
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 December 2025

by Felicity Thompson BA(Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/C/25/3370727

64 Stoneleigh Road, Clayhall, Ilford IG5 0JE

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Kamal Ahmed against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The notice was issued on 8 July 2025.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is unauthorised front porch and canopy.
 - The requirements of the notice are to:
 - i Remove the front porch; and
 - ii Remove the front canopy in its entirety; and
 - iii Remove all resultant debris from site.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is four months.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a), (f) and (g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act (as amended), for the front porch at 64 Stoneleigh Road, Clayhall, Ilford IG5 0JE.
2. The appeal is dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld insofar as it relates to the canopy at 64 Stoneleigh Road, Clayhall, Ilford IG5 0JE and planning permission is refused for the canopy on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act (as amended).

The appeal on ground (a) the deemed planning application

Background and Main Issue

3. Planning permission was previously refused by the Council and dismissed on appeal¹ for the front porch and canopy subject of this appeal. It is against this background that I have considered the appeal.
4. The main issue is the effect of the porch and canopy on the character and appearance of the property and area generally.

Reasons

5. The appeal property was formerly semi-detached but is now attached to the neighbouring 62 Stoneleigh Road by extensions. Whilst properties in the area include similar design features, many have been altered by replacement windows, and extensions, including front porch additions of varying appearance.

¹ APP/W5780/D/24/3353720

6. As I saw at my visit and as shown in the appellant's photographs, white columns are used in some front porch extensions. However, as the previous Inspector concluded, while through the passage of time these have become part of the area, they are not so prevalent that they could be described as characteristic.
7. The porch has a gabled roof form which sits just below the first-floor window. Whilst relatively large, as also stated by the previous Inspector, the general form and proportions reflect the projections to the front of the property, and there are other similar gable style porches in the locality, including at No.62.
8. However, the deep flat roof canopy has an awkward relationship with the porch and bay window, essentially dissecting them. Together with the columns, which do not reflect the character or style of the property, the canopy appears as a dominant and incongruous addition which materially harms the character and appearance of the property and surrounding area.
9. I have had regard to the images provided of other porch/canopy extensions, some of which I saw at my visit. However, whilst comparable in most cases in terms of scale and all feature similar columns, none have a flat roof canopy with the same awkward relationship with the porch. These are not therefore directly comparable, and their existence does not provide a strong argument to justify the appeal development.
10. The terms of the appeal on ground (a) derive directly from the alleged breach of planning control set out in the notice and as built. Nevertheless, I do have the power under section 177(1)(a) of the 1990 Act to grant planning permission for any part of the matters stated in the notice.
11. Under ground (f) the appellant proposed an alternative which included the removal of around 50% of the canopy, broadly the section which overlaps the bay window, and the replacement of the columns with brick piers to match the house. However, there would still be a fairly significant section of the canopy remaining and removing only part would not overcome its awkward and harmful appearance with the porch.
12. Overall, for the reasons given the porch and canopy together cause harm to the character and appearance of the property and area generally, contrary to policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015 – 2030 Adopted March 2018. Together these require high quality design which complements the character of the building, and which maintains or improves the appearance of the street scene.
13. However, since it seems the canopy could be removed without the removal of the porch, and since the porch alone would cause no harm to the character and appearance of the property and area generally, I consider it appropriate to issue a split decision. I therefore intend to grant planning permission under s177(5) of the 1990 Act for the porch. No conditions are necessary since the development is complete.

Other Matters

14. I recognise that this appeal concerns the appellant's home and family life. However, it does not follow that removal of the canopy would be a violation of their rights. Dismissing the appeal is a proportionate response necessary in the wider

public interest, given the identified harm and as such, would be a justified interference with the appellant's Human Rights.

The appeal on ground (f)

15. The appeal on ground (f) is that the requirements of the notice exceed what is necessary.
16. The appellant's case under ground (f) I have already considered under ground (a). Although planning permission has been granted in respect of parts of the development enforced against, the notice has been upheld without varying any requirements relating to them, since this could have given rise to two separate planning permissions, namely the one that has been granted in this appeal decision and the one that would be deemed to be granted by section 173(11) due to under-enforcement.
17. The appeal on ground (f) fails.

The appeal on ground (g)

18. The appeal on ground (g) is that the period for compliance with the notice falls short of what is reasonable. Given what I have set out above, four months is a reasonable period to remove only the canopy. Accordingly, the appeal on ground (g) fails.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should succeed in part only, and I will grant planning permission for the front porch at 64 Stoneleigh Road, Clayhall, Ilford IG5 0JE, but otherwise I will uphold the notice and refuse to grant planning permission in respect of the canopy. The requirements of the notice will cease to have effect so far as inconsistent with the planning permission which I will grant by virtue of section 180 of the 1990 Act (as amended).

Felicity Thompson

INSPECTOR