



---

## Appeal Decision

by Stephen Hawkins MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 October 2026

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/D0121/C/25/3374721**

**Stable Cottage Livery Yard, Stock Lane, Langford BS40 5EX**

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
  - The appeal is made by Mr Dereck Hazell against an enforcement notice issued by North Somerset Council.
  - The notice was issued on 11 September 2025.
  - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is without planning permission, the material change of use of the land to a mixed use of agriculture, the use of the land for equestrian purposes and the use of the land for the parking of vehicles which are not parked for a purpose incidental to the lawful uses of the land and are parked in association with users of Bristol Airport.
  - The requirements of the notice are: 1. Cease the use of the land for the parking of vehicles which are parked in association with users of Bristol Airport and not parked for a purpose incidental to the lawful uses of the land. 2. Remove all vehicles from the land which are parked in association with users of Bristol Airport and not parked for a purpose incidental to the lawful uses of the land.
  - The period for compliance with the requirements is twelve weeks.
  - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). Since the prescribed fee has not been paid within the specified period, the appeal on ground (a) and the application for planning permission deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the Act has lapsed.
- 

### Decision

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

### Preliminary matter

2. The appeal can be determined without the need for a site visit, as I have been able to reach a decision based on the information already available.

### Ground (g) appeal

3. The ground of appeal is that the period specified for complying with the requirements of the enforcement notice falls short of what should reasonably be allowed.
4. The appeal premises contains a range of equestrian buildings and a manège, along with paddocks and hard surfaced circulation areas. The notice attacks the material change of use of the premises to a mixed use, which includes use for the parking of vehicles in association with users of Bristol Airport.
5. The appellant sought to extend the compliance period to six months. As the appeal has been made solely on ground (g), the length of the compliance period is the only matter before me. Therefore, the appellant cannot have had any reasonable expectation of the notice being quashed. By making this limited appeal, they have already delayed the date the notice will come into effect, with the certain knowledge that all of its requirements would have to be complied with.

6. Set in that context, I am mindful that during the time which has elapsed since submission of the appeal it has been open to the appellant to explore the securing of an alternative location for parking vehicles associated with any advanced bookings taken for airport parking and to arrange for the removal of all the vehicles associated with the use from the premises. Moreover, the twelve-week period specified provides an ample final opportunity in which to take such steps, if the appellant has not already done so.
7. To sum up, the compliance period specified in the notice strikes an appropriate balance between remedying the breach as soon as practicable whilst also avoiding imposing a disproportionate burden on the appellant. Extending that period however would serve little purpose other than to perpetuate the breach.
8. The ground (g) appeal fails.

### **Conclusion**

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed. I shall uphold the enforcement notice.

*Stephen Hawkins*

INSPECTOR