



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 October 2025

by H Whitfield BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/25/3370506

Unit 2, 210 Ilford Lane, Redbridge, Ilford IG1 2LW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Sajid Khan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref is 1155/25.
 - The development proposed is described as “Retention of front canopy with pvc roof used for customer waiting”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is invalid and therefore I am unable to determine it.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application form states that the development has been completed, which aligns with my site visit observations. The development constructed appears to be in accordance with the submitted plans insofar as they depict the design of the front extension.
3. Section 79(6) of The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 provides that if, before or during the determination of the appeal, the Secretary of State forms the opinion that planning permission for that development could not have been granted by the local planning authority, they may decline to determine the appeal. This can include applications for planning permission that have not been validly made.

Reasons

4. Article 7 of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (the DMPO) sets out the general requirements for applications for planning permission. This includes the requirement to submit a plan which identifies the land to which the application relates and any other plans, drawings and information necessary to describe the development.
5. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) indicates that as a minimum, applicants must submit a location plan that shows the application site in relation to the surrounding area. The application site should be edged clearly with a red line on the location plan, include all land necessary to carry out the development and a blue line should be drawn around any other land owned by the applicant, close to or adjoining the application site¹.
6. The planning application was accompanied by a location plan², elevations and floor plans³. The location plan shows a red line around part of a larger building which is

¹ 'Making an application' Paragraphs: 023 & 024 Reference IDs: 14-023-20140306 & 14-024-20140306

² Included on plan ref. A00 Rev. A

³ Refs. A01 Rev. A, A02 Rev. A, A03 Rev. A & A04 Rev. A

annotated as Unit 2. The red line is drawn flush with the front of the building facing Ilford Lane. Dashed lines are shown around the front and side of the building outside of the red line. From my site visit observations, the location plan does not appear to accurately depict the surrounding built form. For example, to the north of the site is a fuel station, the shape and positioning of which does not appear to correspond with the plans.

7. The location plan shows the front of the building running in line with the extent of the Jubilee Gardens Park site to the south. From my site observations, no building exists to the south. However, the back edge of the footway runs in line with the front elevation of the wider building of which the appeal site is apart. This also broadly aligns with built form on the corner of Mayville Road (annotated as Jersey Road on the location plan) and Ilford Lane. The balconies on the front elevation of the appeal building project beyond this line and it is beneath the balcony where the front extension has been constructed. Taking this into account, the red line boundary delineating the application site does not incorporate the constructed single storey extension which projects beyond the front elevation of the wider building as it is shown on the plans.
8. Comments have been sought from both parties on this matter. In response, the appellant supplied an alternative plan showing a location plan and existing block plan⁴. However, this plan offers no further detail or clarification, and the Council has confirmed that this was not a plan upon which it based its decision. The Council states it read the location plan as including the overhanging balconies on the building within the red line. However, the plans are not sufficiently detailed for this to be definitive and for the reasons given above, I do not consider this to be the case.
9. The PPG is clear that the application site must be edged in red and this must include all land necessary to carry out the development. The submitted location plan therefore does not comply with national guidance and requirements. Amended plans have not been sought as part of the determination of this appeal to address this matter as all parties to appeal proceedings have a responsibility to avoid unnecessary delays. The submission of amendments at this stage would also potentially require additional notifications to be undertaken and could prejudice interested parties. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the planning application that is the subject of this appeal was not validly made, and the Council could not have granted planning permission for the development.
10. An Inspector can only consider the merits of an application and determine a subsequent appeal if they are satisfied that a valid planning application was made in the first instance. Whether the Council validated and determined the application is not determinative. In this instance, the planning application did not comply with the requirements of the DMPO or the PPG and thus it was invalid. I therefore have no jurisdiction to determine the appeal or consider the planning merits of the development.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons, I find the appeal to be invalid. Accordingly, I decline to determine the appeal and propose to take no further action.

H Whitfield

INSPECTOR

⁴ Titled 'Plans (Front Extension)' ref. A00 Rev. A