



Costs Decision

Site visit made on 9 July 2025

by **M Aqbal BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 September 2025

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/W/24/3357108 82 Parkstone Heights, Poole BH14 0RZ

- 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 V Patel for a full award of costs against Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for demolition of 2no. flats and 1no. dwelling and outbuildings, the erection of a block of 8no. flats and 1no. detached house to the rear.
-

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. The applicant's application for costs is based on the alleged unreasonable behaviour of the Council and wasted expense, for the reasons considered below.
4. Based on the chronology provided by the applicant, I acknowledge that the application was subject to a prolonged determination period. However, the evidence before me indicates that the Council's Planning Services were operating under significant pressures during this time, including a high volume of applications and a declining number of planning officers, despite active recruitment campaigns. Financial constraints further limited the Council's ability to engage temporary support.
5. Irrespective, and while the delay is regrettable, the applicant had the option to appeal for non-determination but chose not to do so.
6. The applicant also asserts that the Council did not determine the planning application based on the correct drawings and information, as these were amended during the course of the application. According to the information before me, this largely relates to a revised Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Arboricultural Method Statement. Nonetheless, I have insufficient evidence to confirm that these documents were received by the Council. Even if the Council had made its decision based on these documents, given that there were other reasons for refusing the planning application, it is unlikely that the outcome would have been different.

7. Overall, there is no compelling evidence that the Council was aware of the revised documents or deliberately failed to take them into account. As such, this does not amount to unreasonable behaviour.
8. The planning officer's report included a planning balance and considered the Council's housing delivery position and the implications of paragraph 11 of the Framework. The report acknowledged the shortfall in housing land supply and applied the tilted balance accordingly. However, it also identified harm and conflict with the development plan. The conclusion reached was a matter of professional judgement. Therefore, I am not persuaded that the Council failed to undertake an appropriate planning balance.
9. For these reasons, I conclude that the Council did not behave unreasonably and that the applicant did not incur unnecessary or wasted expense in the appeal process. Accordingly, the application for an award of costs is refused.

M Aqbal

INSPECTOR