



Costs Decision

Site visit made on 13 February 2023

by Chris Baxter BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 March 2023

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/G2713/W/22/3304618 Land East Of, Former Shorthorn Inn, Appleton Wiske, North Yorkshire DL6 2AF

- 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 James Baker for a full award of costs against Hambleton District Council.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for application for outline planning permission [with all matters reserved except access] for the erection of four dwellings [Use Class C3].
-

Decision

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

Reasons

2. Paragraph 030 of 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. Paragraph 049 of the PPG makes it clear that a local planning authority is at risk of an award of costs if it fails to produce evidence to substantiate each reason for refusal on appeal and/or makes vague, generalised or inaccurate assertions about a proposal's impact, which are unsupported by any objective analysis.
4. Whilst the Council is not duty bound to follow advice of its professional officers, if a different decision is reached the Council has to clearly demonstrate on planning grounds why a proposal is unacceptable and provide clear evidence to substantiate that reasoning. In this case, the Planning Officers report had raised no objections to the proposal in terms of its effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area nor were any concerns raised with regards to the submitted information on a sequential approach to site selection. The alleged harm on these matters have not been substantiated other than by means of vague assertions. Little evidence has been put forward by the Council to support the reason for refusals in relation to character and appearance, and whether the proposal is suitably located.
5. In the planning judgement, it appears to me that having regard to the provisions of the development plan, national planning policy and other material considerations, the proposal should reasonably have been permitted. The refusal of planning permission therefore constitutes unreasonable behaviour contrary to the guidance in the PPG and the appellant has been faced with the unnecessary expense of lodging the appeal.

6. Unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense, as described in the PPG, has been demonstrated and an award of costs is justified.

Costs Order

7. 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 Hambleton District Council shall pay to Mr James Baker the costs of the appeal proceedings described in the heading of this decision.
8. The applicant is now invited to submit to the Council, to whom a copy of this decision has been sent, details of those costs with a view to reaching agreement as to the amount.

Chris Baxter

INSPECTOR