



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 June 2025 by Kim Vo MPLAN

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/25/3365266

4 Woodcock Hill, Harrow HA3 0JG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs. Sabah Al-Hassani against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref is 25/0421.
 - The development proposed is described as the retention of outbuilding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the retention of outbuilding at 4 Woodcock Hill, Harrow HA3 0JG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/0421, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: drawing references MX367143 and 4WH(22) – Revision A.
 - 2) The building hereby permitted shall only be used for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the host dwelling known as 4 Woodcock Hill, Harrow HA3 0JG, as shown on the plans hereby approved.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issue

3. An outbuilding, with a finished shower room, was under construction at the time of my site visit but had not yet been completed. For the avoidance of doubt, I have determined the appeal based on the plans referred to above. The main issue in regard to which is whether the outbuilding would be incidental to the host dwelling and its effect on the character of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal scheme relates to an extended single storey outbuilding, sited within the rear garden corner. It is semi-detached with the neighbouring outbuilding at No. 2 Woodcock Hill. The surrounding area is characterised by several outbuildings of varying sizes situated within rear gardens.

5. A shower room, including a sink and toilet, has been installed within the outbuilding. Whilst such are normally found within primary living accommodation, this does not imply that the outbuilding will be for a residential unit in and of itself, nor does it suggest that an increased occupation of the dwelling would occur. The plans show that the outbuilding is intended for a gym and storage use. The appellant has also clarified that the shower room is to support the gym, providing a convenient facility following exercise. This demonstrates it will be for incidental purposes, where a functional relationship with the host dwelling would be maintained.
6. The outbuilding can be independently accessed via the side driveway, which was fully open and undergoing works at the time of my site visit. Nevertheless, separate garden access through the side of a property is often available and I find no reason as to why users of the outbuilding would not share the main access to the host dwelling. Moreover, gym and storage uses are common for residential outbuildings and there is nothing to suggest why it could not have its own facilities. The appeal scheme would sit well in character terms with the surrounding outbuildings due to its similar design and scale. It is also of an appropriate size to accommodate a range of exercise equipment, alongside an associated shower room.
7. Therefore, the outbuilding would be incidental to the host dwelling and would not harm the character of the surrounding area. It would not conflict with Policies DMP1 and BH12 of the Brent Local Plan 2022. Together, and amongst other things, these seek for development proposals to complement the locality and restrict outbuildings to be used as residential accommodation, or to support increased occupation.
8. There is conflict with the Residential Extensions & Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2025 regarding height. However, this does not result in harm on the main issue, especially given that the adjoining neighbour at No. 2 has a similar, but taller outbuilding. The Council have raised no concerns in this respect.

Conditions

9. To provide certainty and for enforcement purposes, I have identified the approved plans. A condition is also necessary to ensure the outbuilding is used for incidental purposes, as suggested by both the Council and the appellant and in the context of a lack of preciseness in the description of development as to the use thereof.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. I recommend that the appeal should be allowed, subject to the stated conditions, given it would comply with the development plan and there is nothing compelling to suggest a decision other than in accordance therewith.

Kim Vo

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR