



Costs Decision

Hearing held on 3 March 2026

Site visit made on 4 March 2026

by R Major BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th March 2026

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/C4235/W/25/3362376

Jose Lomas Farm, Gird Lane, Marple Bridge, Stockport SK6 5LP

- 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 Miss J Doolan for a partial award of costs against Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for proposed conversion of existing stables and extension to form farm house.
-

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 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 The applicant states that the Council requested the first planning application be withdrawn and further documents be provided with the resubmitted planning application. Only for this resubmitted application to be refused.
4. The applicant is therefore seeking a partial award of costs on the grounds of the additional expense that has occurred as a result of the appeal, in addition to the ordinary costs associated with having to twice apply for planning permission.
5. The applicant's concerns in respect of the costs incurred by having to submit two planning applications relate to procedural matters associated with the Council's handling of these applications, rather than their behaviour during the appeal process.
6. Furthermore, whilst I may not share all the concerns put forward by the Council in respect of the appeal proposal, for the reasons detailed within my Decision Letter, I have dismissed the appeal. I do not therefore find the Council's overall decision to refuse the application unreasonable, and thus it did not result in an appeal that could have otherwise been avoided.

Conclusion

7. Given the above, I conclude that unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense has not occurred and an award of costs is therefore not warranted.

R Major

INSPECTOR