

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 September 2025 by L Clark MSc MRTPI

### Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 October 2025

---

### Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/25/3368950

#### 10A Church Avenue, Ruislip, Hillingdon HA4 7HY

- 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 Pratik Peshavaria against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
  - The application Ref is 14922/APP/2025/598.
  - The development proposed is described as 'convert side lawn to a block paved driveway that links to the driveway at the bottom.'
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to "convert side lawn to a block paved driveway that links to the driveway at the bottom" at 10A Church Avenue, Ruislip, Hillingdon HA4 7HY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 14922/APP/2025/598, 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 block/site plan.
  - 3) No block paving shall be laid at the site until details of the materials to be used therefore has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

### Appeal Procedure, Preliminary Matter and Main Issue

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. The description above is taken from the application form. This is sufficient to describe the scheme to which the appeal relates. I have omitted some explanatory text referring to the retention of planting. Whilst superfluous for identification purposes, I have taken it into account. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area (CA).

### Reasons for the Recommendation

3. The appeal site is a detached dwelling on a corner plot where Church Avenue meets King Edwards Road. The area is residential and made up of dwellings that are predominantly set back from the roadside behind mature trees and hedging. These factors combine to create a pleasant leafy feel. There is no obvious

uniformity to the external space of each property and due to the boundary treatments, many are not widely visible. There are many examples of hardstanding at the front and side of the dwellings locally, including to the the appeal property.

4. The significance of the CA is derived in part from its verdant appearance due to the mature roadside boundary treatments and set back nature of the properties. The small area of grass to the side of the appeal dwelling does not contribute substantially to the overall lush appearance of the area and is not a particular feature of merit. The appeal site is tucked behind the existing side boundary wall and mature hedging that would be retained. Therefore, glimpses of the block paving would be minimal and combining this with the small area of land concerned, there would be no harm to the significance of the CA.
5. Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. Paragraph 212 of The National Planning Policy Framework 2024 places emphasis on great weight being given to the asset's conservation. Given the assessment above, the proposal would ensure that both the character and appearance of the CA would be preserved. It would therefore comply with Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon London Local Plan: Part 1 2021, Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 4, DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHB 14 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 2020 and Policy HC1 of the London Plan 2021. These policies are concerned with conserving heritage assets amongst other things.

### **Conditions**

6. Other than the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans for certainty and enforcement purposes. Further details of materials is also necessary given that there have been none provided. It would be sufficient to agree this prior to the paving being laid.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

7. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would comply with the development plan and there is nothing compelling to suggest otherwise. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions set out.

*L Clark*

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

### **Inspector's Decision**

8. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed, subject to the stated conditions.

*John Morrison*

INSPECTOR