



---

## Costs Decision

Site visit made on 18 February 2026

by **T Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27<sup>th</sup> March 2026

---

### **Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/P2935/W/25/3376477 Guyzance Hall Estate, Acklington, Morpeth Easting (x) 421266 Northing (y) 603733**

- 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 Jonathan Dodd (Guyzance Hall Estate Ltd) for a full award of costs against Northumberland County Council.
  - The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for new boiler house and wood chip store to serve Guyzance Estate and part of a garden storage area (10m<sup>2</sup>).
- 

#### **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 costs claim consists of the statement of case for the appeal. Therefore, the specifics of the reasons for the costs claim have not been drawn clearly to my attention.
4. Nonetheless, it is clear from that statement that the appellant considers that it was unreasonable for the Council to require a Planning Obligation to secure the Council's fees for monitoring Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) measures at the appeal site.
5. However, as can be seen from the Decision Letter, I have not found the Council's position to be unreasonable. Therefore, the Council has not acted to prevent or delay development which should clearly be permitted. Nor has it refused planning permission on a planning ground capable of being dealt with by condition. It also has not required the appellant enter into a planning obligation which does not accord with the law or relevant national policy in the National Planning Policy Framework on planning obligations.
6. For the above reasons I cannot therefore conclude that the Council has behaved unreasonably and thereby caused the party applying for costs to incur unnecessary or wasted expense in the appeal process.

#### **Conclusion**

7. Unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense in the appeal process has not occurred and an award of costs is not warranted.

*T Burnham*

INSPECTOR