



Costs Decision

Site visit made on 2 December 2025

by **P Burley BA (Hons) MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 December 2025

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/Y9507/W/25/3367266

The Old Drum, Chapel Street, Petersfield, Hampshire GU32 3DP

- 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 Unreal Estate Limited for a partial award of costs against the South Downs National Park Authority.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of the Authority to grant planning permission for the extension of existing outbuilding to create dwelling together with amenity space, bin and cycle storage.
-

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. Whilst the applicant has said that the Authority did not provide any objective evidence to support the second reason for refusal, no internal lighting assessment was submitted with the appeal application and it is not for the Authority to commission an assessment. In the absence of such information, I do not find it unreasonable for the Authority to have based its decision on its professional judgement having regard to the site's characteristics and its context.
4. The applicant has also referred to the Authority's disagreement, as set out in its appeal Statement of Case, with the conclusions of the internal lighting assessment that was submitted with the appeal, noting that no reasonable authority could have concluded that internal lighting would be inadequate on the basis of that assessment. Whilst there may be disagreement between the parties on this matter, it is nevertheless the case that this information was not available to the Authority when it determined the application and, therefore, I do not find the Authority acted unreasonably in partially refusing the application on the basis that the scheme would provide inadequate light to the habitable rooms.
5. Therefore, unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense has not occurred and an award of costs is not warranted.

P Burley

INSPECTOR