

Beth Hobbs

From: west2@planninginspectorate.gov.uk
Sent: 07 February 2023 08:31
To: Planning Support
Subject: Planning Inspectorate APP/W1145/W/22/3298786: Land adjacent The Laurels Inn, EX20 3HJ
Attachments: Despatch Cover Letter - Costs - Helen Smith - 07 Feb 2023.pdf; Final Costs Decision.pdf; Final Decision.pdf
Categories: Beth

CAUTION: This email originated from outside Torridge District Council. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

The Planning Inspectorate (England)
Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Temple Quay, Bristol, BS1 6PN

The Planning Inspectorate (Wales)
Crown Buildings, Cathays Park, Cardiff, CF10 3NQ

<http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/planninginspectorate>

Twitter: [@PINSGov](https://twitter.com/PINSGov)

This communication does not constitute legal advice.

How we use your information

The Planning Inspectorate takes its data protection responsibilities for the information you provide us with very seriously. To find out more about how we use and manage your personal data, please go to our [privacy notice](#).



The Planning Inspectorate

3C
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Direct Line: 0303 444 1833
Customer Services:
0303 444 5000

Email: west2@planninginspectorate.gov.uk
www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate

Your Ref: 1/1119/2021/OUT
Our Ref: APP/W1145/W/22/3298786

Helen Smith
Torridge District Council
Development Control
Riverbank House
Bideford
Devon
EX39 2QG

07 February 2023

Dear Helen Smith,

Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Appeal by Mr & Mrs Paul and Lorraine Johnson
Site Address: Land adjacent The Laurels Inn, Petrockstow , EX20 3HJ

I enclose a copy of our Inspector's decision on the above appeal(s), together with a copy of the decision on an application for an award of costs.

If you wish to learn more about how an appeal decision or related cost decision may be challenged, or to give feedback or raise complaint about the way we handled the appeal(s), you may wish to visit our "Feedback & Complaints" webpage at <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/planning-inspectorate/about/complaints-procedure>.

If you do not have internet access you may write to the Customer Quality Unit at the address above. Alternatively, if you would prefer hard copies of our information on the right to challenge and our feedback procedure, please contact our Customer Service Team on 0303 444 5000.

The Planning Inspectorate is not the administering body for High Court challenges and cannot change or revoke the outcome of an appeal decision. If you feel there are grounds for challenging the decision you may consider obtaining legal advice as only the High Court can quash the decision. If you would like more information on the strictly enforced deadlines and grounds for challenge, or a copy of the forms for lodging a challenge, please contact the Administrative Court on 020 7947 6655.

Guidance on Awards of costs, including how the amount of costs can be settled, can be located following the Planning Practice Guidance.

<http://planningguidance.communities.gov.uk/blog/guidance/appeals/how-to-make-an-application-for-an-award-of-costs/>

We are continually seeking ways to improve the quality of service we provide to our customers. As part of this commitment we are seeking feedback from those who use our

service. It would be appreciated if you could take some time to complete this short survey, which should take no more than a few minutes complete:

https://www.surveymonkey.co.uk/r/Planning_inspectorate_customer_survey

Thank you in advance for taking the time to provide us with valuable feedback.

Yours sincerely,

Cassandra Low

Cassandra Low

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/planning-inspectorate-privacy-notice>

Where applicable, you can use the internet to submit documents, to see information and to check the progress of cases through GOV.UK. The address of the search page is - <https://www.gov.uk/appeal-planning-inspectorate>



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2022

by B J Sims BSc (Hons) CEng MICE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W1145/W/22/3298786

The Laurels Inn, Petrockstowe, Okehampton, Devon, EX20 3HJ.

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr P and Mrs L Johnson against the decision of Torridge District Council.
 - The application Ref 1/1119/2021/OUT, dated 23 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 10 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of 2 No former almshouses into 2 No units of holiday accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed

Procedural Matters

Application for Costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr and Mrs Johnson against Torridge District Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Pre-application Advice

3. The Appellants quote positive pre-application advice from the Council that there is opportunity to improve the appeal buildings and the setting of the neighbouring heritage assets and that the Inn car park could be used by occupants of the tourist units without impact on highway safety. Such advice is always given without prejudice to the outcome of any subsequent formal application and any appeal is determined on a fresh assessment of the evidence provided.

Validity of the Outline Application

4. The Council contends that the application should have been made in outline, given an outline application is legally defined¹ as being for the construction of a building, whereas the present proposal is for conversion, albeit necessarily involving substantial rebuilding work.

¹ The Town and Country Planning (Development Procedure Order)(England) 2015. SI 2015 No 595 Art 2(1): "outline planning permission" means a planning permission for the erection of a building, which is granted subject to a condition requiring the subsequent approval of the local planning authority with respect to one or more reserved matters;

5. The Council nevertheless formally validated the application and then proceeded to exercise its statutory right to request further information on the reserved matters. For clarity, that process does not have the effect that matters of detail are then no longer reserved. The Council then refused the application for reasons of potential planning effects without reference to the legal objection.
6. On careful consideration of the legal submissions included within the Council's appeal statement, I have concluded that Article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure)(England) Order 2015 does make clear that outline planning permission means a planning permission for the erection of a building, as distinct from conversion of a building, and that it is not possible, therefore, under the provisions of that Order, to grant outline planning permission for the development proposed in this case.
7. On that basis this appeal cannot succeed and I have no jurisdiction to take any further action, other than formally to dismiss the appeal as made.

B J Sims

Inspector



Costs Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2022

by B J Sims BSc (Hons) CEng MICE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 February 2023

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/W1145/W/22/3298786 The Laurels Inn, Petrockstowe, Okehampton, Devon, EX20 3HJ.

- 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 Mr P and Mrs L Johnson for a full or partial award of costs against Torridge District Council.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of an application for outline planning permission for the conversion of 2 No former almshouses into 2 No units of holiday accommodation.
-

Decision

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

Reasons

Procedural Considerations

2. The Applicants are concerned that they received positive pre-application advice from Council officers but that this was not made known to the Planning Committee in deciding the subsequent formal application. I give this aspect of the application for costs no weight because such pre-application advice is given without prejudice to the outcome of a subsequent planning application and is not in the public domain.
3. However, I find that the manner in which the Council handled the application to have been confusing and potentially misleading to the elected Members of the Planning Committee.
4. First, Council officers held the view that the application should not have been made in outline because the legal definition¹ of an outline permission relates to the erection of a building, not conversion, and the proposal raised issues of potential impact on nearby designated heritage assets. At the same time, the Council did not decline to determine but validated the application, the refusal of which, on grounds of potential planning effects and not the legal objection, led to the subsequent appeal.
5. Second, the Council then exercised its statutory right to request the Applicants to provide further information on the reserved matters. This was willingly

¹ The Town and Country Planning (Development Procedure Order)(England) 2015. SI 2015 No 595 Art 2(1): "outline planning permission" means a planning permission for the erection of a building, which is granted subject to a condition requiring the subsequent approval of the local planning authority with respect to one or more reserved matters;

provided with an offer of further liaison if required, albeit short of submitting full design details at the outline stage. That process does not have the effect that matters of detail are then no longer reserved.

6. Third, nevertheless Council officers evidently stated or implied that the application was thus subject to detailed assessment in the manner of a full application, save only for landscaping.
7. I consider that this procedure amounted to unreasonable conduct, compromising the proper consideration of the application by the Committee.
8. The subsequent appeal could not be determined for the legal reason outlined above.

Substantive Considerations

9. The Council was entitled to form its judgement that the application should be refused owing to insufficient information. However, it does not follow that, as stated in the reasons for refusal, there would necessarily be harm and conflict with development plan policy.
10. To that extent, the reasons for refusal are implicitly self-contradictory.
11. The approach of the Council was apparently founded on its stated conviction, and that of statutory consultees, as reported to Committee, that the application should have been made in full in the first place and that the submitted information was inadequate.
12. I consider that the approach of the Council amounted also to substantive unreasonable conduct.

Conclusions

13. The Planning Practice Guidance 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.
14. I have found unreasonable behaviour by the Council in terms of both procedural and substantive considerations, as described in the Planning Practice Guidance, and that this led, in practice, to unnecessary or wasted expense by the Appellants in seeking to pursue an appeal that was not legally capable of determination.
15. I conclude accordingly that a full award of costs is justified.

Costs Order

16. 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 Torridge District Council shall pay to Mr P and Mrs L Johnson the costs of the appeal proceedings described in the heading of this decision; such costs to be assessed in the Senior Courts Costs Office if not agreed.
17. The applicant is now invited to submit to Torridge District Council, to which a copy of this decision has been sent, details of those costs with a view to reaching agreement as to the amount.

B J Sims

Inspector