



Costs Decision

Site visit made on 17 June 2025

by N Unwin BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th December 2025

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/25/3363233

77 Lealand Road, Tottenham, Haringey, London N15 6JT

- 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 Abraham Ost for a full award of costs against the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for a ground floor wrap-around extension to the flat and a type 3 loft extension to the upper flat.
-

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 appellant contends that the Council misinterpreted the primary objective of the House Extensions in South Tottenham Supplementary Planning Document (2013) (the SPD). The section of the SPD relevant to the main issue of the appeal clearly relates to the preservation of the character and appearance of the area.
4. The SPD permits extensions at third floor level for single dwellings acknowledging the benefits of additional accommodation for large families, thus justifying any impact on the character and appearance of the area. Given the proposal involves the upward extension of a flat, this benefit does not apply.
5. The SPD states that extensions to houses that have been converted to flats will not be permitted, however it also says that each application will be considered on its individual merits, having regard to the overall character of the specific street. Whilst I do not agree with its position, it was reasonable for the Council to assess the impact of the proposal against the relevant provisions of the SPD.
6. The appellant raises the planning permissions for at Flat B, 57 Crowland Road, Second Floor Flat, 57 Elm Park Avenue, and 2 Cadoxton Avenue. Nonetheless, these examples are on surrounding streets and assessed within their own visual context. Given their distance from the appeal site, the proposal would not be viewed within the context of these approvals. It is therefore reasonable for the Council to have come to a different conclusion on these applications.

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

N Unwin

INSPECTOR