



Costs Decision

Site visit made on 22 July 2025

by **Graham Wraight BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 August 2025

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/A0665/W/25/3364429 Forest Cottage, Ashton Road, Norley, Northwich WA6 6NY

- 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 & Mrs Reed for a full award of costs against Mr Callum Buckle.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for a replacement dwelling and detached garage.
-

Decision

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

Reasons

2. Parties in planning appeals normally meet their own expenses. Whilst there is provision in the legislation for awards of costs to be made to interested parties, the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) advises that:

'It is not anticipated that awards of costs will be made in favour of, or against, other interested parties, other than in exceptional circumstances. An award will not be made in favour of, or against interested parties, where a finding of unreasonable behaviour by one of the principal parties relates to the merits of the appeal. However an award may be made in favour of, or against, an interested party on procedural grounds, for example where an appeal has been withdrawn without good reason or where an unnecessary adjournment of a hearing or inquiry is caused by unreasonable conduct. In cases dealt with by written representations, it is not envisaged that awards of costs involving interested parties will arise.'
3. There is no allegation of procedural unreasonableness made against the respondent. Instead, the applicant's costs claim focusses on the planning merits of the case, considered in the context of the previous planning application and the subsequently dismissed appeal. Applying the guidance of the PPG, a costs application made by an interested party, solely on substantive grounds and with respect to a written representations case, must fail.
4. For the record however, there are clear material differences in the two proposals and the respondent put forward a robust case in their re-submitted application, including in terms of providing expert evidence on the heritage considerations. On that basis they were, in my view, well within the bounds of reasonableness in submitting the new application and in making a further appeal.
5. For the reasons given above, an award of costs is not warranted.

Graham Wraight INSPECTOR