
Costs Decision

Site visit made on 1 July 2025

by **E Grierson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th July 2025

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/W1525/W/25/3363487 262 Beehive Lane, Great Baddow, Chelmsford, Essex CM2 8LX

- 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 W. Lawrence Taylor Ltd for a full award of costs against Chelmsford City Council.
 - The appeal was against the grant subject to conditions of planning permission for the removal of condition 3 to approved planning application CHR/0802/62 (Erection of staff bungalow) to permit use as a residential dwelling by a person not employed on the farm.
-

Decision

1. The application for an award of 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. On substantive grounds, the appellant states that the application for costs relates to the conditions imposed by the council and the merits of the case. The merits of the case have been discussed within the appeal decision and I have concluded that the conditions are necessary and the appeal should be dismissed. Discussion in relation to the term 'rural based economy' is also included within my reasoning.
4. The appellant also contends that the council still sought to defend these conditions despite having the opportunity to reflect on their position. However, the decision to defend their position is entirely at the Council's discretion and I find no unreasonable behaviour in relation to this.
5. Therefore, whilst I note that costs would have been incurred by the appellant, I find that it has not been demonstrated that these have resulted from unreasonable behaviour on behalf of the council as described in the Planning Practice Guidance. For this reason, an award for costs is not justified.

Conclusion

6. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, an award of costs is refused.

E Grierson

INSPECTOR