



Costs Decision

Site visit made on 13 January 2026

by K Townend BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th February 2026

**Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/F1610/W/25/3370186
Grove Piece, 400895 Lavender Cottage to A417 Duntisbourne Leer
Gloucestershire GL7 7AS**

- 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 Bryony Barraclough for a full award of costs against Cotswold District Council.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for conversion of existing stables to residential use and associated landscaping works.
-

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. In summary, the applicant claims that the Council has acted unreasonably by preventing development that should have been permitted as the scheme complies with Policies EC6 and DS4 of the Cotswold District Local Plan (the LP) and with the National Planning Policy Framework. Moreover, the applicant claims that the Council did not give sufficient weight to the benefits of the scheme in the planning balance when considering the Council cannot demonstrate a five year housing land supply.
4. The applicant also claims that the Council has not substantiated the highways reason for refusal relying on the consultation comments from the Local Highway Authority which are, in themselves, generalised, subjective and fail to provide any technical justification for the refusal and that the second reason for refusal is also unsupported, vague and inaccurate.
5. The Council's view is that all of the relevant issues were discussed at Planning Committee, the members were entitled to reach a different conclusion to that recommended by the Officer, and that the highway concerns and landscape impact were strong reasons to refuse the application, even with a lack of a five year housing land supply.
6. The Council has provided detailed information to support the reasons for refusal within its statement of case and to respond to the applicant's appeal statement. The Council's statement and their evidence is based on local policy, national policy,

legislation, and guidance. It is sufficiently detailed to not be vague or generalised assertions of the impacts.

7. Although I have reached a different conclusion on the weight to be given to the highway safety impact and the overall effect on the character and appearance of the area, including the Cotswold National Landscape, the Council had reasonable concerns about both matters, which justified its decision. The Council are entitled to give different weight to the issues and the applicant, therefore, had to address the concerns. Consequently, the appeal could not have been avoided. I therefore have no substantive evidence that the Council has acted unreasonably in the appeal. As such, there can be no question that the applicant has incurred unnecessary or wasted expense.

Conclusion

8. For the above reasons, I find that unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary expense, as described in the PPG, has not been demonstrated, thus the award of costs is not justified.

K Townend

INSPECTOR