



Costs Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2025

by S Simms BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 November 2025

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/25/3370676 Land Rear of 73 Willow Tree Lane and Adjacent To 2 Douglas Crescent, Hayes UB4 9BL

- 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 Mr Leonard Kokoli 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 demolition of existing garage and erection of a one bedroom ground floor over basement dwelling.
-

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 applicant seeks a full award of costs on the basis that the appeal proposal is acceptable and that a condition could have resolved one reason for refusal.
4. The acceptability or otherwise of the appeal proposal is not, of itself, evidence of unreasonable behaviour on the part of the Council. On a specific point, I found sufficient differences between the proposal and that in a cited appeal decision, that the judgement of the Council could not be said to be unreasonable.
5. Similarly, I found in my appeal decision that I could not be sure that a condition to increase floor-to-ceiling separations could be complied with, either at all or without impacting other aspects of the design that others may wish to comment on. It is not clear whether the Council identified the issue to the applicant prior to determination, but the policy is clear and it is not unreasonable to determine an application on the basis of the submission if conditions could not make it acceptable.
6. Therefore, unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense has not occurred and an award of costs is not warranted.

S Simms

INSPECTOR