



Costs Decision

Site visit made on 27 January 2026

by N Armstrong BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th March 2026

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/U2750/W/25/3374618

49 Gaskin Close, Langthorpe, North Yorkshire YO51 9RN

- 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 N Turner for a full award of costs against North Yorkshire Council.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for change of use from domestic garage to create pilates studio for small classes (Max 2 Persons).
-

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 makes it clear 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 unreasonably refusing planning applications. In this case, the applicant contends that despite a reduction in the scale of the proposals from a previous planning application, support from neighbours and consultees, the Council did not appear to understand the proposals. They also suggest the Council has ignored comments from consultees in refusing the application.
4. The Council's delegated planning report clearly references comments received from consultees and other interested parties. It also sets out their assessment of the proposal having regard to the development plan, national policy and other considerations. In doing so, the Council has explained and substantiated the reasons for refusal in this instance, including when exercising their planning judgement on the potential use of conditions.
5. There is no compelling evidence before me to demonstrate that the Council did not understand the proposals or that they ignored comments from consultees. Whilst the applicant disagrees with the Council's decision, this does not amount to unreasonable behaviour in this case.

Conclusion

6. For the above reasons, I conclude that unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense, as defined in the PPG, has not been demonstrated. Accordingly, the application for costs is refused.

N Armstrong

INSPECTOR