



Costs Decision

Site visit made on 2 July 2019

by Jamie Reed DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 July 2019

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/P2935/D/19/3227451 Rose Cottage, Longhoughton Road, Lesbury NE66 3AT

- 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 Mrs Lucy Thomas for a full award of costs against Northumberland County Council.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for ground and first floor extension to the cottage.
-

Decision

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

Reasons

2. The Planning Practice Guidance 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 submits that the Council has acted unreasonably in that it has been inconsistent with its approach on determining applications within the Lesbury Conservation Area (LCA) and that it has not substantiated its reasons for refusing their application. Whilst comparisons can often be made between proposals, each of the other applications within the LCA that the applicant has referred to will have had its own site-specific circumstances and merits upon which it was considered. The Council Officer's report gives clear reasons as to how they reached their decision and makes references to the relevant local and national policies and guidance that are applicable to the site. Therefore, I find no unreasonable behaviour on the part of the Council in this regard.
4. The applicant also submits that the Council did not discuss the proposal with them prior to reaching their decision and as a result, they have incurred additional costs in administering the planning appeal. From the evidence before me, it is apparent that the Council has previously considered similar proposals when considering an earlier planning application at the property. As such, I do not find any unreasonableness in this regard on the part of the Council.
5. I therefore conclude that the Council has not acted unreasonably in this case and as such, the applicant was not put to any wasted or unnecessary expense.

Jamie Reed

INSPECTOR