



Costs Decision

Site visit made on 3 August 2021

by Tamsin Law BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 September 2021

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/W/21/3275479 23 St. Lucia Crescent, Horfield, Bristol BS7 0XR

- 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 Jeanette and Michelle Arnold and Teasdale for a full award of costs against Bristol City Council.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of the Council to planning permission for the demolition of existing bungalow and construction of a pair of semi-detached bungalows, (one 2 bedroom and one 1 bedroom).
-

Decision

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

Reasons

2. Planning Practice Guidance advises that, irrespective of the outcome of the appeal, costs may be awarded against a party who has behaved unreasonably and the unreasonable behaviour has directly caused another party to incur unnecessary or wasted expense in the appeal process. The application for costs relies to a substantial extent on how the Council reached its decision that the development should be refused.
3. Whilst I appreciate the outcome of the application will have been a disappointment to the appellants, the Council were not unreasonable in coming to that decision from the information they had available to them. I note the concerns that the Council have used the same reason for refusal as previous applications, however the concerns raised in the reason for refusal are apparent in the Officer Report which adequately sets out how the proposal, in the Council's opinion, would conflict with relevant adopted planning policies. Accordingly, I am satisfied that the Council's reasoning was credible and it was entitled to reach the decision it did. The fact that I found differently does not discredit the Council's case.
4. The appellant has also expressed concerns regarding a lack of communication with the Council and delays in the application process. Whilst this might have caused the appellant some concern, I find nothing to suggest that a decision was reached other than on the basis of the merits of the proposal, as submitted by the applicant. I also find no evidence that the appellant incurred any additional expense as a result of this delay.
5. Accordingly, I do not find that the Council failed to properly evaluate the application or consider the merits of the scheme and therefore the appeal could

not have been avoided. I have found that the Council had reasonable concerns about the impact of the proposal which justified its decision.

Conclusion

6. I therefore conclude that for the reasons set out above, unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary expense during the appeal process has not been demonstrated. For this reason, and having regard to all other matters raised, an award for costs is therefore not justified.

Tamsin Law

INSPECTOR