



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2025

by **A Berry MTCP (Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/C/23/3327724

27 Eva Road, Chadwell Heath, Romford RM6 4NA

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) ("the 1990 Act").
 - The appeal is made by Mr K Pindoria against an enforcement notice ("EN") issued by the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The EN was issued on 14 July 2023.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the EN is: Without planning permission, the construction of an unauthorised front porch.
 - The requirements of the EN are to:
 - (i) Remove the porch in its entirety; and
 - (ii) Remove all debris from site.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is: Six months from the date the notice takes effect.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a) and (g) of the 1990 Act. 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 1990 Act.
-

Decision

1. It is directed that the EN is corrected and varied by:

- *the deletion of the words "Without planning permission, the construction of an unauthorised front porch" and their substitution with the words "Without planning permission, the erection of a partially completed front porch" in section 3; and*
- *the deletion of the words "(i) Remove the porch in its entirety" and their substitution with the words "(i) Remove the partially completed front porch" in section 5.*

Subject to the correction and variation, the appeal is dismissed, the EN is upheld, and planning permission is refused on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended.

Matters Concerning the Notice

2. The wording of the alleged breach of planning control forms the basis of the deemed planning permission and therefore it needs to be accurate. The alleged breach of planning control as set out in the EN implies that the front porch is complete. However, the evidence before me and what I saw on my site visit indicate that it is unfinished.
3. I sought the parties' views on correcting the alleged breach of planning control to "...the erection of a partially completed front porch". Both parties agreed to it being corrected in this way. As the amended description accurately reflects the

development that has occurred, I am satisfied that no injustice would be caused by the correction. I have therefore determined the appeal based on the corrected breach.

4. As a consequence of correcting the alleged breach of planning control, requirement (i) should also be varied to align with the breach. As this variation would be for precision, I am satisfied that it would not cause injustice to either party.

Appeal on Ground (a) and the Deemed Planning Permission

5. An appeal under ground (a) is that planning permission should be granted for the matters alleged. The **main issue** is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Background

6. The property is an end of terrace, two-storey dwelling. At the time of my site visit it was apparent that the dwelling had recently been extended and building work was continuing. The property had the appearance of a building site with hoardings surrounding the front garden. The unauthorised porch has been erected in front of the dwelling's front door. It comprises blockwork walls and a dual pitched roof. The porch is incomplete with temporary boarding in place of the windows and door, and there is no render to the exterior walls.
7. Success on ground (a) and the deemed planning permission can only relate to the partially completed porch. Planning permission cannot be granted for works that would allow the porch to be completed. Consequently, I can only assess the effect of the partially completed porch on the main issue.

Reasons

8. The dwelling is located on a residential street that is characterised by two-storey dwellings grouped predominantly into terraces of four. The dwellings' front elevations originally matched. However, various alterations and extensions have resulted in a more mixed appearance. Notwithstanding this, porches in the vicinity of the appeal site tend to have a mono-pitch roof and are of a similar scale.
9. I acknowledge that the dwelling has a dual pitched gable above the bay window and that the partially completed porch's roof reflects this design feature. However, the dual pitched roof is incongruous with the design of the original porches within the street and is further emphasised by the dwelling's siting in a prominent location at the head of Arthur Road.
10. The appellant asserts that if the partially completed porch's height was reduced to 3m, it would comprise permitted development and still have a dual pitched roof. This has not been disputed by the Council. However, the unfinished appearance of the porch is unsightly, and it significantly detracts from the surrounding area. As such, it would be inappropriate to grant planning permission for the partially completed development.
11. The appellant has directed me to a map showing the location of other gable roofs in the local area, and planning approvals for porches with a dual-pitched roof. However, none of these examples are on the same street as the appeal site and

therefore, they are not directly comparable. In any event, I must determine each case on its own merits.

12. For these reasons, the partially completed porch harms the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It therefore conflicts with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030, adopted 2018 which, amongst other things, seek to ensure high quality design in all development in the borough, and that development respects the local character of the area and makes a positive architectural and urban design contribution to its context and location.

Other Matters

13. The appellant asserts that the porch is required for family members who are visually impaired and require additional natural light to the porch to improve their living standards. I am sympathetic to the needs of the family members. However, the dwelling is currently unoccupied. Even if the dwelling was occupied, I am not persuaded from the evidence before me that light levels could not be increased with a smaller porch or a porch of a different design.

Conclusion on Ground (a) and the Deemed Planning Permission

14. For the reasons given above, having regard to the development plan as a whole and all other material considerations, I conclude that the appeal on ground (a) should be dismissed, and the deemed planning permission should be refused.

Appeal on Ground (g)

15. An appeal under ground (g) is that the period specified for compliance with the EN falls short of what should reasonably be allowed. The period for compliance specified in the EN is six months. The appellant has not provided any reasons why the 6 month period is unreasonable, and no alternative period has been offered.
16. The porch is a relatively small structure and is unfinished. I have not been provided with evidence to suggest that its removal would be overly complicated or time consuming. Therefore, six months is sufficient for a contractor to be appointed, and the porch demolished. Alternatively, six months would also provide adequate time for a planning application to be determined for a porch.

Conclusion on Ground (g)

17. Consequently, I find that the six month compliance period afforded by the EN does not fall short of what is reasonable.

Overall Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed. I shall uphold the EN with a correction and a variation and refuse to grant planning permission on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act.

A Berry

INSPECTOR