
Costs Decision

Site visit made on 13 May 2026

by K Craddock BA (Hons) MAUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th June 2026

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/W/25/3371936

Franklin House, Station Approach, SHEPPERTON TW17 8AR

- 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 Lipa Fried for a full award of costs against Spelthorne Borough Council.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for a two-storey front extension and the addition of a new floor.
-

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. Unreasonable behaviour on the part of a local planning authority may include preventing or delaying development which should clearly be permitted, having regard to its accordance with the development plan, national policy and any other material considerations, or making vague, generalised or inaccurate assertions about a proposal's impact, which are unsupported by objective analysis.
4. The applicant contends that the reason for refusal is vague and unsubstantiated, that the Council should not have acted contrary to officer advice, and the committee members' decision relied on immaterial considerations.
5. The Council has responded directly to the application for costs, citing that members of the Planning Committee are not bound by the recommendations contained in officers' committee reports and are at liberty to exercise their planning judgment. The Council highlights that the reason for refusal was based on relevant planning policies and did not take into account the non-planning matters discussed during the committee meeting or published on social media afterwards. The Council also highlights the committee minutes, which confirm the councillors who took part in the recorded votes, and the level of support versus opposition for each of the motions put before the committee.
6. I have no substantive evidence to demonstrate the Council has made a decision inconsistent with its own development plan or one that has relied upon non-planning matters. The committee minutes support the Council's position and set out

a clear sequence of events regarding the decision-making and clarifying who participated in it.

Conclusion

7. For the above reasons, I conclude that unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense in the appeal process, as described in the PPG, has not been demonstrated. Therefore, the application for an award of costs is refused.

K Craddock

INSPECTOR