



Costs Decision

Site visit made on 18 March 2026

by R J Redford MTCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 April 2026

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: 6001947

3 Loxdale, Shrewsbury, Shropshire SY3 6AE

- 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 and Mrs Clarke for a full award of costs against Shropshire Council.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of outline planning permission for the erection of 2no. dwellings.
-

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 has behaved unreasonably by preventing development which should be permitted as if accords with relevant planning policy and failed to support its reason for refusal with objective analysis. The appealed application was refused on a single ground relating to character and appearance.
4. Whilst the applicant's perspective is understood, and the appeal allowed, the Council's decision notice cites relevant policies of the development plan in line with section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended), and, although brief, identifies the proposed elements which it considers would cause harm to character and appearance. Further, the Council and applicant discussed the quantum of development in an earlier application on the site (24/00388/OUT), which was approved the year before the appealed application.
5. I am therefore satisfied that the Council's assessment was based on a thorough understanding of the appeal site and the potential effect of the scheme within that context. That it concludes differently to the applicant does not infer that the Council acted unreasonably, it simply shows a difference in planning judgement. As does the weight it attributed to the previous 1970s approval (SA/74/0856) and the plot size analysis submitted by the applicant.
6. Unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense, as described in the PPG, has not therefore been demonstrated.

R J Redford

INSPECTOR