



Costs Decision

Site visit made on 21 May 2025

by **G Powys Jones MSc FRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 June 2025

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/D/25/3362400

Cotswold View, St John's Road, Slimbridge, Gloucestershire, GL2 7DB

- The application is made under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), sections 78, 322 and Schedule 6, and the Local Government Act 1972, section 250(5).
 - The application is made by Mr Peter Guiver for a full award of costs against Stroud District Council.
 - The appeal was against the Council's refusal to grant planning permission for proposed front and rear extensions, alterations to roof and additional roof windows, external insulation, and proposed garage without complying with a condition attached to planning permission Ref S.22/2033/HHOLD, dated 23 November 2022.
-

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 appellant's reasons for the application were made in writing. In summary, he contends that the Council acted unreasonably in that it made vague, generalised and inaccurate assertions about the proposal's impact, which are unsupported by any objective analysis. The Council failed to produce evidence to substantiate the reason for refusal.
4. The Council's case and evidence in support of its decision is found in its officer report, and I find that to be sufficiently detailed to make it clear to me why the application was refused permission. It should also be borne in mind that the property was subject to a fairly recent submission, where detailed negotiations between the parties took place before a positive decision was eventually issued. The appellant should not therefore have been surprised, in view of the outcome of those earlier negotiations, of the stance that the Council would probably adopt on the revised submission subject of this appeal.
5. Whilst the appellants consider the Council's assertions to be vague and generalised, the reason for refusal is as clear as can be in the context of circumstances which call for a subjective rather than objective judgments on the merits of a proposal. That I disagreed with the Council's view of the proposal does not automatically render the Council's assessment unreasonable. The Council, with regard to the development plan in particular, was entitled to arrive at the judgment reached, notwithstanding that I did not share its view.

6. I therefore find that unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense, as described in the Planning Practice Guidance, has not been demonstrated, and the application is therefore refused.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR