



Costs Decision

Site visit made on 25 November 2025

by F P Tinsley MA (Hons) MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 January 2026

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/A3010/W/25/3373192

Mill House, Retford Road, Rampton, Nottinghamshire, DN22 0JB

- 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 & Mrs G Buttrick against the decision of Bassetlaw District Council.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission 'Proposed Timber Single Storey Granny Annexe for Ancillary Use to the Main Dwelling'
-

Decision

1. The application for an award of costs is refused.

Reasons

2. Parties involved in planning appeals normally bear their own costs. However, the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) states that costs may be awarded against a party that has acted unreasonably and, as a result, caused the party applying for costs to incur unnecessary or wasted expense during the appeal process.
3. The applicant's reasons for making a costs application relate to advice received from the Council regarding the type of application required to seek planning permission for the proposed development. The issue concerns whether this should have been a full planning application or a householder application. The applicant claims that the advice given led to the withdrawal of the original full application and the subsequent submission of a householder application. This resulted in additional application fees being incurred by the applicant.
4. My considerations are limited to whether unreasonable behaviour has caused the party applying for costs to incur unnecessary or wasted expense during the appeal process. The alleged unreasonable behaviour and additional costs occurred at the planning application stage and is therefore outside the scope of my consideration for an award of costs which is restricted to the appeal process.

Conclusion

5. In view of the above, I find that unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense, as described in the Planning Practice Guidance, has not been demonstrated. Therefore, an award of costs against the Council is not justified

F P Tinsley

INSPECTOR