



---

## Costs Decision

Hearing held on 24 February 2026

Site visits made on 23 and 24 February 2026

by **Graham Chamberlain BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 March 2026

---

### **Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/Y/25/3363363**

#### **Northwood Police Station, 2 Murray Road, Northwood, London HA6 2YN**

- The application is made under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, sections 20, 89 and Schedule 3, and the Local Government Act 1972, section 250(5).
  - The application is made by Azaf Investments Ltd for a full award of costs against the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
  - The appeal was against the refusal of listed building consent for works described as 'Erection of a single storey entrance pavilion on the side (south) elevation. Erection of an access lift on the rear elevation. Conservation and restoration of the existing building fabric. Internal layout changes. Fenestration alterations, re-servicing and removal of plant room rear extension. Alterations to fencing and landscaping'.
- 

### **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. In this case, the applicant submits that the Council imported planning matters (highway safety and air quality) into its assessment of the application for Listed Building Consent (LBC), and this was an incorrect approach because the Council should have only considered the merits of the physical works to the listed building being applied for. Thus, it is alleged that the Council refused an application that should have been approved.
4. The Council's delegated report relating to the application for LBC outlines several clear findings. Firstly, the Officer confirms that a low level of less than substantial harm to the listed building would occur on account of the proposed works. This was an 'overall' conclusion which balanced both the beneficial and harmful works being applied for. Officers then went on to consider whether the public benefits of the project would outweigh the net harm identified.
5. Officers explained that the project would secure the long-term future of the building and would increase public access to it. These would be public benefits that would be secured if the planning application proposing the change of use of the building to a nursery was approved. Indeed, Officers appeared to be satisfied that the public benefits of the project would outweigh the harm to the listed building.

6. Nevertheless, Officers made the point that the planning application would need to be implemented simultaneously with any LBC to ensure the public benefits required to justify the net harm caused by the proposed works would materialise.
7. However, Officers also explained that the planning application was being refused due to its impacts on highway safety and air quality. The assessment of these impacts was confined to the planning application, but the outcome of the planning application was germane to the assessment of the LBC. This is because the identified public benefits of the scheme, especially securing a long-term use of the building, would not materialise without planning permission being granted.
8. It was therefore logical, and reasonable, for the Council to refuse the application for LBC because the harmful works being applied for would not be outweighed by the beneficial works, and the public benefits required to address the residual net harm would not occur because planning permission had been refused. Accordingly, unreasonable behaviour has not happened.

### **Conclusion**

9. Unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense has not arisen and consequently an award of costs is not warranted.

*Graham Chamberlain*  
INSPECTOR