



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: 18 November 2025

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/25/3368240

6 Brandville Road, West Drayton UB7 9DA

- 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 Shloimy Shok 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 dormer extension and the conversion from a single dwelling house into two 3-bed 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 application is made on three grounds. Firstly, that the Council mischaracterised a structure that would serve one of the proposed bedrooms; secondly, that it did not use conditions to make development acceptable and, thirdly, that it omitted to recognise that cycle parking was proposed.
4. The Council's officer report (OR) which considered the application stated that the drawings did not show part of the property to be used as a bedroom would be rebuilt and that, as it was constructed from wood with a plastic roof, it was unsuitable for habitable use. As the description of development did not refer to rebuilding, and the submitted plans included no annotation to put this beyond doubt, it was therefore reasonable for the Council to highlight this matter.
5. The applicant states that the Council should have imposed a condition to secure a unilateral undertaking to prevent occupiers applying for parking permits. However, as I have found in the appeal decision, such a condition would not be enforceable. Therefore, the Council was reasonable not to do so. Furthermore, the Procedural Guide to Planning Appeals and the Planning Obligations Good Practice Advice are clear that responsibility to progress a planning obligation lies with the applicant.
6. Finally, the applicant alleges that the decision states that no cycle parking would be provided. The OR does state this and is erroneous in doing so. However, it was not a reason for refusal, the Council's Statement of Case acknowledges that cycle parking is proposed, and it is not clear that this caused wasted expense.

7. Therefore, unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense has not occurred and an award of costs is not warranted.

S Simms

INSPECTOR