



Appeal Decision

by Ken McEntee

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

Decision date: 8 May 2026

Appeal ref: APP/W5780/C/25/3377181

Land at 159 Ilford Lane, Ilford, London, IG1 2RR

- 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 Javed Akhtar (Javed Halal Meat Ltd) against an enforcement notice issued by the London Borough of Redbridge.
- The notice was issued on 2 December 2025.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is: "Without planning permission, the unauthorised extension to the shop front on the host building on the Land".
- The requirement of the notice is: "i. Remove the single storey front extension (as shown in the photograph at Appendix A of the notice) from the Land, including all materials and debris therefrom."
- The time period for compliance with the requirements of the notice is "no later than (3) months from the date 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. The main basis of the appellant's case is that more time is required to comply with the requirements of the notice in order to appoint contractors and to agree a programme of works in a safe and orderly manner, so as to minimise disruption to the operation of the business. The appellant therefore requests the compliance period be extended to 6 months. While I appreciate the appellant's reasons for this request, I am mindful that more than 4 months have elapsed since the appeal was submitted with enforcement action effectively suspended. As the compliance period will begin again from the date of this decision, the appellant will effectively have had some 7 months in which to make the necessary arrangements to carry out the necessary works to comply with the requirements of the notice – one month more than that requested. Therefore, on the evidence before me, there does not appear to be any good reason to extend the compliance period further. The appeal fails accordingly.

Formal decision

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

K McEntee