
Costs Decision

Site visit made on 23 January 2017

by Christa Masters MA (hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 31st January 2017

**Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/D/16/3164115
18 Kingswood Creek, Wraysbury, Staines TW19 5EN**

- 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 Hothi Design Build for a full award of costs against Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for proposed roof extension and front and rear dormers.
-

Decision

1. The application for an award of costs is refused.

Reasons

2. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) advises that costs may be awarded against a party who has behaved unreasonably and directly caused another party to incur unnecessary or wasted expense in the appeal process.
3. The appellants application for an award of costs relies substantially on the fact that they do not consider that the Council have behaved in a positive manner. However, dissatisfaction with the Council's procedural policies should appropriately be made in the first instance through the authority's own complaints procedure. The appellant also contends the reason for refusal is erroneous. However based on the evidence before me, I am satisfied that the reason for refusal is precise and clear. Accordingly, unreasonable behaviour has not been demonstrated in this regard.
4. In conclusion, I do not consider the Council has behaved unreasonably and I therefore find that unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense, as described by the PPG, has not been demonstrated.

Christa Masters

INSPECTOR
