



Costs Decision

Site visit made on 11 July 2025

by B Davies MSc FGS CGeol

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 October 2025

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/P1615/W/25/3363086

The Willows, Road from Mayview to Junction at Yates Farm, Malswick, Newent Parish, Gloucestershire, GL18 1HF

- 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 partial award of costs against Mr Nigel Grinnell.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for 'change of use of annexe to C3 dwelling and single storey rear extension'.
-

1. The application for an award of costs is refused.
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 Council submits that the appellant acted unreasonably in submitting the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) at the appeal rather than with the application.
4. I concur that the report should have been provided with the application, and this resulted in an unnecessary reason for refusal.
5. However, it has not been demonstrated that this led to unnecessary expense. This is because:
 - The detailed review of the PEA and associated expense would have had to occur at some stage. The Council's ecologist was unable to assess the impacts on biodiversity at the application stage because of a lack of information and had to undertake a detailed review at the appeal stage instead.
 - There is no evidence that reviewing the detailed information at a later stage took significantly longer or cost more than it would have done if the information had been received in a timely manner.
6. This may have been a different matter had the lack of ecological information been the only reason for refusal, which could have led to an unnecessary appeal. However, in this case the appeal would have proceeded anyway for other reasons.
7. Therefore, unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense has not been demonstrated and an award of costs is not warranted.

B Davies, INSPECTOR