



Appeal Decision

Site visit not required

by **D Hartley BA (Hons) MTP MBA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/C/23/3331938

28 Drayton Gardens, West Drayton, UB7 7LG

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) (the Act).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Amandeep Singh against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The notice was issued on 15 September 2023.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is without planning permission, the development of a single storey rear extension.
 - The requirements of the notice are to (i) demolish the single storey rear extension approximate location hatched purple on the attached plan and (ii) remove from the land all the debris, items and fittings, building materials, plant and machinery resulting from the works listed above.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is three calendar months.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the ground set out in section 174(2)(g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
-

Decision

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

Reasons

2. The appeal on ground (g) is made on the basis that the period specified in the notice in accordance with section 173(9) of the Act falls short of what should reasonably be allowed.
3. The period for compliance with the requirements of the notice is three calendar months. The appellant asserts that more time should be given so that he can *'research and find an available architect or agent'*. A ground (g) appeal relates to whether the period for compliance with the requirements of the notice is reasonable as distinct from affording the appellant more time to employ an architect or agent who may be able to consider the various grounds of appeal. Moreover, and, in any event, it is noteworthy that only ground (g) of section 174(2) of the Act is pleaded in this case. Consequently, the appellant has appealed for the sole reason of securing more time and in the expectation that the enforcement notice will be upheld as it was issued. Given this, I can take account of the time that has lapsed since the issue of the enforcement notice in deciding what period for compliance is reasonable.
4. The appellant claims that the unauthorised development is simply to store his equipment as the *'one bed flat and storage is very tight'* and that it is also used for shelter when it is raining. He claims that it is a temporary structure. These are essentially matters that are relevant to the consideration of a deemed planning

application and, in this case, an appeal has not been pursued on ground (a) of section 174(2) of the Act.

5. There is no ground (c) appeal before me and, in any event, there is no evidence to suggest that the unauthorised structure, which relates to a flat, does not need planning permission, whether it was erected on either temporary or a permanent basis.
6. On the evidence that is before me, including the time that has lapsed between lodging the appeal and the date of this decision, I find that the compliance period of three months strikes a reasonable and proportionate balance between bringing the harmful development to an end in the public interest, and affording sufficient time for the appellant to ensure full compliance with the requirements of the notice. In reaching this view, I have no reason to doubt the comment made by the occupier of No. 4 Thatcher Close who says that the extension was built within two days and hence that it could be taken down in no more than one day.
7. For the above reasons, I conclude that the ground (g) appeal fails.

Conclusion

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

D Hartley

INSPECTOR