



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 August 2024

**by Elaine Benson BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 29<sup>th</sup> August 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/24/3346790**

**49 St Georges Drive, Ickenham, Uxbridge UB10 8HP**

- 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 and Mrs D Sood against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
  - The application Ref is 31872/APP/2024/677.
  - The development proposed is 'retention of existing driveway surfacing'.
- 

### Preliminary Matter

1. Planning permission is required only for the specified development and no distinction is made against proposals for development and those made retrospectively. I have therefore deleted the words 'retention of existing' from the description of development in the decision that follows.

### Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for driveway surfacing at 49 St Georges Drive, Ickenham, Uxbridge UB10 8HP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 31872/APP/2024/677.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

### Reasons

4. The front drive of the appeal property has already been surfaced with white slabs. Whilst the surfacing is nonpermeable, the use of a channel drain along the front of the paving prevents surface water discharge onto the highway.
5. Within the surrounding area are paved frontages comprising a number of different materials, including red or grey paving blocks and gravel. Some are enclosed by boundary treatments, others, like the appeal site, have open frontages. The appellant acknowledges that the driveway tiles are a new material within the area. I accept that their appearance may have weathered somewhat since the Council's decision was made, however the tiles do not have a reflective or shiny finish as stated. The materials used for the drive do not dominate or detract from the appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area.

6. Furthermore, the evidence indicates that the works undertaken could be considered to constitute 'permitted development', with no requirement to change the materials used. Whilst such a determination it is not a matter for consideration this appeal, the potential fallback position is a material consideration which attracts significant weight.
7. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the surrounding area. It therefore complies with the design requirements of Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).
8. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed. As the development has already been carried out, there is no need to impose any conditions.

*Elaine Benson*

INSPECTOR