



Costs Decision

Site visit made on 24 July 2025

by **R Kent BA (Hons) MTP DipM MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 August 2025

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/P1615/W/25/3363461 Old Church Rooms, Church Way, Blakeney, Gloucestershire GL15 4DT

- 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 Forest of Dean District Council for a full award of costs against Katherine Rollett.
 - The appeal was against the grant subject to conditions of planning permission for '*Variation of Condition 1 (installation of screens within 3 months of permission) relating to planning permission P0938/24/NONMAT to extend the timescale for the implementation of the privacy screens by an additional 5 months*'.
 - The condition in dispute is No 01 which states that: "*The screens as shown and detailed on drawing number PL02 Revision B dated 5th August 2024 must be installed by the 5th April 2025 and thereafter maintained permanently.*"
 - The reason given for the condition is "*To safeguard the privacy of adjacent properties, in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CSP.1*".
-

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 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. I recognise that the Council has dealt with the application to vary the condition on the basis on which it was submitted to the Council. Although the application sought an additional 5 months to implement the privacy screens and the Council agreed this, it is apparent from the appellant's statement that the bee colony together with financial constraints has impacted on the timescales for carrying out the development. The timescales for completing the development have altered and it is not unreasonable for the appellant to seek more time. Although it may have been possible for the appellant to seek a further extension of time or agree an alternative wording of the condition by other means, I am not convinced that it was unreasonable for the appellant to use the appeal process to do so.
4. Therefore, unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense has not occurred and an award of costs is not warranted.

R Kent

INSPECTOR