



Costs Decision

Site visit made on 10 February 2026

by **T C King BA(Hons), MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 March 2026

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/C/24/3338804

17 Alexandra Road, Slough, SL1 2NQ

- 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 Slough Borough Council for a full award of costs against Adnan Asghar.
 - The appeal was against the Council's decision to issue an enforcement notice against a material change of use of the land.
-

Decision

1. The application for an award of costs is allowed in the terms set out below.

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. From the poor presentation and lack of substance to the applicant's case I consider that this was a case of forlorn hope, given the circumstances, and the planning position at 17 Alexandra Road. The appellant would have been well aware of this and yet, at the outset, lodged appeals on legal grounds (b) and (c) which, considering the breach had occurred and planning permission was required for the use, would have failed.
4. During the appeal process the appellant then withdrew these grounds and an appeal under ground (a) initially indicated, whereby a deemed planning application would have been generated, lapsed as the requisite fee was not paid. Ultimately, the appellant's case rested on a late ground (d) submission, with the claim that the use of the outbuilding as a self-contained residential unit, had already acquired immunity from planning control due to the passage of time. However, the appellant must have been aware that no evidence of value had been adduced – or could be adduced - to demonstrate that this was the case.
5. An appeal under ground (f) was made, yet no representations were made as to why steps for compliance, as stipulated in the enforcement notice, were considered excessive, yet no alternative steps were suggested.
6. In such circumstances, I consider that the appeal was without credibility, at best inadvisable, and it necessitated the Council having to respond to what appear as effectively groundless claims. Accordingly, I am satisfied that unreasonable behaviour resulting in significant unnecessary or wasted expense, as described in the PPG, has here been demonstrated.

Costs Order

7. In exercise of the powers under section 250(5) of the Local Government Act 1972 and Schedule 6 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended, and all other enabling powers in that behalf, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Adnan Asghar shall pay to Slough Borough Council the costs of the appeal proceedings described in the heading of this decision; such costs to be assessed in the Senior Courts Costs Office if not agreed.
8. The applicant is now invited to submit to Adnan Asghar, to whom a copy of this decision has been sent, details of those costs with a view to reaching agreement as to the amount.

T C King

INSPECTOR