / Sand School

Kerves Farm Cottage, Kerves Lane, Horsham RH13 6RJ

Application reference	DC/26/1134
Site	Kerves Farm Cottage, Kerves Lane, Horsham RH13 6RJ
Proposal	Variation of Condition 4 of DC/11/1176 to show the sand school as part of Kerves Farm Cottage and not Kerves Barn
Objectors	

Dear Planning Officer,

Re: Objection to application DC/26/1134 - Variation of Condition 4 of DC/11/1176, Kerves Farm Cottage, Kerves Lane, Horsham

We object to application DC/26/1134, which seeks to vary Condition 4 of planning permission DC/11/1176 so that the all-weather riding arena / sand school /menage becomes associated with Kerves Farm Cottage rather than Kerves Barn.

The application is presented as an administrative amendment arising from historic land ownership changes. However, we do not consider that the proposal can properly be regarded as a simple conveyancing matter. The original condition was imposed to protect amenity and enable the Local Planning Authority to regulate and control the development.

The key issue is whether the revised wording would continue to provide effective planning control in the current circumstances of the site.

Key point: The issue is not merely who owns the land today. The issue is whether the original planning justification for the condition remains valid and whether the proposed wording would continue to provide effective protection against commercialisation, external users, intensified activity and harm to neighbouring amenity.

1. The Original Condition Served a Fundamental Planning Purpose

Condition 4 of DC/11/1176 states:

"The sandschool hereby permitted shall be used solely in connection with Kerves Barn, Kerves Lane, Horsham as a dwelling and shall not be used for commercial purposes, as a riding establishment or for competitions."

The reason for the condition was:

“In the interests of amenity, to enable the Local Planning Authority to regulate and control the development...”

This was not a minor administrative condition. It was a key planning control which restricted the use of the arena to a particular dwelling and prevented wider equestrian or commercial use. The annotated site layout (attachment: App_1 Annotated Site Layout) shows the close proximity of Kerves Barn in relation to the sand school.

The Council has already confirmed that the subdivision of the land has resulted in a breach of the original condition because the sand school no longer sits within the ownership of Kerves Barn.

The question therefore is not simply whether the wording should be updated to match ownership. The question is whether the revised wording would continue to achieve the original planning purpose.

The application describes the matter as arising from historical conveyancing and ownership changes. However, planning conditions run with the land and are not personal to individual owners. The fact that land has changed ownership, or that a condition was not amended before a sale took place, does not in itself mean that a planning condition should be varied. The relevant planning question is whether the original purpose of the condition remains necessary and whether the proposed wording would continue to provide an equivalent level of planning control and protection for neighbouring amenity.

2. Wider Site Context and Subdivision of the Former Planning Unit

This application should not be assessed in isolation. When the original permissions were granted, Kerves Farm, Kerves Barn, the stables, paddocks and associated equestrian facilities formed part of a single planning unit under a single family ownership. Following the subdivision and disposal of parts of the site, the sand school, stables and associated land are now detached from the dwelling to which the original planning controls were expressly linked.

Since that subdivision, the wider site has become the subject of a number of planning applications, enforcement investigations and planning concerns, including matters relating to the sand school, hardstanding, access arrangements, parking, lighting, equestrian activity and holiday accommodation.

The property history currently identifies four planning applications and several planning enforcement entries relating to the property history. This includes DC/26/1056 for the retrospective shepherd's hut, DC/26/1134 for the variation of Condition 4, EN/26/0087 concerning alleged hardstanding/access matters, EN/26/0210 concerning the sand school and associated conditions, and EN/26/0219 which remains pending consideration.

The Council should therefore consider the cumulative planning history and current operational context of the site when determining whether the proposed variation would continue to achieve the objectives of the original condition.

Before varying an important planning control originally imposed to regulate development in the interests of amenity, the Council should be satisfied that the revised wording remains sufficiently robust to prevent commercialisation, intensification and uses that extend beyond those originally contemplated when permission was granted.

We note that enforcement reference EN/26/0210 relates not only to Condition 4 of DC/11/1176 concerning the sand school, but also to Condition 14 of SQ/122/98 regarding the use of the stables in association with the residential use of the original barn conversion. The enforcement position therefore appears to recognise that both the arena and stable facilities

were subject to planning controls linking them to the original residential planning unit. The Council should therefore be cautious about considering the arena in isolation where the wider equestrian holding, including the stables and associated land, formed part of the same planning framework and functional unit.

3. The Original Arena Approval Was Based on Limited Ancillary Use

The Council's original decision to grant permission for the arena was based on the assessment that the facility would remain ancillary to Kerves Barn and would not result in a material increase in activity.

The officer assessment concluded that the proposal would not result in an intensification of use that would materially harm neighbouring properties or the rural character of the area. That conclusion was reached in the specific context of the arena being tied to Kerves Barn and restricted by conditions preventing commercial use, riding establishment use, competitions, floodlighting and amplified sound.

Importantly, when planning permission was granted, the occupiers of Kerves Barn both benefited from and were subject to the impacts associated with the arena. The facility was approved as an ancillary domestic equestrian use serving Kerves Barn, and the planning assessment was undertaken on that basis. The arena, stables and associated equestrian land formed part of the same planning unit and were under common ownership.

Following the subdivision of the former Kerves Farm holding, that relationship has fundamentally changed. The arena, stables and associated land are now under separate ownership from Kerves Barn and no longer operate as part of the same residential planning unit. As a result, the occupiers of Kerves Barn no longer receive the benefit of the arena and associated equestrian facilities, yet remain exposed to any impacts arising from their use, including activity, noise, lighting, dust, vehicle movements, parking and wider operational changes.

The Council should therefore carefully consider whether the original planning assumptions and amenity conclusions remain valid in the current circumstances. The original permission was granted on the basis that the arena would remain ancillary to Kerves Barn and would not result in material intensification or harm to neighbouring amenity. The fact that ownership has subsequently changed does not automatically mean that the planning justification for the original condition has disappeared.

The Council should therefore carefully consider whether those conclusions remain applicable following:

- the subdivision of the site;
- the transfer of the arena to a different dwelling;
- the separation of the arena from the original planning unit;
- the subsequent planning applications affecting the site;
- the associated enforcement investigations; and
- the wider operational changes that have occurred since the site was divided.

The application is presented as an administrative correction arising from land ownership changes. However, the Council is being asked to vary a condition that formed an important part of the original planning balance. Before doing so, it should be satisfied that the revised wording continues to provide effective protection against commercialisation, third-party use, intensified activity and harm to neighbouring residential amenity, including the amenity of Kerves Barn, which no longer benefits from the arena but continues to live alongside it.

4. The Proposed Condition is Ambiguous

The proposed variation seeks to replace "Kerves Barn" with "Kerves Farm Cottage", whilst retaining wording prohibiting commercial purposes, riding establishment use and competitions.

If the Council is minded to approve any variation, the wording should be strengthened and clarified. The revised condition should explicitly provide that the arena is for **private domestic equestrian use only**, ancillary to the occupation of a single dwelling, namely **Kerves Farm Cottage**, and for the use of the occupiers of that dwelling and their own horses only.

The revised condition should prohibit:

- arena hire;
- paid use;
- use by third parties;
- use by non-residents of Kerves Farm Cottage;
- use by visiting horse owners;
- clinics, training events, organised instruction or other equestrian activities involving persons other than the occupiers of Kerves Farm Cottage and their own horses;
- competitions;
- riding establishment activities;
- use associated with holiday accommodation;
- commercial equestrian activity of any description; and
- any organised use involving persons other than the occupiers of Kerves Farm Cottage and their own horses.

The restriction should apply **whether or not any payment is made** and whether the use is described as arena hire, shared use, informal use, private use, training use, livery use or any other arrangement.

Without such clarity, there would remain a risk that activity capable of generating the same impacts as commercial arena use could occur while being presented as non-commercial or incidental use. The purpose of the original condition was to regulate and control the development in the interests of amenity. Any revised condition should therefore prevent not only formal commercial activity but also any use by persons other than the occupiers of Kerves Farm Cottage and their own horses that could result in increased activity, vehicle movements, parking, noise, lighting or intensification of use.

The Council should also consider whether additional controls are required to protect neighbouring residential amenity, including restrictions on hours of use and any external lighting associated with the arena. While the arena was originally approved as an ancillary domestic facility, the current application seeks to alter one of the key planning controls that formed part of the original planning balance. Appropriate controls should therefore remain in place to prevent harm to neighbouring occupiers.

5. Proposed Stable Wording Is Ambiguous

The supporting statement proposes:

"The stables shall only be used for livery purposes in association with the residential use of Kerves Farm Cottage and shall not be let out or used for independent commercial purposes."

We are concerned that this wording is ambiguous and appears wider than the restrictions proposed for the arena.

In particular:

- What is meant by "livery purposes"?
- Does the wording permit horses owned by third parties?
- Does the wording permit horses belonging to persons who do not reside at Kerves Farm Cottage?
- Does the wording permit paid or unpaid livery arrangements?
- What is meant by "independent commercial purposes"?
- Does the wording prohibit all commercial use or only separate commercial enterprises?

The stable wording should be consistent with the arena restriction.

In our view, the stables, paddocks, arena and associated equestrian facilities should operate as a **single private domestic equestrian unit serving one dwelling only, namely Kerves Farm Cottage**. The planning controls applying to the arena, stables, paddocks and associated land should therefore be consistent and should prevent use by third parties, whether paid or unpaid.

Any revised condition should therefore make clear that the stables are for the keeping of horses owned by and for the private use of the occupiers of Kerves Farm Cottage and should not be:

- hired out;
- licensed;
- advertised;
- used for livery purposes involving third parties;
- used by horse owners who do not reside at Kerves Farm Cottage;
- used for commercial or non-commercial equestrian activities involving external users; or
- used in conjunction with arena hire, training activities or other intensified equestrian use.

The Council should also consider the relationship between the stables, paddocks, arena and wider equestrian landholding. Public advertisements have offered both arena use (sand school) and the rental of a 4.5-acre field associated with the site. The screenshots submitted with this objection include visible date stamps and should be considered alongside the wider planning and enforcement context affecting the site.

In our view, the planning restrictions should apply not only to the arena and stables individually but to the wider equestrian holding associated with Kerves Farm Cottage, including paddocks, grazing land, hardstanding, accessways and associated facilities. Otherwise there is a risk that activities restricted in one area could simply be displaced to another part of the same equestrian holding.

Any revised condition should therefore ensure that the arena, stables, paddocks and associated land are not hired out, licensed, advertised, rented, shared or otherwise made available for use by persons who do not reside at Kerves Farm Cottage, regardless of whether payment is involved.

Otherwise there is a risk that the arena, stables and associated equestrian land become subject to different levels of planning control, creating uncertainty regarding the future use of the site and weakening the effectiveness of the original planning restrictions.

6. Extent of Stable Development and Planning Control

The Council should also consider whether the current equestrian development reflects the scale, layout and planning assumptions that formed the basis of the original permissions under **SQ/122/98**.

The approved plans show a specific arrangement comprising a replacement stable block, associated equestrian buildings and limited parking provision. The approved scheme formed part of the planning balance when permission was granted and was subject to conditions intended to control the form and extent of development.

Of particular relevance is **Condition 2 of SQ/122/98**, which states that the permitted building(s) shall not be extended or altered in any way unless planning permission is first obtained from the Local Planning Authority. The condition was imposed in the interests of visual amenity and the proper control of development within the countryside.

However, the wider planning history of the site includes SQ/122/98 and associated conditions which formed part of the planning framework governing the equestrian development.

We also note that Condition 14 of SQ/122/98, which forms part of the enforcement context referred to under EN/26/0210, does not appear to have been included within the application documentation and made available for public inspection. The Council should therefore ensure that all relevant planning conditions and decision notices forming part of the wider planning framework have been considered when determining this application. It is important that the proposal is assessed in the context of the complete planning history rather than by reference to a single condition in isolation.

We recognise that some buildings, structures or alterations may have existed for a considerable period and may therefore fall outside planning enforcement. We do not invite the Council to determine those matters through this application. However, they remain relevant context when considering whether the wider equestrian holding continues to operate in a manner consistent with the planning assumptions that underpinned the original permissions.

The Council should also note that the officer's original assessment and approved plans for **DC/11/1176** show land adjacent to the arena as paddock and open equestrian land. Since that time, parts of the area surrounding the arena have been altered and are the subject of separate planning and enforcement considerations, including matters relating to hardstanding and operational use. Whilst we do not invite the Council to determine those matters through this application, they remain relevant context when considering whether the wider equestrian holding continues to operate in the manner originally envisaged when planning permission was granted.

Against that background, the Council should satisfy itself that the revised condition will continue to provide effective planning control over the arena, stables, paddocks and associated equestrian landholding. The current application is presented as an administrative amendment arising from ownership changes. However, before varying an important planning control, the Council should consider whether the current layout and operation of the wider equestrian facilities remain consistent with the planning assumptions that underpinned the original permissions and whether the revised condition will continue to provide an appropriate level of protection for neighbouring amenity.

7. Public Advertising and Wider Use Are Relevant Context

The Council should also have regard to the manner in which the wider site is publicly marketed and presented.

Publicly available material has advertised private arena hire and equestrian facilities associated with the site, including references to a 20m x 40m arena, equestrian use and access arrangements. The arena hire advertisements were actively promoted through local Facebook groups during February and March 2026.

In addition, publicly available advertisements have offered the rental of a 4.5-acre field associated with the wider equestrian holding. Screenshots submitted with this objection include visible date stamps and indicate that these advertisements are recent.

Whilst advertising activity does not in itself determine the planning merits of the application, it is relevant context when assessing whether the proposed wording provides sufficient safeguards against future third-party use, commercialisation or intensification of the wider equestrian holding and whether the varied condition would remain robust and enforceable over time.

The Council should also consider this application in the context of the currently undetermined shepherd's hut application **DC/26/1056**. Whilst the two applications relate to different development proposals, the supporting material submitted in support of the holiday accommodation use describes a commercial visitor accommodation operation, whilst the current application seeks to reassure the Council that the arena, stables and associated equestrian facilities will remain private in nature and will not operate as an independent commercial enterprise.

We do not suggest that the Council should determine one application by reference to the other. However, when viewed together, the proposals demonstrate the importance of ensuring that any varied condition is precise, robust and capable of preventing future uncertainty regarding the use of the arena, stables, paddocks and associated equestrian land.

The Council should therefore be satisfied that the revised wording cannot be interpreted as permitting use by holiday guests, visiting riders, third-party horse owners, arena users or other persons who do not reside at Kerves Farm Cottage, whether or not payment is involved.

In our view, the arena, stables, paddocks and associated equestrian land should remain ancillary to a single dwelling, namely Kerves Farm Cottage, and should not be available for use by holiday guests, external riders, visiting horse owners, clients, customers or other third parties, whether payment is involved or not.

The application should therefore not be assessed solely on the basis of the existing wording of the condition, but also in the context of the wider operation, marketing and use of the site and whether the revised condition will continue to provide effective protection against future commercialisation or intensification.

8. Arena Surface, Dust and Residential Amenity

The Council should also satisfy itself that the arena has been constructed and operated in accordance with the approved details.

The approved arena cross-section identifies the riding surface as "Equine silica sand", and Condition 2 requires all materials used to conform with those approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Enforcement correspondence has identified a potential discrepancy between the approved surface and the material currently installed, which appears to comprise a black rubber-based surface. If the surface differs from the approved specification, the Council should establish whether the development accords with the approved plans and conditions before varying the condition.

The surface material is relevant because it may affect visual appearance, maintenance requirements, drainage characteristics and the potential generation of dust or particulate matter during use, harrowing and periods of dry or windy weather.

Any future alteration or replacement of the arena surface should remain subject to the appropriate planning controls and should be assessed having regard to its potential impact on visual amenity, drainage, dust generation and neighbouring residential amenity.

Given the relationship between the arena and neighbouring residential properties, including the close proximity of Kerves Barn, the Council should consider whether any dust or particulate generation gives rise to residential amenity concerns before varying a condition originally imposed to protect amenity.

9. Floodlighting Requires Clarification

The original planning permission required separate approval for any external lighting or floodlighting associated with the arena.

The Council's original assessment was based upon a private domestic equestrian facility operating without floodlighting. Appropriate control of lighting formed an important part of the planning balance in relation to neighbouring amenity and the rural character of the area.

Enforcement correspondence has raised concern regarding the apparent presence of a floodlight serving the arena. In addition, publicly available advertising material submitted with this objection refers to a "floodlight for early morning / evening riding" and to a "20m x 40m school with lights". Whilst such references do not determine the planning merits of the application, they reinforce the need for the Council to satisfy itself that any lighting associated with the arena is authorised and complies with Condition 6 of DC/11/1176 before varying an important planning control originally imposed in the interests of amenity.

If any floodlighting, lighting columns, fixed lighting equipment or associated infrastructure has been erected without the necessary planning approval, the Council should take this into account when considering whether the original planning assumptions remain valid.

The Council should also ensure that any revised planning controls are sufficiently robust to prevent the introduction or use of unauthorised lighting in connection with the arena, stables, paddocks or associated equestrian land. This should include both permanently installed lighting and temporary or portable floodlighting capable of facilitating use of the arena during hours of darkness.

Given the proximity of neighbouring residential properties and the wider countryside setting, the continued absence of floodlighting formed part of the basis upon which the original permission was granted. The Council should therefore be satisfied that the current application would not weaken those controls or increase the potential for future amenity impacts arising from evening or extended use of the arena.

10. Hardstanding, Parking and Access Must Be Considered

The application should also be considered alongside EN/26/0087 concerning alleged hardstanding and access works adjacent to the equestrian facilities.

Parking, access and vehicular movements are intrinsically linked to the operation of the arena and associated equestrian facilities. It would therefore be inappropriate to vary an important planning condition without considering whether the current parking and access arrangements remain consistent with the planning history of the site.

11. The Council Should Consider Whether the Original Planning Balance Still Applies

The application assumes that the existing location and operation of the arena remain appropriate and that only the wording of the condition requires amendment. We do not consider that this assumption should be accepted without scrutiny.

Before varying a condition imposed to regulate development in the interests of amenity, the Council should be satisfied that:

- the original planning objectives remain capable of being achieved;
- the arena accords with approved details;
- the stable layout and associated facilities accord with the approved plans;
- the revised wording is clear, effective and enforceable;
- the variation would not weaken existing planning controls;
- the proposal would not facilitate future commercialisation or intensification;
- the arena, stables, paddocks and associated equestrian landholding remain genuinely ancillary to a single dwelling, namely Kerves Farm Cottage;
- the wider equestrian holding cannot be hired out, shared, licensed or otherwise used by third parties, whether paid or unpaid;
- the variation would not facilitate use by holiday guests, external riders, visiting horse owners or other non-residents;

- the proposal would not increase activity on the wider site beyond that originally contemplated when planning permission was granted; and
- the use would not give rise to additional amenity impacts from parking, access, lighting, dust, noise or third-party activity.

The issue is not simply ownership of the land. The issue is whether the revised condition will continue to provide effective planning control over the arena, stables, paddocks and associated equestrian landholding in circumstances that are materially different from those that existed when the original permissions were granted.

The Council should be satisfied that the proposed variation would not increase the risk of planning harm arising from commercialisation, intensified activity, third-party use, additional vehicle movements, parking pressure, lighting impacts, noise, dust or other effects on neighbouring residential amenity.

The Council should also have regard to the practical enforceability of any revised condition. The existence of current enforcement investigations, together with publicly available advertising material relating to arena use, field rental and lighting, demonstrates the importance of ensuring that planning restrictions are not only clearly worded but are capable of being effectively monitored and enforced in practice.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, we respectfully request that **DC/26/1134 be refused**. The Council should not approve the variation unless it is satisfied that the revised condition will continue to provide effective planning control and will not give rise to planning harm that would not otherwise have arisen under the original condition.

If the Council is nevertheless minded to approve a variation, the revised condition should be strengthened to ensure that the sand school, stables, paddocks, grazing land and associated equestrian facilities remain restricted to genuine private domestic use ancillary to a single dwelling, namely Kerves Farm Cottage, and cannot be used for arena hire, third-party use, field rental, commercial equestrian activities, holiday accommodation-related activities, riding establishments, competitions, organised training activities or any form of intensified equestrian enterprise.

We also respectfully request that the Council considers this application alongside the wider planning and enforcement context affecting the site and carefully assesses whether the original planning balance, which was based upon a single planning unit under common ownership and tightly controlled equestrian use, continues to apply in the current circumstances.

Yours faithfully,



Appendix 1 – Planning and Enforcement Chronology

This chronology summarises the planning history and enforcement context relevant to DC/26/1134. It is included to assist the Council in considering whether the proposed variation of Condition 4 should be treated as a simple administrative amendment or assessed in the wider planning context of the site.

Refer to Appendix 1 Attachment ‘**App_1_Annotated Site Layout**’ to show the extent of planning matters across the site.

A. Original Planning Permissions and Controls

- 22 April 1999 – Planning permission SQ/122/98 granted for the conversion of Kerves Barn to a dwelling, together with a replacement stable block and associated equestrian facilities.
- 5 August 2011 – Planning permission DC/11/1176 granted for the all-weather riding arena / sand school.
- 2011 officer assessment – The arena was considered acceptable on the basis that it would remain ancillary to Kerves Barn and would not materially intensify activity or harm neighbouring amenity.
- 2011 Condition 4 – The sand school was required to be used solely in connection with Kerves Barn as a dwelling and not for commercial purposes, as a riding establishment or for competitions.
- 2011 conditions also restricted floodlighting and required materials to conform with the approved details.
- 2011 approved arena drawings identified the riding surface as “Equine silica sand”.

B. Subdivision and Change in Site Context

- July 2017 – Kerves Farmhouse was sold separately from the wider Kerves Farm holding.
- January 2025 – Kerves Barn was sold.
- March 2025 – Kerves Farm Cottage and associated land were sold to the current owner.
- Following the subdivision and disposal of parts of the former Kerves Farm holding, the sand school and associated equestrian land became detached from Kerves Barn, the dwelling to which the original planning condition was expressly linked.
- This changed ownership and site context is material because the original planning control was imposed to regulate activity and protect amenity, not merely to describe ownership.

C. Current Planning Applications

- DC/26/1012 – Construction of dormers to the rear roof elevation of Kerves Farm Cottage. Lawful Development Certificate – Proposed. Pending consideration.
- DC/26/1056 – Retrospective application for a shepherd’s hut for short-term letting purposes.
- DC/26/1134 – Current application to vary Condition 4 of DC/11/1176 to show the sand school as part of Kerves Farm Cottage and not Kerves Barn.

D. Current Enforcement Context

- EN/26/0084 – Enforcement enquiry relating to the shepherd’s hut, resulting in planning application DC/26/1056.
- EN/26/0087 – Alleged: Laying of hardstanding used for the parking of horse lorries and commercial vehicles in connection with the use of the land for holiday lets, and the extension of the access/driveway without planning permission (pending consideration).
- EN/26/0210 – Enforcement enquiry relating to the Breach of condition 4 of DC/11/1176 (use of sand school solely in connection with Kerves Barn) and condition 14 of SQ/122/98 (stables to be used in association with the residential use of the barn conversion at Kerves Lane Farm)
- EN/26/0219 – Alleged: use of horsebox being used for residential accommodation (pending consideration).

E. Relevance of the Chronology to DC/26/1134

- The arena was originally approved on the basis of limited ancillary use linked to Kerves Barn.
- The original condition formed part of the planning balance and was imposed to protect amenity and enable the Council to regulate the development.
- The sand school has now become separated from Kerves Barn following subdivision of the former planning unit.
- A number of planning applications and enforcement matters have arisen since the subdivision of the site.
- The Council should therefore consider whether the proposed variation would continue to provide robust and enforceable protection against commercial use, third-party use, intensified activity, lighting, hardstanding, parking, access impacts, dust and other amenity concerns.

Evidence References and Attachments

This objection is intended to be read alongside the following material:

- DC/11/1176 decision notice, including Conditions 2, 4, 6 and 8;
- DC/11/1176 approved plans and cross-section showing “Equine silica sand”;
- SQ/122/98 decision notice and approved plans for the barn conversion, replacement stable block and stable parking;
- Council enforcement correspondence relating to EN/26/0210 and EN/26/0087;
- property history screenshot showing the current planning applications and enforcement entries;
- public advertising material or screenshots relating to arena hire, hardstanding, access, stables or associated use, where submitted separately.

Property History Screenshot

Screenshot showing planning applications and enforcement entries in the property history. This is included as contextual evidence for the wider planning history referred to above.

[Address](#) **Property History (13)** [Constraints \(0\)](#) [Map](#)

Planning Applications (4)

- [Conversion of garage into living accommodation with single storey and two storey extensions including dormers](#)
Ref. No: DC/13/1328 | Status: Application Permitted
- [Construction of dormers in rear roof elevation. \(Lawful Development Certificate - Proposed\).](#)
Ref. No: DC/26/1012 | Status: Pending Consideration
- [Siting of a shepherds hut to the rear for short term letting purposes. \(Retrospective\).](#)
Ref. No: DC/26/1056 | Status: Pending Consideration
- [Variation of Condition 4 of previously approved application DC/11/1176 \(All weather riding arena\) to show The Sand School as part of Kerves Farm Cottage and not Kerves Barn.](#)
Ref. No: DC/26/1134 | Status: Pending Consideration

Planning Enforcements (9)

- [Enforcement Enquiry](#)
Ref. No: EN/26/0084 | Status: DC Application Submitted
- [Enforcement Enquiry](#)
Ref. No: EN/26/0085 | Status: Case Closed
- [Enforcement Enquiry](#)
Ref. No: EN/26/0086 | Status: Case Closed
- [Enforcement Enquiry](#)
Ref. No: EN/26/0087 | Status: Pending Consideration
- [Enforcement Enquiry](#)
Ref. No: EN/26/0088 | Status: Case Closed
- [Enforcement Enquiry](#)
Ref. No: EN/26/0089 | Status: Case Closed
- [Enforcement Enquiry](#)
Ref. No: EN/26/0090 | Status: Case Closed
- [Enforcement Enquiry](#)
Ref. No: EN/26/0210 | Status: DC Application Submitted
- [Enforcement Enquiry](#)
Ref. No: EN/26/0219 | Status: Pending Consideration

Properties (0)

Powered by  idox