Penderfyniadau Cynllunio ac Amgylchedd Cymru
Planning & Environment Decisions Wales

Costs Decision

---

by Declan K Beggan BSc (Hons) MSc DipTP DipMan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Decision date: 04/09/2026

Costs application in relation to CAS-04831-S0Q2H8

Site address: Stables, Gatewen Road, New Broughton, Wrexham

- The application is made under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, sections 78, 322C and Schedule 6.
- The application is made by Gloria Seale-Beglin against the decision of Wrexham County Borough Council.
- The appeal was in connection with an appeal made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- A site visit was made by the Inspector on 2 June 2026.

Decision

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

Reasons

2. The Section 12 Annex ‘Award of Costs’ of the Development Management Manual (‘the Annex’) advises that, parties are expected to meet their own costs at appeal and irrespective of the outcome of an appeal, costs may only be awarded against a party who has behaved unreasonably, thereby causing the party applying for costs to incur unnecessary or wasted expense in the appeal process.
3. The thrust of the costs’ application refers to such matters as costs incurred by the appellant in drawing up plans, carrying out an ecological survey and planning related fees incurred. Reference is also made to a previous application (Council reference P2025/0219), that the appellant subsequently withdrew re-submitting the application the subject of the appeal. The applicant also refers to matters of planning merit related to the case.
4. The events leading upto the Council’s decision with regard to the current planning application subject to this appeal are not matters I can consider within this costs application i.e. matters related to any pre-application advice. To be clear the Annex advises costs cannot be claimed for the period during the determination of an application which has led to proceedings. Any costs the applicant sustained were entirely at her own risk prior to obtaining the relevant consent and therefore carry no weight in this costs process; in any event the highlighted costs related to details that do not appear be at all unusual as part of normal course of events when submitting an application or during the Council’s consideration of a planning application.

5. Despite the applicant's opinions to the contrary, for the reasons set out in my decision to dismiss the appeal, I found that the Council's arguments for refusing the proposed development had regard to national and local planning policies and were in the main justified and reasonable. Consideration of planning applications and appeals involves matters of judgment which are at times finely balanced and whilst I found in favour of the applicant in regard to the Council's fourth refusal reason, nonetheless, I consider the Council provided adequate and reasonable evidence in defence of their case having regard to relevant planning policies.

Formal Decision

6. As I have found no unreasonable behaviour by the Council, the applicant has not incurred unnecessary or wasted expense and the costs application must fail in full or part.

Declan K Beggan

INSPECTOR