



Appeal Decision

by M Ollerenshaw BSc (Hons) MTPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 June 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/C/25/3375065

Land at Flat 22, Regents Plaza, 8 Grenville Road, London, NW6 5HU

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Maurice Shasha, Turnpine Ltd against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The notice was issued on 18 September 2025.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is without planning permission: the material change of use of the first floor flat to use as a temporary sleeping accommodation.
 - The requirements of the notice are to cease the use of the unit for temporary sleeping accommodation.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is one month.
 - 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. It is directed that the enforcement notice be varied by deleting the requirement under section 5 (What you are required to do) and substituting the following:
“Cease the use of the unit for temporary sleeping accommodation, except insofar as such use is permitted by section 25A of the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1973, as amended by the Deregulation Act 2015”.
2. Subject to this variation, the appeal is dismissed, and the enforcement notice is upheld.

Preliminary Matters

3. No site visit was necessary as the appeal can be determined based on the written evidence. There were no objections from the parties to this approach and I am satisfied no injustice would be caused.
4. S25A of the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1973, as amended by the Deregulation Act 2015, permits the use of residential premises in Greater London as temporary sleeping accommodation for up to 90 nights per calendar year provided certain conditions are met; beyond these limits, the use constitutes a material change of use requiring consent. The parties make submissions regarding the relationship between short-term letting and class C3 use¹. However, there is no dispute that the use as temporary sleeping accommodation has exceeded the 90 nights annual limit such that there has been a material change of use, as alleged.

The appeal on ground (f)

5. An appeal on ground (f) is that the steps required by the notice exceed what is necessary to remedy any breach of planning control or, as the case may be, to remedy any injury to amenity which has been caused by any such breach.

¹ Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended).

6. The notice requires the use as temporary sleeping accommodation to cease. That would remedy the breach of planning control, consistent with section 173(4) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
7. The basis of the appellant's ground (f) appeal is that the requirement to cease the use as temporary sleeping accommodation is unreasonable because the property can be lawfully used for this purpose within use class C3 for up to 90 nights per calendar year. The notice does not prevent the appellant from using the property for any use that may be lawful under the Deregulation Act 2015. However, for the avoidance of doubt, I shall vary the requirement to clarify that the use as temporary sleeping accommodation shall cease, except insofar as such use is permitted by section 25A of the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1973, as amended by the Deregulation Act 2015. This variation would clarify the requirements whilst still remedying the breach of planning control, and no injustice would be caused.
8. The appeal on ground (f) succeeds to this limited extent.

The appeal on ground (g)

9. An appeal on this ground is that the period given for compliance with the notice falls short of what should reasonably be allowed. The compliance period is one month.
10. The appellant requests a 90 day compliance period to align with the 90 nights allowance under the Deregulation Act 2015. However, the purpose of the compliance period is to give sufficient time to remedy the breach, rather than to reflect the scope of any lawful use under separate legislation, and extending the compliance period to 90 days would enable the continuation of the breach. The one month compliance period is reasonable given that the short-term visitor lettings can be ceased quickly, future bookings can be cancelled, and no physical works are required by the notice.
11. For the above reasons, I conclude that one month is a reasonable and proportionate period to comply with the requirements. The appeal on ground (g) therefore fails.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should partially succeed on ground (f) only, and I shall uphold the enforcement notice with a variation.

M Offerenshaw

INSPECTOR