
Costs Decision

Site visit made on 2 September 2025

by Mr T Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 October 2025

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/25/3366678 68 Knoll Crescent, Northwood, HA6 1HY

- The application is made under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, sections 78, 322 and Schedule 6, and the Local Government Act 1972, section 250(5).
 - The application is made by Mrs Geetanjalee Devani for a full award of costs against the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for the conversion of existing dwellinghouse into 2 no. self contained flats.
-

Decision

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

Reasons

2. Parties in planning appeals normally meet their own expenses. However, the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) 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 fact that the Council suggested amendments to the appellant's proposals, which led to the withdrawal and re-submission of the planning application, is normal practice. I can see that the Council's correspondence to the appellant includes statements that the advice given is that of the individual officer and does not prejudice the formal decision of the Council. This should have given the appellant a clear indication that there would be no guarantee that her planning application would be favourably considered, even if she followed the officer's advice. Additionally, I can see that the appellant did not offer any response to the officer's concerns in relation to the tree at the site frontage, other than stating that trees in the rear would not be affected.
4. The appellant states that no external alteration are proposed and so the proposal will have little effect. It is not accurate to say that there are no external alterations as alterations to windows and a new parking space are proposed. These and the change in the use of the property all need to be taken into account.
5. I acknowledge that the proposal would bring about an additional new home to a Council which appears to be in need of new homes. However, this benefit cannot be taken to override every other planning consideration and the Council judged that the negative aspects of the proposal outweigh its benefit.
6. The appellant raises matters which are of personal benefit to her and are not matters which weigh in planning decisions. Similarly her comments in relation to individuals involved in the planning application have no place in my considerations.

7. I consider that the Council has appropriately weighed planning considerations and arrived at a reasoned decision. That decision is supported by the merits of this case and planning policy.
8. Therefore, unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense has not occurred and an award of costs is not warranted.

T Wood

INSPECTOR