



Appeal Decision

by Ken McEntee

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

Decision date: 2 June 2026

Appeal ref: APP/N5660/C/26/3377229
Land at 20 Liston Road, London, SW4 0DF

- 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 Oliver Marshall against an enforcement notice issued by the London Borough of Lambeth.
- The notice was issued on 27 November 2025.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is: "Without planning permission, the installation of a rear wooden terrace with wooden balustrade (in between the top floor of the three-storey outriggers) and replacement of the wooden access door with a larger aluminium door ("the unauthorised rear roof terrace and aluminium door").
- The requirements of the notice are: "a) Remove the unauthorised rear roof terrace and aluminium door - and reinstate the wooden access door and affected elevations as existed prior to the breach of planning control; and b) Remove all associated waste and debris resulting from compliance with the above steps, from the premises".
- The time period for compliance with the requirements of the notice is "Four months after 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 appellant believes that the period to comply with the requirements of the notice is too short as it doesn't allow sufficient time to raise funds, appoint a contractor and to schedule the works. He therefore requests that the compliance period be extended to 9 months.
2. While I acknowledge the appellant's reasons this request, I am also mindful that some 5 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 the 9 months requested in which to undertake the processes he describes and to carry out the necessary works to comply with the requirements of the notice. Therefore, on the evidence before me, there is no good reason to justify extending the compliance period further. The appeal fails accordingly.
3. However, while I am dismissing the appeal, I note that there is a currently an outstanding planning appeal (6001652) for retrospective permission for the enlargement of the existing terrace and door, that is yet to be decided. If this should cause any genuine difficulties for the appellant, it is open to him to submit

a request to the Council to use their powers under section 173A(1)(b) of the 1990 Act to extend the compliance period themselves, should they be satisfied there is justification for doing so.

Formal decision

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

K McEntee