



Appeal Decision

by Ken McEntee

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

Decision date: 13 August 2026

Appeal ref: APP/D1780/C/26/3377915

Land at 124 Bevois Valley Road, Southampton, Hants, SO14 0JZ

- 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 Mohammed Azad Majid against an enforcement notice issued by Southampton City Council.
- The notice was issued on 15 January 2026.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is "Without planning permission, the material change of use of the Land to six serviced apartments".
- The requirements of the notice are: "(i) Cease the use of the Land as six serviced apartments; (ii) Remove all fixtures and fittings from the Land that facilitate the breach of planning control; and (iii) Remove all resulting materials from the Land arising from compliance with paragraph (ii) above".
- The period for compliance with the requirements of the notice is: "Three 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. It appears clear that the main basis of the appellant's case for requiring more time to comply with the requirements of the notice, is due to the impact a 3-month period would have on existing bookings. I note he has provided evidence of those bookings. The appellant therefore requests that the compliance period be extended to 6 months.
2. I note the appellant's reasons for this request, but I am also mindful that some 6 months have elapsed since the appeal was submitted with enforcement action effectively suspended and the apartment bookings are for September 2026. As the period for compliance will begin again from the date of this decision, the appellant will effectively have had some 9 months in which to comply with the requirements of the notice, which is 3 months more than that requested. I also note that planning appeal 6005235 in relation to a proposed temporary change of use to serviced apartments for a period of 3 years, was dismissed on 8 July 2026.
3. Therefore, on the evidence before me, there is no good reason to extend the compliance period further and I take the view that the stated harm caused by the unauthorised use should be brought to an end as soon as possible. The ground (g) appeal fails accordingly.

Formal decision

4. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld without variation.

K McEntee