



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 17 June 2025

by Chris Preston BA (Hons) Town and Country Planning, Bachelor of Planning (BPI)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 July 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/J3720/W/24/3356345

Land off Welsh Road, Welsh Road, Priors Hardwick, Southam, Warwickshire, CV47 7SN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) for the development of land without complying with conditions subject to which a previous planning permission was granted.
- The appeal is made by Mr Sholto Toner against the decision of Stratford-on-Avon District Council.
- The application Ref is 24/00841/VARY.
- The application sought planning permission for the erection of stables and yard without complying with conditions attached to planning permission Ref 21/02877/FUL, dated 09 February 2022.
- The conditions in dispute are Nos 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 & 12 which state that:
 - (2) The development to which this permission relates must be commenced not later than the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
 - (3) The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a Construction Management Plan [CMP] is submitted to and approved in writing by both the local planning and local highway authorities. The CMP must contain details of measures to prevent mud and debris on the public highway, including wheel washing facilities and the methods to be used to keep the public highway clear of any mud, debris and obstacles (in the event of spillage).
 - (4) The development hereby permitted shall not proceed above slab level until samples and trade descriptions of the materials to be used in the areas of approved hardstanding have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved scheme shall be carried out concurrently with the development and completed prior to the first use of the development.
 - (5) Prior to the erection, installation, fixing, placement and/or operation of any external lighting on the site (including on the building itself), details of such external lighting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Such details shall include the equipment and supporting structures, positions, sizes, heights, type, luminance/light intensity, direction and cowling of all external lights and the hours at which such lighting is to be operated.
 - (6) The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until a Horse Waste Management Plan [HWMP] has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The HWMP shall address the following matters.
 - (a) The maximum number of horses to be stabled and accommodated on the site at any one time.
 - (b) The location and means of storage of all horse waste on the site. All horse waste should be transferred to a concrete base muck heap, the location and size of which should be identified on a submitted drawing.
 - (c) The means of preventing surface water run-off from the muck heap to ensure there is no risk of polluting any nearby watercourses, controlled waters, property and ecosystems.
 - (d) Confirmation that no muck/manure will be spread on any part of the application site edged red on the approved drawing.
 - (e) Clarification as to how often all muck/manure will be removed from the site.
 - (f) Confirmation that no waste shall be burnt on any part of the application site at any time.The approved HWMP shall be strictly adhered to thereafter throughout the lifespan of the development. There shall be no variations to that Plan unless previously approved in writing by the local planning authority.

- (7) The access to the site for vehicles shall not be used in connection with the development hereby permitted until it has been constructed to a minimum width of five metres and surfaced with a bound material for a distance of at least 7.5 metres from the near edge of the public highway carriageway, in general accordance with Drawing Number 21/09/101, Rev A, dated 16th December 2021.
- (12) The existing field gate is to be retained and no additional gates should be erected at the vehicular access to the development, in general accordance with Drawing Number 21/09/101, Rev A, dated 16th December 2021.
- The reason[s] given for the condition are:
 - (2) To define the permission and to ensure that the development meets the design quality and environmental requirements of Policy CS.9 of the Stratford-on-Avon Core Strategy (2011-2031).
 - (3) To maintain highway safety and public convenience and ensure safe access to the site, having due regard to Policy CS.26 of the Stratford-on-Avon District Core Strategy 2011-2031.
 - (4) To ensure the environment of the development is improved and enhanced in accordance with Policies CS.5, CS.9 and CS.12 of the Stratford-on-Avon District Core Strategy 2011-2031.
 - (5) To protect the rural character of this edge of settlement location and to safeguard the residential amenities of owners/occupiers of existing neighbouring properties, having due regard to Policies AS.10, CS.5, CS.9 and CS.12 of the Stratford-on-Avon District Core Strategy 2011-2031.
 - (6) In order to protect the amenities of this rural area and neighbouring properties, having regard to Policy CS.9 of the Stratford-on-Avon District Core Strategy 2011-2031.
 - (7) To maintain highway safety and public convenience and ensure safe access to the site, having due regard to Policy CS.26 of the Stratford-on-Avon District Core Strategy 2011-2031.
 - (12) To maintain highway safety and public convenience and ensure safe access to the site, having due regard to Policy CS.26 of the Stratford-on-Avon District Core Strategy 2011-2031.

Appeal B Ref: APP/J3720/C/24/3356293

Appeal C Ref: APP/J3720/C/24/3356294

Land off Welsh Road, Church End, Priors Hardwick, Southam, Warwickshire, CV47 7SN

- The appeals are made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
- Appeal B is made by Mr Sholto Toner and Appeal C is made by Mrs C Toner against an enforcement notice issued by Stratford-on-Avon District Council.
- The notice was issued on 24 October 2024.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is described as:
- Without planning permission, the following operational development:
 - a) erection of a building (in the approximate position identified as 'A' on the Plan); and
 - b) the creation of an area of hardstanding (in the approximate position identified as 'B' on the Plan)The above operational development is being used for domestic purposes associated with the new dwelling known as Ironstone (located to the south of the Land) and also amounts to a material change of use of the land from former paddock (agricultural use) to domestic use.
- The requirements of the notice are to:
 - (a) Demolish the building;
 - (b) Remove the area of hardstanding;
 - (c) Remove all the materials associated with requirements (a) and (b) above;
 - (d) Remove all domestic paraphernalia and domestic planting from the Land (including the wendy house structure in the approximate position marked 'X' on the Plan); and
 - (e) Cease the use of the Land for domestic purposes and thereafter only use the land for agricultural purposes
- The period for compliance with the requirements is within 4 months of the date the notice takes effect.
- Appeal B is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2) (a), (f), (g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). Since an appeal has been brought on ground (a), an application for planning permission is deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the Act.
- Appeal C is proceeding on grounds (f) and (g) alone.

Decision in Respect of Appeal A

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Decision in Respect of Appeal B

2. Appeal B is allowed insofar as it relates to the erection of a building (in the approximate position identified as 'A' of the plan attached to the enforcement notice) and the creation of an area of hardstanding (in the approximate position identified as 'B' on the plan attached to the notice) and planning permission is granted on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act (as amended), for the erection of a building (in the approximate position identified as 'A' of the plan attached to the enforcement notice) and the creation of an area of hardstanding (in the approximate position identified as 'B' on the plan attached to the notice), subject to the conditions appended to this decision.
3. The appeal is dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld insofar as it relates to the material change of use of the land from former paddock (agricultural use) to domestic use and planning permission is refused in respect of the material change of use of the land from former paddock (agricultural use) to domestic use on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act (as amended).

Decision in Respect of Appeal C

4. The appeal is dismissed.

Applications for costs

5. An application for an award of costs in respect of Appeals A & B was made by Stratford-on-Avon District Council against the appellants. That application is subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary and Procedural Matters

6. Three appeals are before me for determination in respect of the same property, as set out in the banner heading above. Appeal A is made in respect of the Council's decision to refuse to an application for planning permission to carry out development without complying with conditions imposed on planning permission 21/02877/FUL, granted in February 2022 (the 2022 permission), for the erection of stables and an associated yard¹. Appeals B and C are made against the Council's decision to serve and enforcement notice. I shall deal with all three appeals within this decision letter.
7. Where two appellants are named on the appeal form in respect of an enforcement notice appeal, it is standard practice to issue an appeal reference to each appellant. The fee, required to be paid in respect of ground (a), will often only be paid in respect of one appeal and that is the case in this instance. Accordingly, Appeal B will proceed on grounds (a), (f) and (g) and Appeal C on grounds (f) and (g) alone.

APPEAL A

Procedural Matters and Reasons

8. Appeal A is made against the Council's refusal to grant permission to carry out development without complying with conditions attached to planning permission 21/02877/FUL, granted in February 2022 (the 2022 permission), for the erection of

¹ Made under s73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

stables and an associated yard. The associated planning application was made under s73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (the Act). Section 73 does not apply if the planning permission was granted subject to a time limited commencement condition and that time period has expired without the development having begun S73(4). Condition 1 of the 2022 permission required that the development be commenced not later than three years from the date of the permission.

9. The Council disputes whether the 2022 permission was begun. Its view is that the building that has been erected was not that approved by the permission but a different form of development; a residential outbuilding as opposed to a stable. In other words, the Council contends that what has been constructed is not simply a breach of the conditions attached to the 2022 permission but that it is not covered by the 2022 permission at all. If that is correct and the 2022 permission has not been commenced then it would not be possible for me to grant planning permission in respect of Appeal A because it is more than three years since the original permission was granted.
10. Within their appeal statement in respect of Appeals B & C, the appellants contend that the 2022 permission was implemented but no appeal has been made on Ground (b) or (c). In other words, no appeal is made on the basis that there has not been a breach of planning control or that the matters alleged in the notice have not occurred. The appellant has not suggested that the breach should have been described as a breach of condition as opposed to unauthorised operational development.
11. The Council raised the issue of whether an appeal should have been brought on grounds (b) or (c) in response to the appellants' statement of case but at the final comments stage the appellants rejected that argument, stating that the grounds of appeal were a matter for them to decide, not the Council. Thus, it was clearly a deliberate choice not to appeal on those grounds.
12. Moreover, the evidence presented indicates that the building was initially constructed as a garage/ domestic outbuilding and not as a stable block. At the time the notice was served, none of the internal loose boxes shown on the approved plans had been installed and the upper floor was boarded out, with domestic style composite boards, as opposed to being open to the rafters as shown on the approved plans. The fact that the upper floor was boarded out and rooflights installed gave a much more residential character than the approved stables. The building was in use for the storage of domestic items, parking of cars and a television was shown hanging from the wall. Whilst the floor to ceiling height may be enough to allow a horse or pony to access the ground floor, the enclosed nature of the space when fully boarded out gave the clear impression that was not the intended use, nor was it how the building was actually being used.
13. The driveway also connected directly to the main house, as opposed to being from the lane to the rear, with no gates or fencing to segregate the structure from the adjacent dwelling. A name plate with the word "Ironstone" affixed to the external wall gives away the link to that residential property. Internally, the building was used for the storage of domestic items, parking of cars, tools and childrens' toys and a television was shown to be hanging from a wall in photographs provided by the Council.

14. The former paddock had taken on a more domestic character, with areas of closely mown grass, akin to a lawn, containing a picnic table and Wendy house. Given the lack of any fencing that read as an extension to the domestic garden of the dwelling.
15. Externally, the building itself was similar to that approved by the 2022 permission. The dimensions are broadly the same and the main differences are the roofing material, clay tiles as opposed to slate; the three rooflights that have been installed; the dimension of the doors; and the position of the door in the side elevation. The visual impact of those changes is relatively minor if viewed in isolation.
16. However, a planning permission is not just for a building of a particular external appearance but needs to be looked at wholistically in terms of its form and function. Functionally, the internal arrangement, as constructed, complete and in use at the time the notice was served, was fundamentally different to what was approved by the 2022 permission. It was a domestic outbuilding rather than a stable block.
17. For that reason, I concur with the view of the Council and find that the appellants did not construct the approved development at all. What they constructed, when viewed in the round, was a different building for which they did not have permission. Rather, a different development occurred, including the erection of a domestic outbuilding which was completed, used for that purpose and only retrofitted for use as a stable, after the notice had been served.
18. Accordingly, given that the development undertaken was not that which had permission, it follows that the 2022 permission was not commenced within the three period required by condition 1 of that permission. It was never begun at all. That being the case, it is not possible for me to consider the appeal or grant planning permission by virtue of the terms of s73 of the Act. Accordingly, I shall dismiss the appeal.

APPEAL B:

The Appeal on Ground (a)

Main Issues

19. Based upon the stated reasons for issuing the enforcement notice and the appeal submissions, the main issues are whether the development is an acceptable form of development within the countryside having regard to the development plan; the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, including the Priors Hardwick Conservation Area (the CA); and whether any harm arising in respect of those issues can be overcome through the imposition of conditions.

The Development Plan

20. The appeal site is located within the countryside, as defined by the Stratford-on-Avon District Core Strategy 2011-2031 (the CS). Policy AS.10 of the CS seeks to maintain and enhance the rural character of the district and sets out the type of development that will be considered acceptable within the countryside, listed at (a) to (v) of the policy. The erection of a building and the associated material change of use of agricultural land to residential use do not fall within any of those categories.

21. The policy also allows for other types of development within the countryside where it is fully justified and provides significant benefits to the local area. It is not entirely clear what the term “fully justified” is intended to mean but regardless of that point, there are no obvious benefits arising from the development, other than the private benefit to the appellant. It follows that the development, as constructed at the time the notice was served, was contrary to the aims of policy AS.10 with respect of development within the countryside.

Character and Appearance of the Area

22. The appeal site is situated on the north-eastern edge of Priors Hardwick, closely to the rear of the recently constructed dwelling known as Ironstone. The boundary of the CA broadly follows the alignment of the carriageway at Church End up to the junction with Welsh Road, with the grass verge adjacent to the junction included but the modern dwellings to the north of the lane, including Ironstone, excluded. Thus, the appeal site sits just outside but directly adjacent to the CA.
23. In terms of built form the village has a loose settlement pattern with buildings strung out along three principal lanes, with concentrations at the respective junctions and a significant area of open space between them. The result is quite a distinctive settlement pattern. That layout, allied to the number of vernacular cottages, farmhouses and associated farm buildings, many of which are now converted to residential use, provide the essential character of the CA.
24. Although outside the defined edge of the village the building in question is closely related, visually, to Ironstone and appears subservient to it in scale. Moreover, it is common within the village for dwellings to have associated buildings and structures and also common for buildings to be situated at the junction of the principal lanes as described above. Therefore, the structure does not appear unusual or out of context on account of its siting.
25. The materials are sensitive to the location and the structure does not appear markedly different to that previously found to be acceptable by the Council. There is a mix of blue slate and clay tiles on traditional buildings in the village and the roofing material is acceptable in that context. The rooflights are a very minor change and set discreetly in the roofslope. Whilst the internal function of the building at the time the notice was served was different to that previously approved that change in function would not impact notably on the way the building itself is appreciated from external vantage points. It remains a modest and attractive building in terms of its size, design and use of materials.
26. Whilst the building relates well to its surroundings, the material change of use of the former paddock to residential purposes, essentially extending the garden of Ironstone, does not conform to the established character of the area. There is a well-defined village edge along the northern boundary and the incursion of domestic features, including the access gate on Welsh Road, which is of domestic design, the Wendy house and the general use of grassed areas as lawn has undoubtedly altered the rural character. The surrounding fields and paddocks play a significant role in maintaining the essential rural character of the settlement and are important in how the CA is perceived on the approaches to the village.
27. In fact, the appellant makes no case to the contrary in that respect and seemingly accepts that domestic use of the paddock would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. I find that is the case and, as such, the development has

caused harm to the distinctive historic character of the village. Given the importance of the surrounding agricultural land to the way the CA is appreciated the harm in that respect is also such that the development has failed to preserve or enhance the CA, contrary to the aims of policy CS8 of the CS.

28. Similarly, whilst I am satisfied that the design of the building conforms to the aims of policy CS9, the domestication of the surroundings fails to reflect the local context, contrary to the aims of subsection B(2) of that policy and the landscape protection aims of policy CS12.

Whether any Identified Harm Could be Overcome Through the Imposition of Conditions

29. As noted above, the harm to the character and appearance of the area arises from the domestication of the land as opposed to the structure itself. The erection of a building for domestic purposes also falls contrary to the aims of policy AS10 with respect to the type of development that is supported in the countryside by the CS. However, the description of the breach of planning control within the notice is the “erection of a building”. That description does not set out a specific use.
30. The appellant’s position is that the harm arising from the material change of use of the land could be mitigated by upholding the contents of the notice in that respect but that the use of the building and associated hardstanding could be controlled by condition, such that the use is restricted to that of a stable and yard, as originally approved.
31. No reason has been presented to suggest that it would not be possible legally to impose such a condition if I were minded to do so. Under section 75(2) of the Act, where planning permission is granted for the erection of a building, the grant of permission may specify the purposes for which the building may be used. In enforcement cases such as this, where no use is specified in the description of the breach, the use will typically be specified in a planning condition.
32. Suggested wording for a condition to that effect has been put forward by the appellant, along the lines of a condition attached to the 2022 permission. Subject to some amendments to ensure that the wording is sufficiently precise I am satisfied that a condition could effectively control the future use of the building and yard.
33. There may sometimes be practical difficulties in taking such an approach where it requires a new use to be commenced that is different from the purpose for which the building was constructed. However, in this instance the structure was already in use as a stable at the time of my visit, having been adapted internally after the notice was served. The current adaptation has not been shown on an accurate plan, with the loose boxes being in a different location and of a different dimension to those on plans previously approved. A further condition could require the building to be fully amended in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved by the Council.
34. The details provided could ensure that the looseboxes are of suitable dimensions with regard to horse welfare, in line with the dimensions approved by the Council in respect of the 2022 permission. That may require further adaptation but the loose boxes are simple structures that would require little work to adapt to ensure a properly regulated and planned internal layout that was fit for purpose.

35. Externally, the yard may be smaller than initially planned but is still of reasonable dimensions for its intended purpose as a private stable and the use of hard surfacing is not uncommon. In fact, a hard surface was previously approved by the Council. Although small of itself, the entrance gate onto Welsh Road has an unduly domestic appearance and a condition to ensure its replacement with a 5 bar gate, as shown to previously exist on submitted plans, would ameliorate the impact on the established rural character. Whilst reference to crime prevention has been put forward as a rationale for the existing gate, there is little evidence to support the statement and the impermeable nature of the current gate would actually help to conceal any activity behind such that I am unconvinced of any claimed benefit over a more traditional five-bar gate.
36. At the time of my visit, a new fence had been erected to segregate the residential element of Ironstone from the development beyond. Such fencing is needed in order for the equine use to be self contained and in the interests of the character of the area. However, on the information available I cannot verify the position of the fencing in respect of any residential garden land that was approved in relation to Ironstone. The Council was also seemingly unaware that the fencing had been erected and hadn't had the opportunity to comment on its location or appearance. Accordingly, a suitably worded condition could ensure that details of fencing are submitted to and agreed in writing by the Council and subsequently implemented in a set timescale.
37. Consequently, subject to conditions relating to the internal adaptation, external fencing and gates and to control the use of the building the current harm could be effectively mitigated. If I were minded to grant a split decision, that would ensure that the requirement to cease the use of the remaining land for domestic purposes would still take effect, thereby removing the harm caused by the domestication of the land. The grazing of horses would fall within the permitted use of agriculture such that there would be no conflict between the approval of the building, its use as a stable and the use of the surrounding land.
38. A number of other conditions were imposed on the 2022 permission, some of which remain necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. A condition to prevent the installation of external lighting, unless details have first been approved in writing by the planning authority is necessary in the interests of visual amenity. A condition to ensure ongoing compliance with a "Horse Waste Management Plan" details of which have been previously approved is necessary to protect the amenities of neighbouring residents.
39. The access arrangements have been constructed and there is no allegation of any harm to highway safety in that respect, particularly given the quiet nature of surrounding roads, nor is there any indication that the access would not be maintained in future. Accordingly no specific conditions are required to make the development acceptable in that respect. A water butt has also been provided.
40. Overall, through the use of conditions I am satisfied that it is possible to regulate the development and largely bring the use and external appearance into line with that found previously acceptable by the Council, in conformity with the relevant policies of the development plan referred to above, including respective design policies CS8, CS9 and CS12 and policy AS.10 with respect to the use, as previously found acceptable by the Council.

Conclusion on Ground (a)

41. Therefore, I conclude that the ground (a) appeal should succeed in part only, and I will grant planning permission for the erection of a building and the creation of an area of hardstanding but otherwise I will uphold the notice and refuse to grant planning permission in respect of the other part of the matters, namely, the material change of use of land from former paddock to domestic use. Although I shall uphold the notice, the requirements of the notice will cease to have effect so far as inconsistent with the planning permission which I will grant by virtue of section 180 of the 1990 Act (as amended).

Appeals B & C on Ground (f)

42. The appellants' position on ground (f) was essentially that demolishing the building and removing the yard went further than was necessary to remedy the breach of planning control or the injury to amenity as the case may be. There was some overlap in that respect with the ground (a) appeal and given my decision to grant a split decision, allowing the operational development there is no need to consider the ground (f) appeal in respect of the building operations. No lesser steps would remedy the breach in respect of the upheld element of the notice and the appeals fail in that respect.

Appeals B & C on Ground (g)

43. The appeals on ground (g) were made in respect of the time given in the notice to demolish the building and remove the area of hardstanding and remove materials from the site. Those requirements will no longer need to be undertaken having regard to my decision in respect of the appeal on ground (a). No appeals were made in respect of the time period to cease the use of the paddock for domestic purposes and it follows that the appeals in those respects fail and the notice will be upheld insofar as it relates to the relevant time period for compliance.

Conclusion on Appeals B & C

44. In view of the above, Appeal B succeeds, in part, on ground (a) and I shall grant planning permission in respect of part of the matters but refuse permission for the remaining part and uphold the notice accordingly.
45. Both appeals fail on grounds (f) and (g) and I shall therefore dismiss Appeal C. Although the notice will be upheld it will only take effect insofar as is inconsistent with the planning permission I shall grant in respect of Appeal B on ground (a).

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR

Appendix 1

List of those who have appealed

Reference	Case Reference	Appellant
Appeal A	APP/J3720/C/24/3356293	Mr Sholto Toner
Appeal B	APP/J3720/C/24/3356294	Mrs C Toner
Appeal C	APP/J3720/W/24/3356345	Mr Sholto Toner

APPENDIX: Schedule of Conditions in Respect of Appeal B

- 1) The building hereby permitted shall be demolished to ground level, the hard surfacing of the yard shall be removed and all materials resulting from the demolition/ removal of the hard surface shall be removed within three calendar months of the date of failure to meet any one of the requirements set out in i) to iv) below:
 - i) Within 3 months of the date of this decision a scheme including the following measures shall have been submitted for the written approval of the local planning authority and the scheme shall include a timetable for its implementation:
 - a) An internal floor plan of the building and any necessary sections depicting how the stables will be laid out, such details to include dimensions and location of the internal loose boxes, details of surrounding circulation space, storage areas and tack room, together with sections depicting any first floor storage areas;
 - b) Detailed site plan and associated elevational drawings depicting the location and design of fencing and gates that will be erected between the dwelling at Ironstone and the stables/ yard; and
 - c) Details of the design of a five bar gate which shall replace the existing access gate from the paddock onto Welsh Road..
 - ii) If within 9 months of the date of this decision the local planning authority refuse to approve the scheme or fail to give a decision within the prescribed period, an appeal shall have been made to, and accepted as validly made by, the Secretary of State.
 - iii) If an appeal is made in pursuance of ii) above, that appeal shall have been finally determined and the submitted scheme shall have been approved by the Secretary of State.
 - iv) The approved scheme shall have been carried out and completed in accordance with the approved timetable.

Upon implementation of the approved scheme specified in this condition, that scheme shall thereafter be retained/remain in use.

In the event of a legal challenge to this decision, or to a decision made pursuant to the procedure set out in this condition, the operation of the time limits specified in this condition will be suspended until that legal challenge has been finally determined.

- 2) The building hereby approved and the associated yard shall be used for the keeping and stabling of horses only and associated storage and tack room facilities in relation to that approved use and shall not be used for any other purpose. The keeping and stabling of horses shall be undertaken on a private basis and the buildings and yard hereby approved shall not be used for any trade, business, commercial riding, livery use or any other commercial equestrian enterprise.
- 3) Prior to the erection, installation, fixing, placement and/or operation of any external lighting on the site (including on the building itself), details of such external lighting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Such details shall include the equipment and supporting structures, positions, sizes, heights, type, luminance/light intensity, direction

and cowlings of all external lights and the hours at which such lighting is to be operated.

- 4) The development hereby permitted shall be used over the lifetime of the development in strict accordance with the 'Horse Waste Management Plan' submitted to the LPA on 21 July 2023 and approved under application reference: DISCN/00322/23, unless the local planning authority gives prior written approval to any subsequent variation.