



Costs Decision

Site visit made on 17 March 2026

by **E Everitt BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 March 2026

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/Q3820/D/25/3375897

60 Hazelwick Road, Three Bridges, Crawley, West Sussex RH10 1LZ

- 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 Julie O'Brien for a full award of costs against Crawley Borough Council.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for part demolition and alterations to existing rear dormer.
-

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 asserts that the Council did not provide the opportunity to make amendments to the appeal scheme which would have rendered the scheme acceptable. However, the planning application sought permission for the scheme as proposed. There was no requirement upon the Council to seek or consider potential amendments which could have made the scheme acceptable, regardless of how quickly amended plans could have been provided. Engaging in further pre-application discussions with the Council prior to the submission of the application would have provided the opportunity for the consideration of potential amendments to the scheme.
4. Moreover, given the nature of the harm identified by the Council relating to the scale and form of development, minor amendments would not have been capable of, in its view, making the proposal acceptable. Accordingly, while I appreciate that the outcome of the application will have been a disappointment to the applicant, I am satisfied that the Council's approach to the application did not amount to procedural unfairness.
5. The applicant also suggests that the Council's conclusion that the proposal would harm the significance of the Hazelwick Road Conservation Area (CA) was not adequately justified given the significance of the CA results mainly from the Hazelwick Road frontages of properties. The Council's Officer Report clearly sets out that the CA is not confined to the front of properties in Hazelwick Road and includes entire dwellings, other buildings, and rear gardens. The report goes on to identify that, consequently, development which occurs at the rear of properties also

needs to be considered in relation to the character and appearance of the CA. The report outlines the reasons why, in this context, the Council considered the appeal proposal to be harmful. There is nothing before me to suggest that, on the basis of this assessment, the Council was unreasonable in coming to its decision.

Conclusion

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

E Everitt

INSPECTOR