Planning Inspectorate

Costs Decision

Site visit made on 22 June 2026

by E Fawcett BA (Jt Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 July 2026

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: 6005832
Woodfold Park Stud, Woodfold Park, Mellor, Lancashire BB2 7QA

- 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 Chris Ellison for a full award of costs against Ribble Valley Borough Council.
- The appeal was against the refusal of the Council to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) for rear single-storey extension to detached dwellinghouse.

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. Local planning authorities are required to behave reasonably in relation to the substance of the matter under appeal. Examples of unreasonable behaviour may include preventing or delaying development which should clearly be permitted and not determining similar cases in a consistent manner.

4. In claiming the costs of the appeal, the applicant submits that the Council has acted unreasonably by incorrectly considering the permitted development rights under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended (the GPDO), despite a previous Lawful Development Certificate being granted which considered similar principles.

5. The Council confined its assessment of the application to the conditions and limitations applicable to development permitted by Class A. Although I have reached a different view to the Council in respect of paragraph A.1(g)(i), the Council provided respectable reasons to support its contention that the scheme failed to meet this limitation. Moreover, I have agreed in my decision that the proposal would not comply with the restriction set out in paragraph A.1(j)(iii) and would therefore not constitute permitted development.

6. Whilst the previous appeal, relating to an application for a Lawful Development Certificate[1], had some similarities to the current appeal proposal, the limitations of

[1] APP/T2350/X/24/3340642

Class A, other than in relation to paragraph A.1(b), were not disputed by the parties. This previous decision does not therefore provide an alternative interpretation of the relevant paragraphs of the GPDO which are currently in dispute by the parties and has not altered my decision. Consequently, I do not consider that the Council acted unreasonably in refusing to grant approval for the proposal.

Conclusion

7. In view of the above, I find that unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense, as described in the PPG, has not been demonstrated. Therefore, an award of costs is not justified against the Council.

E Fawcett

INSPECTOR