



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 March 2026

by V Bond LLB (Hons) Solicitor (Non-Practising)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 APRIL 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/C/25/3365624

Land at 141 Windsor Road, Forest Gate, LONDON, E7 0RA

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Khalid Yousaf against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
 - The notice was issued on 23 April 2025.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is Without planning permission the installation of a front door.
 - The requirements of the notice are: 1) Remove the front door (as shown edged in yellow on the photograph attached at Appendix 1); 2) On completion of step 1, remove all materials and debris from the site.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is: Three months.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a), (c) and (f) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). 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 Act.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed, the enforcement notice 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.

The appeal on ground (c)

2. The appeal on this ground is that the matters alleged do not constitute a breach of planning control. The onus is on the appellant to make their case on the balance of probabilities.
3. Section 191(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (1990 Act) states that operations are lawful at any time if (a) no enforcement action may then be taken in respect of them (whether because they did not involve development or require planning permission, because the time for enforcement action has expired, or for any other reason); and (b) they do not constitute a contravention of any of the requirements of any enforcement notice then in force.
4. The basis for the appellant's ground (c) appeal is that the Woodgrange Conservation Area Design Guide (DG) referenced by the LPA was not subject to proper consultation and so 'cannot be relied upon'. No substantive evidence is submitted to support this claim and the LPA has provided evidence related to consultation with its appeal statement. In any event, the weight to be accorded to the DG is connected to the assessment of planning merits under ground (a) and does not impact upon lawfulness for the purposes of s191(2) of the 1990 Act.

5. The LPA has outlined that a 2018 Article 4 Direction is in effect in respect of the appeal property which removed permitted development rights including those related to the appeal development. The appeal development does not therefore benefit from deemed planning permission pursuant to the GPDO¹. The appellant has not made any detailed submission that the door installed does not represent development requiring planning permission and, in my view, it has materially affected the external appearance of the building by reason of introducing a contemporary design feature which is prominent in public views of the property.
6. The appellant has not then demonstrated on the balance of probability that the appeal development does not represent a breach of planning control. The ground (c) appeal fails.

The appeal on ground (a) and the deemed planning application (DPA)

Preliminary Matters

7. On 16 December 2025 the Government published a consultation on proposed reforms to the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (Framework). These proposals could be subject to further change and can only be given very limited weight at this stage. It has therefore not been necessary to consult the parties on the changes.

Main Issue

8. The main issue is whether or not the appeal development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Woodgrange Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

9. The DG describes the Woodgrange Estate as having been built as 'a smart middle class Victorian suburb between 1877 and 1892' with houses that were 'given a distinctive character and set in attractive surroundings'. While there are some examples of modern replacement doors within the CA, original timber front doors remain a strong characterising feature.
10. The DG outlines that original front doors should be repaired, restored and kept, with reference made to a characteristic timber four-panelled half glazed design. It is indicated that replacement doors should be purpose-made by a specialist door company or joiner.
11. The door which is the subject of the notice is a modern replacement door which does not feature a traditional four panelled design but instead displays a curved glazing design, along with contemporary style door furniture. I note that the front door installed was handmade to the owner's design at considerable cost and replaced a non-original set of doors which were also not of a traditional design. The appellant also considers the newly installed door to be a 'significant improvement' on the doors previously in situ. However, in my view, the very obviously contemporary design of the replacement front door represents a visually jarring feature in the street scene which materially erodes the historic character of the CA.
12. The appellant refers to there being 'many' replacement front doors within the CA, referencing modern designs and differing styles. I do not have details of the

¹ Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015

particular circumstances leading to these developments but the presence of other harmful development does not justify further harm resulting from the appeal development. The appellant has indicated acceptance of any planning conditions deemed necessary but the harm identified cannot in my view be overcome by the imposition of conditions.

Public Benefits and Heritage Balancing

13. I have identified harm to the significance of the CA as outlined above. In view of the nature of the development, I find the harm caused to be less than substantial in the terms of paragraph 212 of the Framework, but nevertheless this is due to considerable importance and weight. In these circumstances, paragraph 214 of the Framework indicates that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the development. The appellant has outlined that there is a private financial cost if the appeal development is not permitted but no public benefits have been put forward that outweigh the less than substantial harm identified.
14. I conclude then on the main issue that the appeal development does not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA and conflicts in this way with Policies SP1, SP3, SP5 and SP8 of the London Borough of Newham Local Plan 2018 which seek development that contributes to local distinctiveness and integrates with the street scene, along with the conservation of heritage assets.
15. There is a failure to accord also with Policies D4, D8 and HC1 of the London Plan 2021 which strive to ensure good design and a sense of place together with protection of the historic environment. Conflict also arises with the DG and the Framework for the reasons outlined above. In reaching this conclusion, I have had regard to my statutory duty under s72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Overall conclusion on ground (a) and the DPA

16. The appeal development causes harm to the character and appearance of the CA contrary to the development plan read as a whole. No material considerations are advanced which warrant a decision other than in accordance with the development plan. The ground (a) appeal therefore fails and planning permission will be refused in respect of the DPA.

The appeal on ground (f)

17. This ground of appeal is that the requirements of the notice exceed what is necessary.
18. S.173 of the 1990 Act indicates that there are two purposes which the requirements of an enforcement notice can seek to achieve. The first is to remedy the breach of planning control which has occurred; the second is to remedy an injury to amenity which has been caused by the breach. The fact that the notice in this case requires removal of the front door installed and removal of resultant materials and debris suggests that its purpose is to remedy the breach of planning control.
19. The appellant's submissions under ground (f) have been addressed in my dealing with the planning merits of the development under ground (a). While I acknowledge the financial cost to the appellant in the installation of the appeal development, this is not enough to indicate that the requirements of the notice

exceed what is necessary to remedy the breach of planning control. The ground (f) appeal accordingly fails.

Conclusion

20. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed. I shall uphold the enforcement notice and refuse to grant planning permission on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act (as amended).

V Bond

INSPECTOR