



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 June 2026

by V Goldberg BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 July 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/C/25/3374501

Land at 335 High Street, Slough SL1 1TX

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) (the Act)
- The appeal is made by Ms Ramanjeet Kaur against an enforcement notice issued by Slough Borough Council.
- The notice was issued on 12 September 2025.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is: Without planning permission, the unauthorised erection of a front extension.
- The requirements of the notice are to:
 - 5.1 Demolish the front extension in its entirety.
 - 5.2 Permanently remove from the land all materials, rubbish, debris, plant and machinery resulting from compliance with the above requirement.
- The period for compliance with the requirements is: (2) calendar months after this 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).

Summary of decision: The appeal is dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld with variations in the terms set out below in the Formal Decision.

The Enforcement Notice

1. The requirements of the Enforcement Notice (EN) seek the demolition of the front extension and the removal of all materials arising from that demolition. However, the inclusion of the words “in its entirety” within requirement 5.1 are unnecessary. This is because the requirement to demolish the extension is clear, as the ordinary meaning of demolition is to take down and remove a structure in full. The addition of the words “in its entirety” therefore adds no further precision and therefore they are unnecessary.
2. Similarly, the inclusion of the word “permanently” within requirement 5.2 is unnecessary. The removal of the items concerned would, in themselves, remedy the breach of planning control. Moreover, section 181(1) of the Act provides that compliance with an EN does not discharge the notice; its effect endures. Accordingly, any failure to remove all materials, rubbish, debris, plant and machinery resulting from compliance or their subsequent reintroduction, would constitute a further breach, irrespective of whether the term “permanently” is included.
3. For these reasons, requirements 5.1 and 5.2 of the EN are varied by the deletion of the words “in its entirety” from 5.1 and “permanently” from 5.2. These variations do not result in injustice to either party, as the terms are unnecessary and their removal does not materially alter the scope or effectiveness of the EN.

Preliminary Matter

4. As the EN was issued after the 25 April 2024, the ground (a) appeal is barred as the requirements of s174(2A) have been met. Namely, the EN was issued within the two year period after the making of a related application that is no longer under consideration. Consequently, in determining this appeal, I am unable to take account of any planning merits, and my consideration is confined to matters relating to the ground (f) and (g) appeals.

Appeal on Ground (f)

5. An appeal is brought under ground (f) on the basis that the steps required by the EN exceed what is necessary to remedy any breach of planning control identified in the Notice, or, as the case may be, to remedy any injury to amenity arising from that breach.
6. The EN requires the demolition of the front extension. I am therefore satisfied that the purpose of the EN is to remedy the breach of planning control, a position with which the appellant agrees.
7. The appellant submits that, insofar as the Council's concerns relate to the design, materials, or height of the front extension, such matters could be addressed through modifications to the development. In particular, the appellant suggests that the requirements of the EN be varied to secure a reduction in the height of the structure's side walls.
8. However, there is no mechanism before me to impose any necessary conditions to ensure that such modifications would adequately address the identified concerns. Moreover, while a revised scheme of this nature may fall within the scope of the development as carried out, no detailed proposals have been provided for my assessment. In the absence of such details, it is not for me to determine what form or extent of height reduction would be acceptable.
9. The appellant further asserts that the requirement to demolish the front extension would cost £3,000- £5,000 and the appellant could subsequently rebuild a seating area with the same footprint. However, in the context of a ground (f) appeal, any lesser steps which would fail to achieve the purpose of the EN cannot be accepted.
10. Given that the purpose of the EN is to remedy the breach of planning control, the only means of compliance identified is the removal of the front extension. Consequently, I find that the requirements of the EN are appropriate to remedy the breach of planning control. The steps required by the EN do not exceed what is necessary to achieve that purpose. The appellant has not advanced any lesser steps that would secure the same outcome, and therefore the appeal under ground (f) fails.

Appeal on Ground (g)

11. An appeal on ground (g) is brought on the grounds that the period specified for compliance falls short of what is reasonable. The appellant seeks to extend the period from two to six months to allow time to appoint contractors, organise the safe removal of the structure, and, potentially, to obtain a highway safety licence to undertake works adjacent to a public footpath.

12. However, the appellant has not demonstrated that it would not be possible to appoint a contractor and complete the required works within two months. Given the straightforward nature of the demolition, I am not persuaded that a longer compliance period is necessary. Furthermore, the potential requirement for a highway safety licence has not been substantiated, particularly as the appellant indicates that the structure is located wholly within their land and does not encroach onto the public footpath.
13. With regard to the appellant's claim that additional time is required to pursue modifications to the structure, this would be a matter for the appellant to negotiate with the Council should a further application to amend the scheme be submitted.
14. In determining what constitutes a reasonable period for compliance, I have had regard to the planning harm arising from the unauthorised development. The two-month period strikes a proportionate balance between allowing sufficient time to comply and securing the prompt remedy of the breach of planning control.
15. On the evidence before me, I am not persuaded that the compliance period is unreasonable or that an extension to six months is justified. Accordingly, the appeal on ground (g) fails.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed. I shall uphold the EN with variations.

Formal Decision

17. It is directed that the enforcement notice is varied by:
 - the deletion of the words "*Demolish the front extension in its entirety*" and their substitution with the words: "*Demolish the front extension*" in requirement 5.1 of the enforcement notice; and;
 - the deletion of the words "*Permanently remove from the land all materials, rubbish, debris, plant and machinery resulting from compliance with the above requirement*" and their substitution with the words: "*Remove from the land all materials, rubbish, debris, plant and machinery resulting from compliance with the above requirement*" in requirement 5.2 of the enforcement notice.
17. Subject to the variations, the appeal is dismissed, and the enforcement notice is upheld.

V Goldberg

INSPECTOR