



Costs Decision

Site visit made on 11 February 2026

by **Chris Baxter BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 March 2026

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/M2840/W/25/3363516 Darsdale Home For The Blind, Chelveston Road, Raunds NN9 6DA

- 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 Dipak Patel (Darsdale Care Home Ltd) for a partial award of costs against North Northamptonshire Council.
 - The appeal was against the failure of the Council to issue a notice of their decision within the prescribed period on an application for 36 new retirement residential apartments with communal facilities.
-

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 considers the Council have acted unreasonably by taking so long to progress the planning application. They refer to the planning application being validated in October 2021 with it still being with the Council three years later, resulting in a request from the Council to provide further ecological surveys.
4. The PPG specifically advises that costs may be awarded against a party who has acted unreasonably and incurred unnecessary or wasted expense **in the appeal process**. The request for the further ecological surveys was made prior to the appeal process.
5. The applicant also details that the planning application should have been dealt with in a timely manner. Given the objections raised by the Council and the main issues that are discussed in my Decision, it is unlikely that a more timely decision from the Council would not have resulted in the submission of an appeal. Therefore, even if I do find that the Council have acted unreasonable in this regard, it would not have resulted in unnecessary or wasted expense in terms of the submission of a planning appeal.
6. Therefore, unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense in the appeal process, has not occurred and an award of costs is not warranted.

Chris Baxter

INSPECTOR