



Costs Decision

Site visit made on 12 March 2025

by E Pickernell BSc MSC MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 March 2025

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/H1840/W/24/3349365 Meadowside, Addis Lane, Cutnall Green, Droitwich WR9 0NB

- 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 C Meredith for a full award of costs against Wychavon District Council.
 - The appeal was against the failure of the Council to issue a notice of their decision within the prescribed period on an application for permission in principle for partial demolition of existing dwelling and the construction of a new dwelling access and parking.
-

Decision

1. The application for an award of costs is refused.

Reasons

2. Parties in planning appeals normally meet their own expenses. However, 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. The applicant contends that the Council acted unreasonably in seeking additional information in respect of access, when this is not a matter for consideration in applications for permission in principle. They consider that the Council should not have asked for a revised red line plan.
4. PPG advises that costs can only be awarded in relation to unnecessary or wasted expense at the appeal. The actions to which the appellant refers took place at the time of the application and I am mindful that a course of action was recommended to the applicant which could have avoided the necessity of the appeal.
5. Although I have found that the application was validly made, the Council has adequately explained its reasons for taking a contrary view in respect of the validity of the application.
6. Therefore, unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense has not been demonstrated and an award of costs is not warranted.

E Pickernell

INSPECTOR