
Costs Decision

Site visit made on 9 September 2025

by **L Fern BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 October 2025

**Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/U2615/W/25/3365862
Doles Poultry Farm, Stanmaur, Doles Lane, Bradwell, Great Yarmouth, Norfolk
NR31 9DZ**

- 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 Great Yarmouth Borough Council for a partial award of costs against Mr Geoff Perry.
 - The appeal was against the refusal to grant approval required for conversion of agricultural building to 3 single-storey dwellings (2no. 1-bedroom and 1no. 2-bedroom), including works of partial demolition of rear and front elevations and removal of part of the roof. Removal of wall panels and insertion of windows, doors and rooflights and infilling of an existing opening.
-

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. This application relies on the case that the appellant acted unreasonably by applying for an award of costs against the Council based on unsubstantiated claims and a lack of justification.
4. The appellant was within their rights to apply for an award of costs against the Council as part of the appeal process. Although I did not uphold their application and it was lacking in supporting evidence, they did set out their reasons and justification. The lack of merit in their arguments does not amount to unreasonable behaviour in this regard.
5. For these reasons, I am satisfied that the appellant acted reasonably in applying for an award of costs.
6. I therefore conclude that unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense in the appeal process, as described in the PPG, has not been demonstrated. Therefore, the application for an award of costs is refused.

L Fern

INSPECTOR