

# Supreme Court Sets Key Precedent on the 'Humpty Dumpty' Test of how to interpret Development Plans #NPPF

MARCH 22, 2012MARCH 22, 2012 / ANDREW LAINTON

The case relates to **Tesco Stores Limited (Appellants) v Dundee City Council (Respondents) (Scotland)**

([http://www.supremecourt.gov.uk/docs/UKSC\\_2011\\_0079\\_Judgment.pdf](http://www.supremecourt.gov.uk/docs/UKSC_2011_0079_Judgment.pdf)).

Although it is a scottish case it is relevent to England and Wales because

- a) we all have the same supreme court;
- b) as such where the underlying law itself is similar presidents will apply.

So for example one of the key precedents for developments plans relevent to England is a case in Edinburgh, as the law on the application of development plans to development management decisions is identical.

This case related to one supermarket near another and interpretation of development plan policy on the 'sequential approach'.

Officers had accepted the applicants argument that there was no suitable town centre site, but that it would be likely to have a detrimental effect on the vitality and viability of a nearby district centre and therefore contrary to the development plan. The

report recommended approval because of two other material considerations, economic benefits from redevelopment of a closed factory site and because of associated road improvements, which would assist in development of employment sites.

The argument put by the appellants was

In the present case, the Director had interpreted "suitable" as meaning "suitable for the development proposed by the applicant"; and the respondents had proceeded on the same basis.

That was not however a tenable meaning. Properly interpreted, "suitable" meant "suitable for meeting identified deficiencies in retail provision in the area". Since no such deficiency had been identified, it followed on a proper interpretation of the plan that the first criterion did not require to be considered: it was inappropriate to undertake the sequential approach.

However national planning policy in both England and Scotland set out the sequential approach and the 'needs' tests as separate bullet points, not so conjoined as suggested, though there is certainly an argument that they should. Of course England has additional policy nuances about fitting stores to town centre sites.

The court found that:

LORD REED (with whom Lord Brown, Lord Kerr and Lord Dyson agree)

It has long been established that a planning authority must proceed upon a proper understanding of the development plan: see, for example, *Gransden & Co Ltd v Secretary of State for the Environment* (1985) 54 P & CR 86, 94 per Woolf J, affd (1986) 54 P & CR 361; *Horsham DC v Secretary of State for the Environment* (1991) 63 P & CR 219, 225-226 per Nolan LJ. The need for a proper understanding follows, in the first place, from the fact that the planning authority is required by statute to have regard to the provisions of the development plan: it cannot have regard to the provisions of the plan if it fails to understand them. It also follows from the legal status given to the development plan by section 25 of the 1997 Act. The effect of the predecessor of section 25, namely section 18A of the Town and Country (Planning) Scotland Act 1972 (as inserted by section 58 of the Planning and Compensation Act 1991), was considered by the House of Lords in the case of *City of Edinburgh Council v Secretary of State for Scotland* 1998 SC (HL) 33, [1997] 1 WLR 1447. It is sufficient for present purposes to cite a passage from the speech of Lord Clyde, with which the other members of the House expressed their agreement. At p 44, 1459, his Lordship observed:

“In the practical application of sec 18A it will obviously be necessary for the decision-maker to consider the development plan, identify any provisions in it which are relevant to the question before him and make a proper interpretation of them. His decision will be open to challenge if he fails to have regard to a policy in the development plan which is relevant to the application or fails properly to interpret it.”

In the present case, the planning authority was required by section 25 to consider whether the proposed development was in accordance with the development plan and, if not, whether material considerations justified departing from the plan. In order to carry out that exercise, the planning authority required to proceed on the basis of what Lord Clyde described as “a proper interpretation” of the relevant provisions of the plan. We were however referred by counsel to a number of judicial dicta which were said to support the proposition that the meaning of the development plan was a matter to be determined by the planning authority: the court, it was submitted, had no role in determining the meaning of the plan unless the view taken by the planning authority could be characterised as perverse or irrational. That submission, if correct, would deprive sections 25 and 37(2) of the 1997 Act of much of their effect, and would drain the need for a “proper interpretation” of the plan of much of its meaning and purpose. It would also make little practical sense. **The development plan is a carefully drafted and considered**

**statement of policy, published in order to inform the public of the approach which will be followed by planning authorities in decision-making unless there is good reason to depart from it. It is intended to guide the behaviour of developers and planning authorities. As in other areas of administrative law, the policies which it sets out are designed to secure consistency and direction in the exercise of discretionary powers, while allowing a measure of flexibility to be retained. Those considerations point away from the view that the meaning of the plan is in principle a matter which each planning authority is entitled to determine**

**from time to time as it pleases, within the limits of rationality.** On the contrary, these considerations suggest that in principle, in this area of public administration as in others (as discussed, for example, in *R (Raissi) v Secretary of State for the Home Department* [2008] QB 836), policy statements should be interpreted objectively in accordance with the language used, read as always in its proper context.

**That is not to say that such statements should be construed as if they were statutory or contractual provisions.** Although a development plan has a legal status and legal effects, it is not analogous in its nature or purpose to a statute or a contract. As has often been observed, development plans are full of broad statements of policy, many of which may be mutually irreconcilable, so that in a particular case one must give way to another. In addition, many of the provisions of development plans are framed in language whose application to a given set of facts requires the exercise of judgment. Such matters fall within the jurisdiction of planning authorities, and their exercise of their judgment can only be challenged on the ground that it is irrational or perverse (*Tesco Stores Ltd v Secretary of State for the Environment* [1995] 1 WLR 759, 780 per Lord Hoffmann). Nevertheless, **planning authorities do not live in the world of Humpty Dumpty: they cannot make the development plan mean whatever they would like it to mean.**

The principal authority referred to in relation to this matter was the judgment of Brooke LJ in *R v Derbyshire County Council, Ex p Woods* [1997] JPL 958 at 967. Properly understood, however, what was said there is not inconsistent with the approach which I have described. In the passage in question, Brooke LJ stated:

“If there is a dispute about the meaning of the words included in a policy document which a planning authority is bound to take into account, it is of course for the court to determine as a matter of law what the words are capable of meaning. If the

decision maker attaches a meaning to the words they are not properly capable of bearing, then it will have made an error of law, and it will have failed properly to understand the policy.”

By way of illustration, Brooke LJ referred to the earlier case of *Northavon DC v Secretary of State for the Environment* [1993] JPL 761, which concerned a policy applicable to “institutions standing in extensive grounds”. As was observed, the words spoke for themselves, but their application to particular factual situations would often be a matter of judgment for the planning authority. That exercise of judgment would only be susceptible to review in the event that it was unreasonable. The latter case might be contrasted with the case of *R (Heath and Hampstead Society) v Camden LBC* [2008] 2 P & CR 233, where a planning authority’s decision that a replacement dwelling was not “materially larger” than its predecessor, within the meaning of a policy, was vitiated by its failure to understand the policy correctly: read in its context, the phrase “materially larger” referred to the size of the new building compared with its predecessor, rather than requiring a broader comparison of their relative impact, as the planning authority had supposed. Similarly in *City of Edinburgh Council v Scottish Ministers* 2001 SC 957 the reporter’s decision that a licensed restaurant constituted “similar licensed premises” to a public house, within the meaning of a policy, was vitiated by her misunderstanding of the policy: the context was one in which a distinction was drawn between public houses, wine bars and the like, on the one hand, and restaurants, on the other.

**A provision in the development plan which requires an assessment of whether a site is “suitable” for a particular purpose calls for judgment in its application. But the question whether such a provision is concerned with suitability for one purpose or another is not a question of planning judgment: it is a question of textual interpretation, which can only be answered by construing the language used in its context. In the present case, in particular, the question whether the word “suitable”, in the policies in question, means “suitable for the development proposed by the applicant”, or “suitable for meeting identified deficiencies in retail provision in the area”, is not a question which can be answered by the exercise of planning judgment: it is a logically prior question as to the issue to which planning judgment requires to be directed.**

It is of course true, as counsel for the respondents submitted, that a planning authority might misconstrue part of a policy but nevertheless reach the same conclusion, on the question whether the proposal was in accordance with the policy, as it would have reached if it had construed the policy correctly. That is not however a complete answer to a challenge to the planning authority’s decision. An error in relation to one part

of a policy might affect the overall conclusion as to whether a proposal was in accordance with the development plan even if the question whether the proposal was in conformity with the policy would have been answered in the same way. The policy criteria with which the proposal was considered to be incompatible might, for example, be of less weight than the criteria which were mistakenly thought to be fulfilled. Equally, a planning authority might misconstrue part of a policy but nevertheless reach the same conclusion as it would otherwise have reached on the question whether the proposal was in accordance with the development plan. Again, however, that is not a complete answer. **Where it is concluded that the proposal is not in accordance with the development plan, it is necessary to understand the nature and extent of the departure from the plan which the grant of consent would involve in order to consider on a proper basis whether such a departure is justified by other material considerations.**

In the present case, the Lord Ordinary rejected the appellants' submissions on the basis that the interpretation of planning policy was always primarily a matter for the planning authority, whose assessment could be challenged only on the basis of unreasonableness: there was, in particular, more than one way in Page 13 which the sequential approach could reasonably be applied ([2010] CSOH 128, para 23). For the reasons I have explained, that approach does not correctly reflect the role which the court has to play in the determination of the meaning of the development plan. A different approach was adopted by the Second Division: since, it was said, the proposal was in head-on conflict with the retail and employment policies of the development plan, and the sequential approach offered no justification for it, a challenge based upon an alleged misapplication of the sequential approach was entirely beside the point (2011 SC 457, [2011] CSIH 9, para 38). For the reasons I have explained, however, **even where a proposal is plainly in breach of policy and contrary to the development plan, a failure properly to understand the policy in question may result in a failure to appreciate the full extent or significance of the departure from the development plan which the grant of consent would involve, and may consequently vitiate the planning authority's determination. Whether there has in fact been a misunderstanding of the policy, and whether any such misunderstanding may have led to a flawed decision, has therefore to be considered.**

I turn then to the question whether the respondents misconstrued the policies in question in the present case...**the interpretation favoured by the appellants appears to me to conflate the first and third criteria of the policies in question.** The first criterion concerns the availability of a

“suitable” site in a sequentially preferable location. The third criterion is that the proposal would address a deficiency in shopping provision which cannot be met in a sequentially preferable location. If “suitable” meant “suitable for meeting identified deficiencies in retail provision”, as the appellants contend, then there would be no distinction between those two criteria, and no purpose in their both being included.

...since it is apparent from the structure and local plans that the policies in question were intended to implement the guidance given in NPPG 8 in relation to the sequential approach, that guidance forms part of the relevant context to which regard can be had when interpreting the policies. The material parts of the guidance are set out in para 6 above. They provide further support for the respondents’ interpretation of the policies. Paragraph 13 refers to the need to identify sites which can meet the requirements of developers and retailers, and to the scope for accommodating the proposed development. Paragraph 14 advises planning authorities to assist the private sector in identifying sites which could be suitable for the proposed use. **Throughout the relevant section of the guidance, the focus is upon the availability of sites which might accommodate the proposed development and the requirements of the developer, rather than upon addressing an identified deficiency in shopping provision. The latter is of course also relevant to retailing policy, but it is not the issue with which the specific question of the suitability of sites is concerned.**

I said earlier that it was necessary to qualify the statement that the Director and the respondents proceeded, and were correct to proceed, on the basis that “suitable” meant “suitable for the development proposed by the applicant”. As paragraph 13 of NPPG 8 makes clear, the application of the sequential approach requires flexibility and realism from developers and retailers as well as planning authorities. The need for flexibility and realism reflects an inbuilt difficulty about the sequential approach. On the one hand, the policy could be defeated by developers’ and retailers’ taking an inflexible approach to their requirements. On the other hand, as Sedley J remarked in *R v Teesside Development Corporation, Ex p William Morrison Supermarket plc and Redcar and Cleveland BC* [1998] JPL 23, 43, to refuse an out-of-centre planning consent on the ground that an admittedly smaller site is available within the town centre may be to take an entirely inappropriate business decision on behalf of the developer. The guidance seeks to address this problem. It advises that developers and retailers should have regard to the circumstances of the particular town centre when preparing their proposals, as regards the format, design and scale of the

development. As part of such an approach, they are expected to consider the scope for accommodating the proposed development in a different built form, and where appropriate adjusting or sub-dividing large proposals, in order that their scale may fit better with existing development in the town centre. The guidance also advises that planning authorities should be responsive to the needs of retailers. Where development proposals in out-of-centre locations fall outside the development plan framework, developers are expected to demonstrate that town centre and edge-of-centre options have been thoroughly assessed. That advice is not repeated in the structure plan or the local plan, but the same approach must be implicit: otherwise, the policies would in practice be inoperable.

It follows from the foregoing that it would be an oversimplification to say that the characteristics of the proposed development, such as its scale, are necessarily definitive for the purposes of the sequential test. That statement has to be qualified to the extent that the applicant is expected to have prepared his proposals in accordance with the recommended approach: he is, for example, expected to have had regard to the circumstances of the particular town centre, to have given consideration to the scope for accommodating the development in a different form, and to have thoroughly assessed sequentially preferable locations on that footing. Provided the applicant has done so, however, **the question remains, as Lord Glennie observed in *Lidl UK GmbH v Scottish Ministers* [2006] CSOH 165, para 14, whether an alternative site is suitable for the proposed development, not whether the proposed development can be altered or reduced so that it can be made to fit an alternative site.**

In the present case, it is apparent that a flexible approach was adopted. The interveners did not confine their assessment to sites which could accommodate the development in the precise form in which it had been designed, but examined sites which could accommodate a smaller development and a more restricted range of retailing. Even taking that approach, however, they did not regard the Lochee site vacated by the appellants as being suitable for their needs: it was far smaller than they required, and its car parking facilities were inadequate. In accepting that assessment, the respondents exercised their judgment as to how the policy should be applied to the facts: they did not proceed on an erroneous understanding of the policy.

Finally, I would observe that **an error by the respondents in interpreting their policies would be material only if there was a real possibility that their determination might otherwise have been different. In the particular circumstances of the present case, I am not persuaded that**

**there was any such possibility.** The considerations in favour of the proposed development were very powerful. They were also specific to the particular development proposed: on the information before the respondents, there was no prospect of any other development of the application site, or of any development elsewhere which could deliver equivalent planning and economic benefits. Against that background, the argument that a different decision might have been taken if the respondents had been advised that the first criterion in the policies in question did not arise, rather than that criterion had been met, appears to me to be implausible.

Lord Hope added the important additional view that

The words “the proposal” which appear in the third and fifth of the list of the criteria which must be satisfied serve to reinforce the point that **the whole exercise is directed to what the developer is proposing, not some other proposal which the planning authority might seek to substitute for it which is for something less than that sought by the developer.**

Ok what do we take from the decision:

- Interpret plans properly (and by implication other material considerations such as the new NPPF) otherwise you cant demonstrate that the 'plan led' test has been met. The 'Humpty Dumpty' test is strengthened, you can't argue that interpreting plans is a matter solely for the decision maker, it has to be justifiable. So it is likely we will see more JR of untenable interpretations. The Supreme Court may have written a template for the 'lawyers charter' of the NPPF.
- But this wont automatically lead to cases being overturned if the decision is unlikely to be otherwise if there are 'very powerful' arguments for the decision (though no cases were quoted on this point this is established law).
- The Lord Hope clarification that development management is about assessing the scheme in front of you not some imagined alternative is important.

It is less easy to draw lessons on the interpretation of 'town centre first' as firstly the english policy on flexibility is a little stronger and secondly it has a life of 5 days. In any event if the NPPF had not been coming I doubt section 6-33 of the Sequential approach good practice guide (<http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/towncentresguide.pdf>) could have survived this judgement, it would have to have been reworded. So the result is likely to be a weakening of town centre first principle and more references in England to the Lidl case referred to above. Looking forward to Michael Bach's comments.

National Planning Policy Framework, urban planning

## 2 thoughts on “Supreme Court Sets Key Precedent on the ‘Humpty Dumpty’ Test of how to interpret Development Plans #NPPF”

1. Pingback: [Response to Kirkwalls on the Humpty Dumpty #NPPF « Decisions, Decisions, Decisions](#)
2. Pingback: [If You Drive Wiser, You Can Save Fuel | Bites With Brandy](#)

[BLOG AT WORDPRESS.COM.](#)