



Costs Decision

Site visit made on 26 August 2025

by **N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 September 2025

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/D/25/3369859

29 Meynell Crescent, Hackney, London, E9 7AS

- The application is made under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), sections 78, 322 and Schedule 6, and the Local Government Act 1972, section 250(5).
 - The application is made by Mr T Sprange for a full award of costs against the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for creation of dropped kerb and vehicle crossover.
-

Decision

1. The application for an award of costs is refused.

Reasons

2. The Planning Practice Guidance advises that costs may be awarded against a party who has behaved unreasonably and thereby caused the party applying for costs to incur unnecessary or wasted expense in the appeal process.
3. The appellant states that the Council acted unreasonably by acting inconsistently in dealing with the application the subject of the appeal, in the light of previously determined proposals at the appeal site.
4. The appellant also considers that the Council's decision was based on vague and generalised assertions and that the Council's comments supporting its decision were brief and unsubstantiated.
5. In respect of the first of these points, I referred in my decision to the appellant's consideration that the proposed development was acceptable because the Council had been "silent" on it when refusing a previous application. However, there is no substantive evidence before me to demonstrate that the Council had previously found the proposal the subject of the appeal to comprise "acceptable" development.
6. I note that, whilst it included a proposed drop kerb and vehicle crossover, the previous application referred to was for a different form of development to that the subject of the appeal. There is no substantive evidence before me to demonstrate that in refusing this previous application and in refusing the application the subject of the appeal, the Council acted inconsistently to the point of unreasonableness.
7. The Council refused the application the subject of the appeal for three reasons. Each of these reasons was substantiated by information provided in the Council's officer's report. This supporting information set out in a clear, succinct, evidenced and well-reasoned manner the reasons why the proposed development does not, in

the Council's view, meet planning policy requirements. Indeed, in reaching my decision, I concurred with some of the detailed points provided by the Council in support of its reasons for refusal.

8. Given the above, I cannot agree that the Council's decision was based upon vague and generalised assertions and do not consider that the Council behaved unreasonably in the way that it supported its decision.
9. Taking all of the above into account, I find that unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense, as described in the Planning Practice Guidance, has not been demonstrated.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR