
Costs Decision

Site visit made on 1 October 2025

by **E Pickernell BSc MSC MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 October 2025

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/W/25/3367218

15 Uppleby Road, Poole BH12 3DB

- 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 Valiant Homes Ltd for a full award of costs against Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for sever land and erect 1 No 3 bedroom house with parking.
-

Decision

1. The application for an award of costs is refused.

Reasons

2. Parties in planning appeals normally meet their own expenses. However, 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's judgement in respect of the size of the plot and the suitability of the amenity space was incorrect given that there is no conflict with any policy specifying minimum plot and garden sizes.
4. These are matters of planning judgement. Although I have come to a different conclusion in relation to the suitability of the amenity space, I nevertheless find that the Council provided a thorough assessment of these matters and substantiated the reasons for refusal.
5. The Council acknowledged that the provisions of paragraph 11d) of the Framework were applicable in this instance. The report contains a clear planning balance which concludes that the harms identified would outweigh the benefits. The Council explained its reasoning in apportioning weight to the benefits and harms of the proposal, and I do not find this approach to be inconsistent with the provisions of the Framework or the policies of the local plan.
6. I conclude that unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense as described in PPG, has not been demonstrated. Therefore, the application for an award of costs must fail.

E Pickernell

INSPECTOR