



Costs Decision

Site visit made on 18 September 2025

by **E Worley BA (Hons) Dip EP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 November 2025

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/W/25/3358649 5 Seafield Road, Bournemouth BH6 3JE

- 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 D Lowman on behalf of Prestige Organisation Ltd for a full award of costs against Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for the demolition of existing house and the erection of a block of 5 flats with off road car parking.
-

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. The PPG states that awards against a local planning authority may be procedural, relating to the appeal process, or substantive, relating to the planning merits of the appeal. The applicant contends that the Council has behaved unreasonably on substantive grounds in relation to the application of paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and behaved unreasonably by making vague, generalised or inaccurate assertions about a proposal's impact, which are unsupported by any objective analysis
3. It is alleged by the applicant that the Council failed to properly consider the Council's shortfall in housing land supply when considering the planning balance and did not reasonably consider the benefits of the proposal in that regard. The Council's Delegated Report is clear that, despite the housing land supply position, the Council considered that the adverse impacts of the development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework when taken as a whole. There is no substantive evidence to suggest that it failed to properly consider the housing land supply when considering the planning balance or did not reasonably consider the benefits of the provision of housing. Thus, I do not consider that the Council acted unreasonably in that regard.
4. Moreover, in relation to the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, I am satisfied that the Council's Delegated Report sets out clear reasons in relation to the alleged harm, having regard to the relevant material considerations and an exercise of planning judgement. Consequently, I do

not consider that the Council has failed to justify its conclusions in relation to the appeal proposal.

Conclusion

5. While I appreciate that the outcome of the planning application will have been a disappointment to the applicant, for the foregoing reasons I cannot agree that the Council has acted unreasonably, as described in the PPG, or that the applicant was put to unnecessary or wasted expense in relation to the appeal process. The application for costs is therefore refused.

E Worley

INSPECTOR