Planning Inspectorate

# Costs Decision

Site visit made on 17 November 2025

**by R Bartlett PGDip URP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 08 December 2025**

**Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/E2530/W/25/3372567**
**Top Lock Meadows, Uffington Road, Stamford, PE9 3FF**

- 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 My Pad Ltd for a full award of costs against South Kesteven District Council.
- The appeal was against the refusal of the Council to grant planning permission for a residential development of 41 dwellings and associated works, without complying with conditions attached to planning permission Ref S17/2496, dated 26 July 2018.

## 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. Both of these tests must be met to warrant an award of costs.

3. The appellant claims that the Meadow View Business Park comprises only uses falling within Class E, which could not be changed without the need for planning permission. It is also suggested that there are no nighttime operations. However, I have not been provided with evidence of the lawful uses of each unit, or of any restrictions to their operating hours. From my own observations on site, there are a mix of uses, some of which could change to other uses or operations without the need for planning permission.

4. Consequently, I agree with the concerns raised by the Council, and see no error in law of their assessment of this matter.

5. Furthermore, no explanation as to what type of unnecessary or wasted expense has been caused to the applicant or how, because of the Council's actions has been submitted.

6. I therefore conclude that unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense has not occurred and an award of costs is not warranted.

*R Bartlett*

INSPECTOR