



Costs Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2025

by Diane Cragg DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 July 2025

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/L3815/W/25/3363606 Meadow View Stables, Monks Hill, Westbourne, West Sussex, PO10 8SX

- 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 F Wickens for a full award of costs against Chichester District Council.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for the demolition of existing day room and construction of 1 no. shared utility building (alternative to utility building approved under WE/14/04206/FUL).
-

Decision

1. The application for 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. The applicant has made a substantive award for costs on the basis that the Council behaved unreasonably by 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.
4. In particular, the applicant considers that the Council failed to take account of the needs of the extended family on the appeal site or provide adequate justification in terms of the size of the building, noting that similar buildings having been approved elsewhere.
5. The planning decision is one that is a matter of judgement. The Council provided a Statement of Case to substantiate the reason for refusal. The Council's statement sets out why it considers the development should not be approved with reference to previous decisions and Development Plan policies. I do not agree with the applicant that the Council disregarded the needs of the extended family. The Council concluded that, in principle, the construction of a day room was acceptable and that there were benefits associated with the development for the occupiers of the appeal site.
6. While it is clear from the accompanying appeal decision that I do not agree with the Council's decision, I am satisfied that the Council did not exercise its judgement in an unreasonable manner.

7. Therefore, I find that unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense, as described in the PPG, has not been demonstrated and the application for costs is refused.

Diane Cragg

INSPECTOR