
Costs Decision

Site visit made on 23 September 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 November 2025

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/U2615/W/25/3366847 Burghwell House, Market Road, Burgh Castle, Great Yarmouth NR31 9EN

- 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 full award of costs against Tredwell Developments Limited.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for an upward extension to existing detached dwelling.
-

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 largely relies on the case that the appellant acted unreasonably by appealing the decision made by the Council on unsubstantiated and unjustified grounds, and by applying for an award of costs against the Council without defensible reason to do so.
4. The appeal process is an integral part of the planning process, and the appellant was within their rights to submit the appeal given that they felt aggrieved by the Council's decision. Although I dismissed the appeal, reasoning was provided in the appellant's appeal submission in relation to all of the reasons for refusal.
5. Furthermore, although I did not uphold the appellant's costs application, the appellant was within their rights to submit it as part of the appeal process. Whilst brief, they did provide reasoning and justification for doing so, which largely amounted to their experience of proceedings and interpretation of the GPDO and its conditions and limitations.
6. In both the case of the appeal submission and the costs application, the lack of strength in their arguments does not amount to unreasonable behaviour in this regard.
7. For these reasons, I am satisfied that the appellant acted reasonably in submitting the appeal and applying for an award of costs.

8. 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