



Costs Decision

Site visit made on 13 January 2026

by K Mee BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 January 2026

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/V4250/W/25/3374553 Queens Arms, 9 Harrison Street, Wigan WN5 9AU

- 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 Ms Keely Dalfen on behalf of Queens Hall Action on Poverty (The Brick) for a full award of costs against Wigan Council.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for the change of use from public house (sui generis) to temporary accommodation and support centre (sui generis), external alterations to side elevation.
-

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 has acted unreasonably by failing to produce evidence to substantiate the reason for refusal and erroneously referring to drawing number 2442-PL-07, 'Enabling works first floor and cellar plan' in the refusal reason. While I have reached a different conclusion on the appeal overall, the Council's submissions, including its Statement of Case in response to the appeal, nonetheless adequately explains its concerns regarding the layout and size of the proposed accommodation, including the provision of bathroom facilities, and subsequent effects on the living conditions of future occupiers. The Council has therefore shown that it was able to substantiate the reason for refusal, which was clearly a matter of planning judgment.
4. Furthermore, the drawing referenced in the refusal reason appears to be that submitted at both the planning application and appeal stages, on which the Council made its decision.

Conclusion

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

K Mee

INSPECTOR