



Appeal Decision

by **Ken McEntee**

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

Decision date: 10 September 2025

Appeal ref: APP/F5540/C/25/3362056

Land at 77 Inwood Road, Hounslow, London, TW3 1XH

- 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 George Chekurishvili against an enforcement notice issued by the London Borough of Hounslow.
- The notice was issued on 28 January 2025.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is: "Without planning permission, the unauthorised erection of a single storey rear extension, a single storey rear infill extension, a front veranda extension and flue".
- The requirements of the notice are "i. Demolish the single storey rear extension marked as 'A' on the attached plan. ii. Demolish the single storey rear infill extension marked 'B' on the attached plan. iii. Demolish the front veranda extension marked as 'C' on the attached plan. iv. Demolish the flue. v. Remove all resultant debris from the Land".
- 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 enforcement notice is upheld without variation.

Reasons for the decision

1. The main basis of the appellant's case is that he would like more time to comply with the requirements of the notice in order to allow enough time to prepare and submit a planning application and possible appeal to regularise the unauthorised development. He requests that the compliance period be extended to 6 months. While I note the reasons for this request, I am mindful that some 6 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, the appellant will effectively have had some 9 months in which to pursue a retrospective permission and to carry out the necessary works to comply with the requirements of the notice, which is 3 months more than that requested. That being the case, there does not appear to be any good reason before me 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