



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/25/3374072

Land north of Stable Cottage, Stock Lane, Langford, Somerset 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 29 August 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 and the use of the land for the parking of vehicles which are not parked for a purpose ancillary to the lawful agricultural use 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, except for vehicles parked for a purpose ancillary to the lawful agricultural use of the land.
2. Remove all vehicles from the land that are not parked for a purpose ancillary to the lawful agricultural use of the land.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is eight weeks.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(b) and (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 matters

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.
3. No appeal has been made on ground (a) and the relevant fee has not been paid. Therefore, planning merits considerations, which would include the effect of the matters stated in the notice on the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring residential property, cannot form part of my deliberations.

Ground (b) appeal

4. The ground of appeal is that the matters stated in the enforcement notice as constituting a breach of planning control have not occurred. The burden is firmly on the appellant to show why their appeal should succeed on this ground, the relevant test of the evidence being on the balance of probability.
5. The appeal premises comprises an open field forming part of a larger agricultural and equestrian holding. The notice attacks the material change of use of the field to a mixed use for agriculture and use for the parking of vehicles in association with users of Bristol Airport.
6. The ground (b) appeal is limited in scope; the appellant simply contends that some of the vehicles which have been parked in the field are not associated with users of Bristol Airport. There is no dispute that the use for the parking of vehicles in association with airport users has in fact occurred.

7. The appellant supplied little firm evidence however to support their claim. No details are given of any vehicles which were parked in the field prior to the issuing of the notice which might have been associated with a use other than for airport parking.
8. Moreover, the Council's evidence does not support the appellant's claim, as it points towards the vehicles being parked in the field as almost exclusively associated with airport users. In particular, details of visits which took place during August and September 2025 suggest that the overwhelming majority of vehicles being parked in the field were associated with airport users, with the use being operated by a parking company. Also, advanced signage was displayed directing users to airport parking in the field.
9. Furthermore, in responding to a Planning Contravention Notice (PCN) dated 11 September 2025 the appellant confirmed that the vehicles parked in the field were associated with an airport parking company operating on that and adjoining land. The appellant made no mention of any other parking taking place in association with a different non-agricultural use of the field in their PCN responses. I attach considerable weight to this evidence, given the potentially serious consequences associated with providing false or misleading information in response to a PCN and in the absence of firm evidence which might bring into question the accuracy of the appellant's responses in that document.
10. Therefore, having considered the available evidence, I find that on the balance of probability the mixed use for agriculture and airport parking alleged was in fact the use occurring at the field prior to the notice being issued. All or almost all of the vehicles parked in the field were, more likely than not, associated with users of Bristol Airport; the appellant has been unable to show otherwise.
11. The ground (b) appeal fails.

Ground (g) appeal

12. The ground of appeal is that the period specified for complying with the requirements of the notice falls short of what should reasonably be allowed.
13. The appellant sought to extend the compliance period to six months. In my estimation, the eight-week period specified nevertheless provides ample time in which to secure 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. There is little firm evidence that the honouring of advanced bookings depends on the premises being available or that there is any significant risk of customers who are out of the country and/or out of contact being prejudiced if their vehicles are moved to another location.
14. Consequently, the compliance period is no shorter than that necessary to ensure the breach is remedied as soon as practicable but does not impose a disproportionate burden on the appellant. In the circumstances, extending that period would serve little purpose other than to perpetuate the breach.
15. The ground (g) appeal also fails.

Conclusion

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

Stephen Hawkins

INSPECTOR