



Costs Decision

Site visit made on 30 September 2025

by Mr R Walker BA HONS DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th October 2025

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/X2410/W/25/3369623

49 Iveshead Road, Shepshed, Leicestershire LE12 9EP

- 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 Thompson for a full award of costs against Charnwood Borough Council.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for outline application for the erection of up to 4no. dwellinghouses (all matters reserved except for access).
-

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 submits that the Council has acted unreasonably in that it did not partake in positive and collaborative pre-application engagement, failed to accept revised information during the application stage, delayed determining the application and failed to provide evidence for its reasons for refusal. The Council has defended itself in relation to the allegations presented.
4. It is not unreasonable for the Council to make an assessment on the site's character or with regards to the effects on living conditions and conclude as it did as this exercises a certain amount of subjective judgement. It did seek to substantiate its position drawing from the character of the row of houses along Iveshead Road rather than the broader area and quantifying its concerns around comings and goings. As such, I do not agree that the Council acted unreasonably in refusing the application on this basis. I confirm in this regard that I have made my own assessment on these matters.
5. The Council's position regarding the principle of development to the rear appeared to evolve from the initial pre-application discussions. However, I have no substantive evidence before me to conclude that the change in the Council's position on this matter would have resulted in the appeal being avoided or has caused additional expense during the appeal.
6. The failure to accept revised information during the application, the subsequent resolution of that issue or the delay in determining the application did not result in any wasted expense in the appeal. Moreover, given my decision in the appeal, the Council did not prevent or delay development that should have been permitted.

7. I therefore conclude that unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense, as described in the PPG, has not been demonstrated.

Mr R Walker

INSPECTOR