



Costs Decision

Site visit made on 24 February 2026

by Richard S Jones BA (Hons), BTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 March 2026

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/X/24/3345051

1 Christchurch Avenue, Harrow, Kenton, HA3 8ND

- The application is made under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, sections 195, 322 and Schedule 6 and the Local Government Act 1972, section 250(5).
 - The application is made by Mr. Amin Noori for a full award of costs against the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of a certificate of lawful use or development (LDC) for loft conversion including hip to gable roof, rear dormer window, insertion of three roof lights and associated internal alteration.
-

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 argues that the Council's interpretation of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class B of the GPDO¹ and its decision, are flawed given the numerous previous appeal decisions relating to the issues raised. However, only one appeal was submitted in support of his case and that did not directly deal with the relevant issue at hand.
4. The Council for its part has referred to three appeal decisions in its officer report which it considers supports its approach. Whilst I have not agreed that should be applied to the main side elevation, that is a matter of planning judgement, rather than amounting to unreasonable behaviour, having regard to the advice in the Government's Technical Guidance² that the visual impact of the materials used will be the most important consideration.
5. I have nonetheless found that the approach to the use of materials at roof level, as set out in the Technical Guidance, should be applied to the remainder of the proposed dormer. On that basis, I have found the Council's decision to be well-founded. It follows that I do not find that the Council has acted in an unreasonable manner.

¹ The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015

² Permitted development rights for householders – Technical Guidance – September 2019 - Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government

Conclusion

6. I therefore find that unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense, as described in the PPG, has not been demonstrated.

Richard S Jones

INSPECTOR