



Costs Decision

Site visit made on 5 November 2025

by Sarah Dyer BA BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th November 2025

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/F2605/X/24/3336916 The Old Mill, Road From Larling To Bridgham, Harling Road, Roudham, Norfolk NR16 2QW

- The application is made under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, sections 195, 322 and Schedule 6 and the Local Government Act 1972, section 250(5).
 - The application is made by Mr Graeme Denham of Crendon Timber Engineering Ltd for a full award of costs against Breckland Council.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of a certificate of lawful use or development for provision of two timber storage building utilising the allowances provided by Schedule 2, Part 7, Class H of the General Permitted Development Order 1995.
-

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. In this case the applicant argues that the appeal could have been avoided on the basis that the reasons for refusal of the LDC are inadequate and incorrect.
3. It will be seen from the decision letter that the conclusion which I have reached is on a different basis to that reached by the Council. However, it does not follow that the Council acted unreasonably in terms of the decision which it made.
4. In its officer report the Council refers to the relevant section in the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (the GPDO) and addresses the question of whether the proposed development constitutes a building. The latter is not a straightforward matter, and the Council has adequately set out its reasoning in the officer report and this is expanded upon in its appeal submissions. The reasons for the Council's decision are set out in its refusal of the LDC and reflect its assessment of the application as submitted by the applicant. To that extent they are also not incorrect. Having concluded that in its view the development did not constitute a building, it was unnecessary for the Council to go on to consider whether it met the restrictions and conditions imposed by the GPDO.
5. Therefore, unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense has not occurred and an award of costs is not warranted.

Sarah Dyer

INSPECTOR