



Appeal Decision

by M Bale BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/C/24/3340193

45 Hampshire Avenue, Slough SL1 3AG

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Adnan Ali against an enforcement notice issued by Slough Borough Council.
 - The notice was issued on 7 February 2024.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is: Without planning permission, the material change of use of the outbuilding, with associated facilitating works and its use as a self-contained dwelling.
 - The requirements of the notice are to:
 1. Cease the use of the outbuilding as a self-contained dwelling.
 2. Remove the kitchen from the outbuilding.
 3. Remove all plumbing, boiler and associated pipework in connection to the kitchen within the building.
 4. Remove from the land all materials, rubbish, debris, plant and machinery resulting from compliance with the above requirements.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is: Four (4) calendar months after the notice takes effect.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(f) and (g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and the Enforcement Notice is upheld.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Slough Borough Council against Mr Adnan Ali. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Ground (f)

3. The purpose of the enforcement notice (“the Notice”) is to remedy the breach of planning control. Therefore, insofar as it relates to this appeal, ground (f) is that the steps required to be taken, or the activities required to cease, exceed what is necessary to remedy the breach of planning control. Whether lesser steps might remedy any injury to amenity is not relevant.
4. As well as ceasing the use, the Notice seeks removal of the kitchen, and plumbing, boiler and associated pipework in connection to it. Internal fixtures and fittings could be put to other uses within the outbuilding, such as purposes incidental to the use of the main dwellinghouse. However, there is nothing to suggest that the kitchen and associated services were not installed to facilitate the breach of planning control.
5. I also note that the Decision Notice granting planning permission for the outbuilding includes a condition that no kitchen should be installed. While this

Notice does not allege a breach of condition, there is, therefore, a clear expectation that this facility should not be in the outbuilding and its removal does not go beyond what is reasonable and necessary to remedy the breach. In the absence of a clear proposal for their reuse within the site, it is also reasonable to ensure that any removed items are taken away.

6. For these reasons, the appeal on ground (f) should fail.

Ground (g)

7. Ground (g) is that the period specified to comply with the Notice falls short of what should reasonably be allowed. I understand that the building is occupied by a tenant who will need to be served with an eviction notice. While that could be a time-consuming process, the appellant has provided no substantive evidence that it will take longer than 4 months.
8. Therefore, I find that the time specified is reasonable and the ground (g) appeal should also fail.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

M Bale

INSPECTOR