



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 November 2025

by Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/25/3373874

220 Ellerdine Road, Hounslow TW3 2PX

- 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 Nav Mann against the decision of the London Borough of Hounslow Council.
 - The application Ref is P/2025/1518.
 - The development proposed is a ground floor wrap around extension, first floor rear extension, internal alterations, floor plan redesign and all associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for is a ground floor wrap around extension, first floor rear extension, internal alterations, floor plan redesign and all associated works at 220 Ellerdine Road, Hounslow TW3 2PX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2025/1518, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: B189221-3000 Rev A and B189221-3100 Rev A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a two storey semi detached house located on a corner plot at the junction of Ellerdine Road and Norbury Avenue. Whilst the front of the house faces towards Ellerdine Road its main entrance is located on the gabled side elevation. It is located in an area of similarly scaled semi-detached houses on similarly sized plots.
4. Along with the majority of houses in the immediate area the appeal dwelling has undergone alteration and extension, which creates a varied streetscape with little architectural cohesion. The appeal dwelling has previously been extended with a loft conversion with a hip to gable alteration and a full width tile clad box dormer to the main rear roof slope, with a side infill extension on that side facing semi-detached

- pair. There is also a detached single storey flat roofed outbuilding at the rear of the garden.
5. Along with a small discretely positioned first floor extension above part of the existing infill extension, the appeal proposal is for a ground floor single storey side and rear extension with hipped roof that would wrap around the original house. This would be set well back from the front elevation and would reach around the rear to connect with the existing infill extension, with only a marginal overlap. The proposed wraparound extension would be set in from the side boundary with Norbury Avenue by approximately 0.5 metres. The submitted drawings show the existing tall wall and taller hedging on the boundary retained.
 6. The proposed ground floor extension is very similar in design and scale to a proposal for a side and rear wrap around extension at the appeal dwelling that was allowed on appeal in 2016 but was not implemented. The only difference between this allowed proposal and the current appeal proposal appears to be that it would have been set marginally further back from the front elevation. I have given this earlier allowed appeal substantial weight in my considerations.
 7. However, planning policy, guidance and practice develop overtime, and since the allowed appeal there has been the adoption of a new residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (2017) (the SPD). My considerations in this case have therefore been with regard to the adopted SPD, to which I have given substantial weight.
 8. The design guidance in the current SPD states that wraparound extensions that connect a side extension with a rear extension on a corner plot will normally be refused. In this case there is no existing side extension or rear extensions that would be connected by the proposal. The proposal would form the side and rear extension. The substantial set back of the proposal from the front elevation is also greater than that set out in the SPD. Although the proposal would be closer to the boundary than the recommended 1m set out in the SPD, it would be substantially screened by the retained tall wall and taller hedge in street views. As such, I find that the appeal proposal would accord with the guidance and the aims and objectives of the SPD.
 9. The scale of the proposal, its set back from the front elevation and the screening provided by the boundary wall and hedge would result in the proposed extension appearing as a secondary and subordinate addition that would have a limited presence in available views of the appeal dwelling. As such, the proposal would not appear as a prominent addition within the streetscene. Rather, in scale, design and position would reflect the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and would be complimentary to that of the local area.

Other matters

10. A third party has raised concerns with regard to the effect of the proposal on privacy and overshadowing. Given the scale of the proposal, its positioning and distance to neighbouring properties I find that it would present no greater opportunity for overlooking and loss of privacy than that from the existing openings at the rear of the appeal dwelling. Given the scale of the proposal, its positioning and distance to neighbouring properties I further find that that the proposal would not result in overshadowing that would result in any significant loss of daylight or sunlight. I find,

therefore, that the proposal would not result in any harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers.

11. For these reasons, I find that the proposal would not result in any harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area. It would, therefore, accord with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (2015). Amongst other matters these collectively seek development, including by extension, that is of high quality urban design and architecture, creatively responds to the area's character, does not harm the existing character and appearance of the building and its context, complementing the original building and harmonising with neighbouring properties.

Conditions

12. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council should I be minded to allow the appeal. I find that there are no exceptional reasons to attach the suggested condition limiting any potential permitted development rights with regard to new openings in the proposed extensions. Along with the standard condition relating to the timing of implementation, I have attached conditions to ensure design quality that require compliance with the approved drawings and materials that match existing.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given and with regard to all other matters raised the appeal is allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR