



Costs Decision

Site visit made on 6 October 2025

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 October 2025

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/25/3371794 6 The Ridgeway, Harrow, London HA3 0LL

- 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 Joshi for a full award of costs against Brent Council.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for a part ground floor side extension and ground floor rear extension.
-

Decision

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

Reasons

2. 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. The PPG states that awards against a local planning authority may be either procedural or substantive.
3. The award of costs is made on the basis that the applicant believes that the Council have acted unreasonably by virtue of the fact that they failed to engage proactively before the determination of the planning application; and that the refusal was not supported by objective analysis, being refused on a matter capable of resolution by a minor change/condition. Consequently they opine that an unnecessary delay to the development had been caused that should have clearly been permitted.
4. I can wholly understand the applicant's frustration with regard to a lack of communication from the Council as to how the design could have been revised, and it does appear that no response was received other than in regard to details around the case officer's site visit. Whilst I think that it would not have been appropriate to have imposed a condition requiring further details of the porch to be submitted, the council did have the option to entertain revised drawings, although they are not duty bound to do so.
5. Whilst relatively brief, I consider that the Council's officer report did substantiate the reasons for refusal of planning permission and as I found in my appeal decision the proposal conflicts with the Council's supplementary planning document on such matters; further it was quite clear that the Council's primary concern was the impact of the porch itself on the host dwelling as opposed to the wider street scene.
6. All in all based on the plans that were before me, I concluded that the appeal should be dismissed on the grounds that it would have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the area and therefore I consider that a refusal of permission by the council did not amount to unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary and wasted expense to the applicant.

7. I therefore consider that unreasonable behaviour as described in the PPG has not been demonstrated and the application for a full award of costs is refused.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR