



Appeal Decision

by Ken McEntee

a person appointed by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 12 August 2025

Appeal ref: APP/T0355/C/25/3364138

Land at 4 Castle Avenue, Datchet, Slough, Berks, SL3 9BA

- 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 Mr Chakri Nampallu against an enforcement notice issued by the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead.
- The notice was issued on 27 March 2025.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is: "Without planning permission, the erection of a single storey front extension and single storey rear storey extension with integral decking boards".
- The requirements of the notice are "i Demolish the single storey front extension as shown in figure 1 on drawing number 4CA/005/PL and the attached image marked JH1. ii. Remove from the land all building materials and rubble arising from the demolition works, following compliance with step (i). iii. Demolish the single storey rear extension and associated decking boards, as shown in figure 2 on drawing number 4CA/005/PL and the attached image marked JH2. iv. Remove from the land all building materials and rubble arising from the demolition works, following compliance with step (iii)".
- The time period for compliance with the notice for both requirements is "Within 6 Calendar months from the date 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 enforcement notice is upheld without variation.

Reasons for the decision

1. The appellant contends that the period for compliance with the requirements of the notice is too short as it does not allow sufficient time to raise the necessary finances and appoint a contractor to schedule and carry out the works. He therefore requests that the compliance period be extended to 12 months. While I note the appellant's reasons for this request, I am mindful that some 4 months have elapsed since this appeal was submitted with enforcement action effectively suspended. As the compliance period will begin again from the date of this decision, the appellant will effectively have had some 10 months in which to raise the necessary funds and to find a suitable contractor to carry out the required works. I consider this period to be both reasonable and proportionate. Therefore, I am not satisfied there is good reason to justify extending 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