



Costs Decision

Site visit made on 15 May 2025

by **Sarah Manchester BSc MSc PhD MEnvSc**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 June 2025

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/U2750/W/24/3350243

Manor Cottage, Shaw Lane, Farnham, Knaresborough, North Yorkshire HG5 9JE

- 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 and Mrs Green for an award of costs against North Yorkshire Council.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for erection of self-build dwelling, landscaping and associated works and enhancement to the facade of Manor Cottage.
-

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. In this case, the application form for an award of costs has not been completed. It does not set out what the applicants think was unreasonable behaviour by the Council that caused them unnecessary or wasted expense in the appeal nor the nature of that expense.
4. The applicants are understandably disappointed with the Council's decision and exercised their right of appeal accordingly. However, as can be seen from my appeal decision, I found that the proposal would result in harm and conflict with the development plan and the National Planning Policy Framework and I dismissed the appeal. Therefore, the Council did not unreasonably withhold planning permission nor prevent or delay development that should clearly be permitted, having regard to its accordance with the development plan, national policy and any other material considerations. Having reviewed the evidence in the appeal, I am unable to agree that the Council has behaved unreasonably.

Conclusion

5. Therefore, I find that, with reference to the PPG, unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense in the appeal process has not been demonstrated. Consequently, an award of costs is not justified in this case and the application is refused.

Sarah Manchester

INSPECTOR