

Samara Jones-Hall | Registration No. 20013220 | Submission for Deadline 3

In my professional career I worked in 5 areas that I believe are particularly relevant to this application made by this particular Applicant.

1. Trustee in-house legal Counsel at a very senior level at one of the largest offshore banks.
2. Head of Business Control Unit (compliance, risk and legal) at one of the largest offshore banks.
3. Fiduciary associate (legal) at one of the largest trusts and private wealth practices in the Channel Islands.
4. Senior Supervisory manager for the Jersey Financial Services Commission.
5. Head of Fund Derivatives Legal at one of largest multinational investment bank and financial services companies in the world.

WRITTEN REPRESENTATION SUMMARY

As of 15 February 2019, Applicant has glossed over some real clangers in 3 critical areas that highlight the Applicant's lack of a track record, its inexperience in running a complex and heavily regulated dedicated air freight facility (or any other major infrastructure) or Applicant is just running too thin on resources due to a lack of financing, cashflow issues, no assets, no employees and no office; or both.

*"It is the Ministry of Defence that is waiting to hear from the applicant and **it is incorrect to suggest that it is the other way round**¹."*

*"Manston [Airspace Change Proposal] details do not yet appear on the CAA Portal [is] because the ACP Sponsor has **failed to obtain the necessary** Portal access permissions from us as required by the requirements of CAP 1[6]16. The Sponsor **has been hastened** on this requirement. Once Portal access has been granted the*

¹ Letter from Defence Infrastructure Organisation of 6 February 2019 (under Deadline 2 on the Planning Inspectorate website).

*Sponsor will then be able to update the information and the Portal will reflect the ACP progress. As the **ACP has not yet been received by us, a case officer** has yet to be assigned²”.*

This recent statement from CAA sits in contrast to Applicant Counsel’s oral update provided to the ExA at the Preliminary Meeting of:

*“Applicant...is **currently awaiting appointment of a case officer** at the CAA before [Airspace Change Process] application can progress any further³.”*

And last and no means least, Applicant clearly states in the Consultation Report and the Environmental Statement that:

*“...following further correspondence with the Director Public Health **concerning other consultee contacts, the Clinical Chair of the Thanet Clinical Commissioning Group** was consulted by teleconference in March 2018⁴.”*

*“...**health-focussed consultation** was carried out with the Kent Director of Public Health (DPH) and the **Clinical Chair of Thanet Clinical Commissioning Group**⁵”.*

When in fact the Director of Public Health wrote to the Applicant informing them that:

*“health care services and the organisations that are responsible for delivering these (both commissioning and providing) will **need to be consulted**. This includes **Thanet Clinical Commissioning Group, East Kent Hospitals Foundation Trust, Kent Community Healthcare Foundation Trust, Kent and Medway***

² Letter to me from CAA of 14 January 2019

³ Deadline 1 submission - 18 January 2019 - document ref TR020002/D1/Cover at Page 9

⁴ 6.1 Consultation Report (**APP-075**) at Page 84

⁵ 5.2-2 Environmental Statement – Volume 2 – Chapters 11-16 (**APP-034**) at 15.3.4

Partnership Trust, Southeast Ambulance Trust⁶,

A freedom of information request has confirmed that:

*“as far as [NHS England] are aware, no NHS Thanet CCG’s Governing Body member [defined as individuals that make up the CCG’s governing body] has had **any correspondence** with RiverOak Strategic Partners [Applicant] or any of their associated companies and/or professional advisors and/or any third party⁷.”*

Rather than making sure that pressing matters like the relocation of the HRDF, health impact assessments and airspace change proposals are actioned. Applicant currently seems more concerned with self-publishing a number of articles, 7-10, interviewing himself about himself from the period 23 January 2019 to date. He also set up a website about himself during this period of time.

I have received confirmation from the Solicitors Regulation Authority that Mr Anthony Freudmann (SRA number 103135) was admitted to the roll of solicitors of England and Wales on 15 June 1972. Mr Freudmann is now a former solicitor and is no longer regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority. [REDACTED]

I have evidenced and can further support that there is no case for the applicant’s development and further it is not possible for the applicant’s proposed development to be operational until 2023 at the earliest, even if funding and finance can be secured. I will provide further evidence to rebut the Azimuth Report, in particular, business model and corporate structure in response to the answers to written questions.

Another procedural matter that has fallen through the cracks is the fact that **Ramsgate** is a **Heritage Action Zone (HAZ)**. This is a **national policy**, which the

⁶ Email dated 10 October 2017 from a pack called manston HIA pack through a Freedom of Information Act 2000 request made by third party for email correspondence between the Director of Public Health and Applicant

⁷ NHS Email dated 11 February 2019 Freedom of Information Request response

proposed development will greatly hinder and stunt. Since the airport has closed there has been a significant amount of heritage related investment into Ramsgate (£40million+) and increasing. The project has involved (and continues to do so) schools and the community in exhibitions and heritage-related skills training and apprenticeships.

There has also been an unprecedented amount of tourists to Thanet year on year⁸ and part of the tourist offer is heritage-based tourism as well as active/leisure tourism and café culture.

The number of estate agents has increased since the closure of the airport. House prices have risen by an average of 34.31%⁹ in the last 5 years compared to 30.17%¹⁰ in Brighton and 25.28%¹¹ in London as well as the number of outdoor events and activities. There is also a steady rise in commuters and DFLs (Down From London/ Elsewhere).

Ramsgate is the largest conservation area in Kent and has a large number of listed buildings¹². The impact of the Applicant proposal on the Conservation Area of Ramsgate **must be considered under statute (Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and Section 66(1) of the 1990 Act)** and case law (Barnwell Manor Wind Energy Ltd v East Northamptonshire District Council and Others: CA 18 Feb 2014¹³). The cited statute and case law requires a **decision-maker** to give the **desirability of preserving the building or its setting'** not merely careful consideration but **considerable importance and weight** when balancing the advantages of the proposed development against any harm from wind farm development or in this

⁸ <https://theisleofthanetnews.com/2019/01/09/record-4-2-million-visitors-give-319-million-boost-to-thanets-economy/>

⁹ Zoopla House Price Function

¹⁰ *Ibid*

¹¹ *Ibid*

¹² Colliers International (October 2018) Creative Industries in Historic Buildings and Environments Conservation Area Case Studies Page 76

¹³ Weekly Law Reports (ICLR)/2015/Volume 1 /*East Northamptonshire District Council and others v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and another - [2015] 1 WLR 45

case aeroplanes and associated noise, vibrations as well as auditory and visual blight on landscape.

Applicant's proposal will have a large impact on public funding (Transport Assessment, Consultations, Transportation (bus, road, rail, cyclist), Transportation (CO2 Emissions), Health, Public Health Areas, Educational System, Ramsgate Town Centre, Museums based at Manston) as well as the draft Local Plan. In addition to how the Applicant's interference with the draft Local Plan process has impacted the market value of the Manston site in question.

As you walk around Ramsgate you will see much of the architecture and past history of housing in Ramsgate from pre-1750. I have written a whistle stop tour around Ramsgate in my written representation to demonstrate just how much of it was **built before even the thought of an airport**. The architecture was laid out with the **sea, coast, tranquility and views in mind**, which is very much at odds with the Applicant's proposal.

For the avoidance of any doubt, I do not agree with any statement or aspect of the applicant's application and any matters not specifically addressed in my written representation should **not be taken** as agreement on my part.

//



Samara Jones-Hall <[REDACTED]>

FCS 1521 Form Submission id: 241813 - Manston Airport Reactivation - (Enquiry Ms S Jones-Hall)

Airspace User Response <Airspace.UserResponse@caa.co.uk>
To: [REDACTED]

Mon, Jan 14, 2019 at 10:51 AM

Dear Ms Jones-Hall,

Thank you for the e-mail message below in which you pose questions related to the Manston Airport ACP. The answers are as follows:

1. To date, no formal ACP has been received by us. However, a "Statement of Need" was sent to us on 9 Nov 2018. The reason why the Manston ACP details do not yet appear on the CAA Portal is because the ACP Sponsor has failed to obtain the necessary Portal access permissions from us as required by the requirements of CAP 1916. The Sponsor has been hastened on this requirement. Once Portal access has been granted the Sponsor will then be able to update the information and the Portal will reflect the ACP progress.
2. As the ACP has not yet been received by us, a case officer has yet to be assigned. We will endeavour to publish time scales once the scope of the airspace change and work load required has been assessed.

Thank you again for contacting the CAA,

Yours sincerely,

Aviation Related Environmental Enquiry (AREE)**Airspace Regulator (Co-ordination)**

Airspace, ATM and Aerodromes

Safety and Airspace Regulation Group

Civil Aviation Authority

From: Samara Jones-Hall [REDACTED]
Sent: 09 January 2019 19:54

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0) 1273 546 800

www: www.rpsgroup.com

From: Andrew.Scott-Clark@kent.gov.uk [mailto:Andrew.Scott-Clark@kent.gov.uk]

Sent: 10 October 2017 17:39

To: Tara Barratt

Cc: Andrew Buroni; Catherine.Barrett@kent.gov.uk

Subject: [EXT] RE: Manston Airport Health Impact Assessment

Further to our telephone conversation last week, I'm now responding on the draft scope of the HIA you have sent me for comment.

As you are aware the population of Thanet is diverse with a range of health needs with some of the most deprived communities in Kent being resident in the district of Thanet. In fact of the 88 Lower Layer Super output areas which make up the population with the highest rates of all age all cause mortality or lowest life expectancy in Kent, some 24 of those are situated in Thanet. A number of these will directly affected by your proposals, particularly Newington and Central Harbour/Eastcliffe areas of Ramsgate. We know that these populations will be more adversely affected by issues such as noise and air pollution than the general population.

The local health economy is also struggling to deliver sustainable health care services and the organisations that are responsible for delivering these (both commissioning and providing) will need to be consulted. This includes Thanet Clinical Commissioning Group, East Kent Hospitals Foundation Trust, Kent Community Healthcare Foundation Trust, Kent and Medway Partnership Trust, Southeast Ambulance Trust, as clearly both the construction phase and the operation phase may have impact on local health services; services that are currently under significant financial and capacity pressure.

I hope this is useful at this stage. Please note that I'm on A/L from today until 20th October inclusive and am happy to discuss further on my return.

Your sincerely

Andrew Scott-Clark | Director of Public Health | Kent County Council | Room 1.61, Sessions House, County Hall, County Road, Maidstone, Kent, ME14 1XQ | Internal 7200 416659 | External: +443000416659 | www.kent.gov.uk |

****Please note my new KCC phone number**

From: Tara Barratt [mailto:Tara.Barratt@rpsgroup.com]

Sent: 28 September 2017 17:27

To: Scott-Clark, Andrew - AH PH (Public Health)

Cc: Andrew Buroni; Barrett, Catherine - AH PH (Public Health)

Subject: RE: Manston Airport Health Impact Assessment

Hi Andrew,

Thanks for the quick response. Would you be around for a phone call early next week? We are working to a very tight schedule on this one.



FOI
NEL CSU
Kent House - 4th Floor
81 Station Road
Ashford
TN23 1PP

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
11th February 2019

Email: NELCSU.foi@nhs.net
www.thanetccg.nhs.uk

Our Ref: FOI.18.THA199

Dear [REDACTED]

RE: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST

Thank you for your request for information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 received on 15th December 2018 by NHS Thanet Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG). The information you have requested is listed below together with the response:

Could you please provide information about all correspondence you have had and any members of the Thanet Clinical Commissioning Group have had with RiverOak Strategic Partners including but not limited to any of their associated companies and/or professional advisors and/or any third party.

Clarification Requested: Can we please have clarification of your meaning of 'the members of the Thanet Clinical Commissioning Group'. The NHS Thanet CCG's understanding of the word 'members', as stated in their Constitution (page 7; section 3 – Membership), would be the GP practices.

Clarification Received: I meant members as you have defined and the individuals that make up the CCG's governing body.

I can confirm NHS Thanet CCG does hold this information. I can confirm, as far as they are aware, no NHS Thanet CCGs Governing Body member has had any correspondence with RiverOak Strategic Partners or any of their associated companies and/or professional advisors and/or any third party.

With regard to the NHS Thanet CCG GP Practices, I can confirm NHS Thanet CCG does not to hold this information. Therefore you may wish to redirect this part of your request to the individual GP Practices, who should be able to answer it for you. Their contact details can be found on the following link:

<https://www.thanetccg.nhs.uk/about-us/publications/?assetdet8f69bb2e-477d-4a1d-9070-609ed325f716=373306&categoryesctl8f69bb2e-477d-4a1d-9070-609ed325f716=16633>

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

We hope that this has dealt with your request for information however, should you remain dissatisfied, you have the right to request that we conduct an internal review of the way we have handled your request. If you would like us to conduct such a review please contact us within two months of this letter:

Email NELCSU.foi@nhs.net or

FOI-Internal Review Request
NEL CSU
Kent House - 4th Floor
81 Station Road
Ashford
TN23 1PP

Your request for an internal review will then be processed in accordance with our Freedom of Information Policy.

If you are still dissatisfied following the internal review, you have the right under Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act (2000) to appeal against the decision by contacting the Information Commissioner. The Information Commissioner provides full and detailed guidance on the Freedom of Information Act and on when and how to complain.

Please find below the link to their website page and their helpline number.

<https://ico.org.uk/for-the-public/official-information/>

Helpline number: 0303 123 1113 or 01625 545745

In line with the Information Commissioner's directive on the disclosure of information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 your request will form part of our disclosure log. Therefore, a version of our response, which will protect your anonymity, will be posted on the NHS Thanet Clinical Commissioning Group website.

Yours sincerely

Freedom of Information Team
NEL CSU

This Freedom of Information request has been processed by NEL CSU on behalf of

NHS Thanet Clinical Commissioning Group
Thanet District Council
Cecil St
Margate
Kent
CT9 1XZ

NEL CSU is NEL Commissioning Support Unit and is hosted by NHS England. NEL CSU provides a number of administrative functions including managing Freedom of Information Requests.

The four clinical commissioning groups (CCGs) in east Kent are working together to improve healthcare across their communities.

NHS Ashford CCG - NHS Canterbury and Coastal CCG - NHS South Kent Coast CCG - NHS Thanet CCG

There is some pressure to relax the planning policies that have ensured that development in the past three decades has fitted to fit into the scale and intricacy of the historic city. There are several recent buildings of 10-12 stories, and the current proposal by Broadway Malayan for the Anglia Centre site includes 1250 residential units and a 25-storey tower. However, because the area is large, major redevelopment does not, so far, appear to threaten the supply of premises suitable for creative industries. A greater- if more distant- peril would arise if the erosion of the city's historic character as a result of major redevelopments led to a change in the perception of Norwich as an attractive, desirable location for small businesses.

3.7 RAMSGATE CONSERVATION AREA

3.7.1 LOCATION, ORIGINS AND ARCHITECTURAL CHARACTER

Ramsgate Conservation Area covers much of the historic town of Ramsgate. It extends to 12.2 km² and is the largest conservation area in Kent. It contains 333 listed buildings of which several are listed grade I or II*. The local authority is Thanet District Council, which also covers the nearby towns of Margate and Broadstairs and their rural hinterland. The council has not prepared a local list or formally identified unlisted buildings that make a positive contribution to the area, but a substantial number of those predating 1914 would probably fall into the latter category.

In the medieval period, Ramsgate was a limb (i.e. branch) of the Cinque Port of Sandwich, but it was essentially a fishing village until the 16th and 17th centuries. In 1749, a new stone pier was built so that the harbour was accessible at all states of tide and could serve the merchant and naval fleets as a 'Port of Refuge', subsequently becoming a 'Royal Harbour'. By the end of the 18th century it developed as one of the first English sea-bathing resorts, and was developed with numerous terraces of houses, Assembly Rooms and baths; although it still had a large fishing fleet.

The Royal Harbour with its breakwater and associated buildings, is the defining visual and historic architectural feature of the town. The principal commercial and residential streets occupy the shallow valley that surrounds the harbour. The residential core is comprised mainly of 18th and early 19th century terraced housing. Outside this, are extensive areas of 19th and early 20th century development. Grade I listed buildings include the group comprising The Grange, St Augustine's Church, cloister and presbytery, designed for himself by the greatest of English gothic revival architect, AWN Pugin, a romantic recreation of what he saw as the medieval ideal of a Christian community; and the early 19th century church of St George. The Royal Harbour is listed Grade II*.

Much of the 19th century townscape survives and, apart from a few intrusive modern exceptions, the town preserves its historic scale of 3-4-storey terraces, with ground floor shops in the main streets.

3.7.2 POST-1945 CHANGES

Ramsgate suffered much less bomb damage than nearby Margate, for example, but, as with other English seaside towns, it suffered a significant economic decline as the domestic holiday industry was replaced by the popularity of foreign holidays. A number of initiatives to regenerate the local economy have been made.

Several unsuccessful attempts to reintroduce cross-channel ferries led to a massive industrial site (the modern 'Port of Ramsgate') being developed on reclaimed land to the west of the Royal Harbour.



Weekly Law Reports (ICLR)/2015/Volume 1 /*East Northamptonshire District Council and others v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and another - [2015] 1 WLR 45

[2015] 1 WLR 45

***East Northamptonshire District Council and others v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and another**

Court of Appeal

[2014] EWCA Civ 137

2014 Jan 23; Feb 18

Maurice Kay, Sullivan, Rafferty LJJ

Planning -- Planning permission -- Development affecting listed building -- Application for planning permission for wind farm development close to Grade I listed buildings -- Requirement on decision-maker to "have special regard to the desirability of preserving" setting of listed buildings -- Inspector finding benefit of proposed development outweighing harm to buildings and granting permission -- Whether statutory duty requiring inspector to give considerable importance and weight to desirability of preserving setting of listed buildings when carrying out balancing exercise -- Whether applying with particular force where setting Grade I listed building affected -- Relevance of finding that harm to setting less than substantial -- Relevance of perception of any reasonable observer -- Whether inspector's decision flawed -- Whether rightly quashed -- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (c 9), s 66(1)

The local planning authority refused the developer's application for planning permission to build a four-turbine wind farm on land in a conservation area which contained a number of listed buildings including a collection of Grade I listed buildings and gardens. The developer appealed to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, who appointed a planning inspector to determine the appeal. By section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990¹ the inspector was under a duty when considering whether to grant planning permission to "have special regard to the desirability of preserving" a listed building or its setting. Listed buildings came within the definition of "designated heritage assets" in the Government's Planning Policy Statement 5² and practice guide. The inspector concluded that while the wind farm would fall within and affect the settings of a wide range of heritage assets, on balance the significant benefits of the proposed development in terms of the renewable energy which it would produce outweighed the less than substantial harm which it would cause to the setting of such designated heritage assets and the wider landscape, and accordingly granted planning permission. One of the reasons given for the inspector's conclusion that the harm would be less than substantial was that "any reasonable observer" would know that the development was a modern addition to the landscape, separate from the planned historic landscape or building he was within or considering or interpreting. The judge granted an application by, among others, the local planning authority under section 288 of the Town and County Planning Act 1990 to quash the inspector's decision on the ground that it was flawed because, among other things, he had failed to give effect to the duty under section 66(1) by not giving sufficient weight to the desirability of preserving the setting of the listed buildings.

On the developer's appeal--

Held, dismissing the appeal, (1) that section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 required the decision-maker to give "the desirability of preserving the building or its setting" not merely careful consideration

[2015] 1 WLR 45 at 46

for the purpose of deciding whether there would be some harm, but considerable importance and weight when balancing the advantages of the proposed development against any such harm; that that general duty applied with particular force if harm would be caused to the setting of a Grade I listed building, which was a designated heritage asset of the highest significance; that, if the harm to the setting of the Grade I listed building would be less than substantial, the strength of the presumption against the grant of planning permission would be lessened but it would not be entirely removed; that, since the planning inspector had not given considerable importance and weight to the desirability of preserving the setting of the listed buildings when carrying out the balancing exercise, he had not given proper effect to the section 66(1) duty; and that, accordingly, the judge had been right to conclude that the inspector's decision was flawed on that basis (post, paras 22, 23, 24, 26, 28, 29, 45, 46, 47).

The Bath Society v Secretary of State for the Environment [1991] 1 WLR 1303, CA and *South Lakeland District Council v Secretary of State for the Environment* [1992] 2 AC 141, HL(E) applied.

(2) That, to the extent that the application of the "reasonable observer" test had been the decisive factor in the inspector's reasoning for his conclusion that harm to the setting of the listed buildings was less than substantial, he had not properly applied the relevant Government policy guidance; that if it had not been the decisive factor he had not given adequate reasons for that conclusion; and that, accordingly, the judge had been right to conclude that the inspector's decision was flawed on that basis also (post, paras 43-44, 45, 46, 47).

Decision of Lang J [2013] EWHC 473 (Admin); [2013] 2 P & CR 94 affirmed.

The following cases are referred to in the judgment of Sullivan LJ:

Bath Society, The v Secretary of State for the Environment [1991] 1 WLR 1303; [1992] 1 All ER 28; 89 LGR 834, CA

Heatherington (UK) Ltd v Secretary of State for the Environment (1994) 69 P & CR 374

R (Garner) v Elmbridge Borough Council [2011] EWHC 86 (Admin); [2011] PTSR D25; [2011] EWCA Civ 891; [2012] PTSR D7, CA

South Lakeland District Council v Secretary of State for the Environment [1992] 2 AC 141; [1992] 2 WLR 204; [1992] 1 All ER 573; 90 LGR 201, HL(E)

Tesco Stores Ltd v Secretary of State for the Environment [1995] 1 WLR 759; [1995] 2 All ER 636; 93 LGR 403, HL(E)

No additional cases were cited in argument.

APPEAL from Lang J

By an application under section 288 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 the applicants, East Northamptonshire District Council (the local planning authority), English Heritage and the Na-

tional Trust, applied for an order to quash the decision of a planning inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, by a decision letter dated 12 March 2012, allowing an appeal by the developer, Barnwell Manor Wind Energy Ltd, against the decision of the local planning authority dated 24 January 2011 to refuse its application for planning permission for a four-turbine wind farm in a conservation area. The Secretary of State conceded that the inspector's decision should be quashed and took no further part in proceedings. By order dated 11 March 2013 following judgment on 8 March 2013 Lang J [2013] EWHC 473 (Admin); [2013] 2 P & CR 94 granted the application on the basis grounds that the inspector (1) had failed under the duty in section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to and

[2015] 1 WLR 45 at 47

give considerable weight to the desirability of preserving the settings of listed buildings, including Lyveden New Bield; (2) had failed correctly to interpret and apply the policies in Planning Policy Statement 5; and (3) had failed to give adequate reasons for his decision.

By an appellant's notice dated 28 March 2013, the developer appealed, with permission of the judge, on the grounds that the judge (1) had erred in concluding that section 66(1) of the 1990 Act required the inspector to give considerable weight to the desirability of preserving the settings of the many listed buildings in the area; (2) had taken an over-rigid approach to the policy statement and practice guide which were not intended to be prescriptive; and (3) had erred in finding that the inspector had failed to give adequate reasons for his conclusion that the harm would in all cases be less than substantial.

The facts are stated in the judgment of Sullivan LJ.

Gordon Nardell QC and *Justine Thornton* (instructed by *Eversheds LLP*) for the developer.

Morag Ellis QC and *Robin Green* (instructed by *Sharpe Pritchard*) for the applicants.

The Secretary of State did not appear and was not represented.

The court took time for consideration.

18 February 2014. The following judgments were handed down.

SULLIVAN LJ

Introduction

1 This is an appeal against the order dated 11 March 2013 of Lang J quashing the decision dated 12 March 2012 of a planning inspector appointed by the Secretary of State granting planning permission for a four-turbine wind farm on land north of Catshead Woods, Sudborough, Northamptonshire. The background to the appeal is set out in Lang J's judgment [2013] 2 P & CR 94 of 8 March 2013.

Section 66

2 Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 ("the Listed Buildings Act") imposes a "General duty as respects listed buildings in exercise of planning functions". Subsection (1) provides:

"In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses."

Planning policy

3 When the permission was granted the Government's planning policies on the conservation of the historic environment were contained in Planning Policy Statement 5 ("PPS5"). In PPS5 those parts of the historic environment that have significance because of their historic, archaeological, architectural

[2015] 1 WLR 45 at 48

or artistic interest are called heritage assets. Listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments and registered parks and gardens are called "designated heritage assets". Guidance to help practitioners implement the policies in PPS5 was contained in "PPS5: planning for the historic environment: historic environment planning practice guide". For present purposes, policies HE9 and HE10 in PPS5 are of particular relevance. Policy HE9.1 advised that:

"There should be a presumption in favour of the conservation of designated heritage assets and the more significant the designated heritage asset, the greater the presumption in favour of its conservation should be ... Substantial harm to or loss of a Grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional. Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, including scheduled monuments ... Grade I and II* listed buildings and Grade I and II* registered parks and gardens ... should be wholly exceptional."

Policy HE9.4 advised that:

"Where a proposal has a harmful impact on the significance of a designated heritage asset which is less than substantial harm, in all cases local planning authorities should: (i) weigh the public benefit of the proposal (for example, that it helps to secure the optimum viable use of the heritage asset in the interests of its long term conservation) against the harm; and (ii) recognise that the greater the harm to the significance of the heritage asset the greater the justification will be needed for any loss."

Policy HE10.1 advised decision-makers that when considering applications for development that do not preserve those elements of the setting of a heritage asset, they:

"should weigh any such harm against the wider benefits of the application. The greater the negative impact on the significance of the heritage asset, the greater the benefits that will be needed to justify approval."

The inspector's decision

4 The inspector concluded, at para 22, that the wind farm would fall within and affect the setting of a wide range of heritage assets. For the purposes of this appeal the parties' submissions largely focused on one of the most significant of those assets: a site owned by the National Trust, Lyveden New Bield. Lyveden New Bield is covered by a range of heritage designations: Grade I listed building, inclusion in the register of parks and gardens of special historic interest at Grade I, and scheduled ancient monument.

5 It was common ground between the parties at the inquiry that the group of designated heritage assets at Lyveden New Bield was probably the finest surviving example of an Elizabethan garden, and that as a group the heritage asset at Lyveden New Bield had a cultural value of national, if not international significance. The inspector agreed, and found, at para 45: "this group of designated heritage assets has archaeological, architectural, artistic and historic significance of the highest magnitude."

[2015] 1 WLR 45 at 49

6 The closest turbine in the wind farm site (following the deletion of one turbine) to Lyveden New Bield was around 1.3 km from the boundary of the registered park and 1.7 km from the New Bield itself. The inspector found, at para 46:

"The wind turbines proposed would be visible from all around the site, to varying degrees, because of the presence of trees. Their visible presence would have a clear influence on the surroundings in which the heritage assets are experienced and as such they would fall within, and affect, the setting of the group."

This conclusion led the inspector to identify the central question, at para 46:

"Bearing in mind PPS5 policy HE7, the central question is the extent to which that visible presence would affect the significance of the heritage assets concerned."

7 The inspector answered that question in relation to Lyveden New Bield in paras 47-51 of his decision letter.

"47. While records of Sir Thomas Tresham's intentions for the site are relatively, and unusually, copious, it is not altogether clear to what extent the gardens and the garden lodge were completed and whether the designer considered views out of the garden to be of any particular significance. As a consequence, notwithstanding planting programmes that the National Trust have undertaken in recent times, the experience of Lyveden New Bield as a place, and as a planned landscape, with earthworks, moats and buildings within it, today, requires imagination and interpretation.

"48. At the times of my visits, there were limited numbers of visitors and few vehicles entering and leaving the site. I can imagine that at busy times, the situation might be somewhat different but the relative absence of man-made features in views across and out of the gardens compartments, from the prospect mounds especially, and from within the garden lodge, give the place a sense of isolation that makes the use of one's imagination to interpret Sir Thomas Tresham's design intentions somewhat easier.

"49. The visible, and sometimes moving, presence of the proposed wind turbine array would introduce a man-made feature, of significant scale, into the experience of the place. The array would act as a distraction that would make it more difficult to understand the place, and the intentions underpinning its design. That would cause harm to the setting of the group of designated heritage assets within it.

"50. However, while the array would be readily visible as a backdrop to the garden lodge in some directional views, from the garden lodge itself in views towards it, and from the prospect mounds, from within the moated orchard, and various other places around the site, at a separation distance of between one and two kilometres, the turbines would not be so close, or fill the field of view to the extent, that they would dominate the outlook from the site. Moreover, the turbine array would not intrude on any obviously intended, planned view out of the garden, or from the garden lodge (which has windows all around its cruciform perimeter). Any reasonable observer would know that the turbine array was a

[2015] 1 WLR 45 at 50
modern addition to the landscape, separate from the planned historic landscape, or building they were within, or considering, or interpreting.

"51. On that basis, the presence of the wind turbine array would not be so distracting that it would prevent or make unduly difficult, an understanding, appreciation or interpretation of the significance of the elements that make up Lyveden New Bield and Lyveden Old Bield, or their relationship to each other. As a consequence, the effect on the setting of these designated heritage assets, while clearly detrimental, would not reach the level of substantial harm."

8 The inspector carried out "the balancing exercise" in paras 85-86 of his decision letter.

"85. The proposal would harm the setting of a number of designated heritage assets. However, the harm would in all cases be less than substantial and reduced by its temporary nature and reversibility. The proposal would also cause harm to the landscape but this would be ameliorated by a number of factors. Read in isolation though, all this means that the proposal would fail to accord with [conservation policies in the East Midlands regional plan ("EMRP")]. On the other hand, having regard to advice in PPS22, the benefits that would accrue from the wind farm in the 25-year period of its operation attract significant weight in favour of the proposal. The 10 MW that it could provide would contribute towards the 2020 regional target for renewable energy, as required by EMRP policy 40 and Appendix 5, and the wider UK national requirement.

"86. PPS5 policies HE9.4 and HE10.1 require the identified harm to the setting of designated heritage assets to be balanced against the benefits that the proposal would provide. Application of the development plan as a whole would also require that harm, and the harm to the landscape, to be weighed against the benefits. Key principle (i) of PPS22 says that renewable energy developments should be capable of being accommodated throughout England in locations where the technology is viable and environmental, economic, and social impacts can be addressed satisfactorily. I take that as a clear expression that the threshold of acceptability for a proposal like the one at issue in this appeal is not such that all harm must be avoided. In my view, the significant benefits of the proposal in terms of the energy it would produce from a renewable source outweigh the less than substantial harm it would cause to the setting of designated heritage assets and the wider landscape."

Lang J's judgment

9 Before Lang J the first, second and third applicants challenged the inspector's decision on three grounds. In summary, they submitted that the inspector had failed (1) to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the settings of listed buildings, including Lyveden New Bield; (2) correctly to interpret and apply the policies in PPS5; and (3) to give adequate reasons for his decision. The Secretary of State had conceded prior to the hearing that the inspector's decision should be quashed on ground (3), and took no part in the proceedings before Lang J and in this court.

[2015] 1 WLR 45 at 51

10 Lang J concluded [2013] 2 P & CR 94, para 72 that all three grounds of challenge were made out. In respect of ground (1) she concluded, at para 39:

"in order to give effect to the statutory duty under section 66(1), a decision-maker should accord considerable importance and weight to the 'desirability of preserving ... the setting' of listed buildings when weighing this factor in the balance with other 'material considerations' which have not been given this special statutory status. Thus, where the section 66(1) duty is in play, it is necessary to qualify Lord Hoffmann's statement in *Tesco Stores Ltd v Secretary of State for the Environment* [1995] 1 WLR 759, 780 F-H that the weight to be given to a material consideration was a question of planning judgment for the planning authority."

Applying that interpretation of section 66(1) she concluded, at para 46:

"the inspector did not at any stage in the balancing exercise accord 'special weight', or considerable importance to 'the desirability of preserving the setting'. He treated the 'harm' to the setting and the wider benefit of the wind farm proposal as if those two factors were of equal importance. Indeed, he downplayed 'the desirability of preserving the setting' by adopting key principle (i) of PPS22, as a 'clear indication that the threshold of acceptability for a proposal like the one at issue in this appeal is not such that all harm must be avoided' (para 86). In so doing, he applied the policy without giving effect to the section 66(1) duty, which applies to all listed buildings, whether the 'harm' has been assessed as substantial or less than substantial."

11 In respect of ground (2) Lang J concluded that the policy guidance in PPS5 and the practice guide required the inspector to assess the contribution that the setting made to the significance of the heritage assets, including Lyveden New Bield, and the effect of the proposed wind turbines on both the significance of the heritage asset *and* the ability to appreciate that significance. Having analysed the inspector's decision, she found, at paras 55-65, that the inspector's assessment had been too narrow. He had failed to assess the contribution that the setting of Lyveden New Bield made to its significance as a heritage asset and the extent to which the wind turbines would enhance or detract from that significance, and had wrongly limited his assessment to one factor: the ability of the public to understand the asset based on the ability of "the reasonable observer" to distinguish between the "modern addition" to the landscape and the "historic landscape."

12 In respect of ground (3) Lang J found, at para 68, that the question whether Sir Thomas Tresham intended that the views from the garden and the garden lodge should be of significance was a controversial and important issue at the inquiry which the inspector should have resolved before proceeding to assess the level of harm. However, the inspector's reasoning on this issue was unclear. Having said in para 47 of his decision that it was "not altogether clear ... whether the designer considered views out of the garden to be of any significance", he had concluded, in para 50, that "the turbine array would not intrude on any obviously intended, planned view

[2015] 1 WLR 45 at 52

out of the garden, or from the garden lodge (which has windows all around its cruciform perimeter)." It was not clear from paras 70-71 whether this was a conclusion that there were no planned views (as submitted by the second defendant) or a conclusion that there were such views but the turbine array would not intrude into them.

The grounds of appeal

13 On behalf of the second defendant, Mr Nardell QC challenged Lang J's conclusions in respect of all three grounds. At the forefront of his appeal was the submission that Lang J had erred in concluding that section 66(1) required the inspector, when carrying out the balancing exercise, to give "considerable weight" to the desirability of preserving the settings of the many listed buildings, including Lyveden New Bield. He submitted that section 66(1) did not require the decision-maker to give any particular weight to that factor. It required the decision-maker to ask the right question--would there be some harm to the setting of the listed building--and if the answer to that question was "yes"--to refuse planning permission unless that harm was outweighed by the advantages of the proposed development. When carrying out that balancing exercise the weight to be given to the harm to the setting of the listed building on the one hand and the advantages of the proposal on the other was entirely a matter of planning judgment for the decision-maker.

14 Turning to the policy ground, he submitted that Lang J had erred by taking an over-rigid approach to PPS5 and the practice guide which were not intended to be prescriptive. Given the way in which those objecting to the proposed wind farm had put their case at the inquiry, the inspector had been entitled to focus on the extent to which the presence of the turbines in views to and from the listed buildings, including Lyveden New Bield, would affect the ability of the public to appreciate the heritage assets.

15 In response to the reasons ground, he submitted that the question whether any significant view from the lodge or garden at Lyveden New Bield was planned or intended was a subsidiary, and not a "principal important controversial", issue. In any event, he submitted that on a natural reading of para 50 of the decision letter the inspector had simply found that the turbines would not intrude into such significant views, *if any*, as were obviously planned or intended, so it had been unnecessary for him to resolve the issue that he had left open in para 47 of the decision.

Discussion

Ground 1

16 What was Parliament's intention in imposing both the section 66 duty and the parallel duty under section 72(1) of the Listed Buildings Act to pay "special attention ... to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance" of conservation areas? It is common ground that, despite the slight difference in wording, the nature of the duty is the same under both enactments. It is also common ground that "preserving" in both enactments means doing no harm: see *South Lakeland District Council v Secretary of State for the Environment* [1992] 2 AC 141,150, per Lord Bridge of Harwich.

[2015] 1 WLR 45 at 53

17 Was it Parliament's intention that the decision-maker should consider very carefully whether a proposed development would harm the setting of the listed building (or the character or appearance of the conservation area), and if the conclusion was that there would be some harm, then consider whether that harm was outweighed by the advantages of the proposal, giving that harm such weight as the decision-maker thought appropriate; or was it Parliament's intention that when deciding whether the harm to the setting of the listed building was outweighed by the advantages of the proposal, the decision-maker should give particular weight to the desirability of avoiding such harm?

18 Lang J analysed the authorities in paras 34-39 of her judgment. In chronological order they are: *The Bath Society v Secretary of State for the Environment* [1991] 1 WLR 1303; the *South Lakeland* case (see para 16 above); *Heatherington (UK) Ltd v Secretary of State for the Environment* (1994) 69 P & CR 374; and *Tesco Stores Ltd v Secretary of State for the Environment* [1995] 1 WLR 759. The *Bath Society* case and the *South Lakeland* case were concerned with (what is now) the duty under section 72. The *Heatherington* case is the only case in which the section 66 duty was considered. The *Tesco* case was not a section 66 or section 72 case, it was concerned with the duty to have regard to "other material considerations" under section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 ("the Planning Act").

19 When summarising his conclusions in the *Bath Society* case [1991] 1 WLR 1303, 1318 F-H about the proper approach which should be adopted to an application for planning permission in a conservation area, Glidewell LJ distinguished between the general duty under (what is now) section 70(2) of the Planning Act, and the duty under (what is now) section 72(1) of the Listed Buildings Act. Within a conservation area the decision-maker has two statutory duties to perform, but the requirement in section 72(1) to pay "special attention" should be the first consideration for the decision-maker. Glidewell LJ continued, at p 1319:

"Since, however, it is a consideration to which special attention is to be paid as a matter of statutory duty, it must be regarded as having considerable importance and weight ... As I have said, the conclusion that the development will neither enhance nor preserve will be a consideration of considerable importance and weight. This does not necessarily mean that the application for permission must be refused, but it does in my view mean that the development should only be permitted if the decision-maker concludes that it carries some advantage or benefit which outweighs the failure to satisfy the section [72(1)] test and such detriment as may inevitably follow from that."

20 In the *South Lakeland* case [1992] 2 AC 141 the issue was whether the concept of "preserving" in what is now section 72(1) meant "positively preserving" or merely doing no harm. The House of Lords concluded that the latter interpretation was correct, but in his speech (with which the other members of the House agreed) Lord Bridge described the statutory intention in these terms, at p 146 E-G:

"There is no dispute that the intention of section [72(1)] is that planning decisions in respect of development proposed to be carried out

[2015] 1 WLR 45 at 54

in a conservation area must give a high priority to the objective of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area. If any proposed development would conflict with that objective, there will be a strong presumption against the grant of planning permission, though, no doubt, in exceptional cases the presumption may be overridden in favour of development which is desirable on the ground of some other public interest. But if a development would not conflict with that objective, the special attention required to be paid to that objective will no longer stand in its way and the development will be permitted or refused in the application of ordinary planning criteria."

21 In the *Heatherington* case 69 P & CR 374, the principal issue was the interrelationship between the duty imposed by section 66(1) and the newly imposed duty under section 54A of the Planning Act (since repealed and replaced by the duty under section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004). However, Mr David Keene QC, at p 383, when referring to the section 66(1) duty, applied Glidewell LJ's dicta in the *Bath Society* case (see para 19 above), and said that the statutory objective "remains one to which considerable weight should be attached".

22 Mr Nardell submitted, correctly, that the inspector's error in the *Bath Society* case [1991] 1 WLR 1303 was that he had failed to carry out the necessary balancing exercise. In the present case the inspector had expressly carried out the balancing exercise, and decided that the advantages of the proposed wind farm outweighed the less than substantial harm to the setting of the heritage assets. Mr Nardell submitted that there was nothing in Glidewell LJ's judgment which supported the proposition that the court could go behind the inspector's conclusion. I accept that (subject to grounds 2 and 3, see para 29 et seq below) the inspector's assessment of the degree of harm to the setting of the listed building was a matter for his planning judgment, but I do not accept that he was then free to give that harm such weight as he chose when carrying out the balancing exercise. In my view, Glidewell LJ's judgment is authority for the proposition that a finding of harm to the setting of a listed building is a consideration to which the decision-maker must give "considerable importance and weight."

23 That conclusion is reinforced by the passage in the speech of Lord Bridge in the *South Lakeland* case [1992] 2 AC 141 to which I have referred: see para 20 above. It is true, as Mr Nardell submits, that the ratio of that decision is that "preserve" means "do no harm". However, Lord Bridge's explanation of the statutory purpose is highly persuasive, and his observation that there will be a "strong presumption" against granting permission for development that would harm the character or appearance of a conservation area is consistent with Glidewell LJ's conclusion in the *Bath Society* case. There is a "strong presumption" against granting planning permission for development which would harm the character or appearance of a conservation area precisely because the desirability of preserving the character or appearance of the area is a consideration of "considerable importance and weight."

24 While I would accept Mr Nardell's submission that the *Heatherington* case 69 P & CR 374 does not take the matter any further, it does not cast any doubt on the proposition that emerges from the *Bath Society* case [1991] 1 WLR 1303 and the *South Lakeland* case [1992] 2 AC 141: that Parliament in enacting section 66(1) did intend that the desirability of preserving the settings of listed buildings should not simply be given careful consideration by the decision-maker for the purpose of deciding whether there would be some harm, but should be given "considerable importance and weight" when the decision-maker carries out the balancing exercise. [2015] 1 WLR 45 at 55

25 In support of his submission that, provided he asked the right question--was the harm to the settings of the listed buildings outweighed by the advantages of the proposed development--the inspector was free to give what weight he chose to that harm, Mr Nardell relied on the statement in the speech of Lord Hoffmann in the *Tesco* case [1995] 1 WLR 759, 780 H that the weight to be given to a material consideration is entirely a matter for the local planning authority (or in this case, the inspector): "If there is one principle of planning law more firmly settled than any other, it is that matters of planning judgment are within the exclusive province of the local planning authority or the Secretary of State."

26 As a general proposition, the principle is not in doubt, but the case was concerned with the application of section 70(2) of the Planning Act. It was not a case under section 66(1) or 72(1) of the Listed Buildings Act. The proposition that decision-makers may be required by either statute or planning policy to give particular weight to certain material considerations was not disputed by Mr Nardell. There are many examples of

planning policies, both national and local, which require decision-makers when exercising their planning judgment to give particular weight to certain material considerations. No such policies were in issue in the *Tesco* case, but an example can be seen in this case. In para 16 of his decision letter the inspector referred to planning policy statement 22: Renewable Energy (PPS22) which says that the wider environmental and economic benefits of all proposals for renewable energy, whatever their scale, are material considerations which should be given "significant weight". In this case, the requirement to give "considerable importance and weight" to the policy objective of preserving the setting of listed buildings has been imposed by Parliament. Section 70(3) of the Planning Act provides that section 70(1), which confers the power to grant planning permission, has effect subject to, inter alia, sections 66 and 72 of the Listed Buildings Act. Section 70(2) of the Planning Act, as substituted by section 143(2) of the Localism Act 2011, requires the decision-maker to have regard to "material considerations" when granting planning permission, but Parliament has made the power to grant permission having regard to material considerations expressly subject to the section 66(1) duty.

27 Mr Nardell also referred us to the decisions of Ouseley J and this court in *R (Garner) v Elmbridge Borough Council* [2011] EWHC 86 (Admin); [2011] PTSR D25; [2011] EWCA Civ 891; [2012] PTSR D7, but the issue in that case was whether the local planning authority had been entitled to conclude that no harm would be caused to the setting of another heritage asset of the highest significance, Hampton Court Palace. Such was the weight given to the desirability of preserving the setting of the palace that it was common ground that it would not be acceptable to grant planning

[2015] 1 WLR 45 at 56

permission for a redevelopment scheme which would have harmed the setting of the palace on the basis that such harm would be outweighed by some other planning advantage [2011] EWCA Civ 891 at [14]. Far from assisting Mr Nardell's case, the *Garner* case is an example of the practical application of the advice in policy HE9.1: that substantial harm to designated heritage assets of the highest significance should not merely be exceptional, but "wholly exceptional".

28 It does not follow that if the harm to such heritage assets is found to be less than substantial, the balancing exercise referred to in policies HE9.4 and HE10.1 should ignore the overarching statutory duty imposed by section 66(1), which properly understood (see the *Bath Society* case [1991] 1 WLR 1303, the *South Lakeland* case [1992] 2 AC 141 and the *Heatherington* case 69 P & CR 374) requires considerable weight to be given by decision-makers to the desirability of preserving the setting of all listed buildings, including Grade II listed buildings. That general duty applies with particular force if harm would be caused to the setting of a Grade I listed building, a designated heritage asset of the highest significance. If the harm to the setting of a Grade I listed building would be less than substantial that will plainly lessen the strength of the presumption against the grant of planning permission (so that a grant of permission would no longer have to be "wholly exceptional"), but it does not follow that the "strong presumption" against the grant of planning permission has been entirely removed.

29 For these reasons, I agree with Lang J's conclusion that Parliament's intention in enacting section 66(1) was that decision-makers should give "considerable importance and weight" to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings when carrying out the balancing exercise. I also agree with her conclusion that the inspector did not give considerable importance and weight to this factor when carrying out the balancing exercise in this decision. He appears to have treated the less than substantial harm to the setting of the listed buildings, including Lyveden New Bield, as a less than substantial objection to the grant of planning permission. The second defendant's skeleton argument effectively conceded as much in contending that the weight to be given to this factor was, subject only to irrationality, entirely a matter for the inspector's planning judgment. In his oral submissions Mr Nardell contended that the inspector had given considerable weight to this factor, but he was unable to point to any particular passage in the decision letter which supported this contention, and there is a marked contrast between the "significant weight" which the inspector expressly gave in para 85 of the decision letter to the renewable energy considerations in favour of the proposal having regard to the policy advice in PPS22, and the manner in which he approached the section 66(1) duty. It is true that the inspector set out the duty in para 17 of the decision letter, but at no stage in the decision letter did he expressly acknowledge the need, if he found that there would be harm to the setting of the

many listed buildings, to give considerable weight to the desirability of preserving the setting of those buildings. This is a fatal flaw in the decision even if grounds 2 and 3 are not made out.

[2015] 1 WLR 45 at 57

Ground 2

30 Grounds 2 and 3 are interlinked. The applicants contend that the inspector either misapplied the relevant policy guidance, or if he correctly applied it, failed to give adequate reasons for his conclusion that the harm to the setting of the listed buildings, including Lyveden New Bield, would in all cases be less than substantial. I begin with the policy challenge in ground 2. Lang J set out the policy guidance relating to setting in PPS5 and the practice guide in [2013] 2 P & CR 94, paras 62-64. The contribution made by the setting of Lyveden New Bield to its significance as a heritage asset was undoubtedly a "principal controversial" issue at the inquiry. In his proof of evidence on behalf of the local planning authority Mr Mills, its senior conservation officer, said, at para 4.5.1:

"To make an assessment of the indirect impact of development or change on an asset it is first necessary to make a judgment about the contribution made by its setting."

Having carried out a detailed assessment of that contribution he concluded, at para 4.5.17:

"In summary, what Tresham created at the site was a designed experience that was intimately linked to the surrounding landscape. The presence of the four prospect mounts along with the raised terrace provide a clear indication of the relationship of the site with the surrounding landscape."

Only then did he assess the impact of the proposed development on the setting by way of "a discussion as to the impact of the proposal on how the site is accessed and experienced by visitors".

31 In its written representations to the inquiry English Heritage said of the significance and setting of Lyveden New Bield:

"The aesthetic value of the Lyveden heritage assets partly derives from the extraordinary symbolism and quality of the New Bield and the theatrical design of the park and garden. However, it also derives from their visual association with each other and with their setting. The New Bield is a striking presence when viewed on the skyline from a distance. The New Bield and Lyveden park and garden are wonderfully complemented by their undeveloped setting of woodland, pasture and arable land."

In para 8.23, English Heritage said:

"The New Bield and Lyveden park and garden were designed to be prominent and admired in their rural setting, isolated from competing structures. The character and setting of the Lyveden heritage assets makes a crucial contribution to their significance individually and as a group."

32 In its written representations to the inquiry the National Trust said, at para 11, that each arm of the cruciform New Bield "was intended to offer extensive views in *all directions* over the surrounding parks and the Tresham estate beyond". The National Trust's evidence, at para 12, was that "one if not *the principal designed view from* within the lodge was from the

[2015] 1 WLR 45 at 58

withdrawing rooms which linked to the important Great Chamber and Great Hall on the upper two levels of the west arm of the lodge". The Trust contended that this vista survived today, and was directly aligned with the proposed wind farm site. (Emphasis in both paragraphs as in the original.)

33 In his proof of evidence, the planning witness for the Stop Barnwell Manor Wind Farm Group said that:

"the views of Lyveden New Bield from the east, south-east and south, both as an individual structure and as a group with its adjoining historic garden and listed cottage, are views of a very high order. The proposed turbines, by virtue of their monumental scale, modern mechanical appearance, and motion of the blades, would be wholly alien in this scene and would draw the eye away from the New Bield, destroying its dominating presence in the landscape."

34 This evidence was disputed by the second defendant's conservation witness, and the second defendant rightly contends that a section 288 appeal is not an opportunity to re-argue the planning merits. I have set out these extracts from the objectors' evidence at the inquiry because they demonstrate that the objectors were contending that the undeveloped setting of Lyveden New Bield made a crucial contribution to its significance as a heritage asset; that the New Bield (the lodge) had been designed to be a striking and dominant presence when viewed in its rural setting; and that the lodge had been designed so as to afford extensive views in all directions over that rural setting. Did the inspector resolve these issues in his decision, and if so, how?

35 I endorse Lang J's conclusion that the inspector did not assess the contribution made by the setting of Lyveden New Bield, by virtue of its being undeveloped, to the significance of Lyveden New Bield as a heritage asset. The inspector did not grapple with (or if he did consider it, gave no reasons for rejecting) the objectors' case that the setting of Lyveden New Bield was of crucial importance to its significance as a heritage asset because Lyveden New Bield was designed to have a dominating presence in the surrounding rural landscape, and to afford extensive views in all directions over that landscape; and that these qualities would be seriously harmed by the visual impact of a modern man-made feature of significant scale in that setting.

36 The inspector's reason for concluding in para 51 of the decision that the presence of the wind turbine array, while clearly having a detrimental effect on the setting of Lyveden New Bield, would not reach the level of substantial harm, was that it would not be so distracting that it would not prevent, or make unduly difficult, an understanding, appreciation or interpretation of the significance of the elements that make up Lyveden New Bield or Lyveden Old Bield or their relationship to each other.

37 That is, at best, only a partial answer to the objectors' case. As the practice guide makes clear, the ability of the public to appreciate a heritage asset is one, but by no means the only, factor to be considered when assessing the contribution that setting makes to the significance of a heritage asset. The contribution that setting makes does not depend on there being an ability to access or experience the setting: see in particular paras 117 and 122 of the practice guide, cited in Lang J's judgment [2013] 2 P & CR 94, para 64.

[2015] 1 WLR 45 at 59

Ground 3

38 The inspector said that his conclusion in para 51 of the decision letter that the presence of the wind turbine array would not be so distracting that it would prevent or make unduly difficult, an understanding, appreciation or interpretation of the significance of the elements that make up Lyveden New Bield had been reached on the basis of his conclusions in para 50. In that paragraph, having said that the wind turbine array

"would be readily visible as a backdrop to the garden lodge in some directional views, from the garden lodge itself in views towards it, and from the prospect mounds, from within the ... orchard, and various other places around the site, at a separation distance of between one and two kilometres",

the inspector gave three reasons which formed the basis of his conclusion in para 51.

39 Those three reasons were: (a) The turbines would not be so close, or fill the field of view to the extent, that they would dominate the outlook from the site. (b) The turbine array would not intrude on any obviously intended, planned view out of the garden or the garden lodge (which has windows all around its cruciform perimeter). (c) Any reasonable observer would know that the turbine array was a modern addition to the landscape, separate from the planned historic landscape, or building they were within, or considering, or interpreting.

40 Taking those reasons in turn, reason (a) does not engage with the objectors' contention that the setting of Lyveden New Bield made a crucial contribution to its significance as a heritage asset because Lyveden New Bield was designed to be the dominant feature in the surrounding rural landscape. A finding that the "readily visible" turbine array would not dominate the outlook from the site puts the boot on the wrong foot. If this aspect of the objectors' case was not rejected (and there is no reasoned conclusion to that effect) the question was not whether the turbine array would dominate the outlook from Lyveden New Bield, but whether Lyveden New Bield would continue to be dominant within its rural setting.

41 Mr Nardell's submission to this court was not that the inspector had found that there were no planned views (cf the submission recorded in para 70 of Lang J's judgment), but that the inspector had concluded that the turbine array would not intrude into obviously intended or planned views *if any*. That submission is difficult to understand given the inspector's conclusion that the turbine array would be "readily visible" from the garden lodge, from the prospect mounds, and from various other places around the site. Unless the inspector had concluded that there were *no* intended or planned views from the garden or the garden lodge, and he did not reach that conclusion (see para 47 of the decision letter), it is difficult to see how he could have reached the conclusion that the "readily visible" turbine array would not "intrude" on any obviously intended or planned views from the garden lodge. I am inclined to agree with Mr Nardell's alternative submission that the inspector's conclusion that while "readily visible" from the garden lodge, the turbine array would not "intrude" on any obviously intended or planned view from it, is best

[2015] 1 WLR 45 at 60

understood by reference to his third conclusion in para 50. While visible in views from the garden lodge the turbine array would not intrude upon, in the sense of doing substantial harm to, those views, for the reasons given in the last sentence of para 50.

42 I confess that, notwithstanding Mr Nardell's assistance, I found some difficulty, not in understanding the final sentence of para 50--plainly any reasonable observer would know that the turbine array was a modern addition to the landscape and was separate from the planned historic landscape at Lyveden New Bield--but in understanding how it could rationally justify the conclusion that the detrimental effect of the turbine array on the setting of Lyveden New Bield would not reach the level of substantial harm. The inspector's application of the "reasonable observer" test was not confined to the effect of the turbine array on the setting of Lyveden New Bield. As Lang J pointed out in para 57 of her judgment, in other paragraphs of his decision letter the inspector emphasised one particular factor, namely the ability of members of the public to understand and distinguish between a modern wind turbine array and a heritage asset, as his reason for concluding either that the proposed wind turbines would have no impact on the settings of other heritage assets of national significance (paras 28-31); or a harmful impact that was "much less than substantial" on the setting of a Grade I listed church in a conservation area: para 36.

43 Matters of planning judgment are, of course, for the inspector. No one would quarrel with his conclusion that "any reasonable observer" would understand the differing functions of a wind turbine and a church and a country house or a settlement (para 30); would not be confused about the origins or purpose of a settlement and a church and a wind turbine array (para 36); and would know that a wind turbine array was a modern addition to the landscape (para 50); but no matter how non-prescriptive the approach to the policy guidance in PPS5 and the practice guide, that guidance nowhere suggests that the question whether the

harm to the setting of a designated heritage asset is substantial can be answered simply by applying the "reasonable observer" test adopted by the inspector in this decision.

44 If that test was to be the principal basis for deciding whether harm to the setting of a designated heritage asset was substantial, it is difficult to envisage any circumstances, other than those cases where the proposed turbine array would be in the immediate vicinity of the heritage asset, in which it could be said that any harm to the setting of a heritage asset would be substantial: the reasonable observer would always be able to understand the differing functions of the heritage asset and the turbine array, and would always know that the latter was a modern addition to the landscape. Indeed, applying the inspector's approach, the more obviously modern, large scale and functional the imposition on the landscape forming part of the setting of a heritage asset, the less harm there would be to that setting because the "reasonable observer" would be less likely to be confused about the origins and purpose of the new and the old. If the "reasonable observer" test was the decisive factor in the inspector's reasoning, as it appears to have been, he was not properly applying the policy approach set out in PPS5 and the practice guide. If it was not the decisive factor in the inspector's

[2015] 1 WLR 45 at 61

reasoning, then he did not give adequate reasons for his conclusion that the harm to the setting of Lyveden New Bield would not be substantial. Since his conclusion that the harm to the setting of the designated heritage assets would in all cases be less than substantial was fed into the balancing exercise in paras 85 and 86, the decision letter would have been fatally flawed on grounds 2 and 3 even if the inspector had given proper effect to the section 66(1) duty.

Conclusion

45 For the reasons set out above, which largely echo those given by Lang J in her judgment, I would dismiss this appeal.

RAFFERTY LJ

46 I agree.

MAURICE KAY LJ

47 I also agree.

Appeal dismissed.

Alison Sylvester, Barrister

¹ Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, s 66(1): see post, para 2.

² Planning Policy Statement 5, policies HE9.1, HE9.4, HE10.1: see post, para 3.

