



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 May 2026

by **Mark Caine BSc (Hons) MTPL MRTPI LSRA**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 September 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/C/25/3360036

Premises known as 56 St Stephens Road, Hounslow TW3 2BQ

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
- The appeal is made by Mr Yogbir Grewal against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
- The notice was issued on 19 December 2024.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is Without planning permission, the erection of a side roof extension and rear roof extension.
- The requirements of the notice are to:
 - i. Demolish the side roof dormer
 - ii. Demolish the rear roof dormer
 - iii. Restore the roof to a condition prior to the breaching taking place
 - iv. Remove all resultant debris from the LandOR
 - i. Carry out roof extensions works in accordance to plans submitted under planning reference P/2022/0446
 - ii. Remove all resultant debris from the Land.
- The period for compliance with the requirements is: 6 months after the date 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 succeeds to the extent that the enforcement notice is upheld with corrections and variations in the terms set out below in the Formal Decision.

The Enforcement Notice

1. Section 176(1) of the Act states that, on appeal, the Secretary of State may (a) correct any defect, error or misdescription in the enforcement notice; or (b) vary the terms of the enforcement notice, if they are satisfied that the correction will not cause injustice to the appellant or the LPA.
2. To ensure that the requirements are described in the same terms as the allegation, and for the purposes of consistency and clarity, the terms “side roof extension” and “rear roof extension” in section 3 of the notice should be changed to “side roof dormer” and “rear roof dormer”. The wording of the requirement to “carry out roof extensions works in accordance to plans” in section 5 is also not consistent with the description of the other terms in the notice or grammatically correct. This should be replaced with “Build the side and rear roof dormers in accordance with the plans”. In addition, there is a typographical error in the requirement to “Restore the roof to a (my emphasis) condition prior to the breach taking place”. This should be replaced with “Restore the roof to its condition prior to the breach taking place”.
3. I am satisfied that I can make these corrections without causing injustice to the appellant or the Council.

The appeal on ground (f)

4. An appeal on ground (f) is brought on the grounds that the steps required by the notice to be taken exceed what is necessary to remedy any breach of planning control which may be constituted by those matters stated in the notice or, as the case may be, remedy any injury to amenity which has been caused by such breach.
5. Section 173(4) of the 1990 Act states that the purpose of an enforcement notice is to (a) remedy the breach of planning control, or (b) remedy any injury to amenity which has been caused by the breach. The 1990 Act sets out that the breach may be remedied by making the development comply with the terms of any planning permission granted in respect of the land, by discontinuing any use of the land or by restoring the land to its condition before the breach took place.
6. In this case, the corrected requirements of the notice are to demolish the side and rear roof dormers and restore the roof to its condition before the breach took place, or to construct the development in accordance with previously approved plans. Accordingly, the purpose is clearly to remedy the breach of control.
7. I have been made aware that in the time since the service of the enforcement notice, planning permission has been granted for the retention and alterations to a rear roof extension, part first floor rear extension and side roof extension to No 56 (Ref: P/2025/0322). The differences between what has been built and what is permitted are clearly documented and the remedial works required to comply with the permission are readily apparent.
8. However, correcting and varying the notice to delete reference to the demolition of the side and rear roof dormers and compliance with the originally approved plans is unnecessary. This is because I am able to vary the notice to allow for the further option of complying with planning permission P/2025/0322. Whilst it is recognised this option may result in less cost and disruption (indeed the rear dormer, as built, appears to accord with this approval), any of the three compliance options would serve to remedy the breach. However, without introducing the third option I concur that the requirements would be excessive.

The appeal on ground (g)

9. The appeal on ground (g) is made on the basis that the period specified in the notice falls short of what should reasonably be allowed. The period for compliance is 6 months as set out in the header of this decision.
10. The appellant is seeking a compliance period of 9 months to allow time to raise funds for the required works and to secure a builder. However, the removal or rebuilding of the dormers are likely to be relatively small-scale and straightforward operations for a suitably experienced small building contractor. Such works are also likely to be of limited duration, perhaps taking a few months to complete.
11. No specific details have been advanced concerning any difficulties in securing the services of suitable local contractors, or of extensive delays in their availability to undertake work. There is also no substantiated evidence to persuade me that the appellant's financial position is such that he does not have the finances to carry out the works required by the notice, in the period specified, or that this would lead to any mental stress.

12. As such, I consider 6 months to be a reasonable and a proportionate response to the breach of planning control that has occurred. The appeal on ground (g) therefore fails.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the requirements of the notice are excessive to remedy the breach of planning control. I shall vary the enforcement notice prior to upholding it. The appeal on ground (f) succeeds to that extent.

Formal Decision

14. It is directed that the enforcement notice is corrected by:

- The deletion of the wording in section 3 in its entirety and the substitution of the following wording instead:

“3. THE BREACH OF PLANNING CONTROL ALLEGED

Without planning permission, the erection of a side roof dormer and rear roof dormer.”

15. It is directed that the enforcement notice is corrected and varied by:

- The deletion of paragraph 5 in its entirety and its substitution with the following new paragraph 5:

“5. WHAT YOU ARE REQUIRED TO DO

- i. Demolish the side roof dormer.
- ii. Demolish the rear roof dormer.
- iii. Restore the roof to its condition prior to the breach taking place.
- iv. Remove all resultant debris from the Land.

OR

- i. Build the side roof dormer and rear roof dormer in accordance with the plans submitted under planning reference P/2022/0446.
- ii. Remove all resultant debris from the Land.

OR

- i. The side roof dormer and rear roof dormer shall be altered to comply with the terms of the planning permission ref P/2025/0322, dated 28 March 2025 for the retention and alterations to a rear roof extension, part first floor rear extension and side roof extension to the house, including the conditions subject to which that permission was granted.
- ii. Remove all resultant debris from the Land.”

16. Subject to these corrections and variations, the enforcement notice is upheld.

Mark Caine INSPECTOR