



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 16 December 2025

by Simon Hand MA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th January 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/K3415/F/24/3348222

Swinfen Hall Hotel, Swinfen, Lichfield , WS14 9RE

- The appeal is made under section 39 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended).
- The appeal is made by Nexthot Limited against a listed building enforcement notice issued by Lichfield District Council..
- The contravention of listed building control alleged in the notice is: the following works, hereafter referred to as “the Works”, that affect the character of the Building as one of special architectural or historical interest, have been or are being undertaken without the benefit of listed building consent (for reference, an annotated floor-plan, showing the room numbers referred to in the matters appearing to constitute the breach below is included at Appendix 1 of this Notice):
 - A. The installation of a chandelier through the Rococo ceiling in Room 1, including the damage to and removal of elements of the central ceiling rose,
 - B. The removal of brass door handles throughout the ground floor and the replacement with modern composite handles,
 - C. The removal of timber sash windows to either side of the front entrance door and their replacement with UPVC double-glazed windows,
 - D. The painting of the fireplace in Room 2, losing the historically varnished finish,
 - E. The creation of a new kitchen in Room 3, with units covering panelling to the walls, and the painting of the wooden panelling, resulting in the loss of the historically varnished finish,
 - F. The removal of the door and doorframe to the north-eastern side of Room 3 including the high skirting and plaster mouldings otherwise evident throughout Room 3, and the creation of a new large opening between these Rooms, and the installation of additional lower skirting boards and associated plaster mouldings within the opening,
 - G. The removal of three French windows to Room 4 and their replacement with modern UPVC doors,
 - H. The painting of all wooden panelling to Room 6 and the loss of the historically varnished finish,
 - I. The painting of the two organ surrounds to Room 6 and the loss of the original French polished finish,
 - J. The painting of the balustrading, handrails and wooden detailing to the main central stair, losing the historically varnished finish,
 - K. The removal of the timber French window to Room 10 and its replacement with a modern UPVC French window,
 - L. The installation of a spa bath, together with the application of concrete to the floor in Room 31,
 - M. The installation of fitted wardrobes to Room 33,
 - N. The blocking-up of the doorway between Room 33 and Room 34,
 - O. The removal of a wall between Room 34 and Room 35,
 - P. The installation of a fitted and fixed bed headboard to the wall to Room 35,
 - Q. The removal of the central timber sash window and the cutting through of brick-work and stone cill to this window of Room 35 and the installation of a UPVC door.
- The requirements of the notice are: The following steps must be taken to comply with the requirements of this notice:
 - A. The chandelier to the Rococo ceiling in Room 1 shall be removed and damage caused to the central ceiling rose shall be made good and re-instated to the original detail,
 - B. The modern composite door handles shall be removed and round brass door handles to match those remaining shall be reinstated,

- C. The UPVC double-glazed windows to either side of the front entrance door shall be removed and new single-glazed timber sash windows to match in detail, profile and design to those on the rest of the front elevation shall be reinstated,
 - D. The paint on the fireplace and surround in Room 2 shall be carefully removed and the fireplace and surround shall be varnished to match that prior to the fireplace being painted,
 - E. The new kitchen in Room 3 shall be removed,
 - F. The paint covering the wooden panelling in Room 3 shall be carefully removed and shall be revarnished and stained to match the finish prior to the unauthorised works being undertaken,
 - G. The new opening between Room 3 and Room 4 shall be blocked up in brickwork laid in a 1:3 lime mortar, and re-plastered, with a new door and door surround to match that to the righthand side of the fireplace in Room 3 shall be re-instated to Room 3,
 - H. Skirting boards and associated plaster mouldings to match that remaining in Room 3 in terms of height, profile, pattern, detail and material shall be re-instated in Room 3 where the works in Step G above have been finished, and any damage to existing and remaining plaster mouldings shall be repaired to return the details to the original, both in materials and detail,
 - I. The plasterwork shown in photograph 3.64, Room 4, looking SW of the Historic Building Report prepared by Donald Insall Associates, March 2021 (Appendix 2) where the new opening has been created shall be re-instated to Room 4,
 - J. Skirting boards and associated plaster mouldings to match that remaining in Room 4 in terms of height, profile, pattern, detail and material shall be re-instated in Room 4 where the works in Step G above have been finished, and any damage to existing and remaining plaster mouldings shall be repaired to return the details to the original, both in materials and detail,
 - K. The three UPVC French windows to Room 4 shall be removed and new timber single-glazed French windows to match those removed without consent shall be reinstated,
 - L. The fitted cabinet to the front of the fireplace to Room 4, covering the fireplace and surround shall be removed, and any damage caused to the fireplace, fire-surround and/or dado rails shall be repaired in materials and details to match the existing,
 - M. The paint covering the wooden panelling in Room 6 shall be carefully removed and shall be varnished to match that prior to the painting of the panelling being undertaken,
 - N. The paint covering the two organ surrounds to Room 6 shall be carefully removed and both shall be French polished,
 - O. The paint covering the balustrading, handrails and wooden detailing to the main central stair shall be carefully removed and following this shall be varnished to match that prior to the painting of the panelling being undertaken,
 - P. The modern UPVC window to Room 10 shall be removed and a new timber single-glazed French window to match that removed without consent shall be reinstated,
 - Q. The installation of a spa bath, together with the application of concrete to the floor in Room 31 shall be removed,
 - R. The fitted wardrobes to Room 33 shall be removed and any damage caused to the plaster mouldings and/or the fireplace shall be made good and where necessary repaired,
 - S. The new doorway between Room 33 and Room 34 shall be reinstated with a door surround to match that shown in photograph 3.118 of the Historic Building Report prepared by Donald Insall Associates March 2021 (Appendix 2),
 - T. The wall between Room 34 and Room 35 shall be reinstated,
 - U. The fitted and fixed bed headboard to the wall in Room 35 shall be removed, covering the historic fireplace, and any damage caused to the plaster mouldings and/or the fireplace shall be repaired in materials and details to match the existing,
 - V. The UPVC French window to Room 35 shall be removed,
 - W. New brickwork, to match the existing in size, finish and colour shall be carefully re-instated to Room 35, and toothed into the existing brickwork, and shall be laid in a lime mortar to match the existing on the rear elevation,
 - X. A new stone cill, to match in terms of size, material, profile and design to the windows immediately to each side of the new unauthorised doorway to Room 35 shall be re-instated, laid in a lime mortar to match the existing lime mortar on the rear elevation,
 - Y. A new single-glazed timber sash window to match in profile, detail and material to the windows either side of this window shall be reinstated above the cill reinstated as set out in Step X above,
 - Z. Remove any waste generated from the compliance of Steps A – Y from the site edged red on the attached plan.
- The period for compliance with the requirements is 6 months.

The appeal is made on the grounds set out in section 39(1) (b), (c), (e), (g), (h) and (i) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended.

Appeal B Ref: APP/K3415/C/24/3344531

Swinfen Hall Hotel, Swinfen, LICHFIELD, WS14 9RE

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Nexthot Limited against an enforcement notice issued by Lichfield District Council.
 - The notice was issued on 19 April 2024.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is without planning permission:
 - a) the unauthorised engineering operation to create an earth bund in the approximate location denoted by a blue line on the attached plan,
 - b) the unauthorised engineering operation to create an outdoor swimming pool in the approximate location denoted by a purple rectangle on the attached plan,
 - c) the unauthorised operational development to erect ornate metal pillars and gates over 2 metres in height in the approximate location denoted by a green line on the attached plan,
 - d) the unauthorised use of an existing flat roof (above the existing cocktail lounge) as a balcony.
 - The requirements of the notice are:
 1. Remove the earth bund from the approximate location denoted by a blue line on the attached plan. In doing so, the following consideration must be given:
 - a. Ensure the works carried out to comply with Step 1 are done in a manner that does not negatively impact the health of adjacent trees protected by a Tree Preservation Order [TPO] (tree preservation order 2020/00453/TPO, attached to this notice).
 - b. Ensure the soil within the Root Protection Area of the adjacent TPO trees is not compacted to ensure no interruption of the exchange of gases between the roots and the air occurs.
 2. Remove the brick work associated with the construction of the outdoor swimming pool.
 3. Restore the land on which the unauthorised outdoor swimming pool has been built by making good the excavated area ensuring the original land level is restored prior the excavation taking place.
 4. Following compliance with Step 3, the area should be laid with turf, returning the area to its former condition prior to excavation taking place.
 5. Remove the metal pillars and metal gates erected at the entrance of the site, in the approximate location denoted by a green line.
 6. Cease the use of the flat roof above the former cocktail lounge with brick and stone balustrading about the former cocktail lounge as a balcony/standing area.
 7. Remove from the Site and dispose of any waste generated from compliance with steps 1 – 5.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is: 2 months.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2) (a) and (g) 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.
-

Decision

Appeal A – 3348222

1. It is directed that the listed building enforcement notice be corrected by the deletion of allegation N (blocking of door between rooms 33 and 34);

It is directed that the listed building enforcement notice be varied by deleting requirements A (the chandelier), D (room 2 fireplace), E and F (the new kitchen and painting in room 3), L (cabinet in room 4), Q (spa bath and floor in room 31), R (fitted wardrobes in room 33), S (new door between 33 and 34), T (wall between rooms 34 and 35) and Y (sash window in room 35). It is further directed the listed building enforcement notice is varied by rewording requirement G to say “*the new opening between Rooms 3 and 4 shall be blocked up in brickwork laid in a 1:3 lime mortar, and re-plastered, except for the new door and door surround to match that to the righthand side of the fireplace in Room 3 which shall be re-instated in the centre of the opening*”; rewording requirement I to say “*the plasterwork shown in*

photograph 3.64, Room 4, looking SW of the Historic Building Report prepared by Donald Insall Associates, March 2021 (Appendix 2) where the new opening has been created shall be re-instated to Room 4 except where the new door from requirement G is positioned”; and requirements W and X are reworded to say “W. A new single-glazed timber door to match in profile, detail and material the ground floor doors on the apsidal extension, suitably remodelled to 3 window pane width shall be reinstated in the existing opening”; X. New stone voussoirs and door cill to match in terms of size, material, profile and design to the door to the fire escape on the west elevation (photograph 3.10 in the Donald Insall report) shall be re-instated, laid in a lime mortar to match the existing lime mortar on the rear elevation.

Subject to these corrections and variations the appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to allegations A, D, E, L, M and O and listed building consent is granted for the retention of the chandelier in room 1 (A), the painting of the fireplace in room 2 (D), the creation of a new kitchen and painting of panelling in room 3 (E), the installation of a spa bath and new floor to room 31 (L), the installation of fitted wardrobes to room 33 (M) and the removal of the wall between rooms 34 and 35 (O) at Swinfen Hall Hotel, Swinfen, Lichfield, WS14 9RE.

The appeal is dismissed and the listed building enforcement notice is upheld as corrected and varied, insofar as it relates to allegations B (brass door handles), C (entrance door windows), F (new opening between rooms 3 and 4), G (French windows in room 4), H (painting of panelling in room 6), I (painting of organ and fire surrounds in room 6), J (painting of main stair), K (room 10 window), P (headboard in room 35) and Q (door to balcony in room 35) and listed building consent is refused for the retention of the works carried out in contravention of section 9 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended).

Appeal B - 3344531

2. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to breach (b), (c) and (d) and planning permission is granted on the applications deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act (as amended), for (b) the unauthorised engineering operation to create an outdoor swimming pool in the approximate location denoted by a purple rectangle on the enforcement notice plan; (c) the unauthorised operational development to erect ornate metal pillars and gates over 2 metres in height in the approximate location denoted by a green line on the enforcement notice plan; and (d) the unauthorised use of an existing flat roof (above the existing cocktail lounge) as a balcony at Swinfen Hall Hotel, Swinfen, Lichfield, WS14 9RE.
3. The appeal is dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld insofar as it relates to breach (a) and planning permission is refused in respect of (a) the unauthorised engineering operation to create an earth bund in the approximate location denoted by a blue line on the enforcement notice plan, at Swinfen Hall Hotel, Swinfen, Lichfield, WS14 9RE on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act (as amended).

Preliminary Matters

4. The appellant is not contesting certain elements of the two notices. These are from the listed building enforcement notice allegations B (door handles), C (UPVC

windows by front door), G (UPVC French windows in room 4), J (painting of balustrades etc), K (UPVC French window room 10). From the s174 enforcement notice the allegation (a) (creation of bunds). Meanwhile the Council accept the new gates and pillars that have been painted black are acceptable and I shall grant planning permission accordingly.

5. It was also agreed during my site visit that the door between rooms 33 and 34 had not been blocked up. I shall delete this allegation (N) and requirement S.
6. Requirement L refers to the removal of a cabinet from Room 4, but as the appellant pointed out there was no allegation concerning this cabinet. As I saw on my site visit the cabinet was a large, but freestanding piece of furniture which did not appear to be touching the wall. In my view this is not therefore a fixture or fitting and I shall delete requirement L.
7. The appeals against the remaining matters are being pursued on a number of grounds and I shall deal with each allegation in turn, rather than ground by ground.

The Listed Building Enforcement Notice Appeal

8. Allegation A concerns the new chandelier in the main entrance hall. This has been attached to the ceiling through the centre of a plaster rose in the centre of the richly decorated ceiling. Photographs show the central boss had an acanthus leaves decoration which has been removed to enable the installation of the chandelier. Initial photographs from the Council show a rather clunky attachment, but this has now been replaced by a more subtle attachment, similar to another chandelier over the staircase.
9. I agree that such central roses often did have a chandelier, though not apparently this one, but the chandelier does not look inherently out of place. The large entrance hall is well lit by windows on two floors, but that is of little use when dusk comes on, as I saw on my site visit. Consequently, I think the chandelier looks entirely appropriate in this setting. The only problem is the small loss of original plaster to accommodate the support bracket. I do not think this affects the significance of the listed building at all so the NPPF is not engaged. The special architectural or historic interest of the listed building has been affected, but on balance I think it has been preserved and I shall grant listed building consent for these works.
10. Allegation D concerns the painting of the fireplace in room 2. This is a large, ornately decorated carved wooden surround which was varnished a rich brown colour. Originally the door frames, panelling, cornices and skirting were all treated the same. The room has now been painted dark blue with black woodwork. The fire surround is also painted black with lighter paint traces to imitate a rococo marble effect. Only the fire surround is included in the notice, so returning it to a wooden hue would look very odd with the new décor.
11. Quite a lot of the internal decoration which is mostly late 19th Century, does seem as if it was intended to mimic an 18th century country house and some of it, especially the ceilings do seem to have been inspired by the rococo. I am less confident the same could be said of the wooden panelling and the fireplace surround in room 4, which looks much more like traditional Victorian heavy mahogany woodwork. Neither am I convinced the rococo effect has been successful, nevertheless, the return of the fireplace to a wood effect would not

seem to achieve anything particularly useful or historic. I consider that in this room it is the existence of the surround that is significant not necessarily its finish. Consequently there has been no loss of significance and the NPPF is not engaged. The special architectural or historic interest of the listed building has been affected, but on balance I think it has been preserved and I shall grant listed building consent for the fire surround.

12. Allegation E concerns the creation of a kitchen in Room 3. This was a small dining room, but was also once a library, and which was dominated by panelled walls in a dark wood finish. It has been transformed into a modern kitchen, painted white and the walls are lined with kitchen cabinets. The cabinets have been scribed round the dado rail and skirting which continues to exist behind them, and in one instance installed in front of a floor length alcove which was made to look like a matching door into the room, but is now only half height, the bottom half hidden behind the cabinets.
13. I think this is a tricky issue. The purpose of the Act is not to control the use of individual rooms. It is accepted that listed buildings have to change and develop in order to survive so there is nothing inherently wrong in turning an old dining room into a kitchen. In fact changing the internal arrangements was something that was regularly done by new owners to country houses in the 18th and 19th centuries. The question today is twofold, firstly whether those changes affect the significance of the heritage asset and secondly whether the special architectural or historic interest of the character of the building has been preserved. The late 19th century wooden panelling was certainly part of the evolution of the use of the building, but it does not follow that the finish of the panelling is significant. Much of the dado rail and skirting may not be visible today but that is because of the taste of the new owner, it has not been removed. I think that to insist on retaining the panelling, skirting etc as it was, would mean the ability to re-use of the room would be curtailed and might end up with freestanding cabinets placed in front of the walls which would look ridiculous but would evade listed building control.
14. Consequently, I do not think that anything that was intrinsic to the historic value of this room has been lost and it could be returned to its previous look by a process of internal redecoration. Therefore it follows that there has been no loss of significance and the NPPF is not engaged. The special architectural or historic interest of the listed building has been affected, but on balance I think it has been preserved and I shall grant listed building consent for the creation of the kitchen.
15. Allegation F concerns a new opening cut between rooms 3 And 4. This has clearly changed the relationship between rooms 3 and 4, essentially trying to make this end of the two rooms open-plan. There is nothing historic about this either in intention or execution. There has not even been an attempt to match up the skirting boards, with narrower boards used in the new opening. The relationship of rooms to each other and the ability to move between them is of much greater significance than the colour they are painted. Such a large opening is entirely inauthentic and harms the significance of the internal layout and the relationship between the 2 rooms.
16. However, the appellant suggests that a hidden door was discovered within the larger opening once work began. This would originally have matched the door further along the wall in room 3. With the same pedimented surrounds. Photographs attest to the existence of this door. The appellant suggests closing

up the new opening but retaining the door would be a reasonable compromise. I agree. It seems the door was blocked up as part of internal changes made by previous owners so there is no objection to re-opening it. Restoring the skirting and door surrounds would also return to room 3 some of the interior décor that has been covered up by the kitchen cabinets. So success under ground (j) means I shall reword requirement G and replace it with one that enables the door to be reinstated. Requirement H remains unaltered but I shall reword requirement I accordingly.

17. Allegations H and I refer to room 6 which was originally the billiards room. This room was built in the 1890s and was designed as a billiards room. It originally contained an organ, which was removed before the Second World War¹ and the massive wooden organ case repurposed as an entrance to room 7 which was a card room. A similar style “elaborate structure” serves as shelving and cupboards behind the bar fitted into the end of the room. This was originally a fire surround. The organ case and bar structure are huge and significant features of the room. The Insall report notes the room retains a high proportion of original features. It is the painting of the wooden panelling, the bar structure and the organ case that the notice attacks. The panelling was mahogany (or possibly walnut) and the other two were French polished. They have all been painted black along with the walls, ceiling and every other feature.
18. Room 6 did have considerable significance as a room in its own right, given the high proportion of original features and the unusual and prominent bar and organ case features. It has now been transformed and the prominence of the wooden features, in particular the panelling, bar structure and organ case have been reduced to such an extent that there has been clear harm to the significance of the room and a serious effect on the special architectural or historic interest of this part of the listed building. There are no public benefits to outweigh the harm.
19. Allegation L refers to the bathroom in room 31. This was a bedroom prior to its conversion and had an ensuite pod installed in the 1980s. The pod remains but now forms part of the larger bathroom with a spa bath in one corner and a new floor, resting on a cementitious levelling compound itself on hardboard over the original wooden floorboards. The allegation refers to the bath and the floor.
20. Previously the room was carpeted so the floorboards were not visible and neither I (nor I assume the Council) know what state they are in. I cannot see the difference between hiding them under a carpet or a vinyl floor laid on a bed. Certainly the carpet can be removed more easily but the floor is also removable and the floorboards could be revealed in the future. In any event they can hardly be said to be of significance when no-one knows what they look like and they are not mentioned in the Insall report. Given that, then putting a bath where the bed was seems entirely a matter of choice for the owner. No original features have been lost.
21. The same goes for the wardrobes in room 33 – allegation M. Yes, the room has been changed, but to what effect? The wardrobes are fitted, in the sense they are scribed around the skirting and dado, but they could easily be standalone units that would not count as fixtures and would have a similar, if not greater impact. All that is lost is the view of some skirting and dado rail and this does not affect

¹ According to the Donald Insall report (2021) from which all descriptions of the room are taken

significance. There has been an affect on the special architectural or historic interest of the listed building but a very minimal one as the changes are reversible and I shall grant listed building consent accordingly.

22. The allegations O and P run together and refer to room 34 and 35. Room 34 was an ensuite bathroom pod cut into room 35. This has now gone and room 35 opened up to what was its original size. This is a significant improvement in the layout of these rooms and reveals the apparently blank chimney breast that is now in the centre of the wall of room 35 that divides it from room 33. Unfortunately a massive headboard has been fastened to the chimney breast. The headboard extends clumsily across the length of wall beyond the chimney breast and creates a void behind. Restoring the room and chimney breast to its original proportions is a positive benefit that improves the significance of the layout of the room but then the effect is sabotaged by the headboard. Although the impact, in the greater scheme of things, is minor it is less than substantial harm and there are no public benefits to the headboard. I shall therefore grant consent for the matters alleged in O and refuse them for P.
23. Allegation Q is the last internal issue, which links to the enforcement notice element concerning the use of the flat roof. The rear (north elevation) of the original building has a later 19th century apsidal extension. Essentially the central bay has been extended out at ground floor level but matching the original in all its details. This creates a semi-circular flat roof with a blind balustrade. This has, in the past, been accessed through the windows of the bedroom on the first floor. The temptation to use this as a sitting out area has proved too great and the central window has been turned into a full height door, by cutting out the masonry below the window cill and installing a UPVC door.
24. The appellant accepts the current door and opening have been crudely fashioned but suggests a compromise whereby a proper full-length door is installed with stone surrounds to match. The central window/door is already picked out with more prominent stone voussoirs, as is typical around the building as a whole, so turning it into a door would not look out of place. The appellant argues that first floor doors of this type as not unusual in this sort of large country house, which maybe well the case, but as the Council point out the roof was not designed as a balcony otherwise it would have had a door to begin with. However, the apsidal extension has already changed the original look of the wall and covered up the giant pilasters that defined the central bay. As a consequence, the introduction of a door in the central position would not look out of place, nor if it were done properly, would it be particularly noteworthy. Whether it can be seen from the ground is neither here nor there, where it can be seen from it would look like a slightly smaller version of the doors into the apsidal extension, retaining the new symmetry of the façade created by the apsidal extension. Consequently, I do not think there is any harm to significance and shall revise requirements W and X accordingly.

The s174 Enforcement Notice Appeal

25. The only matters left for the enforcement notice appeal are the use of the balcony and the swimming pool. The balcony is that referred to above, the sitting out area on top of the apsidal extension. I cannot really see how sitting on the roof harms the listed building in any way. It looks like a balcony and is now being used as one. It is not large, and is accessed from the master bedroom, so it is unlikely to

be used for anything other than occasional sitting. There is no harm to significance or to the listed building by the use.

26. The swimming pool has been part constructed next to a pergola in a part of the garden to the side of the house. The grounds to the west of the house have been truncated by the HM Young Offenders Institution (YOI) and this is screened from the house by a belt of trees. Directly behind the west elevation is a large tennis court area, screened from the house by a thick and tall conifer hedge. A further hedge stands close to the house creating a grassy corridor that leads to the rest of the garden. Beyond the tennis courts on the western side is a tongue of land between the side of the tennis courts and the edge of the grounds which are partly wrapped round the YOI. This tongue of land is screened on 3 sides by thick hedges, the eastern end is open to views of the house and the formal gardens. It currently contains a large, rectangular pergola, and next to that in the ground and roughly the same size, the hole for the swimming pool. The main formal garden to the house is on the north front and consists of a sunken garden and pool, with a relatively modest lawn leading to a balustrade with a deer park beyond. The eastern side has a walled garden and the main entrance is to the south. Thus the western side has rather lost any sense of formal attachment to the house because of the hedges and that the attention of the house is turned to the north, away from the YOI.
27. I accept there is nothing inherently unhistorical about having a swimming pool associated with a country house and while it is part of the setting of the house, I do not think it is intrusive, or harmful. This section of the grounds has, as described above, already been substantially altered, and the pool has been positioned carefully to be unobtrusive. I do not think there is any harm to significance and I shall grant planning permission for it.
28. There was mention of a plant room, but that does not form part of the notice and is not covered in this decision.

Simon Hand

INSPECTOR