

Neutral Citation Number: [2016] EWCA Civ 466  
**IN THE COURT OF APPEAL (CIVIL DIVISION)**  
**ON APPEAL FROM THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE**  
**QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION**  
**PLANNING COURT**  
**MRS JUSTICE LANG DBE**  
**[2015] EWHC 2788 (Admin)**

Royal Courts of Justice  
Strand, London, WC2A 2LL

Date: 18/05/2016

**Before :**

**LADY JUSTICE ARDEN**  
**LORD JUSTICE FLOYD**  
and  
**LORD JUSTICE SALES**

-----  
**Between :**

<b>John Turner</b>	<b><u>Appellant</u></b>
<b>- and -</b>	
<b>(1) Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government</b>	<b><u>Respondents</u></b>
<b>(2) East Dorset Council</b>	

-----  
**Michael Rudd** (instructed by **Hawksley's Solicitors**) for the **Appellant**  
**Richard Kimblin QC** (instructed by **Government Legal Department**) for the **Respondent**  
The 2nd Respondent did not appear and was not represented

Hearing dates : 4 May 2016  
-----

**Judgment**

## **Lord Justice Sales:**

1. This is an appeal from the judgment of Lang J in which she dismissed an application under section 288 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to quash a decision of a Planning Inspector to refuse to grant planning permission for development of a plot of land on Barrack Road, West Parley, Ferndown, Dorset (“the site”). The site is located in the South East Dorset Green Belt. The appellant developer submits that the Inspector erred in his interpretation and application of para. 89 of the National Planning Policy Framework (“the NPPF”) concerning the circumstances in which development on the Green Belt may not be regarded as inappropriate and in his approach to the concept of the “openness” of the Green Belt.

### *Factual background*

2. Barrack Road is characterised by a mix of residential and commercial properties spasmodically placed along the road. The eastern side of the road where the site is located does not have a continuously built up frontage. The site is in open countryside, and not in an urban area or settlement.
3. There is a static single unit mobile home stationed on the site which is used for residential purposes. Adjacent to this is a substantial area of a commercial storage yard which is used for the storage of vehicles; the preparation, repair, valeting and sale of commercial vehicles and cars; the ancillary breaking and dismantling of up to eight vehicles per month; and the ancillary sale and storage of vehicle parts from a workshop on the site. A certificate of lawful existing use was granted in 2003 for the mobile home and lawful use has been established in respect of the storage yard in a planning appeal decision. We were told that the storage yard has capacity to park some 41 lorries as an established lawful use of the site.
4. The appellant’s application for planning permission is for a proposal to replace the mobile home and storage yard with a three bedroom residential bungalow and associated residential curtilage. Another area of land adjacent to the site would be retained to continue the existing commercial enterprise. In his application, the appellant compared the proposed redevelopment with the existing lawful use of the land for the mobile home and 11 parked lorries in order to suggest that the volume of the proposed bungalow would be less than the volume of the mobile home and that many lorries and that, accordingly, the proposed redevelopment “would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt” than the existing lawful use of the site, with the result that it should not be regarded as inappropriate development in the Green Belt (para. 89 of the NPPF).
5. The local planning authority refused the application. The Inspector, Mr Philip Willmer, dismissed the appellant’s appeal. He found that the proposed redevelopment was inappropriate development in the Green Belt, notwithstanding that it would replace the existing lawful use of the site, and that there were no “very special circumstances” (para. 87 of the NPPF) which would justify the grant of permission for the development. The judge dismissed the application to quash his decision.

*The policy framework*

6. This appeal turns on the application of the NPPF, and in particular para. 89. Section 9 of the NPPF is headed "Protecting Green Belt land". It starts at paras. 79-81 with a statement of some broad principles:

"79. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.

80. Green Belt serves five purposes:

- \* To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- \* to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- \* to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- \* to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- \* to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

81. Once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land."

7. The provisions relating to inappropriate development are at paras. 87-90:

"87. As with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

88. When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

89. A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:

- \* buildings for agriculture and forestry;

- \* provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation and for cemeteries, as long as it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;
- \* the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;
- \* the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;
- \* limited infilling in villages, and limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the Local Plan; or
- \* limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development.

90. Certain other forms of development are also not inappropriate in Green Belt provided they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in Green Belt. These are:

- \* mineral extraction;
- \* engineering operations;
- \* local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location;
- \* the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction; and
- \* development brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order."

### *The Inspector's decision*

8. An important part of the appellant's case before the Inspector was his contention that his application fell within the sixth bullet point in para. 89 of the NPPF, so that the proposed development by building the bungalow would not count as inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The Inspector dismissed this contention in paras. 8 to 15 of his decision. At para. 8 he set out the sixth bullet point and recorded the appellant's argument and at para. 9 he explained that the development would not constitute limited infilling. The issue therefore turned on the question of impact on the openness of the Green Belt. The Inspector dealt with this as follows:

“10. The appellant contends that if the development were to go ahead then, in addition to the loss of the volume of the mobile home, or potentially a larger replacement double unit, a further volume of some 372.9 cubic metres, equivalent to eleven commercial vehicles that he has demonstrated could be stored on the appeal site, might also be off set against the volume of the proposed dwelling, thereby limiting the new dwelling’s impact on the openness of the Green Belt.

11. Openness is essentially freedom from operational development and relates primarily to the quantum and extent of development and its physical effect on the appeal site. The Certificate of Lawful Existing Use conveys that the use of the land may be for a mobile home rather than a permanent dwelling. In this respect the mobile home may be replaced with another and I have no doubt, if planning permission is not granted for this development, that over time this may well occur. However, the Certificate of Lawful Existing Use is for the use of the land for the siting of a mobile home for residential purposes, which is distinct from the replacement of one dwelling with another.

12. In my view, therefore, no valid comparison can reasonably be made between the volume of moveable chattels such as caravans and vehicles on one hand, and permanent operational development such as a dwelling on the other. While the retention of the mobile home and vehicles, associated hardstandings etc., will inevitably have their effect on the openness of the Green Belt, this cannot properly be judged simply on measured volume which can vary at any time, unlike the new dwelling that would be a permanent feature. I am therefore not persuaded that the volume of the mobile home and the stored/displayed vehicles proposed to be removed should be off-set in terms of the development’s overall impact on openness.

13. Accordingly, while the replacement of the current single unit mobile home, or even a replacement double unit and vehicles, with the new dwelling might only result in a marginal or no increase in volume, these two things cannot be directly compared as proposed by the appellant.

14. I noted that existing commercial vehicles were parked on either side of the access road to the site during my site visit. However, as I saw, due to their limited height they do not close off longer views into the site. On the other hand the proposed bungalow, as illustrated, that would in any case be permanent with a dominating symmetrical front façade and high pitch roof, would in my view obstruct views into the site and appear as a dominant feature that would have a harmful impact on openness here.

15. For the reasons set out I consider that the proposed development would have a considerably greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing lawful use of the land. I therefore conclude that the proposal does not meet criterion six of the exceptions set out in paragraph 89 of the Framework and, therefore, would be inappropriate development, which by definition is harmful to the Green Belt. I give substantial weight to this harm.”

9. It is this part of the Inspector’s reasoning which is under challenge. (I should mention that although in paras. 11 and 12 of the decision the Inspector referred to “operational development” rather than simply “development”, the judge correctly found that this was an immaterial slip and there is no appeal in that regard). Having found that the redevelopment was inappropriate development in the Green Belt, it is unsurprising that the Inspector found that there were not adequate grounds to justify the grant of planning permission.

*The appeal: discussion*

10. On the appellant’s section 288 application the appellant had three grounds of challenge to the Inspector’s decision, of which two are relevant on this appeal: (i) the Inspector failed to treat the existing development on the site as a relevant material factor to be taken into account in considering whether the sixth bullet point of para. 89 was applicable, and (ii) the Inspector wrongly conflated the concept of openness in relation to the Green Belt with the concept of visual impact. The judge rejected all the grounds of challenge and the appellant now appeals to this Court, relying again on these two grounds.
11. In his oral submissions, Mr Rudd developed the first ground somewhat. His submission was that the Inspector was wrong to say that no valid comparison could be made between the volume of moveable chattels (mobile home and lorries) on the site and a permanent structure in the form of the proposed bungalow; on the proper construction of the concept of “openness of the Green Belt” as used in the sixth bullet point in para. 89 of the NPPF the sole criterion of openness for the purpose of the comparison required by that bullet point was the volume of structures comprising the existing lawful use of a site compared with that of the structure proposed by way of redevelopment of that site (“the volumetric approach”); a comparison between the volume of existing development on the site in this case in the form of the mobile home and 11 lorries as against the volume of the proposed bungalow showed that there would be a lesser impact on the openness of the Green Belt if the existing development were replaced by the bungalow and the Inspector should so have concluded; and the Inspector erred by having regard to a wider range of considerations apart from the volume of development on the site (including the factor of visual impact) in para. 14 of the decision on the way to reaching his conclusion at para. 15. This last point overlaps with the second ground of challenge and it is appropriate to address both grounds together, as the judge did.
12. I do not accept these submissions by Mr Rudd. First, in so far as it is suggested that the Inspector did not address himself to the comparative exercise called for under the sixth bullet point in para. 89, the suggestion is incorrect. The Inspector set out that bullet

point and then proceeded to make an evaluative comparative assessment of the existing lawful use and the proposed redevelopment in paras. 10 to 15 of the decision.

13. The principal matter in issue is whether the Inspector adopted an improper approach to the question of openness of the Green Belt when he made that comparison. The question of the true interpretation of the NPPF is a matter for the court. In my judgment, the approach the Inspector adopted was correct and the judge was right so to hold.
14. The concept of “openness of the Green Belt” is not narrowly limited to the volumetric approach suggested by Mr Rudd. The word “openness” is open-textured and a number of factors are capable of being relevant when it comes to applying it to the particular facts of a specific case. Prominent among these will be factors relevant to how built up the Green Belt is now and how built up it would be if redevelopment occurs (in the context of which, volumetric matters may be a material concern, but are by no means the only one) and factors relevant to the visual impact on the aspect of openness which the Green Belt presents.
15. The question of visual impact is implicitly part of the concept of “openness of the Green Belt” as a matter of the natural meaning of the language used in para. 89 of the NPPF. I consider that this interpretation is also reinforced by the general guidance in paras. 79-81 of the NPPF, which introduce section 9 on the protection of Green Belt Land. There is an important visual dimension to checking “the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas” and the merging of neighbouring towns, as indeed the name “Green Belt” itself implies. Greenness is a visual quality: part of the idea of the Green Belt is that the eye and the spirit should be relieved from the prospect of unrelenting urban sprawl. Openness of aspect is a characteristic quality of the countryside, and “safeguarding the countryside from encroachment” includes preservation of that quality of openness. The preservation of “the setting ... of historic towns” obviously refers in a material way to their visual setting, for instance when seen from a distance across open fields. Again, the reference in para. 81 to planning positively “to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity” in the Green Belt makes it clear that the visual dimension of the Green Belt is an important part of the point of designating land as Green Belt.
16. The visual dimension of the openness of the Green Belt does not exhaust all relevant planning factors relating to visual impact when a proposal for development in the Green Belt comes up for consideration. For example, there may be harm to visual amenity for neighbouring properties arising from the proposed development which needs to be taken into account as well. But it does not follow from the fact that there may be other harms with a visual dimension apart from harm to the openness of the Green Belt that the concept of openness of the Green Belt has no visual dimension itself.
17. Mr Rudd relied upon a section of the judgment of Green J sitting at first instance in *R (Timmins) v Gedling Borough Council* [2014] EWHC 654 (Admin) at [67]-[78], in which the learned judge addressed the question of the relationship between openness of the Green Belt and visual impact. Green J referred to the judgment of Sullivan J in *R (Heath and Hampstead Society) v Camden LBC* [2007] EWHC 977 (Admin); [2007] 2 P&CR 19, which related to previous policy in relation to the Green Belt as set out in Planning Policy Guidance 2 (“PPG 2”), and drew from it the propositions that “there is a clear conceptual distinction between openness and visual impact” and “it is therefore wrong *in principle* to arrive at a specific conclusion as to openness by reference to

visual impact”: para. [78] (Green J’s emphasis). The case went on appeal, but this part of Green J’s judgment was not in issue on the appeal: [2015] EWCA Civ 10; [2016] 1 All ER 895.

18. In my view, Green J went too far and erred in stating the propositions set out above. This section of his judgment should not be followed. There are three problems with it. First, with respect to Green J, I do not think that he focused sufficiently on the language of section 9 of the NPPF, read as part of the coherent and self-contained statement of national planning policy which the NPPF is intended to be. The learned judge does not consider the points made above. Secondly, through his reliance on the *Heath and Hampstead Society* case Green J has given excessive weight to the statement of planning policy in PPG 2 for the purposes of interpretation of the NPPF. He has not made proper allowance for the fact that PPG 2 is expressed in materially different terms from section 9 of the NPPF. Thirdly, I consider that the conclusion he has drawn is not in fact supported by the judgment of Sullivan J in the *Heath and Hampstead Society* case.
19. The general objective of PPG 2 was to make provision for the protection of Green Belts. Paragraph 3.2 stated that inappropriate development was, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt. Paragraph 3.6 stated:

“Provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building, the extension or alteration of dwellings is not inappropriate in Green Belts. The replacement of existing dwellings need not be inappropriate, providing the new dwelling is not materially larger than the dwelling it replaces ...”
20. It was the application of this provision which was in issue in the *Heath and Hampstead Society* case. It can be seen that this provision broadly corresponds with the fourth bullet point in para. 89 of the NPPF and that it has a specific focus on the relative size of an existing building and of the proposed addition or replacement.
21. The NPPF was introduced in 2012 as a new, self-contained statement of national planning policy to replace the various policy guidance documents that had proliferated previously. The NPPF did not simply repeat what was in those documents. It set out national planning policy afresh in terms which are at various points materially different from what went before. This court gave guidance regarding the proper approach to the interpretation of the NPPF in the *Timmins* case at para. [24]. The NPPF should be interpreted objectively in accordance with the language used, read in its proper context. But the previous guidance – specifically in *Timmins*, as in this case and in *Redhill Aerodrome Ltd v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government* [2014] EWCA Civ 1386; [2015] 1 P & CR 36 to which the court in *Timmins* referred, the guidance on Green Belt policy in PPG 2 – remains relevant. In particular, since in promulgating the NPPF the Government made it clear that it strongly supported the Green Belt and did not intend to change the central policy that inappropriate development in the Green Belt should not be allowed, section 9 of the NPPF should not be read in such a way as to weaken protection for the Green Belt: see the *Redhill Aerodrome* case at [16] per Sullivan LJ, quoted in *Timmins* at [24].

22. The *Heath and Hampstead Society* case concerned a proposal to demolish an existing residential building on Metropolitan Open Land (which was subject to a policy giving it the same level of protection as the Green Belt) and replace it with a new dwelling. Sullivan J rejected the submission that the test in para. 3.6 was solely concerned with a mathematical comparison of relevant dimensions: [19]. However, he accepted the alternative submission that the exercise under para. 3.6 was primarily an objective one by reference to size, where which particular physical dimension was most relevant would depend on the circumstances of a particular case, albeit with floor space usually being an important criterion: [20]. It was not appropriate to substitute a test such as “providing the new dwelling is not more visually intrusive than the dwelling it replaces” for the test actually stated in para. 3.6, namely whether the new dwelling was materially larger or not: [20]. As Sullivan J said, “Paragraph 3.6 is concerned with the size of the replacement dwelling, not with its visual impact”: [21]. In that regard, also at para. [21], he relied in addition on para. 3.15 of PPG 2 which made specific provision in relation to visual amenities in the Green Belt. Neither para. 3.6 of PPG 2 (with its specific focus on comparative size of the existing and replacement buildings) nor para. 3.15 of PPG 2 refer to the concept of the “openness of the Green Belt”. They do not correspond with the text of the sixth bullet point in para. 89 of the NPPF, and section 9 of the NPPF contains no provision equivalent to para. 3.15 of PPG 2. It is therefore not appropriate to treat this part of the judgment in *Heath and Hampstead Society* as providing authoritative guidance on the interpretation of the sixth bullet point in para. 89 of the NPPF. At paras. [22] and [36]-[38] Sullivan J emphasised that the relevant issue in the case specifically concerned the application of para. 3.6 of PPG 2 and whether the proposed replacement house was materially larger than the existing house.
23. At para. [22] Sullivan J said, “The loss of openness (i.e. unbuilt on land) within the Green Belt or Metropolitan Open Land is of itself harmful to the underlying policy objective”. Since the concept of the openness of the Green Belt has a spatial or physical aspect as well as a visual aspect, that statement is true in the context of the NPPF as well, provided it is not taken to mean that openness is *only* concerned with the spatial issue. Such an interpretation accords with the guidance on interpretation of the NPPF given by this court in the *Timmins* and *Redhill Aerodrome* cases, to the effect that the NPPF is to be interpreted as providing no less protection for the Green Belt than PPG 2. The case before Sullivan J was concerned with a proposed new, larger building which represented a spatial intrusion upon the openness of the Green Belt but which did not intrude visually on that openness, so he was not concerned to explain what might be the position under PPG 2 generally if there had been visual intrusion instead or as well.
24. Sullivan J gives a general reason for the importance of spatial intrusion at para. [37] of his judgment:

“The planning officer’s approach can be paraphrased as follows:

‘The footprint of the replacement dwelling will be twice as large as that of the existing dwelling, but the public will not be able to see very much of the increase.’

It was the difficulty of establishing in many cases that a particular proposed development within the Green Belt would of itself cause ‘demonstrable harm’ that led to the clear statement of policy in para. 3.2 of PPG 2 that inappropriate development

is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt. The approach adopted in the officer's report runs the risk that Green Belt of Metropolitan Open Land will suffer the death of a thousand cuts. While it may not be possible to demonstrate harm by reason of visual intrusion as a result of an individual – possibly very modest – proposal, the cumulative effect of a number of such proposals, each very modest in itself, could be very damaging to the essential quality of openness of the Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land.”

25. This remains relevant guidance in relation to the concept of openness of the Green Belt in the NPPF. The same strict approach to protection of the Green Belt appears from para. 87 of the NPPF. The openness of the Green Belt has a spatial aspect as well as a visual aspect, and the absence of visual intrusion does not in itself mean that there is no impact on the openness of the Green Belt as a result of the location of a new or materially larger building there. But, as observed above, it does not follow that openness of the Green Belt has no visual dimension.
26. What is also significant in this paragraph of Sullivan J's judgment for present purposes is the last sentence, from which it appears that Sullivan J considered that a series of modest visual intrusions from new developments would be a way in which the essential quality of the openness of the Green Belt could be damaged, even if it could not be said of each such intrusion that it represented demonstrable harm to the openness of the Green Belt in itself. At any rate, Sullivan J does not say that the openness of the Green Belt has no visual dimension. Hence I think that Green J erred in *Timmings* in taking the *Heath and Hampstead Society* case to provide authority for the two propositions he sets out at para. [78] of his judgment, to which I have referred above.
27. Turning back to the Inspector's decision in the present case, there is no error of approach by the Inspector in his assessment of the issue of impact on the openness of the Green Belt. In paras. 11 to 13 the Inspector made a legitimate comparison of the existing position regarding use of the site with the proposed redevelopment. This was a matter of evaluative assessment for the Inspector in the context of making a planning judgment about relative impact on the openness of the Green Belt. His assessment cannot be said to be irrational. It was rational and legitimate for him to assess on the facts of this case that there is a difference between a permanent physical structure in the form of the proposed bungalow and a shifting body of lorries, which would come and go; and even following the narrow volumetric approach urged by the appellant the Inspector was entitled to make the assessment that the two types of use and their impact on the Green Belt could not in the context of this site be “directly compared as proposed by the appellant” (para. 13). The Inspector was also entitled to take into account the difference in the visual intrusion on the openness of the Green Belt as he did in para. 14.

### *Conclusion*

28. For the reasons given above, I would dismiss this appeal.

**Lord Justice Floyd:**

29. I agree.

**Lady Justice Arden DBE:**

30. I also agree.