



Costs Decision

Hearing held on 18 November 2025

Site visit made on 18 November 2025

by **L Clark BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th January 2026

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/P2935/W/25/3371630

West View, Haydon Bridge, Hexham, Northumberland NE47 6NA

Grid References Easting: 383290, Northing: 564617

- 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 Northumberland County Council for a full award of costs against Mr Graeme Scantlebury.
- The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for siting of a caravan on a temporary basis (5 years) for use as a rural workers' dwelling.

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. The applicant contends the respondent acted unreasonably in failing to provide the relevant evidence it required to assess the proposal following his previously refused planning application¹ and by not submitting his draft Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) within the prescribed deadline.
4. In support of his current planning application,² the respondent included, amongst other matters, several statements as counterarguments to his previous refusal. Despite my overall findings on the appeal, I have nothing before me to demonstrate that the level of detail in these statements was the same as in the previous application. As such, I have no substantive evidence to demonstrate that the respondent had acted unreasonably.
5. Even if the applicant drew the same conclusion in the subsequent planning application as it did in the previous, I have nothing before me to demonstrate that it had sought any additional level of detail from the respondent to overcome its concerns prior to determining the planning application. Having had the planning application refused, the respondent exercised his right of appeal.
6. I acknowledge that the applicant would have incurred costs for, amongst other things, hiring the venue for the Hearing and the officers' time preparing its case; however as a cost application seeks to recoup costs incurred by that party during

¹ 25/00811/FUL

² 25/02370/FUL

the appeal process, notwithstanding my findings on the appeal, whether or not the respondent failed to provide any additional information, or whether or not the SoCG was submitted after the deadline, does not demonstrate that any unnecessary or wasted expense has occurred.

7. As can be seen from my decision, any attempt by the respondent to evolve the scheme has been disregarded. However, even if it had been accepted, the applicant has not provided me with any substantive evidence to demonstrate that it undertook an independent assessment which incurred additional costs.

Conclusion

8. Consequently, I find no procedural nor substantive grounds for an award of costs. I therefore find that unreasonable behaviour, as claimed, resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense as described in the PPG, has not been demonstrated.
9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that a full award of costs is not justified.

L Clark

INSPECTOR