
Costs Decision

Site visit made on 1 December 2025

by Ryan Cowley MPlan (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 January 2026

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/D2510/W/25/3373750 Woody's Top, Ruckland Lane, Ruckland, Louth, Lincolnshire LN11 8RQ

- 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 Tim Lamyman, on behalf of Lamyman Worlaby Farms, for a full award of costs against East Lindsey District Council.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for change of use, conversion of, extension and alterations to former youth hostel to provide a holiday let and upgrade existing vehicular access which is an amendment to that previously approved application reference no. N/111/01387/17 without complying with a condition attached to planning permission Ref N/111/02038/17, dated 21/12/2017.
-

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. Local planning authorities must behave reasonably in relation to procedural matters at appeal and with respect to the substance of the matter under appeal. Examples of unreasonable behaviour could include preventing or delaying development which should clearly be permitted, imposing a condition that does not comply with the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) on planning conditions, or not determining similar cases in a consistent manner.
4. The applicant for costs considers that the Council has refused planning permission for a project that clearly aligns with national policy to increase the number of houses and failed to negotiate a resolution, thereby unnecessarily preventing development. They also contend that the Council ignored precedent cases which were given to them and acted inconsistently in their assessment of the application.
5. The reason for refusal is set out clearly in the Council's decision notice. Further justification is provided in the officer report, with reference to local and national planning policy and guidance, and other material considerations. It will be seen from my decision that I agree with the Council's assessment with regard to the development plan conflict and the site's access to essential services and facilities.
6. Even taking account of the provisions of the Framework that seek to significantly boost the supply of housing, there are no material considerations that would

outweigh the identified harm and development plan conflict. I therefore do not find the Council to have acted unreasonably in this respect.

7. The applicant's frustration regarding the level of engagement offered by the Council is noted. The PPG and the Framework encourage Councils to take a positive approach and work proactively with applicants. However, given the matter in dispute concerns the principle of the development, the views of both parties are unlikely to have been reconciled through further discussions during the application.
8. The other planning application and appeal cases referred to in the evidence are not directly comparable to the appeal case for the reasons set out in my decision. The Council assessed the application on its own merits in accordance with its statutory duties, and there is no substantiated evidence it has acted inconsistently in its consideration of similar applications.

Conclusion

9. I therefore conclude that unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense, as described in the PPG, has not been demonstrated.

Ryan Cowley

INSPECTOR