



Costs Decision

Site visit made on 8 January 2026

by **B Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th February 2026

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/F1610/D/25/3370073

Paxford House, Paxford, Blockley, Chipping Campden GL55 6XQ

- 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 Robert Gillon for a full award of costs against Cotswold District Council.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for the erection of a Padel Court.
-

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 PPG sets out that local planning authorities are at risk of an award of costs if they behave unreasonably with respect to the substance of the matter under appeal, for example, by making vague, generalised or inaccurate assertions about a proposal's impact.
4. In relation to the alleged noise implications of the proposal, the Council relied upon specialist advice provided by Environmental and Regulatory Services. Whilst on this matter I largely disagreed with the Council's conclusions, I find that the Council's case is sufficiently detailed, based upon evidence and studies and refers to relevant policy.
5. Whilst the Council did not set out precisely what noise level would be acceptable; their case is based upon a reasonable assumption that the noise from a padel court would be more significant than that of a tennis court and raises pertinent questions about the appellants submitted evidence. It has not therefore been demonstrated that the applicant's time and expense in defending this reason for refusal was not necessary and has resulted in unnecessary or wasted expense on their behalf.
6. The PPG also states that behaviours that may lead to an award of costs include preventing or delaying development which should clearly be permitted. In this regard, I have agreed that the proposal should not go ahead based on the information submitted, and as such this criteria is not demonstrated.

Conclusion

7. I conclude that unreasonable behaviour, either procedural or substantive, resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense, as described in the PPG, has not been demonstrated. The application for an award of costs is therefore refused.

B Phillips

INSPECTOR