



Costs Decision

Site visit made on 13 February 2026

by **N Unwin BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 May 2026

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/W/25/3376270

43 Acrefield, Glanleam Road, Stanmore HA7 4NW

- 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 Gerard Lee for a full award of costs against the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The appeal was against the refusal planning permission for: Full planning application for the erection of five detached two-storey dwellings with basement level, associated access, parking, landscaping, and boundary treatment, following partial redevelopment of the residential curtilage at 43 Glanleam Road, Stanmore.
-

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. Costs may be awarded where a party has behaved unreasonably, and the unreasonable behaviour has directly caused another party to incur unnecessary or wasted expense in the appeal process. Unreasonable behaviour in the context of an application for an award of costs may be either procedural relating to the process, or substantive relating to the issues arising from the merits of the appeal.
4. The appellant contends that the Council misapplied Green Belt policy, specifically whether the site is grey belt land. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) defines grey belt land as I have set out in my appeal decision. The Council assessed the proposal against this criteria, finding that appeal site strongly contributes to criteria (a) of paragraph 143 of the Framework and therefore cannot be considered grey belt land. The Council clearly assessed the proposal against the latest version of the Framework at the time of determination including the changes to the Green Belt chapter and the introduction of grey belt land. Whilst I do not agree with the Council in this regard, I do not consider that they acted unreasonably in reaching this conclusion.
5. Despite the age of the documents, at the time the application was determined, the Harrow Core Strategy (2012) (the Core Strategy) formed part of the statutory development plan and the Garden Land Development Supplementary Planning Document (2013) (the SPD) was a relevant material consideration. As such, it was not unreasonable for the Council to use these documents in the determination of

the application. I note the 2024 updates to the Framework, however these do not directly conflict with the Core Strategy or the SPD when read as a whole. At the time the appeal was determined the London Borough of Harrow Local Plan 2021-2041 (2026) (the Local Plan) had not been adopted and therefore Policy GR10 of the Local Plan could not be afforded full weight.

6. Based on the delegated report, the Council assessed the technical evidence submitted by the appellant in addition to consulting the relevant professionals available to them including the Landscape Officer, Arboricultural Officer, Ecologist, Drainage and Flood Officer, Highways Officer, and Urban Design Officer.
7. Whilst the appeal site may have been a candidate for residential allocation in the Local Plan, it was discounted. As such, the Council did not behave unreasonably assessing the proposal as an unallocated site.
8. The delegated report assessed the proposal against Framework paragraph 155 (c), the sustainability of the location. They concluded that whilst the appeal site is located in a low level Public Transport Accessibility Level area, given its proximity to an underground station and bus stops, the proposal would be sustainably located.
9. Whilst the Planning Policy consultation response raises concerns regarding a public right of way, this did not form part of the Council's reason for refusal.
10. The Council's appeal statement is very similar to its delegated report and does not appear to introduce any new evidence.

Conclusion

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

N Unwin

INSPECTOR