
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 February 2026

by **N Armstrong BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/25/3375122

Unit 5, Compass West Estate, West Road, Tottenham, Haringey, London N17 0XL

- 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 Ms Charlotte Bradbrook of Legal and General Assurance (Pensions Management) Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref is HGY/2025/2087.
 - The development proposed is installation of roof mounted solar PV panels, inverter size – 20kW, total system size – 24.75kWp.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council's decision notice and officer report refer to the application as a certificate of lawfulness. However, the application form is clear that the proposal relates to an application to determine if prior approval is required for the proposed development. The Council has since confirmed that the proposal was decided as a prior approval application. I have determined the appeal on that basis.

Background and Main Issue

3. 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 GPDO), development is permitted for the installation, alteration or replacement of certain solar equipment on non-domestic premises, subject to limitations and conditions.
4. Paragraph J.4 (4) provides that the local planning authority may refuse an application where it considers that the proposed development does not comply with, or the developer has provided insufficient information to enable the authority to establish whether the proposed development complies with, any conditions, limitations or restrictions specified in Class J that are applicable to the development in question.
5. Paragraph J.1 (a) states that development is not permitted by Class J if the solar PV equipment would be installed on a pitched roof and would protrude more than 0.2 metres beyond the plane of the roof when measured from the perpendicular with the external surface of the roof slope. With regard to J.1 (c), development is not permitted if the solar PV equipment would be installed on a roof and within 1 metre of the external edge of that roof. The Council refused the application on

the basis that the proposed development does not comply with these requirements.

6. The appellant submitted a roof plan¹ and an elevations plan² with the planning application. They have also submitted an email and untitled plan providing additional details of the height and siting of the solar PV panels as part of the appeal. I shall address these plans and submissions in my reasoning below.
7. Based on the above, the main issue is whether the proposal would be permitted development, having regard to the requirements set out within Schedule 2, Part 14, Class J of the GPDO, with particular regard to paragraph J.1 (a) and J.1 (c).

Reasons

8. The appeal site is situated within a row of industrial units on the Compass West Estate, which comprises a number of other industrial type buildings. The main entrance of the appeal premises faces into the industrial estate, and its opposite elevation is adjacent to a landscaped strip separating the site from the footway and highway on West Road. The row of units numbered 1 to 6 on the location plan, which includes the appeal site, feature a single pitch sloping roof with curved ends that is highest adjacent to West Road, sloping down to the elevations facing into the estate. Other units opposite the appeal site within the industrial estate feature a shallow, dual-pitched roof with curved ends.
9. There appear to be discrepancies with the plans submitted with the application and what I observed on site. The layout and orientation of the building as shown on the roof plan suggests that there are off shoots to its eastern side and that the roof pitch slopes down towards the West Road elevation. This is the opposite of what is evident on site. In addition, the elevations plan indicates a building with a dual-pitched roof annotated as Nos 9 and 10, which also does not reflect the form of the building at the appeal site.
10. The submitted plans do not indicate the height of the solar PV panels, and no side section or elevation has been submitted that clearly shows the existing roof of the appeal premises and the proposed equipment to be installed. Whilst the additional information submitted with the appeal states that the height of the panels from the roof would be 85mm, there are no details clearly showing the proposed installation of the panels and their height beyond the existing roof plane in plan form. Noting the above discrepancies with the submitted plans, this hinders my understanding of how the solar PV panels would be affixed to the existing roof of the appeal premises and the extent of their protrusion above it in regard to J.1 (a).
11. The roof plan indicates the siting of the panels at different distances from the external edges at either end of the sloping roof, which the Council states would be 550mm from one edge of the roof slope. The additional information and untitled plan indicate the panels would be sited 1.655 metres from the external edge of one part of the roof. However, the information before me does not establish that the 1 metre requirement at J.1 (c) would be satisfied for the opposite part of the roof where the panels are shown to be much closer to its external edge.
12. Given the discrepancies with the submitted plans regarding the layout, form and roof of the existing building at the appeal site, I am not satisfied that the

¹ Drawing no 10200 Revision C01

² Drawing no 10400 Revision C01

submissions accurately show the proposed development. There is insufficient information before me to establish that the proposed development complies with the relevant limitations or restrictions specified in Class J. For these reasons, I cannot conclude that the proposal would comply with the limitations or restrictions set out within Schedule 2, Part 14, Class J of the GPDO with particular regard to paragraph J.1 (a) and J.1 (c). Consequently, I cannot conclude that the proposal constitutes permitted development.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Armstrong

INSPECTOR