



Pinsent Masons

「Landmark  
Chambers」

**Welcome to Landmark Chambers and Pinsent Masons’  
“Overlapping Permissions: all you need to know about  
*Hillside and Pilkington*” webinar**

**The recording may be accessed [here](#).**



Pinsent Masons

## Your speakers today are...



**Nicholle Kingsley (Chair)**  
Partner, Pinsent Masons



**Jamie Lockerbie**  
Partner, Pinsent Masons

**Topic:**  
Overlapping  
Permissions: How do we  
approach them and possible  
consequences of Hillside



**Zack Simons**  
Landmark Chambers

**Topic:**  
The current state of the  
law



**Clare Mirfin**  
Legal Director, Pinsent  
Masons

**Topic:**  
Overlapping Permissions:  
where are we now?

## The current state of the law



**Zack Simons**  
Landmark Chambers

# Overlapping Permissions: where are we now?



Clare Mirfin,  
Pinsent Masons

# Hillside and Overlapping Planning Permissions

- Case of Hillside Parks Limited v Snowdonia National Park Authority [2020]
- Implications for overlapping planning permissions



# Hillside – what did it decide?

- *Pilkington* approach confirmed
- Court of Appeal followed:
  - *Sage* - planning permissions should be interpreted “holistically”
  - *Singh* - for a development to be lawful it must be carried out “fully in accordance with any *final* permission under which it is done”
- *Lucas* not overruled but held to be “decided on its own facts”:  
doubt whether developer can lawfully “pick and choose” different parts of a development to be implemented

# The troubling passage in Hillside

*...it is conceivable that, on its proper construction, a particular planning permission does indeed grant permission for the development to take place in a series of independent acts, each of which is separately permitted by it. I would merely add that, in my respectful view, that is unlikely to be the correct construction of a typical modern planning permission for the development of a large estate such as a housing estate. Typically there would be not only many different residential units to be constructed in accordance with that scheme, there may well be other requirements concerning highways, landscaping, possibly even employment or educational uses, which are all stipulated as being an integral part of the overall scheme which is being permitted. I doubt very much in those circumstances whether a developer could lawfully “pick and choose” different parts of the development to be implemented.*

## *Hillside* – potential effects

- Casts shadow on common practice of drop-in/slot-in and extent to which remainder of development can continue to be carried out following the slot-in
- Until *Hillside* accepted practice was that slot-in applications were acceptable provided it was clear which element of the existing development is being superseded
- P1 = original development and P2 = slot in



## *Hillside* – potential effects (cont.)

- Worrying that development lawfully carried out in accordance with an extant planning permission (P1) could be rendered unlawful because of the inability following the slot-in (P2) to complete the whole of the original planning permission (P1)
- *Singh* para 20 “for a development to be lawful it must be carried out fully in accordance with any final permission under which it is done failing which the whole development is unlawful (Sage per Lord Hobhouse, giving the only substantive speech, at [23]-[25]) endorsed in para 67 of *Hillside*

# Enforcement – another issue unresolved

- *Hillside* (para 68): leaves open question of whether “...*all the development which has already taken place, apparently in accordance with the first grant of permission, is rendered unlawful simply by virtue of the fact that subsequent operations take place pursuant to another permission which is inconsistent with the first*” opening the door to enforcement action/potential criminal liability
- *Hillside* acknowledges discretion around enforcement activity but does not refer to case of *Whitley* - prima facie unlawfulness isn't unlawful if it would be irrational to enforce

# Incomplete development: unlawful?

- No requirement to complete development once started
- Circular 11/95 – Use of conditions in planning permission:
  - conditions requiring completion of whole development should not normally be imposed (see also Appendix B conditions which are unacceptable)
  - development forming single indivisible whole e.g. a single dwelling – completion notice may be appropriate
  - development forming large estate of houses – failure to complete maybe due to market forces – clearly not desirable to compel delivery where no demand/need

## Incomplete development: unlawful? (cont.)

- *Hitchens v. Worcestershire CC* (Court of Appeal)— a development may be commenced but not completed yet still remain lawful
- (para 49) “...if planning permission was granted for 200 houses of which 150 were progressively built out in accordance with the plans and were occupied, all the dwellings so built and occupied would be unlawful unless and until the remaining dwellings were built, even if the 150 were all individually in accordance with the plans and there was no breach of any condition of the permission. That proposition is unsupported by authority and cannot in my view be right.” (Lord Justice Richards)

# Completion notices

- S94 TCPA – ability for LPA to serve completion notices to require a development started to be completed within a specified time period
- *Hitchens* notes there would be no need for completion notices if development was unlawful until it was completed
- A completion notice does not render development carried out prior to notice unlawful (*Cardiff CC v National Assembly for Wales* [2007] 1 P. & C.R. 9)

# Ability to pick and choose?

- Ability to “pick and choose” is questioned in relation to housing estates requiring supporting infrastructure
- Ability to “pick and choose”:
  - can be addressed by appropriate use of conditions and obligations to link and/or restrict elements of development contingent on others (Circular 11/95)
  - no need for such conditions if once started a development had to be finished
  - use of slot-out application to ensure continued compliance with P1
- *Hillside* distinguishes *Lucas* but expressly does not overrule it and does not refer to *Hitchens*

# *Hillside* - has the law changed?

- No BUT
  - overlapping permissions must be approached with care
  - potential for planning permissions to be construed holistically
  - an act on one part of a development site could render earlier but as yet incomplete development unlawful with risk of enforcement action
  - less flexibility/more red tape: new planning application for the whole rather than drop-in?

# **Overlapping Permissions: How do we approach them and possible consequences of Hillside**



**Jamie Lockerbie,  
Pinsent Masons**



Pinsent Masons



# How do we approach 'drop-in' permissions

- 'Drop-in' planning permissions happen all the time: large multi-phased outline planning permissions in multiple ownerships/investors/residents
- A new planning permission (P2) overlaps part of an existing permission (P1).
- *Pilkington* decision describes "special cases [...] where one application deliberately and expressly refers to or incorporates another" (para 512)

# How do we approach 'drop-in' permissions

- How is 'Pilkington' risk addressed?
  - structure of drop-in application – acknowledge the interface with the development it is slotting into
  - are non-material amendments required?
  - structure of original permission – does it contemplate drop-ins?
  - by covenant under s.106 that P1 will not be implemented insofar as it relates to the redline covered by P2 from implementation of P2, LPA therefore clear which permission governs which aspect of development

# Issues if Hillside is taken to the extreme

- Essentially a developer would need to re-apply for the whole development every time a change was needed that went beyond the scope of s.73
- If the whole development is unlawful then what about conditions s.106 obligations?
- EIA/CIL
- Due diligence considerations e.g. investors/disposals
- Increased need for CLUEDs?

# Legislative Reform – A Solution?

- Legislate for a new ‘superseded development permission’ (SDP):
  - new type of planning application/permission;
  - specifically for development that supersedes part of an existing permission (P1)
  - should include the ability to make changes to P1 to ensure the two can integrate/dovetail
  - would specifically provide that P1 is still live save for that part that is superseded when SDP implemented
- Keep s.96A and s.73 although s.73 would not result in the grant of a new permission



Pinsent Masons



# Thank you for listening

© Copyright Landmark Chambers 2021

**Disclaimer: The contents of this presentation do not constitute legal advice and should not be relied upon as a substitute for legal counsel.**

#### London

180 Fleet Street  
London, EC4A 2HG  
+44 (0)20 7430 1221

#### Birmingham

4th Floor, 2 Cornwall Street  
Birmingham, B3 2DL  
+44 (0)121 752 0800

#### Contact us

✉ [clerks@landmarkchambers.co.uk](mailto:clerks@landmarkchambers.co.uk)  
🌐 [www.landmarkchambers.co.uk](http://www.landmarkchambers.co.uk)

#### Follow us

🐦 [@Landmark\\_LC](https://twitter.com/Landmark_LC)  
🌐 [Landmark Chambers](https://www.landmarkchambers.co.uk)