



Appeal Decision

by **Stephen Hawkins MA, MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 October 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/E5900/C/25/3370626

Land on the north side of 218 Bow Common Lane, London E3 4HH

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Ropery Ltd against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Tower Hamlets.
 - The notice was issued on 19 June 2025.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is non-compliance with the approved plans for PA/20/00820, and amended by PA/21/02238, which show a green roof to be installed on the roof of the building shown in the approximate position outlined in blue on the attached plan.
 - The requirements of the notice are: 1. Install the green roof to the roof of the building shown in the approximate position outlined in blue on the attached plan in accordance with the approved plans of PA/20/00820 as amended by PA/21/02238.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is three months.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). Since the prescribed fee has not been paid within the specified period, the appeal on ground (a) and the application for planning permission deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the Act has lapsed.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld.

Preliminary matter

2. The appeal can be determined without the need for a site visit, as I have been able to reach a decision based on the information already available.

Ground (g) appeal

3. The ground of appeal is that the period specified for complying with the requirements of the enforcement notice falls short of what should reasonably be allowed.
4. The appeal concerns a recently erected two storey building, located in the Ropery Street Conservation Area.
5. Since the appeal is made solely on ground (g) and the length of the compliance period is the only matter before me, the appellant cannot have any reasonable expectation of the notice being quashed. By making this limited appeal, they have already delayed the date when the notice will come into effect in the knowledge that the requirement to install a green roof to the building to comply with the terms of the relevant planning permission will be upheld.
6. Besides, the three-month period specified affords ample opportunity for the green roof to be installed at a suitable time of year, if indeed such works have not already been carried out as the appellant intended. That being the case, the compliance period strikes an appropriate balance between remedying the breach as soon as

practicable whilst not imposing a disproportionate burden on the appellant. Allowing a longer period in which to undertake the required works on the other hand would achieve little other than to perpetuate the breach and would not be conducive to maintaining public confidence in the planning system.

7. Therefore, the ground (g) appeal fails.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed. I shall uphold the enforcement notice.

Stephen Hawkins

INSPECTOR