| Scrutiny Meeting | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Meeting Date | 23 March 2022 | | | | | |
| Report Title | Planning Appeal Performance and Costs | | | | | |
| Cabinet Member | Cllr Mike Baldock, Cabinet Member for Planning | | | | | |
| SMT Lead | James Freeman | | | | | |
| Head of Service | James Freeman | | | | | |
| Lead Officer | James Freeman | | | | | |
| Key Decision | No | | | | | |
| Classification | Open | | | | | |
| Recommendations | To note the performance statistics and costs implications in relation to planning appeals. | | | | | |

1 Purpose of Report and Executive Summary

- 1.1 This report presents performance statistics relating to planning appeal decisions and the costs incurred.
- 2.1 The Planning Service does not undertake planning officer time records for individual jobs including time devoted to handling planning appeals. In these circumstances, it has not been possible to identify the full costs of handling planning appeals. Additionally, whilst it may be possible to identify the external costs of employing legal counsel and other specialist consultants to support the Council's position regarding a planning appeal, it has not been possible to identify such costs within the time frame and resources available.
- 2.2 The report does however, include a list of planning appeals where the Council has been the subject of costs against the Council where it has been deemed by a Planning Inspector that the Council has behaved unreasonably and thereby caused another party to incur or waste expense unnecessarily.

2 Background

2.3 Following discussions at the last Scrutiny Committee, a request was made to present the Council's performance statistics with regard to planning appeals, including planning enforcement appeals.

3 Proposals

- 3.1 The Scrutiny Committee are asked to note the performance statistics and costs relating to planning appeals as attached in Appendices.
- 3.2 It should be noted that the Government includes a performance indicator of 10% of major applications allowed at appeal as a proportion of the total number of major applications received above which the Local Planning Authority over a rolling two year period could be considered for special measures where planning powers could potentially be taken away. The Committee will be pleased to hear we are currently operating at a level of circa 2%, significantly below the threshold.

4 Appendices

- 4.1 The following documents are to be published with this report and form part of the report:
 - Appendix I: Appeal and Overturn decisions 2014 to date
 - Appendix II: Total appeal performance separating 'Overturns'
 - Appendix III: Appeal performance: 'overturns' / in line with officer recommendations / delegated by year
 - · Appendix IV: Appeal performance benchmarking by Kent / Family LPA
 - Appendix V: Award of Costs at Appeal

Note: Use Roman numerals for appendices.

5 Background Papers

None

APPENDIX I

Appeal and Overturn decisions 2014 to date.xls

| Total Committee Decisions | Total Delegated Decisions | Appeals allowed | Effective Decisions | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 122 | 738 | 12 | 98.6% | |
| 126 | 1225 | 26 | 98.1% | |
| 132 | 1273 | 22 | 98.4% | |
| 92 | 1430 | 19 | 98.8% | |
| 85 | 1315 | 13 | 99.1% | |
| 88 | 1280 | 22 | 98.4% | |
| 79 | 1168 | 14 | 98.9% | |
| 68 | 1198 | 13 | 99.0% | |
| 792 | 9627 | 141 | 98.6% | |

| I | Planning | | | | | | | | | | | | | Enforce | ment | |
|------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--------------------|---------------------|-------|---------|--|--------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------------|-------|---------|
| | | | Dismissed | | | | | Allowed | | | | | | | | |
| | Total planning appeals | Dismissed / Withdraw n | Delegated Refused / Not detrmnd | Commtte Refused | Commtte Overturn | Split | Allowed | Delegated Refused / Not detrmnd | Commtte Refused | Commtte Overturn | % of appeals allowed | Costs Awarded | Total appeals | Dismissed/ Withdrawn | Split | Allowed |
| 2011 | 31 | 18 | | | | 0 | 13 | | | | 41.9% | | 7 | 4 | 0 | 3 |
| 2012 | 26 | 20 | | | | 0 | 6 | | | | 23.1% | | 13 | 10 | 0 | 3 |
| 2013 | 23 | 13 | | | | 0 | 10 | | | | 43.5% | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2014 | 29 | 15 | | | | 0 | 14 | | | | 48.3% | | 4 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| 2014/15 | 32 | 20 | 13/1 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 37.5% | 3 | 8 | 6/1 | 0 | 1 |
| 2015/16 | 51 | 24 | 19/2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 26 | 16/2 | 0 | 8 | 51.0% | 4 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 2 |
| 2016/17 | 58 | 35 | 26/4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 22 | 6/1 | 0 | 15 | 37.9% | 2 | 11 | 5 | 1 | 5 |
| 2017/18 | 60 | 39 | 32/1 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 19 | 10 | 5 | 4 | 31.7% | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| 2018/19 | 44 | 29 | 26/0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 13 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 29.5% | 0 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 1 |
| 2019/20 | 57 | 35 | 29/2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 16 | 0 | 6 | 38.6% | 1 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| 2020/21 | 48 | 34 | 28/3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 11/2 | 1 | 0 | 29.2% | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 2021/22 yt | 37 | 21 | 17 | 4 | | 1 | 13 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 35.1% | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 387 | 237 | 190/13 | 28 | 5 | 7 | 141 | 90/5 | 8 | 38 | 36.4% | 14 | 48 | 35/1 | 1 | 10 |
| | | 61.2% | 85.7% | 11.8% | 2.1% | 1.8% | 36.4% | 67.4% | 5.7% | 27.0% | | 9.9% | | 75.0% | 2.1% | 20.8% |

Appenix II - Total Appeal performance with 'overturns' seperated

| | Planning & Enforcement Total | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|-------|---------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Total appeals | Dismissed/ Withdrawn | Split | Allowed | | | | | |
| 2011 | 38 | 22 | 0 | 16 | | | | | |
| 2012 | 39 | 30 | 0 | 9 | | | | | |
| 2013 | 23 | 13 | 0 | 10 | | | | | |
| 2014 | 33 | 18 | 0 | 15 | | | | | |
| 2014/15 | 40 | 27 | 0 | 13 | | | | | |
| 2015/16 | 59 | 30 | 1 | 28 | | | | | |
| 2016/17 | 69 | 40 | 1 | 28 | | | | | |
| 2017/18 | 63 | 41 | 2 | 20 | | | | | |
| 2018/19 | 53 | 37 | 2 | 14 | | | | | |
| 2019/20 | 63 | 41 | 0 | 22 | | | | | |
| 2020/21 | 49 | 35 | 0 | 14 | | | | | |
| 2021/22 ytd | 39 | 23 | 1 | 13 | | | | | |
| Total | 435 | 274 | 7 | 152 | | | | | |
| | | 63% | 2% | 35% | | | | | |

| | | Appeals | | | | |
|---------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------|--------------------------|
| | Total Overturns | Number Appealled | Number Allowed | % Appealling | % Allowed | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 2014/15 | 12 | 12 | 11 | 100% | 92% | • |
| 2015/16 | 27 | 10 | 10 | 37% | 100% | |
| 2016/17 | 14 | 9 | 8 | 64% | 89% | |
| 2017/18 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 57% | 50% | |
| 2018/19 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 29% | 50% | |
| 2019/20 | 12 | 6 | 6 | 50% | 100% | |
| 2020/21 | 1 | 1 | | 100% | | Pending |
| 2021/22 | 3 | | | | | Have until 09/06/22 to a |
| Total | 83 | 44 | 38 | 53% | 86% | |

Appendix III - Appeal performance - overturns / in line with officer recommendation / delegated by year

| | | | | | Total |
|---|-----------|--------------|---------|-----------------|-----------|
| **** | | | Total | Total | delegated |
| | Dismissed | Allowed 2 | | overturns 12 | refusals |
| ppeals against cmmttee over-turn sinst officer recommended refusal | 1 | 0 | 3 | 12 | |
| Appeals against delegated refusals | 13 | 10 | 23 | | 87 |
| ppeals against non-determination | 1 | 0 | 1 | | - |
| | 20 | 12 | 32 | 12 | 87 |
| 2015/16 | | | | | |
| ppeals against cmmttee over-turn | 0 | 8 | 8 | 28 | |
| sinst officer recommended refusal | 3 | 0 | 3 | | |
| appeals against delegated refusals | 19 | 16 | 35 | | 153 |
| ppeals against non-determination | 2 | 2 | 4 | | |
| | 24 | 26 | 50 | 28 | 153 |
| 2016/17 | _ | | | | |
| ppeals against cmmttee over-turn | 2 | 15 | 17 | 17 | |
| sinst officer recommended refusal Appeals against delegated refusals | 3 26 | 6 | 3 | | 144 |
| | 4 | 1 | 52 | | 144 |
| ppeals against non-determination | 35 | 22 | 57 | 17 | 144 |
| | 30 | - 22 | 2/ | 1/ | 144 |
| 04/2014 - 03/2017 | | | | | |
| opeals against cmmttee over-turn | 3 | 25 | 28 | 57 | |
| inst officer recommended refusal | 11 | 0 | 11 | | |
| ppeals against delegated refusals | 58 | 32 | 90 | | 384 |
| peals against non-determination | 7 | 3 | 10 | | |
| | 79 | 60 | 139 | 57 | 384 |
| | | | | | |
| 2017/18 | | | | | |
| ppeals against cmmttee over-turn | 1 | 4 | 5 | 7 | |
| sinst officer recommended refusal | 6 | 5 | 11 | | |
| Appeals against delegated refusals | 32 | 10 | 42 | | 188 |
| ppeals against non-determination | 1 | 0 | 1 | | |
| | 40 | 19 | 59 | 7 | 188 |
| | | | | | |
| 2018/19 | | _ | | _ | |
| ppeals against cmmttee over-turn | 1 | 3 | 4 | 7 | |
| sinst officer recommended refusal | 2 28 | 3 10 | 5 38 | | 168 |
| Appeals against delegated refusals ppeals against non-determination | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 168 |
| Abean against non-netermination | 31 | 16 | 47 | 7 | 168 |
| | 21 | 10 | 4/ | , | 100 |
| 2019/20 | | | | | |
| ppeals against cmmttee over-turn | 0 | 6 | 6 | 12 | |
| sinst officer recommended refusal | 5 | 0 | 5 | | |
| Appeals against delegated refusals | 30 | 15 | 45 | | 196 |
| ppeals against non-determination | 2 | 0 | 2 | | |
| | 37 | 21 | 58 | 12 | 196 |
| | | | | | |
| 2020/21 | | | | | |
| ppeals against cmmttee over-turn | 1 | | 2 | 2 | |
| sinst officer recommended refusal | 4 | 0 | 4 | | |
| Appeals against delegated refusals | 28 | 11 | 39 | | 173 |
| ppeals against non-determination | 1 | 1 | 2 | | |
| | 34 | 12 | 47 | 2 | 173 |
| | | | | | |
| 2021/22 | | | | | |
| ppeals against cmmttee over-turn | | | | | |
| sinst officer recommended refusal | | | | | |
| Appeals against delegated refusals | | | | | |
| ppeals against non-determination | | | | | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | |

| Autority | | | PL LOCKER | Attending: | Television 1 8 4 | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Tour | Agrand Alberta | Appendix optionships | Accordage allower | Appeals | Personal Party of the Party of |
| | | | | | | |
| 300 Mar 300 | 14714 | 4275 | 3 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 | in. | 198 | es. |
| - Ner Street | 1500 | SMI | 200 | 196 | 1007 | ers. |
| - Mar 3018 | 14750 | ACC ACC ACC ACC ACC ACC ACC ACC | 100 | 11111111 | | es. |
| ** Mar 3018 | 14862 | 4079 | 206 | MAN . | 1967 | N/K |
| No. 10 | 1500 | MAT. | 207 | | 100 | 97 |
| Mer 10 | 14601 | 400 | 189 | N/N | 1900 | 44 |
| 10am 30 | 1270 | 411 | spik. | ans. | 1961 | APPE . |
| MARCI | 19208 | 8776 | | 28% | 9892 | 72% |
| Ligger Grantin | | | | | | |
| Madige | | | | | | |
| Love | | | | | | |
| Gardin | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 2010 | n/a | n/a | nie. | - | | n/e |
| 2013 | n/is | njik | nja | eik . | eik . | n/e |
| Zio Zio Zio South East | n/a | eth code | nik min | en en | en . | n/e |
| | | - | | | | |
| 300 | 687 | 160 | 91 | 30% | 413 | 304 |
| * No. 2016 | 500 616 | ON COL | : | DAY. | 361 | 100 |
| - Ner 3016 | 600 | 465 | 3 | J.PE | am. | ers. |
| - No. 30 (6) | 468 | 165 | 7 | 30% | 346 | 686 |
| 100 | 91 | en e | | | 414 | 10% |
| 100-10 | CHI | 8 5 5 8 8 6 8 8 | | 30% | 613 381 388 388 388 388 378 | *********** |
| Mar 30 | ** | | ** | | | * |
| MAR21 | 480 | 110 | 7 | 25% | 343 | 75% |
| Kett - MARCH Anthri Carbring Carbri Carbri Carbri Carbring Carbri Carbring Carbring Carbring Carbring Carbring Carbring Carbring Carbring Carbring Carbring Carbring Carbring Carbring Carbring Carbring Carbri Carbri Carbri Carbring Carbri | | | | ******* | 90 | 3100 |
| Contactory | \$2 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 | 11 7 6 5 7 13 12 9 6 6 | 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 19% | 88:11:28 88 98:10:0 | 719 819 619 729 729 729 729 809 809 719 719 |
| Contract Con | 18 | 6 | 1 | 28% | 11 | 6179 |
| Shappan | 20 | 3 | 0 | 27% | 15 | 739 |
| Greature | 40 | 19 | o | 28% | 30 | 729 |
| - | 52 | 12 | 1 | 25% | 39 | 75% |
| Secondo | - 6 | | 0 | 20% | 30 | 80% |
| Therei | 20 | 6 | | 21% | 26 | 79% |
| Toribridge and | 20 | 6 | 0 | 20% | 14 | 70% |
| and the same | 24 | | 2 | 29% | 17 | 719 |
| 3013 Mar 2013 | | | | | = | |
| No 301 | | | | | = | ** |
| We 2016 | | | | | - | 100 |
| E - 300 | | | | | | - |
| E - 200 | | | | | : | - |
| E - 300 | | | | | ** | |
| Audiq | | l | | | - | |
| Alexer' | | | | | - | - |
| Name of | | | | | | |
| 2000 | | | | | | |
| 2061 | | | | | 27 | TPL. |
| | | | | | B # 8 | 2 2 2 |
| 2068 | | | | | 5 7 E 8 | 174 184 184 184 |
| 2068 | | | | | | ere ere ere ere |
| 2013 2014 2015 | | | | | | 2 8 2 2 8 2 1 |
| 2015 2016 2016 2017 | | | | | | 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 3 |
| 2003 2004 2005 2005 2007 2005 | | | | | | 5 6 5 6 5 6 5 6 6 |
| 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2010 2010 2010 | 44 | 14 | | 25% | 2 | 5 6 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 |
| 2011 2014 2015 2015 2017 2015 2010 Sheale | 44 | 14 | 0 | 20% | 8835 | 600 600 600 600 600 600 600 600 600 600 |
| 2011 2012 2015 2015 2017 2016 2010 Sharaka | | 14 79s. | 0 | 20% | 8835 | ETELL STATE OF THE |
| 2015 2016 2016 2017 2016 2017 2010 Sharake | 44 | 54 54 54 | 0 | 10% | 8835 | en en |
| 2013 2014 2015 2017 2017 2015 2017 2015 2010 2010 2010 2010 2010 2010 2010 | | 54 26 26 26 | 0 14 14 15 | 22% Sh | 8835 | en en |
| 2013 2014 2015 2015 2017 2010 2010 5040 2010 2010 2010 2010 2010 2010 2010 2 | | 54 56 56 | O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O | 22% Sin Sin Sin Sin | 8835 | en en |
| 2013 2014 2015 2015 2015 2015 2015 2015 2015 2015 | | 54 54 55 66 | O III | 275 | 8835 | en en |
| 201 201 201 201 201 201 201 201 201 201 | | # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # | O III | 20% | 8835 | 600 600 600 600 600 600 600 600 600 600 |
| Sections of the section of the secti | | 94 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 | 0 | 20% 86 86 86 86 86 86 86 86 86 86 86 86 86 | 8835 | en en |
| John John John John John John John John | | 7 1 5 5 E | 0 | 20% | 8835 | en en |
| JOHN JOHN JOHN JOHN JOHN JOHN JOHN JOHN | | 28th | 0 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 | 2275. | 8835 | Site of the control o |
| See | | 28th | O IN | 2275 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 | 8835 | Site of the control o |
| Section 1 | | 28th | O SI | 20% | 8835 | Site of the control o |
| See | | 28th | O To | 20% | 8835 | Site of the control o |
| Jane John John John John John John John John | | 28th | O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O | 20% | 8835 | Site of the control o |
| See | | 28th | THE STATE OF THE S | 22% | 8835 | Site of the control o |
| See | | The Colon Co | 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1 | 20% 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 | 8835 | en en |
| Set John Set | Cities Cities | 556A 01 03 08 07 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 | The state of the s | 20% 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 | 30 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 | 2000 |
| Set | Cities Cities | 556A 01 03 08 07 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 | To the second se | 20% 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 | 30 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 | 2000 |
| Set | Cities Cities | 556A 01 03 08 07 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 | To the second se | 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% | 30 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 | 2000 |
| Set John Set | Cities Cities | 556A 01 03 08 07 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 | To the second se | 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% | 30 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 | 2000 |
| Set Joseph | Cities Cities | 556A 01 03 08 07 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 | To the second se | 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% | 30 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 | 2000 |
| Set Joseph | Cities Cities | 556A 01 03 08 07 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 | To the second se | 20% 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 0 | 30 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 | 2000 |
| Set John Set | Cities Cities | 556A 01 03 08 07 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 | To the second se | 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% | 30 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 | 2000 |
| Set John Set | Cities Cities | 556A 01 03 08 07 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 | To the second se | 20% 00% 00% 00% 00% 00% 00% 00% 00% 00% | 30 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 | 2000 |
| Set John Set | Cities Cities | 556A 01 03 08 07 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 | To the second se | 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% | 30 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 | 2000 |
| Set Joseph Service Set Joseph Se | Cities Cities | 556A 01 03 08 07 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 | To the second se | 20% 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 0 | 30 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 | SERVICE SERVIC |
| SHA SHAPE SH | | 556A 01 03 08 07 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 | | 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% | 8835 | Site of the control o |

| APPLICATION REF | APPEAL REF | SITE ADDRESS | DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL | AMOUNT | NOTES |
|------------------|--------------------------|---|---|-------------|---|
| 5W/12/1483 | APP/V2255/A/13/2206002 | Land Adjoining Community Hall, Shellness Road/Wing Road, Leysdown, Sheerness, Kent, ME12 4RH | Residential development of 4 no. x 2 bedroom and 1 no. x 3 bedroom single storey dwellings together with all associated driveway parking. | £7,880.10 | No technical evidence presented to support refusal reason on noise disturbance - against officer ecommendation |
| SW/12/1523 | APP/V2255/A/13/2202894 | Building 1 Standard Quay Abbey Road Faversham | Single storey rear extension & internal alterations to grade II listed warehouse building with change of use to restaurant & art gallery/function room | £14,559.54 | Whilst the appeal was dismissd on conservation heritage grounds costs were awared against the Council for not support a further reason for refusal regarding impact on the viability and vibrancy of Faversham Town Centre |
| SW/13/0978 | APP/V2255/A/13/2210856 | Harefield House, Hogbens Hill, Selling | Erection of retaining wall, construction of steps and footpath (retrospective), erection of estate fence within residential curtilage and construction of pond within agricultural curtilage. | unknown | |
| SW/13/0980 | APP/V2255/A/13/2210860 | Harefield House, Hogbens Hill, Selling | Terracing of part of agricultural field. | unknown | Limited costs incurred by the Council through not investigating existing use before serving an enforcment notice |
| ENF/13/0033 | APP/V2255/C/13/2205032 | Harefield House, Hogbens Hill, Selling | Without planning permission and on the approximate areas highlighted in blue on the plan, the material change of use of the Land from agricultural land to land use as domestic vegetable plots associated with the residential use of Harefield House, with associated and facilitating terracing, including the excavation of parts of the Land to cerat a pond, the extend of which, in the opinion of the Council amounts to operational development requiring planning permission | unknown | The Council had acted unreasonably by refusing permission and consent based upon an assumption that a garage may be sought in the future elsewhere on the site which would harm the character and appearance of the locality and the setting of the listed building. |
| 14/501292/FULL | APP/V2255/W/15/30002827 | 2 Gosmere Farm Barns Newhouse Lane Sheldwich | Convert part of the existing garage into a shower/utility room, as part of this proposal we propose to shorten an existing door to fit in with the new floor level. | £675.00 | |
| 14/505985/FULL | APP/V2255/W/15/3133538 | Howt Green Farm, Sheppey Way, Bobbing | Proposed change of use of land for the creation of hardstanding to site 16 mobile homes for 32 weeks of the year for occupation by seasonal agricultural workers along with associated engineering works. | £16,000.00 | Council decided not to contest the appeal and incurred preliminary costs from the appellant. |
| 15/500819/FULL | APP/V2255/W/15/3139546 | Land Adj Driftwood Imperial Drive Warden | 2 No. semi-detached 2-bedroom houses together with stepped terrace to provide 3 No. 3-bedroom houses together with associated parking spaces | £3,283.38 | |
| 16/504494/FULL | APP/V2255/W/16/3164817 | Owens Court Farm Selling | Erection of a cold store | £2,182.80 | insufficient evidence submitted to support refusal reason on the lack of need for the facility and its impact bupon residents in AONB - despite the views expressed by the Council's specialist advisor |
| 18/303133/OUT | APP/V2255/W/19/3238171 | Land west of Barton Hill Drive Minster | Outline application for the development of up to 700 dwellings and all necessary supporting infrastructure including land for provision of a convenience store / community facility, internal access roads, footpaths, cycleways and parking, open space, play areas and landscaping, farinage, utilities and service infrastructure works. (All detailed Matters Reserved for subsequent approval except for access to Lower Road and to Barton Hill Drive). | £135,000.00 | costs incured on failure to substantiate a highways reason for refusal and the expenses the appellant was required to enter into to providing viability evidence regarding affordable housing. |
| 19/500029/FULL | APP/V2255/W/20/3247555 | 132 High St Newington | Erection of a 4 bedroom detached dwelling and associated carport/garage. | £240.00 | the Council anadvertantly sent out incorrect wording of refusal reason in the decisin notice leading to the appellant wasting expenses |
| 19/503810/OUT | W/4001086 | Land On The South East Side Of Bartletts Close Halfway | Outline application for the erection of 17 dwellings with new access road, associated parking and landscaping. (Access being sought, | £900.00 | Costs incurred for the Council presenting a case that there was a need for the access road to be adopted despite advice suggesting bthere was no such need. |
| 19/504417/FULL | APP/V2255/W/20/3253055 | Black Cottages Mutton Lane Ospringe | Erection of 2no. dwellings as replacement of former dwellings, with associated car port | £3,924.00 | Arguments presented at the appeal were not pertinent to the reasons for refusal. |
| 20/501607/LAWPRO | APP/V2255/X/20/3254350 | Noreview Warden Road Eastchurch | Lawful Development Certificate for the proposed siting of a third caravan for the use ancillary to the main dwellinghouse. | £6,000.00 | whilst the appeal was withdrawn, inspector accepted the Council had acted unreasonably in not granting the certificate and the appellant incurred wasted costs in having to appeal |
| 17/505711/HYBRID | APP/V225555/W/19/3233606 | Land at Wises Lane | | £60,000* | The Secretary of State formally determined that the award of costs be limited to the unnecessary or wasted expense incurred in respect of the Coundi's failure to substantiate its reasons for refusal relating to ecology, the effect of the link road on character and appearance, and harm to heritage assets. |