

# **APPLICATION FOR COSTS AT APPEAL**

**Town and Country Planning Act  
1990**

**Town and Country Planning  
(Control of Advertisements)  
(England) Regulations 2007**

Manchester Planning Application Refs.  
139701/FO/2024 and 139702/AOH/2024

July 2024

## **INTRODUCTION**

1. New World Payphones hereby apply for an award of costs against Manchester City Council (“the Council”).
2. The application(s) for costs relate to the refusal of applications for planning permission and express advertising consent made to the Council.
3. The appeal proposal is for the removal and replacement of the existing red telephone kiosk outside 1 Oxford Street with a new digital communications kiosk and ancillary advertisement.

## **THE COSTS REGIME**

4. The Planning Practice Guidance (“the PPG”) advises that, irrespective of the outcome of the appeal, costs may be awarded against a party who has behaved unreasonably, and that unreasonable behaviour has directly caused another party to incur unnecessary expense in the appeal process.
5. The mechanism is designed to ensure that parties behave in a reasonable way, encourage decision makers to exercise judgment in a sound manner and, ultimately, discourage unnecessary appeals. In this regard, it is considered that the local planning authority has failed on all counts.

## **REASONS FOR AN AWARD OF COSTS**

6. The Appeals PPG advises that local planning authorities are at risk of an award of costs if they behave unreasonably with respect to the substance of the matter under appeal, for example, by unreasonably refusing or failing to determine planning applications, or by unreasonably defending appeals. Examples<sup>1</sup> include, but are not limited to, the following:
  - i. vague, generalised or inaccurate assertions about a proposal’s impact, which are unsupported by any objective analysis.
  - ii. persisting in objections to a scheme or elements of a scheme which the Secretary of State or an Inspector has previously indicated to be acceptable.
  - iii. Not determining similar cases in a consistent manner.
  - iv. Failing to grant a further planning permission for a scheme that is the subject of an extant or recently expired permission where there has been no material change in circumstances.

---

<sup>1</sup> Paragraph: 049 Reference ID: 16-049-20140306

- v. refusing to enter into pre-application discussions, or to provide reasonably requested information, when a more helpful approach would probably have resulted in either the appeal being avoided altogether, or the issues to be considered being narrowed, thus reducing the expense associated with the appeal.
7. The Council has not submitted any substantive detail of their objections to warrant withholding consent. References to strategies which may or may not be ongoing, or undocumented and vague regeneration programs/objectives, are considered unsubstantiated and contrived respectively. Anything submitted now would be *after the fact*.
  8. Furthermore, the Council approved similar proposals a short distance away on Oxford Street for replacement communications apparatus (and ancillary advertisements) and a double-sided advertising unit. The premise of these approvals was the removal of outdated telephone boxes and installation of new modern equipment to bolster the connectivity of the city centre. This is exactly what is advanced by the appeal proposal, but the Council have not been consistent in their approach towards NWP compared to other operators.
  9. Finally, the Council entered into pre-application discussions with the Council (set out in the accompanying appeal and original submission). NWP provided a significant degree of information upfront regarding the proposed communications kiosks, including their siting, design and appearance.
  10. In its response, the Council raised no concerns as to the in-situ upgrade, stating only that it would not want a replacement kiosk sited on the opposite side of the road. It also advanced nothing pertaining to the potential conflict with any regeneration program or highways strategy. Had these matters been raised, the time and expense on any application – *and now an appeal* – may not have been incurred.
  11. Based on the evidence presented in this application (and ancillary appeal), New World Payphones consider that Manchester City Council has acted unreasonably, and the appellant has incurred unnecessary costs in appealing this decision. It is NWP's view, therefore, that the Council has refused consent as a matter of general policy rather than for any substantive or objective reasons.
  12. The main expense in this appeal is time, and whilst submitting an appeal may be free of charge, it has necessitated a greater degree of work and effort compared with the original application<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup> This does not consider the time and expense taken by the Planning Inspectorate.

## **SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION**

13. New World Payphones hereby apply for an award of costs against Manchester City Council. The claim is made on the basis that the Council have behaved unreasonably with respect to the substance of the matter under appeal, and the reasons underpinning the decision are unreasonable, unnecessary, and unjustified.
  14. Hence, it is concluded that the Council has acted unreasonably, resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense, and a full award of costs is justified.
-