



Costs Decision

Site visit made on 10 July 2024

by A Knight BA PG Dip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th August 2024

**Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/L3625/W/23/3336125
36 Vernon Walk, Tadworth, Surrey KT20 5QP**

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 Council sought amended plans from the applicant during the life of the planning application, before issuing a refusal. If the scheme was ultimately considered unacceptable to the Council despite alterations they had requested, then it would certainly have been so beforehand. Accordingly, the applicant would not have been saved the cost of an appeal had the Council reached its decision on the initial set of plans, and so has been put to no extra costs in that respect.
4. Regarding timeliness, the applicant's costs claim details the application validation date, the determination deadline, and the decision date, along with correspondence between times. Although the application took longer than 8 weeks and the delay was frustrating for the applicant, as set out above I see no evidence that an earlier decision would have avoided the need for the appeal, and the costs incurred in making it.
5. In view of the above, I find that unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense, as described in the Planning Practice Guidance, has not been demonstrated. Therefore, an award of costs is not justified.

A Knight

INSPECTOR