
Costs Decision

Site visit made on 02 September 2025

by **N Robinson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 September 2025

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/R1845/W/25/3368220 The Coppins, Kidderminster Road, Bewdley, Worcestershire DY12 1LW

- 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 M Dixon for a partial award of costs against Wyre Forest District Council.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for siting of four shepherds' huts glamping pods and associated shower block.
-

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. Unreasonable behaviour may be procedural and/or substantive. In this instance, the applicant alleges that the Council failed to substantiate the 3rd reason for refusal which related to highway safety. It is stated that this resulted in costs incurred by the applicant in defending the appeal.
3. The Council sets out that they did not wish to defend the 3rd reason for refusal on the basis that a revised site plan (drawing 2515-2a) had addressed the Council's concerns in relation to the proposed access. The applicant states that that drawing, that is now found to be acceptable by the Council, was submitted to the Council on 08 May 2025 before the application was determined.
4. As drawing 2515-2a formed part of the planning application, I find that the Council has not satisfactorily substantiated its 3rd reason for refusal. This represents unreasonable behaviour. However, I have not been presented with any evidence of substantive work undertaken preparing a case in respect of the highways reason for refusal, and therefore wasted expense has not been demonstrated.
5. I find that for the reasons set out above, unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary expense during the appeal process has not been demonstrated.

N Robinson

INSPECTOR