Planning Inspectorate

Costs Decision

Site visit made on 1 July 2026

by L Fleming BSc (Hons) MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 August 2026

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: 6004649
Glatton Hall, Glatton Ways, Glatton, England, PE28 5RS

- 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 Miles Stephenson for a partial award of costs against Huntingdonshire District Council.
- The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for installation of solar panels to roof; erection of new boundary fence; erection of garden shed; erection of entrance gate posts.

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. It is alleged that on 29 September 2025 the appellant submitted arboricultural information in response to officer concerns about the effect of the shed on trees and requested a site visit. However, without any further correspondence, a site visit or other engagement, the Council refused planning permission by notice dated 28 November 2026, with the relevant reason for refusal stating that "the application does not contain sufficient information to fully assess the arboricultural implications of the proposal".

4. However, the Council also refused planning permission for another reason relating to insufficient information to assess the effect of the proposal on heritage assets. I have also found that there was insufficient information to reach definitive conclusions on the scheme. Whilst it may have been helpful for the Council to seek further information at the application stage, the Council was not obliged to do so. Whilst the appellant has commission further arboricultural information, this would have been required anyway.

5. Thus, in light of the information before the Council when it made its decision, it did not act unreasonably in refusing planning permission for the reasons given in its decision notice. Therefore, unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense has not occurred and an award of costs (partially or full) is not warranted.

L Fleming
INSPECTOR