



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 September 2025

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/25/3370335

14 The Warren, Hounslow TW5 0JN

- 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 Mr Gurnam Bhogal against the decision of the London Borough of Hounslow Council.
 - The application Ref is P/2025/0745.
 - The development proposed is for an outbuilding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an outbuilding at 14 The Warren, Hounslow TW5 0JN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2025/0745, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: PL/SAK/1.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be in accordance with the details set out within the planning application form.
 - 4) The outbuilding hereby permitted shall only be used for purposes incidental to the domestic enjoyment of the dwelling known as 14 The Warren and for no other purpose, including sleeping accommodation.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area and upon the living conditions of neighbouring residents, with specific reference to outlook and noise/disturbance.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The proposed outbuilding would be located towards the end of the rear garden of no14 which can be accessed via a private track which predominantly serves garages and outbuildings for properties fronting The Warren and Vicarage Farm Road.

4. Many of the outbuildings are quite substantial in scale and therefore I consider that the proposed building would not be out of character with its surroundings. The proposed building would be limited to 4m in height in accordance with the Guidelines sets out within the Hounslow Character, Sustainability and Design Codes SPD. I note that the Council considers that due to the distance between the host dwelling and the proposed outbuilding that the latter would appear subordinate to the former, that the proposed materials would be sympathetic and furthermore that the size and scale of the proposed outbuilding would be similar to other developments in the area, and therefore the proposal would not harm the appearance of the surrounding area, to which I agree.
5. I acknowledge the concerns of the Council regarding the inclusion of primary living accommodation. The SPD stipulates that it is essential that an outbuilding must only be used in a manner incidental to the main house and that the Council will refuse any application that proposes an independent residential unit. It goes on to state that usually (my emphasis) primary living accommodation such as a bedroom, bathroom or kitchen would not be allowed.
6. The appellant highlights that it is common place for home gyms to include a WC/shower room for hygiene reasons and I consider that with the absence of a kitchen it would not be capable of independent occupation in any case. That said, I fully understand the Council's concerns with regard to the creation of independent units of residential accommodation in such backland/rear garden locations; therefore it would be wholly appropriate to restrict the future occupation of the proposed outbuilding to purposes that are purely incidental to that of the main dwelling.
7. Notwithstanding the wording of the second reason for refusal set out within the Council's decision notice, I concur with the view set out within paragraph 5.14 of the Officer Report that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and as such I consider that it would comply with Local Plan Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 and the general advice set out within the SPD.

Living Conditions

8. In addition, by virtue of the depth of the rear gardens to the host dwelling and those adjacent, a significant spacing would be maintained between the proposed outbuilding and the rear elevations/immediate sitting out areas of 12 and 16 The Warren. Bearing in mind that the proposal is purely for an incidental use (gym / games room and storage), as well as having regard to other similar such buildings within the locality, I consider that no demonstrable loss of outlook would be caused nor would undue noise / disturbance be caused to neighbouring residents. I acknowledge that the proposed outbuilding would be constructed right up to the northern boundary shared with no14, however, it would be adjacent to the rear of its garden which in itself also includes an outbuilding of its own. Therefore, I consider that it would not be unduly overbearing either.
9. I acknowledge that section 8 of the SPD states that it is essential that an outbuilding must only be used in a manner incidental to the main house and that any application which, due to its design, may facilitate a future use in such a manner will be refused due to impact on neighbours. However, it falls upon me to determine the appeal based on its merits and I consider that it would be reasonable to impose a condition, as explained above, restricting its use; any material change

from this would require an application for planning permission that could then be dealt with on its own merits. Consequently, I consider that the proposal would preserve neighbour's living conditions and would comply with Local Plan Policies SC7 and CC2 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015 – 2030 which together expect development proposals to minimise harm to neighbouring residents.

Conclusion and Conditions

10. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.
11. In addition to the standard time limit condition, the Council has suggested that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Further, as they have stipulated that the proposed materials are considered acceptable, I have also imposed a condition requiring them to be constructed in accordance with the details as set out within the planning application forms, in the interests of the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, in order to protect future living conditions of local residents, I have also imposed a condition restricting the use of the building to incidental purposes to the host dwelling.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR