



Costs Decision

Site visit made on 9 June 2026

by Mr R Walker BA HONS DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 June 2026

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: 6006265

Land adjacent to Rose Cottage, High Street, Faldingworth, Nr Market Rasen LN8 3SE

- 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 D Spedding for a full award of costs against West Lindsey District Council.
- The appeal was against the refusal of permission in principle originally described as the development proposed is permission in principle (PiP) to erect up to three (3) dwellings

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. The applicant sets down several reasons for its application for costs. These include the lack of Council officer site visit during the application and including a reason for refusal which could have been dealt with under a Technical Details Consent application. The Council has defended itself against the submission.
4. The applicant submits that the nature of an application for permission in principle does not entitle the Council to pursue the arguments around archaeological interests that it has. However, deciding whether the contested issue of archaeology is 'relevant' to the matters of location, land use and amount of development and how, is a question of evaluative judgement for the decision maker.
5. In this regard, the PPG¹ references 'historic environment records' as an information source that should be used to support decisions on whether to grant permission in principle. The Council drew from its records of the settlement in substantiating its concerns and consequently, irrespective of my findings on this main issue, I cannot find that the Council behaved unreasonably, relative to that main issue, in offering a different view to my own.
6. There is no dispute that the Council's officer did not undertake a site visit during the application. However, a site visit was conducted during a pre-application submission for a larger scheme. Moreover, given my conclusions on the first main issue, and overall, in the appeal, the Council has not prevented or delayed development which should clearly be permitted. Therefore, the Council's approach

¹ Planning Practice Guidance, Paragraph: 042 Reference ID: 58-042-20170728

during the application does not constitute unreasonable behaviour which has led to wasted expense in the appeal.

7. Accordingly, I determine that the costs application should fail, and no award is made.

Mr R Walker

INSPECTOR