
Costs Decision

Site visit made on 10 November 2025

by Ryan Cowley MPlan (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 November 2025

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/W/25/3372837

Howbeck Farm, Street Lane, West Morton BD20 5UP

- 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 Messrs Richard Waite and Amar Sattar for a full award of costs against City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for hardstanding track.
-

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. Local planning authorities are required to behave reasonably in relation to procedural matters at the appeal and with respect to the substance of the matter under appeal. Examples of unreasonable behaviour may include preventing or delaying development which should clearly be permitted, failure to produce evidence to substantiate each reason for refusal or vague, generalised or inaccurate assertions about a proposal's impact, unsupported by objective analysis.
4. The applicant for costs contends that the Council acted unreasonably in the context of local and national planning policies, and by failing to consider recent planning appeal decisions for other hardstanding access tracks serving agricultural developments in the district which were found to be acceptable.
5. The reasons for refusal are set out clearly in the Council's decision notice. Further justification is provided in the Council's officer report, with reference to local and national planning policy and guidance. These demonstrate that the Council assessed the application on its own merits, as it is required to do.
6. It will be seen from my decision that I agree with the Council's judgement with regard to the substance of the matter under appeal and I consider there were sufficient grounds for refusing planning permission. Moreover, I found the other appeal decisions referenced to be materially different to the appeal scheme.
7. I therefore do not find that the Council has acted unreasonably in respect of these matters. As such there can be no question that the applicant was put to unnecessary or wasted expense as a result.

Conclusion

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

Ryan Cowley

INSPECTOR