Planning Inspectorate

Costs Decision

Site visit made on 3 November 2025

by C Coles MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th December 2025

Costs application in relation to Appeal A Ref: APP/Z3825/W/25/3370974
Little Wantley, Fryern Road, Storrington, West Sussex RH20 4BJ

- 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 Simon and Victoria Oliphant-Hope for a full award of costs against Horsham District Council.
- The appeal was against the refusal of the Council to grant planning permission for a houseboat with associated decking referred to as 'The Cruiser' and its use as a holiday let.

Costs application in relation to Appeal B Ref: APP/Z3825/W/25/3370975
Little Wantley, Fryern Road, Storrington, West Sussex RH20 4BJ

- 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 Simon and Victoria Oliphant-Hope for a full award of costs against Horsham District Council.
- The appeal was against the refusal of the Council to grant planning permission for the use of 'The Chalet' as a holiday let.

Decision

Appeal A

1. The application for an award of costs is refused.

Appeal B

2. The application for an award of costs is refused.

Reasons

3. 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.

4. As evident from the Council's officer delegated report the Council had regard to the relevant planning policies and justifies the reasoning behind the conclusion reached. A planning balance was exercised by the Council having regard to adopted development plan policy and other material considerations in reaching their decision.

5. The Council gave appropriate regard to the individual merits of the applications, including site context. It then made reasoned conclusions based on the effects of the developments on the character and ambience of the countryside. Whilst the applicants listed in Appendix A of their Statement of Case other applications the Council has determined positively over recent years, no context to these decisions

has been provided therefore it has not been possible to determine how relevant these decisions are to the appeals site.

6. Whilst I have taken a different view to the Council, I find that unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense, as described in the Planning Practice Guidance has not been demonstrated. Therefore an award of costs is not justified against the Council.

C Coles

INSPECTOR