



Appeal Decision

by Ken McEntee

a person appointed by the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities

Decision date: 16 July 2024

Appeal ref: APP/T5150/C/24/3341385

Land at 9A and 9B Northwick Avenue, Harrow, HA3 0AA

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991.
- The appeal is brought by Mrs Jayshree Pattni against an enforcement notice issued by the London Borough of Brent.
- The notice was issued on 21 February 2024.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is "Without planning permission, the erection of a timber framed canopy extension onto the existing rear extension of the premises".
- The requirements of the notice are: "STEP 1 Demolish the timber framed canopy extension to the rear of premises. STEP 2 Remove all items, debris, and materials, arising from the demolition of the unauthorised development, and remove all materials associated with the unauthorised development from the premises".
- The time period for compliance with the notice is **3 months** after this notice takes effect.
- The appeal is proceeding on the ground set out in section 174(2)(g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.

Summary of decision: The appeal is dismissed and the notice is upheld without variation.

Reasons for the decision

1. The basis of the appellant's appeal appears to be that she would like the compliance period to be extended as she plans to submit a planning application to obtain planning permission for the unauthorised development. However, she has not stated how long a period she considers will be necessary and there is no evidence before me of such an application having been submitted. Whether one will be submitted in the future can only be considered as a matter of speculation at this stage. I am also mindful that over 3 months have elapsed since the appeal was submitted with enforcement action effectively suspended. As the compliance period will begin again from the date of this decision, it follows that the appellant will have had more than 6 months in which to either obtain planning permission or to comply with the requirements of the notice. On the evidence before me therefore, I am not satisfied there is good reason to extend the compliance period further. The appeal fails accordingly.

Formal decision

2. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld without variation.

K McEntee