



Costs Decision

Site visit made on 27 May 2025

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 June 2025

**Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/R0335/D/24/3356182
Woodbury, 28, Sandhurst Road, Crowthorne RG45 7HS**

- 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 S Kifle for a full award of costs against Bracknell Forest Council..
 - The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the development of land without complying with condition 2 attached to planning permission Ref: 24/00157/FUL dated 21 May 2024
-

Decision

1. The application for a full 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 asserts that the Council members did not confine their discussion to the addition of the proposed dormer but considered the garage as a whole. However, the quotations referenced by the Applicant in respect of the members' discussion make specific reference to the dormer addition and there is no evidence before me to suggest that the Committee members considered matters that were not pertinent to the proposal before them.
4. The concluding comments by the Applicant indicate that in his opinion conditional approval could have reasonably been granted. However, whilst the imposition of a condition would have addressed the issue relating to overlooking and loss of privacy, the stated reasons for refusal are clear that the concerns extended beyond this matter, also to include overbearing impact and impact on the street scene. These matters were not capable of being addressed by condition. It is therefore my view that in the light of the conclusions reached by the members leading to a refusal of permission, the appeal could not have been averted.
5. I therefore find that unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense, as described in the Planning Practice Guidance, has not been demonstrated.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR