
Costs Decision

Site visit made on 1 July 2025

by **Max Wiltshire BSc, MSc, CEng, MICE**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 October 2025

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/W/25/3365428

22 Chandos Road, Redland, Bristol BS6 6PF

- 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 Remington Properties Limited for a full award of costs against Bristol City Council.
 - The appeal was against the failure of the Council to issue a notice of their decision within the prescribed period on an application for planning permission for development described as "Additional floor to match neighbouring 24 Chandos Rd, Bristol BS6 6PF. Insertion of 1 bedroom flat into new floor."
-

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. The applicant contends that the Council failed to determine the application within a timely manner, and there was lack of timely constructive feedback throughout the assessment process.
4. As noted in my Decision, the Council outlined that if it had determined the application, the proposal would have been refused and stated four putative reasons for refusal. It is clear that if the Council had issued a decision it would have refused the application. I ultimately based my decision to dismiss the appeal based on the refusal reasons raised by the Council.
5. The applicant's cost application, and its final response (to the Council's response to the costs application), clearly indicates its contention that the Proposed Development conforms with the Council's development policies. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that had the Council refused the application the applicant would have appealed the decision and would have incurred costs associated with the appeal. I have no evidence before me to indicate that any costs incurred would be more than those usually associated with an appeal.
6. The applicant has referred to the planning guarantee and associated refund of the application fee. However, this is not associated with this costs application and is a separate matter between the Council and the applicant.

7. Therefore, unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense has not occurred and an award of costs is not warranted.

Max Wiltshire

INSPECTOR