
Costs Decision

Site visit made on 19 August 2025 by T Morris BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 November 2025

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/25/3368023

8 Castlevew Gardens, Cranbrook, Redbridge, Ilford IG1 3QB

- 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 Yunus Ali for a full award of costs against the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of prior approval for a fast track single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

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

Appeal Procedure

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 application.

Reasons for the Recommendation

3. 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.
4. The application for costs centres on the applicant's concern that the Council acted unreasonably in reaching its decision on the original application. This includes substantive and procedural unreasonable behaviour. In particular, the applicant argues that this is due to the Council's failure to honour their published fast-track guarantee, to issue a lawful decision within the required timeframe, and to avoid repeated administrative and procedural errors. Furthermore, it is the applicant's belief that the proposal is permitted development and should therefore have been approved.
5. However, based on the evidence before me and from my own observations from my site visit, the proposed single storey rear extension would not be permitted development. Therefore, the development cannot be considered to be permitted development under The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (the GPDO). While the applicant may disagree with this conclusion, the reasons why the Council came to this conclusion are substantiated in the decision notice and officer report.
6. Based on the dates provided by the applicant and the Council, it appears as though the Council issued the decision within the statutory time limit, in accordance with

the requirements of the GPDO. While it seems to me that the Council failed to issue the decision within their own fast track time limit, I have limited details of this process. In any event, this seems to be a local procedure rather than a statutory requirement. Consequently, while I accept that this is frustrating to the applicant, this in my view does not amount to a procedural failure which would result in unreasonable behaviour.

Conclusion and Recommendation

7. For the reasons given above, unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense has not occurred and an award of costs is not justified. I therefore recommend that the application is refused.

T Morris

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

8. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the application for an award of costs is refused.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR