



Costs Decision

Site visit made on 22 October 2025

by J Hobbs MRTPI MCD BSc (hons)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 November 2025

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/D2510/W/25/3371234 Greetham Bottom Poultry Farm, Somersby Road, Ashby Puerorum, Lincolnshire LN9 6QU

- 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 Andrew Bush for a full award of costs against East Lindsey District Council.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for demolition of a large poultry shed, and erection of a self build dwelling house in association with existing hotel on site; new dwelling to be built within the footprint of the existing poultry shed.
-

Decision

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

Reasons

2. Parties in planning appeals normally meet their own expenses. However, 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. The applicant has raised concerns with the Council's conduct during the determination of the planning application. This includes making generalised or inaccurate references within the Officer's Report and not viewing the application site or taking photographs on the Case Officer's visit to the area. The applicant summarises that it gives the impression that artificial intelligence has been used to produce the Council's documentation. Finally, the applicant contends that the Council did not engage with them when determining the planning application.
4. Although parts of the Officer's Report could have been clarified with the applicant, for example whether the approval for the hotel had been implemented, this would not have had a material effect on the report. Furthermore, whilst the Officer's Report may contain generalised information, there is no substantive evidence before me that artificial intelligence has been used to produce any of the Council's documentation.
5. I also cannot conclude for certain whether the Case Officer viewed the application site or not before making their decision and I acknowledge that the Officer took limited photographs. Nonetheless, given the reason for refusal visiting the site and taking more photographs would not have altered the outcome of the planning application.

6. The Council could have engaged more proactively with the appellant. However, the planning application was refused for one reason which could not have been overcome through further correspondence. Therefore, the outcome of the planning application would have been the same even if the Council had engaged more.
7. Overall, some of the applicant's concerns may have been addressed if the applicant was better informed by the Council. Notwithstanding this, the Council did not act unreasonably, and the Council's actions have not resulted in the applicant incurring an unnecessary or wasted expense. Therefore, an award of costs is not warranted.

J Hobbs

INSPECTOR