



Costs Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2025

by David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th November 2025

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/W/25/3367168

Low Fold, Station Road, Steeton, Keighley, BD20 6RL

- 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 Raz Ahmed for a full award of costs against City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for single storey storage building.
-

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 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 appellant submits that the Council has failed to fully engage with them and their consultants in addressing the proposal, and has incorrectly applied design guidance.
4. The Council has not responded to the costs application, and I have determined the application on the basis of the evidence before me.
5. In respect of guidance used by the Council, although this has not been formally adopted as part of the development plan this can still be used as a basis for assessing proposals. However, I have also concluded that guidance in respect of the layout of forecourts can be applied flexibly in cases such as the appeal site which relate to older sites in mixed use areas. Nevertheless, this is a matter of planning judgment, and I do not consider that the Council has behaved unreasonably in referring to the guidance as part of its wider concerns on the proposal.
6. More fundamentally, I have dismissed the appeal on the basis that the proposal would not make suitable provision for vehicle parking, manoeuvring and loading/unloading space, with significant harm to highway safety. I am not persuaded that further engagement between the appellant and the Council would have been able to address the issues raised by the proposal due to the constraints of the site and the form of building proposed. This matter has therefore not led to an appeal which could otherwise have been avoided.

7. Therefore, unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense has not occurred and an award of costs is not warranted.

David Cross

INSPECTOR