



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 18 July 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st July 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/J4525/C/24/3353619

Dwelling at 64 Grosvenor Street, Sunderland, SR5 2EQ

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). The appeal is made by Mr Sinan Ye against an enforcement notice issued by Sunderland City Council.
 - The notice was issued on 8 October 2024.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is without planning permission, the reconstruction of a pitched roof dormer to the rear (north facing) left hand side (viewed from the rear) roof plane of the dwelling, and the construction of an associated balcony projecting from the rear of the dwelling the approximate location of which is outlined in blue on the attached plan titled "EN Plan" and in the attached photographs titled "EN photographs".
 - The requirements of the notice are to (i) reduce the height of the dormer to no higher than the height of the highest part of the existing roof of the dwelling, (ii) dismantle the balcony such that no part of it extends beyond the roof plane and eaves of the existing dwelling, (iii) following the removal of the balcony, reinstate the dwelling to its condition prior to the breach by reinstating the roof structure with rafters, roofing membrane, slaters lathes and roof tiles of the same size and colour and laid to the same gauge as the existing roof tiles, fascia board and guttering utilising materials and finishes to match the existing external materials, having regard to the Building Regulations 2010, and (iv) remove from the land all surplus materials and wastes arising from compliance with the above requirements.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is (i) for requirements (i) and (ii) no later than one month after this notice takes effect and (ii) for requirements (iii) and (iv) no later than two months after this notice takes effect.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(b) and (f) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/J4525/C/24/3352625

Dwelling at 64 Grosvenor Street, Sunderland, SR5 2EQ

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). The appeal is made by Mr Sinan Ye against an enforcement notice issued by Sunderland City Council.
 - The notice was issued on 25 September 2024.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is the construction of a pitched roof dormer to the front (south facing) roof plane, detailed in the attached photographs titled "EN Photographs".
 - The requirements of the notice are to (i) dismantle the dormer in its entirety, (ii) following the removal of the dormer, make good the resulting void in the main roof with rafters, roof membrane, slaters lathes and roof tiles of the same size and colour and laid to the same gauge as the existing roof tiles, having regard to the Building Regulations 2010, OR, (iii) construct a dormer in full accordance with the planning permission granted on appeal by the Planning Inspectorate on 8 June 2023 (appeal reference: APP/J4525/D/22/3313289/planning application reference 22/02093/FUL), and (iv) remove from the land all surplus materials and wastes arising from compliance with the above requirements.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is (i) for requirement (i) no later than one month after this notice takes effect, and (ii) for requirements (ii) or (iii) and requirement (iv) no later than four months after this notice takes effect.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a) and (f) 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 Ref: APP/J4525/D/24/3352994

64 Grosvenor Street, Sunderland, SR5 2EQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Sinan Ye against the decision of Sunderland City Council.
- The application Ref is 24/01177/FUL.
- The development proposed is described as “there are total 5 physical elements comprised in this Proposal. Element 1 : A smaller Dormer to provide extra space for convenient Medical Equipment, feature can match 7 Double-Fronted new houses for those seats on public Highway; Element 2 : Safety Bars, to prevent one-hand disabled Mia fall out, feature can match those galvanised zinc colour on Common Land; Element 3: auxiliary Canopy above the window, to prevent raindrop water slip inside; Element 4: window shutter, for some shade to respect the Privacy lamp; Dignity for disabled, features can match cladding of 7 houses or the fences up boundary; Element 5: safety wall lamp to brighten the footpath, assistant of gaining access under Equality Act 2010, improving access includes steps and stairs, passageways and paths, entrances and exits, internal external doors, toilets, signs, lighting and ventilation, even the size of premises”.

Appeal D Ref: APP/J4525/C/25/3360295

Dwelling at 64 Grosvenor Street, Sunderland, SR5 2EQ

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). The appeal is made by Mr Sinan Ye against an enforcement notice issued by Sunderland City Council.
- The notice was issued on 31 January 2025.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is without planning permission, the construction of an upstand/plinth, timber fence and brick pier/mock chimney above the ridge of the main roof of the dwelling, detailed in the attached photographs titled “EN Photographs”.
- The requirements of the notice are to (i) dismantle and remove the upstand/plinth, timber fence and brick pier/mock chimney in its entirety, (ii) following the removal of the upstand/plinth, timber fence and brick pier/mock chimney, make good any damage caused, or exposed, and reinstate the roof and ridge line to its condition prior to the breach using external materials of a similar type, size and colour to those comprised in the existing roof, having regard to the Building Regulations 2010, and (ii) remove from the land all surplus materials and wastes arising from compliance with the above requirements.
- The period for compliance with the requirements is one month.
- The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(f) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

Decisions

Appeal A Ref: APP/J4525/C/24/3353619

1. It is directed that the enforcement notice is corrected by the deletion of the words “*The balcony, due to its elevated location and projection causes unacceptable harm to the privacy and living conditions of the neighbouring property, No. 64 Grosvenor Street*” in section 4, and the substitution of the words “*The balcony, due to its elevated location and projection causes unacceptable harm to the privacy and living conditions of the neighbouring property, No. 62 Grosvenor Street*”. Subject to the correction, the appeal is dismissed, and the enforcement notice is upheld.

Appeal B Ref: APP/J4525/C/24/3352625

2. The appeal is allowed, the enforcement notice is quashed 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 development already carried out, namely the construction of a pitched roof dormer to the front (south facing) roof plane, detailed

in the attached photographs titled “EN Photographs” at 64 Grosvenor Street, Sunderland, SR5 2EQ as shown on the plan attached to the notice.

Appeal C Ref: APP/J4525/D/24/3352994

3. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the 2 No. dormers with canopies to front, windbreak with pillar to roof area, safety railings around 1 No. dormer, canopy above existing front window and window shutter to the ground floor Grosvenor Street facing front window. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the front door canopy, ramp, and safety lamp and planning permission is granted for the front door canopy, ramp, and safety lamp at 64 Grosvenor Street, Sunderland, SR5 2EQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/01177/FUL, and the plans submitted with it so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted, and subject to the following conditions:

i) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.

ii) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: Drawing 6 dated 22 July 2024.

Appeal D Ref: APP/J4525/C/25/3360295

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

Applications for Costs

5. In respect of Appeals C and D, applications for costs are made by Mr Sinan Ye against Sunderland City Council. These applications are the subject of separate Decisions.

Preliminary Matters

6. In respect of Appeal C and the banner heading above, I have taken the description of development from the appellant’s planning application form. The Council’s refusal notice refers to the proposed development as the erection of “2 No. dormers with canopies to front, windbreak with pillar to roof area, safety railings around 1 No. dormer and canopy above existing front window (part retrospective)”. This does succinctly describe the proposal, but it does not include the proposed safety lamp on the front of the property. Moreover, the submitted plan includes a canopy over front the entrance door, a roof windbreak made of wooden fencing and attached to the chimney and a pillar, a ramp to the entrance front door, and a window shutter to the ground floor Grosvenor Street front elevation. I have determined this appeal based on all the proposals shown on the submitted plan (i.e., drawing No. 6 dated 22 July 2024).
7. The National Planning Policy Framework was revised in December 2024 (the 2024 Framework) and was subsequently amended on 7 February 2025 to correct cross-references from footnotes 7 and 8 and amend the end of the first sentence of paragraph 155 to make its intent clear. The 2024 Framework replaces the previous version of the National Planning Policy Framework published in December 2023. The 2024 Framework has not materially changed in terms of the planning main issues which are the subject of Appeals B and C. Moreover, the main parties had the opportunity to refer to the 2024 Framework at the statement of case stage.

Reasons

Appeal A Ref: APP/J4525/C/24/3353619

The Notice

8. As part of the appeal, the local planning authority (LPA) has drawn attention to an error in section 4 (Reasons for this notice) which refers to *'the balcony, due to its elevated location and projection causes unacceptable harm to the privacy and living conditions of the neighbouring property, No. 64 Grosvenor Street'*. This is clearly a typographical error as the property adjacent to the balcony is No. 62 Grosvenor Street. I shall correct section 4 of the notice so that it refers to *'No. 62 Grosvenor Street'* rather than *'No. 64 Grosvenor Street'*. In doing so, I do not find that injustice would be caused to the main parties. It is noteworthy, in any event, that there is no deemed planning application to consider on ground (a) of section 174(2) of the Act and hence planning merits are not a matter for consideration.

Appeal on ground (b)

9. The appeal on ground (b) is made on the basis that the matters comprising the alleged breach of planning control have not occurred. The onus is on the appellant to make his case on the legal grounds of appeal.
10. The appellant claims that location plans showing the position of the property, including land registry plans, show that there has been a rear dormer in place for many years and that it included a balcony. I acknowledge that various site location plans do show a line which could depict some form of change to the rear roof slope. However, I do not find that this is sufficient on its own to precisely and unambiguously demonstrate that there has always been the type of balcony on the rear roof slope of the property that exists now.
11. Moreover, the written and photographic evidence from the LPA casts doubt about the claim made by the appellant that the breach of planning control has not occurred. I acknowledge that the undisputed evidence is that there was originally a dormer within the rear roof slope. However, and, as a matter of fact and degree, I find this dormer has been altered, enlarged or reconstructed (including the provision of a new balcony) to such an extent that it amounts to the construction of a new dormer. In reaching this conclusion, I have considered the 'existing plan' of the property which accompanied a pre-application enquiry to the LPA on 18 March 2021 as appended to the LPA's statement of case.
12. The existing plan shows a materially different dormer than exists now in terms of its size and position within the roofspace. I was able to see on my site visit that such a dormer extends above the ridge of the rear roof slope and that its face is much closer to the eaves of the main roof of the property. As a matter of fact and degree, I find that a new dormer with balcony has been constructed.
13. The appellant has not appealed on ground (c), but on this basis alone the new dormer with balcony requires planning permission given the limitations of Class B of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).

14. The photographs appended to the notice show quite clearly works under construction (including new dormer roof timbers) and that, at this time, the development was not substantially completed.
15. The appellant has not sufficiently demonstrated that the breach of planning control has not occurred. The onus is on the appellant to make his case on ground (b) which is a legal ground of appeal. He has not provided clear, unambiguous and precise evidence to counter the position reached by the LPA in respect of the ground (b) appeal matters. Therefore, I conclude that the ground (b) appeal fails.

Appeal on ground (f)

16. The appeal made on ground (f) is that the steps required by the notice to be taken, or the activities required by the notice to cease, exceed what is necessary to remedy any breach of planning control or to remedy any injury to amenity which has been caused by any such a breach.
17. It is not clear from the appellant's evidence why he considers that the steps required by the notice to be taken are excessive. Reference is made to some matters that are not directly relevant to this ground of appeal.
18. The purpose of the notice is to remedy the injury to amenity which has been caused by the breach of planning control. There is no ground (a) appeal before me and hence no deemed planning application in respect of the breach of planning control. In this regard, I have been unable to consider whether the requirements of the notice are excessive from a planning merits point of view.
19. On the evidence that is before me, the requirements of the notice are not excessive as they directly address the planning harm outlined in the reasons for issuing the notice and, importantly, seek to remedy the injury which has been caused to amenity. I therefore conclude that the ground (f) appeal fails.

Appeal B Ref: APP/J4525/C/24/3352625

Appeal on ground (a) and the deemed planning application

Main Issue

20. I have considered the reasons for issuing the notice and the main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

21. The appeal property comprises a mid-terraced cottage type dwelling within a block of seventeen such cottages on the north side of Grosvenor Street. The breach of planning control relates to a pitched roof dormer with overhanging eaves and has been constructed in brown uPVC.
22. The roof of the property has brown tiles. Planning permission was approved on appeal on 20 June 2023¹ for the erection of a front dormer and ramp and canopy to the front entrance. I have been provided with a copy of the approved plan for this planning permission and the appeal decision which includes condition No. 3 which states '*the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the*

¹ Planning permission reference APP/J4525/D/22/3313289

front dormer hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building'. The above planning permission is still capable of being implemented and both this and the Inspector's reasoning are material considerations to which I afford significant weight in decision making terms.

23. In respect of the above planning permission, the Inspector acknowledged conflict with the Council's Development Management Supplementary Planning Document 2021 (SPD) which refers to the uniqueness of the 'Sunderland cottages' which have heritage significance. While the previous Inspector acknowledged that with the approved front dormer it would mean that the number of properties within the terraced block with dormers would be less than 50% and hence fail to accord with the threshold/guidance in the SPD, he nonetheless commented that *'given the circumstances of the street-scene in which the proposed dormer would sit and its small size, the application of the SPD would be an unduly arbitrary way of assessing its impact'*.
24. It is necessary that I consider the appeal dormer in the context of the planning permission for a pitched roof dormer to the front of the property. While the appeal dormer is slightly larger than the approved dormer, it is nonetheless proportionate in scale to the host property roof and does not compromise the visual integrity of the terrace which includes several box dormers, occupying most of the roof spaces, and mainly finished in either white or brown uPVC material. Given the fallback dormer position, and the visual context of the street-scene, I find that the appeal dormer does not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property, or to the area as a whole.
25. I acknowledge that the planning permission for the approved dormer includes a condition requiring the external surfaces of such a dormer to match those used in the existing dwelling. I am not sure what this means. I do not consider that this condition meets the test of precision and enforceability. In any event, I find that the brown uPVC dormer suitably blends with the brown roof tiles to the host property. There is no evidence before me to suggest that this roof is unauthorised even though it does appear to have replaced a grey slate roof.
26. For the above reasons, I conclude that the breach of planning control does not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, or to the area. Therefore, it accords with the character, appearance, and design requirements of policy BH1 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy and Development Plan 2020 (CS&DP) and chapter 12 of the 2024 Framework. While there is conflict with the SPD, where it refers to front dormers on Sunderland cottages, in this instance, and, given the fallback planning permission, this conflict does not justify withholding planning permission for development that I have found not to cause planning harm, and which accords with development plan policies.
27. Therefore, I conclude that the ground (a) appeal succeeds. As the dormer has already been constructed, it is not necessary to impose any planning conditions.

Appeal C Ref: APP/J4525/D/24/3352994

Main Issue

28. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

29. It is proposed to make alterations to the existing pitched front dormer (as approved under appeal A) to the Grosvenor Street facing roof slope to include a canopy and projecting balcony (with the railings), and to erect a second pitched roof dormer with canopy. The proposal also includes a canopy to the ground floor window and entrance door of the Grosvenor Street facing elevation, as well as an entrance ramp, and the provision of a wooden fence to the roof secured between the chimney and a pillar to form a 'wind break'. The evidence is that the appellant is a carer for a disabled individual who has, is or will occupy the host property.
30. As outlined in my Appeal B assessment, the host property is a Sunderland cottage. The SPD refers to the uniqueness of the 'Sunderland cottages' which have heritage significance. While I have approved the front dormer on the property as part of my consideration of the ground (a) appeal under Appeal B, I find that the additional balcony (with railings) and canopy would appear incongruous and overly fussy in the street-scene. While there are other roof dormers within the terrace, they are generally simple in form and do not include the sort of cluttered or fussy design features that are proposed as part of this appeal. The projecting balcony would add significant bulk and scale to the front dormer and would extend almost to the edge of the roof. In this context, the dormer would appear overly large and disproportionate in scale to the host property.
31. The second dormer would also appear incongruous in the street-scene. It would not align with the existing dormer and the provision of a projecting canopy would have the effect of drawing even more attention to what would be experienced as a poorly designed and discordant form of development in Grosvenor Street. As part of my site visit, it was evident that the proposed 'wind break' with brick pier/mock chimney had already been constructed. I find that this development causes very significant harm to the design consistency and appearance of the roof of the terrace. It unacceptably interrupts the rhythm of the chimneys within the terrace and the wooden wind break looks dominant and discordant when viewed by passers-by. Overall, this development has a materially harmful and jarring visual impact when experienced in the street-scene.
32. I acknowledge that the canopy over the front door of the property has already been approved on appeal, as has the proposed ramp at the front door of the dwelling and within the curtilage of the property. Given the fallback planning permission, I find that these elements of the proposal are acceptable in planning terms. Moreover, owing to the position and small size of the proposed 'safety lamp', I am satisfied that this would not look out of place on the host property or cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.
33. Notwithstanding the above, my site visit revealed that neither window canopies nor external shutters are a prevailing characteristic in respect of the cottages within Grosvenor Street. The provision of an additional canopy to the ground floor window of the property, coupled with the proposed shutter, would, in my judgement, cause harm to the overall simplicity and integrity of the front elevation of the terrace as a whole, and hence would lead to unacceptable harm being caused to the character and appearance of the area.
34. For the reasons outlined above, I find that the proposed ramp, front door canopy, and safety lamp are acceptable in planning terms. However, the remainder of the

proposed development is not acceptable and would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the area. These parts of the proposal would fail to accord with the design, character, and appearance requirements of policy BH1 of the CS&DP, the SPD, and chapter 12 of the 2024 Framework.

Other Considerations

35. While the evidence from the appellant is not entirely clear, it would appear that he is a carer for an individual who has a disability. The Council assert that the disabled individual no longer occupies the property. I do not know if this is the case based on the evidence that is before me, but, for the purposes of this appeal I have nonetheless assumed that the disabled individual is or will occupy the premises and that the proposals are put forward to provide additional space and safety for that person, as well as for the appellant.
36. Given the above, I have had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty contained in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, which sets out the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, and victimisation, and to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it. I have also had regard to rights conveyed within Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights as incorporated into the Human Rights Act 1998 which states that everyone has a right to respect for private and family life, their home and correspondence. This is a qualified right, whereby interference may be justified in the public interest, but the concept of proportionality is crucial.
37. While I do not doubt that the window/dormer canopies would seek to reduce the amount of water that penetrates through the windows if open, this must be balanced against the significant harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the area.
38. I acknowledge that the proposed ramp and light would help those visiting the property and ensure ease of access for all users including the disabled occupant. I have, in any event, found that these elements of the proposals are acceptable in planning terms.
39. I am not entirely sure from the evidence why the appellant wants a wind break on the roof, although it appears to relate to alleged health and property heat benefits, and to improve the structural integrity of the house. The evidence in terms of this matter is weak and not suitably substantiated and, in any event, this is a matter that needs to be weighed against the identified planning harm. The appellant claims that the second dormer would *'provide extra space for convenient medical equipment'*, but this is not reasonably substantiated from the point of view as to why the existing space within the dwelling would not equally fulfil this requirement.
40. I do not doubt that the proposal would result in some economic benefit from construction employment point of view. However, that would be a relatively short-lived benefit. I accept that the proposals would increase the amount of useable floorspace for occupiers of the property. Again, this must be weighed against the identified planning harm.
41. I acknowledge that the appellant would like some additional shade in the ground floor room and hence has proposed an external ground floor window shutter.

However, that shade may not be always needed and of course could be realised by opting for more sensitive solutions such as an internal blind or the use of curtains. The evidence before me is not sufficiently compelling to justify allowing the external shutter in the context of the planning harm that would be caused by it should it be installed.

42. The appellant's evidence includes a reference to a nearby housing development being constructed on what he says is or was 'common land'. While the appellant may not be happy about this development, or the circumstances which led to the development being constructed, the evidence does not clearly demonstrate that it has direct relevance to this appeal. The appellant appears to assert that the above housing development may have had a negative impact on the structural integrity of his dwellinghouse. Comments are made about cracking to the walls of the dwellinghouse. However, there is an absence of clear and objective evidence before me to substantiate the claim that cracks are as a result of the nearby development or, importantly, why this reasonably justifies allowing harmful development in planning terms.
43. If development elsewhere has allegedly resulted in structural damage being caused to the appellant's property, then that would need to be considered and pursued by the appellant as a separate private/civil legal matter. I find that any cracking to the walls of the dwellinghouse, or any other alleged structural issues, would likely be capable of being addressed in the absence of the unauthorised development.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

44. The appeal proposal includes different elements. The front door canopy, ramp and 'safety lamp' are acceptable, and, for the reasons outlined, suitably comply with relevant planning policies. This development is clearly severable from the remainder of the scheme, as it is physically and functionally independent. Therefore, I shall issue a split decision in this case, and allow the front door canopy and ramp, and safety lamp. In doing so, it is necessary that I impose of drawings condition and a time limit condition.
45. In respect of the remainder of the proposed development, I have concluded that this would have a materially adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area and host property. Therefore, I shall dismiss the appeal in respect of the remainder of the proposed development.
46. My conclusion to partly refuse planning permission, is a proportionate and necessary approach to the legitimate aim of ensuring that the character and appearance of the area is safeguarded, and poor design avoided. In this case, the protection of the public interest cannot be achieved by means that are less interfering of the human rights of occupiers of the dwelling. Therefore, while I acknowledge the personal circumstances of the occupiers of the property, I conclude that these are not matters which outweigh the harm that would be caused by the proposal in respect of the refused elements of the proposed development.

Appeal D Ref: APP/J4525/C/25/3360295

Appeal on ground (f)

47. The appeal made on ground (f) is that the steps required by the notice to be taken, or the activities required by the notice to cease, exceed what is necessary to

remedy any breach of planning control or to remedy any injury to amenity which has been caused by any such a breach.

48. It is not clear from the appellant's evidence why he considers that the steps required by the notice to be taken are excessive. Reference is made to some matters that are not directly relevant to this ground of appeal.
49. The purpose of the notice is to remedy the breach of planning control. In this regard, the steps in the notice are not excessive. A ground (a) appeal was barred in respect of this appeal. However, I have considered the appeal development as part of my assessment of Appeal C. My reasoning explains that such development has a materially harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area.
50. The appellant refers to the erection of 14 semi-detached houses on what he refers to as 'Grosvenor Street's common land/public rights of way'. Comments are made about the need to strengthen the foundations of the appeal property. It appears to be being alleged that development elsewhere has caused damage to the structural integrity of the appeal property. The appellant appears to be suggesting that the wind break is needed to ensure that the property is structurally sound and to minimise heat loss. I have considered these matters as part of Appeal C and have concluded that such matters are not sufficiently weighty or evidenced to outweigh the material harm that has been caused to the character and appearance of the area from the unauthorised development.
51. I therefore conclude that the ground (f) appeal fails.

Overall Conclusions

Appeal A Ref: APP/J4525/C/24/3353619

52. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed. I shall uphold the enforcement notice with a correction.

Appeal B Ref: APP/J4525/C/24/3352625

53. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal succeeds on ground (a). I shall grant planning permission for the development as described in the notice. The enforcement notice will be quashed. In these circumstances, the appeal on ground (f) does not fall to be considered.

Appeal C Ref: APP/J4525/D/24/3352994

54. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be allowed in part and dismissed in part.

Appeal D Ref: APP/J4525/C/25/3360295

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

D Hartley

INSPECTOR