



Costs Decision

Site visit made on 31 October 2025

by **S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 November 2025

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/K5600/W/25/3371695 Flat 7, 50 Hans Place, London SW1X 0LA

- 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 Ms Tracey Pritchett-Randall for a full award of costs against the Council of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for “*Amendments to the approved scheme PP/24/04818 through the addition of a private glass lift to the centre lightwell of 50 Hans Place, serving the ground floor up to 3rd floor*”.
-

Decision

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

Reasons

2. The Planning Practice Guidance 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 Guidance lists examples of types of behaviour that may give rise to a substantive award of costs against a local planning authority. These include circumstances where an authority fails to produce evidence to substantiate a reason for refusal; or makes vague, generalised or inaccurate assertions about a proposal’s impact, which are unsupported by any objective analysis; or refuses planning permission on a ground capable of being dealt with by a planning condition.
4. Whilst I have not concurred with the Council on some of the matters cited in its reasons for refusal, I find that the Council’s reasoning was adequately substantiated and reasonable, given the complexity of the proposal and information presented at the application stage.
5. Given the Council’s position on character, appearance, and heritage matters, there was no merit or need for engagement with the appellant during the application process.
6. The application followed pre-application advice¹ which raised concerns about noise, vibration, loss of light and privacy and highlighted a need for technical drawings and detailed specifications of the lift. The onus was on the appellant to explain, illustrate and substantiate the proposal with technical evidence, particularly

¹ PRE/AR/23 /03350/LEV 3, dated 6 July 2023

given the rather unique nature of the proposal and the potential impacts resulting from the close vicinity between moving mechanical apparatus and residential windows. As highlighted in my decision, some aspects of the proposal are vague, inadequately explained, or simply not included on the application drawings. This has been unhelpful to the decision-making process.

7. I therefore find that unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense, as described in the Planning Practice Guidance, has not been demonstrated.

S Poole

INSPECTOR