



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 July 2025

by **P Burley BA(Hons) MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/24/3357366

Musgrave House (now World Federation House), Harefield, Uxbridge UB9 6NS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 14, Class J of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Dr Ali Abbas Hasham (The World Federation of KSIMC) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref is 47321/APP/2024/2288.
 - The development proposed is the installation of 288 solar panels to roof(s) (Application under Class J, Part 14, Schedule 2 of the General Permitted Development (England) Order 2015 (as amended)).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. In the interests of clarity, I have adopted the description of development from the Council's decision notice in the banner heading above.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - whether the proposed development is permitted development; and if so
 - whether the proposed development would comply with conditions J.4(1)(a) and J.4(2) of Schedule 2, Part 14, Class J of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (the GPDO).

Reasons

4. Under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 14, Class J of the GPDO, planning permission is granted for the installation or alteration of solar equipment on non-domestic premises subject to a number of limitations and conditions.
5. According to paragraph J.1(c), development is not permitted if the solar photovoltaic equipment or solar thermal equipment would be installed within 1 metre of the external edge of the roof.
6. The submitted information illustrates that photovoltaic panels would be installed within one metre of the external edge of the roof.
7. Therefore, the proposal is not permitted development.

8. As the proposal is not permitted development, it is not necessary for me to consider this prior approval application any further.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

P Burley

INSPECTOR