
Costs Decision

Site visit made on 18 February 2025

by **V Goldberg BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th April 2025

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/W/24/3347100

24 Bargery Road, Catford, Lewisham, London, SE6 2LN

- 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 Avraham Friedman for a full award of costs against the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The appeal was against the failure of the Council to issue a notice of their decision within the prescribed period on an application for planning permission for the erection of a rear extension.
-

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 has applied for an award of costs on the grounds that the Council mishandled and prolonged the processing of the planning application. The application does not allege unnecessary or wasted expense incurred during the appeal process.
4. Whilst behaviour and actions at the time of the planning application can be taken into account, it has not been demonstrated how the suggested mishandling and prolonging the processing of the planning application has resulted in unnecessary or wasted expense in the appeal process. In addition, the request for amended plans to address consultee comments and the associated delays during the application process, would not amount to unreasonable behaviour. Furthermore, delays arising from requests for accurate drawings, would not be unreasonable given the onus is on the applicant to supply the correct information. As such neither a partial nor full award of costs would be justified.
5. I therefore find that unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense, as described in the Planning Practice Guidance, has not been demonstrated.

V Goldberg

INSPECTOR