



Costs Decision

Inquiry opened on 1 December 2011

Site visit made on 2 December 2011

by R J Marshall LLB Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 24 February 2012

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/A/11/2156159 Land adjacent West Wiltshire Crematorium, Littleton, Semington, Wiltshire

- The application is made under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, sections 78, 320 and Schedule 6, and the Local Government Act 1972, section 250(5).
 - The application is made by Mr Patrick Ward for a full, or in the alternative partial, award of costs against Wiltshire Council.
 - The inquiry was in connection with an appeal against the refusal of planning permission for development described as "Change of use to small private gypsy and traveller site for 3 pitches for 8 caravans and associated ancillary works and development (including hardstanding, utility blocks, drainage etc.) and associated keeping of horses".
 - The inquiry sat for 3 days on 1 and 2 December 2011 and 5 January 2012.
-

Decision

1. The application for an award of costs is allowed in the terms set out below.

The submissions for Mr Patrick Ward

2. The costs application was made in writing with some minor verbal additions and amendments. The essence of the case is set out below.
3. The decision to refuse permission was unreasonable. Any concerns, if valid, could have been dealt with by condition.
4. At appeal the Council failed to provide evidence or sufficient evidence to justify its reasons for refusal, contrary to Officer advice, on the impact of the proposal. Insufficient account was taken of national Guidance in *Circular 01/2006 Planning for gypsy and traveller caravan sites*.
5. The Council's concern on prematurity ignores Government Guidance and recent Inspector's decisions in this area and is not supported by substantial evidence. Contrary to Government Guidance and recent Secretary of State decisions the Council attributed undue weight to emerging Government Guidance on gypsy sites and insufficient weight to existing Guidance.
6. The Council failed at any stage to adequately assess material considerations in favour of the proposal such as the unmet need for sites, the lack of alternative sites and personal circumstances.
7. The above considerations justify a full award of costs. Should unreasonable behaviour leading to unnecessary costs be found on only some of the matters above then a partial award of costs is justified.

The response by Wiltshire Council

8. The response by the Council was made in writing and supplemented verbally. The essence of the response is set out below.
9. In issuing draft Guidance on gypsy and traveller sites a press circular indicated that current Guidance had become outdated. The Council had reasonable expectations that the new Guidance, supporting its stance, would by now have been issued.
10. Material circumstances such as need and personal circumstances were before the Committee and taken into account.
11. Should it be found that permission should not be refused for the reasons given by the Council the progress made with the Council's *Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD)* would justify a temporary permission. This would prejudice neither the appellant nor the Council pending an assessment of what sites are acceptable for permanent provision in the District.
12. It was legitimate for the Council to have regard to encroachment into the Countryside. It is a criterion of Local Plan Policy CF12 on gypsy sites and is consistent with emerging Government Guidance. Guidance on this in *Circular 01/06* on this is out of date and will soon be withdrawn.
13. The Council has provided evidence to support its case with appropriate reference to the Development Plan. The potential for nuisance to an adjoining land use is a legitimate concern and in any event took up little Inquiry time.
14. The appellant has given undue weight to past appeal decisions. All cases are to be treated on their individual merits.
15. If costs are awarded there should be a deduction for the time unnecessarily incurred by the appellant in providing excessive evidence and failing to sign a SOCG in time.

Appellant's final response

16. The reason for refusal indicates a distinction between encroachment into the countryside and impact on character and appearance. Although it may not be the view of Council Officers the Council's principal witness considers the main issue to be encroachment and that was distinct from matters of character and appearance.
17. Evidence on personal circumstances may have been before the Committee. However, this matter is dealt with in only the briefest terms in the Council's evidence and the Council has failed to show that it was taken into account in its decision.
18. As for the time the Council is seeking to have deducted from any costs award the amount of evidence provided on behalf of the appellant is no different from that supplied on other gypsy appeals and was provided to fully cover the reasons for refusal.
19. The appellant's response to the costs claim reinforces the view that undue weight was given to emerging national Guidance and local Policies on gypsy

site provision and insufficient weight on *Circular 06/2006*. The Council's approach has thus been wholly unreasonable and unlawful.

Reasons

20. Circular 03/2009 on costs advises that, irrespective of the outcome of the appeal, costs may only 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.
21. The Costs Circular says that Councils are at risk of an award of costs against them if they delay or prevent development which should clearly be permitted. It also requires that at appeal evidence should be provided to substantiate each reason for refusal. Whilst Councillors are not bound to accept Officers' recommendations reasonable planning grounds should be given for a decision contrary to them. Moreover, where appropriate, Councils are expected to show that they have considered the possibility of imposing conditions.
22. The Council's first reason for refusal is based on conflict with various requirements of Policy CF12 of the *West Wiltshire District Plan First Alteration 2004*.
23. The first 2 grounds of concern under this Policy relate to a) the impact of the proposal on the use of the adjoining crematorium and b) encroachment and the character and appearance of the area. Decisions turning on such matters are unlikely to result in an award of costs if realistic and specific evidence was given in support. However, vague, generalised or inaccurate assertions about the impact of a proposal, which are unsupported by objective analysis, are not sufficient.
24. On the effect on the crematorium no substantial evidence was provided to support an assertion that local concerns had been raised regarding anti-social behaviour on the site. Under cross examination the Council's case on the impact on the crematorium was largely narrowed down to the potential for harm caused by barking dogs. However, no substantial evidence was given to show that this is a problem generally on gypsy sites or that it has been so here. I thus consider this reason for refusal to amount to a generalised assertion unsupported by objective analysis.
25. The Council's evidence on the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area was notably sparse. However, seen in the round it went beyond just a mere assertion of encroachment but to the harm that this was alleged to cause to the character and appearance of the area. In this regard it referred to the nature of development on the site, the character and appearance of the area and from where the site can be seen. Whilst I did not find this persuasive it provided a sufficient evidential basis for the stance taken to constitute realistic and specific evidence in the terms of the Cost Circular.
26. The third and fifth grounds of concern under Policy CF12 relate to pedestrian safety and whether the site is in a sufficiently sustainable location. The 2 concerns are linked in part as the Council claims that residents' worries over the safety of crossing the main road fronting the site will cut them off from facilities in the nearest village. However, concerns on pedestrian safety are unsupported by any analysis of actual traffic speeds and flows past the site. Nor has any professional or technical evidence been provided to contradict the advice of Officers or to indicate why the Council should have taken a different

view on this matter than it did when granting temporary permission for the site in 2008.

27. In sustainability terms more generally the Council's concern is that the site is in a rural location and distant from services and in a location where housing generally would not be permitted. However, the site is in reasonable proximity to a nearby village that contains a primary school and is only a few miles from 2 towns offering a good range of services. Both towns are readily accessible by main roads. Moreover, *Circular 01/2006* advises that sustainability should not only be considered in terms of transport mode and distances from services but to various wider benefits including those provided by a settled base. There is little evidence that the Council took such considerations into account. Had it done so, and had regard to the site's reasonable proximity to services, a more reasonable approach would have been taken on sustainability.
28. In part the Council's approach on the suitability of the site for what is proposed is based on a view that *Circular 01/2006* is outdated and will be replaced. However, as the Circular remains in place regard must still be had to it in determining this proposal. The Government has recently produced a consultation document *Planning for traveller sites*. However, consultation on this may prompt amendments, which reduces the weight that may be given to it at this stage. The Council's case on the weight to be given to the emerging guidance was unclear. However, the Council's statement and its written response to this costs claim, suggests that it acted unreasonably in placing too much weight upon it at this stage.
29. The Council's fourth ground of concern under Policy CF12 relates to the principle of allowing a vehicular access onto the A361 due to its status as part of a Primary Route Network. In so doing it relies on Policy T8 of the *Wiltshire and Swindon Structure Plan* which generally seeks to prevent such accesses. However, whilst that may be so, the highways authority has not recommended that this application should be refused and the Council has failed to provide any substantial evidence by way of contrary professional opinion. Matters likely to be relevant to highway safety and the free flow of traffic such as actual traffic speeds and flows, and accident statistics were not addressed in any substantial way by the Council. As such it has acted unreasonably.
30. The second reason for refusal is based on grounds that permanent permission could prejudice the emerging *Gypsy and Travellers Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD)* which is in effect an argument on prematurity. However, Government Guidance in *The Planning System: General Principles* requires reasons for refusal on these grounds to be supported by clear evidence on how the grant of permission would prejudice the outcome of the DPD process. The Council's evidence in support of this ground of refusal is notably sparse and does not specifically address relevant considerations such as the scale of the development and cumulative effect. It amounts to little more, therefore to an assertion that harm would arise. The view that the credibility of the DPD would be undermined by a permission in this case has insufficient regard to the weight that can currently be attached to the emerging DPD.
31. The Council's suggestion that this concern could have been overcome by a temporary permission does not greatly assist its case against the cost claim as there is no evidence that the Council had regard to this in its determination of the application.

32. Turning to other material considerations the need for a gypsy sites generally in an area, and the specific needs of those seeking sites, are important considerations given guidance in *Circular 01/2006*. However, there is scant evidence that the Council took this into account. It is said that Members would have been aware of such matters. However, no substantial evidence was provided to show how those matters were considered and balanced against the factors regarded by the Council to cause harm. Thus the Council acted unreasonably in not having due regard to a material consideration.
33. Drawing together my views the Council provided sufficiently substantial evidence, in the terms of the Costs Circular, to justify only one of its reasons for refusal. Moreover, even on that ground I found overwhelmingly for the appellant. Looking, therefore, at the case as a whole, including my findings on the Council's failure to have proper regard to the other material considerations referred to above, I consider that the Council unreasonably prevented development that should clearly have been permitted. The appellant was thus put to the unnecessary expense of appealing and a full award of costs is justified.
34. I find that unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary expense, as described in Circular 03/2009, has been demonstrated and that a full award of costs is justified.
35. In arriving at this conclusion I have had regard to the Council's view that, were I to find for the appellant on costs, there should be a deduction to account for the costs that may have arisen through his unreasonable behaviour. However, that is a matter best addressed, as it was, in the Council's claim against the appellant and is the subject of a separate decision.

Costs Order

36. In exercise of the powers under section 250(5) of the Local Government Act 1972 and Schedule 6 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended, and all other enabling powers in that behalf, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Wiltshire Council shall pay to Mr Patrick Ward, the costs of the appeal proceedings, such costs to be assessed in the Senior Courts Costs Office if not agreed. The proceedings concerned an appeal more particularly described in the heading of this decision.

RJ Marshall

INSPECTOR

