



University of  
**Salford**  
MANCHESTER

# The quest for sustainable buildings: Getting it right at the planning stage

Adshead, JD

<b>Title</b>	The quest for sustainable buildings: Getting it right at the planning stage
<b>Authors</b>	Adshead, JD
<b>Type</b>	Book Section
<b>URL</b>	This version is available at: <a href="http://usir.salford.ac.uk/id/eprint/17840/">http://usir.salford.ac.uk/id/eprint/17840/</a>
<b>Published Date</b>	2011

USIR is a digital collection of the research output of the University of Salford. Where copyright permits, full text material held in the repository is made freely available online and can be read, downloaded and copied for non-commercial private study or research purposes. Please check the manuscript for any further copyright restrictions.

For more information, including our policy and submission procedure, please contact the Repository Team at: [usir@salford.ac.uk](mailto:usir@salford.ac.uk).

## 4 The Quest for Sustainable Buildings: Getting it Right at the Planning Stage

*Julie Adshead*

### 4.1 Introduction

Climate change and security of energy supply are key drivers of policy and legislation in current times. At the same time, the UK government is also focusing upon those households subject to ‘fuel poverty’.<sup>1</sup> There is an impressive number of initiatives in place to secure reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and to promote energy efficiency. These measures range from legally binding international agreements to local voluntary community schemes. The complexity of the policy and legal frameworks is accentuated by the fact that there are multiple goals to achieve and this results in some incidences of paradox. Take micro generation, for example. Certainly domestic schemes will result in reduced carbon dioxide emissions and should provide a reliable source of energy for the future. As evidenced by the Climate Change and Sustainable Energy Act 2006, the UK government also sees micro generation as one of the hopes for reducing fuel poverty. Micro generation does, however, tend to be expensive (certainly in comparison with current energy prices) and if it is to be successful in the alleviation of ‘fuel poverty’ then substantial financial support will be needed. Ultimately, whether the economics of micro generation make sense will depend upon whether the era of cheap centralized energy is really at an end (Dow, 2007). The array of measures in place to improve energy performance and thus reduce carbon emissions will also serve to ease the burden of energy expenses on poor households. However, their role in addressing the goal of reducing carbon emissions is based on the premise that a large proportion of energy provision is from fossil fuel sources. A switch to a mix of nuclear and renewable sources (although this may raise other entirely different issues in relation to the environment and sustainability) would arguably be far more efficient in reducing carbon emissions from buildings.

This chapter focuses upon the legal provisions in place to reduce carbon emissions from buildings in the UK. In particular, it reviews the role and the potential of the UK planning regime to this end. The first section sets the context in terms of global and regional commitments to counter climate change. Some of the legislative provisions in the UK are then explored. This

## *The quest for sustainable buildings 65*

1 includes overarching measures such as the Climate Change Act, 2008 as well  
2 as specific legislation that targets the energy performance of buildings. This  
3 second section of the chapter also gives some brief attention to the non-  
4 legally binding 'Code for Sustainable Buildings' as this is integral to the way  
5 in which planning law can operate to improve standards. The third and final  
6 part of the chapter considers the role of the UK planning regime, including  
7 the development and future of the 'Merton Rule', incentives for micro  
8 generation through the 'Permitted Development Order' route and the use of  
9 model planning conditions. In order to illustrate how the use of planning  
10 conditions can succeed (or not), two case studies are considered. In one of  
11 the case studies, a planning condition was upheld whereas the relevant  
12 condition in the other case study was subject to a successful appeal. Some  
13 tentative conclusions are then drawn as to the future direction of law and  
14 policy in the UK relating to emissions from buildings in the context of the  
15 coalition government's 'localism' agenda.

## **4.2 The International and Regional Context**

### *4.2.1 The International Regime*

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21 The international climate change regime comprises the United Nations  
22 Framework Convention on Climate Change<sup>2</sup> and its Kyoto Protocol.<sup>3</sup> Both  
23 of these instruments are in force and are legally binding. The Kyoto Protocol  
24 commits many of the industrial nations to a reduction in the annual average  
25 of greenhouse gas emissions. In the 'first commitment period' from 2008 to  
26 2012 the reduction is to an average level of 95 per cent of 1990 emissions.  
27 Fundamental problems have been identified with the Kyoto Protocol. Not  
28 least of these is the fact that the United States (US), responsible for 20 per  
29 cent of the overall output of greenhouse gases, is not a party (UNDP Human  
30 Development Report, 2007/2008). It has also been suggested that the com-  
31 mitments made so far are inadequate and have not been successfully imple-  
32 mented (Barker *et al.*, 2007, den Elzen, 2008). With the first commitment  
33 period drawing to a close in 2012, it was hoped that, following the Bali  
34 Action Plan, adopted by the international community in December, 2007,  
35 an 'agreed outcome' on long-term cooperative action on climate change  
36 would be reached in Copenhagen in December 2009. Despite much debate  
37 as to the possible legal form of the 'agreed outcome' (Rajamani, 2009) and  
38 high hopes of a legally binding agreement (Thomas and Woodward, 2010)  
39 there was no such agreement. The result of the Copenhagen Conference is  
40 an accord, led by the US, between China, India, Brazil, South Africa and the  
41 US to tackle global warming and deliver aid to developing nations. Despite  
42 criticisms of the Kyoto Protocol and the failure to reach any kind of multi-  
43 lateral agreement at Copenhagen, there is no doubt that the Kyoto goals  
44 have been a powerful driver for governments. The Copenhagen accord does  
45 provide for nations to commit to implement emissions targets for 2020 and

66 *Julie Adshead*

1 a number of world leaders have signified their intention to introduce further  
2 more stringent, legally binding targets (Thomas and Woodward, 2010).

4.2.2 *Law and Policy of the European Union*

3  
4  
5  
6 The European Union (EU) has the quota of a reduction to 92 per cent of  
7 1990 levels by 2012 under the Kyoto agreement. However, the EU is  
8 committed to even more stringent targets than those provided for under the  
9 international regime. The EU objective is to reduce overall greenhouse gas  
10 emissions by at least 20 per cent below 1990 levels by 2020 and by 30 per  
11 cent in the event of an international agreement being reached. The Union has  
12 also set a binding target for energy from renewable sources of 20 per cent of  
13 total EU energy consumption by 2020. A range of measures exist to achieve  
14 these goals, including a directive on energy end-use efficiency and energy ser-  
15 vices,<sup>4</sup> with an overall objective of saving 9 per cent of energy by 2012 and  
16 a directive on the promotion of the use of energy from renewable sources<sup>5</sup>  
17 that provides for the improvement of energy efficiency in the context of the  
18 binding target for energy from renewable sources. The key legislative instru-  
19 ment applying to the control of emissions from buildings is the directive on  
20 the energy performance of buildings (2002/91).<sup>6</sup>

21 Under directive 2002/91, member states are required to establish a  
22 methodology for determining the energy performance of buildings and set  
23 minimum energy performance standards. New buildings above 1000 square  
24 metres are to meet these standards as are buildings above this limit that  
25 undergo major renovation. On construction, sale or rent, an energy per-  
26 formance certificate for the building must be made available and this is to be  
27 no more than ten years old. Public buildings exceeding the 1000 square  
28 metres limit are required to display their certificates. The directive also  
29 provides for inspection regimes for boilers and air conditioning systems and  
30 for inspections to be carried out by independent experts (Hookins and  
31 Stonehill, 2006).

32 Over recent years there have been calls from the European Council and the  
33 European Parliament<sup>7</sup> for the Commission's priorities, established in its  
34 *Action Plan for Energy Efficiency: Realising the Potential* published in 2006,<sup>8</sup>  
35 to be comprehensively and swiftly implemented. The action plan identified  
36 the significant potential for cost-effective energy savings in the buildings  
37 sector and, as part of the package of measures to achieve the priorities of the  
38 action plan, a new directive on the energy performance of buildings was  
39 published in May 2010. When in force (2012), the directive will expand upon  
40 the provisions of the 2002 directive significantly (Mittenthal, 2009).

41 Under Article 4 of the new directive, member states will have to set mini-  
42 mum energy performance requirements for buildings or building units 'with  
43 a view to achieving cost-optimal levels'. This requirement will also apply to  
44 'building elements that form part of the building envelope and that have a  
45 significant impact on the energy performance of the building envelope when

## *The quest for sustainable buildings 67*

1 they are replaced or retrofitted'. The requirement to meet minimum energy  
2 performance requirements will apply to all new and existing buildings,  
3 regardless of size.<sup>9</sup> Member states will also be required to set energy per-  
4 formance for technical building systems installed in existing buildings.<sup>10</sup> The  
5 directive includes a new binding requirement upon member states to ensure  
6 that by 2020 all new buildings are nearly zero-energy.<sup>11</sup> The display require-  
7 ments for public buildings are extended to include those 'frequently visited  
8 by the public' and the threshold size is lowered to 500 square metres (to be  
9 reduced further to 250 square metres in 2015).<sup>12</sup> In addition, inspection  
0 requirements are extended to apply to all elements of heating systems (not  
11 just boilers).<sup>13</sup>

### 4.3 UK Legislative Provisions

#### 4.3.1 *The Climate Change Act 2008*

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17 The UK is also committed to more ambitious targets than those set in the  
18 Kyoto Protocol. In fact, it is the first nation worldwide to adopt a legally  
19 binding long-term framework to cut carbon emissions. The controversial  
20 Climate Change Act, 2008 imposes a statutory duty upon the Secretary of  
21 State of 2050 'to ensure that the net UK carbon account for the year 2050 is  
22 at least 80 per cent lower than the 1990 baseline'.<sup>14</sup> The imposition of  
23 statutory duties on government is a novel approach in UK law (Stallworthy,  
24 2010) and some might doubt the meaningfulness, in particular, of imposing  
25 a legal duty on an individual whose identity is, as yet, unknown. It is also  
26 difficult to see how legally binding this target can be, when it is unlikely to  
27 be legally enforceable (Townsend, 2009; Stallworthy, 2010). However,  
28 proponents of the act (Grekos, 2009; Townsend, 2009) recognize its possi-  
29 bilities in terms of improving carbon management, moving the UK towards  
30 a low carbon economy and providing strong leadership and commitment to  
31 shouldering an equitable burden in reducing global emissions. It may also  
32 provide some certainty and encouragement for industry and business.

33 The act requires that a series of five-yearly carbon budgets are set by order  
34 of the Secretary of State. The first three budgets (2008–22) have already been  
35 set by the Carbon Budgets Order<sup>15</sup> with a view to meeting the 2050 target.  
36 Thus 2018–2022 is 34 per cent lower than the 1990 baseline. There is a more  
37 ambitious figure of 42 per cent by 2020, which will only be adopted if a  
38 global agreement is reached. The crediting of carbon units is going to be  
39 crucial if these objectives are to be met. This is clearly illustrated by the scale  
40 of net reduction from 2007 to 2008, which was a mere 2 per cent (DECC,  
41 2010). The Carbon Accounting Regulations, which define carbon units and  
42 set out how carbon can be credited to the account, came into force on 31  
43 May 2009.<sup>16</sup> Greenhouse gas allowances (under trading schemes) can also  
44 act as credits, but only credits under the EU emissions trading scheme can be  
45 credited to the UK carbon account.

68 *Julie Adshead*

1 The Secretary of State is subject to a duty 'to ensure that the net UK carbon  
2 account for a budgetary period does not exceed the carbon budget'.<sup>17</sup> Some  
3 indication as to how this will be achieved is provided in measures recom-  
4 mended by the Climate Change Committee set up under the act to advise the  
5 Secretary of State.<sup>18</sup> The key short-term recommendations of the committee  
6 are:

- 7
- 8 • Energy efficiency improvements in building and industry
  - 9 • Fuel efficiency improvement in road vehicles
  - 0 • A significant shift towards renewable and nuclear power generation and  
11 renewable heat
- 12

13 In order to achieve the extremely ambitious targets provided for in the  
14 2008 act, a range of policy and legislative initiatives have been put in place.  
15 The two primary mechanisms for the delivery of energy efficiency improve-  
16 ments in buildings are building regulations and the planning regime and  
17 these are considered below.

18

#### 19 *4.3.2 Powers under the Building Act 1984*

20

21 The Building Act 1984 places certain aspects of building under statutory  
22 control and empowers the Secretary of State to make regulations that pro-  
23 vide details of exactly how that control is exercised.<sup>19</sup> The scope of the  
24 Building Act in terms of regulating the conservation of fuel and power was  
25 significantly widened by two recent pieces of legislation: The Sustainable and  
26 Secure Buildings Act 2004 and the Climate Change and Sustainable Energy  
27 Act 2006. The Sustainable and Secure Buildings Act 2004 enables the  
28 making of regulations for 'furthering the conservation of fuel and power'<sup>20</sup>  
29 and extends the range of matters in respect of which regulations can be  
30 made.<sup>21</sup> Significantly it allows for the regulation of existing buildings in  
31 matters relating to energy conservation and carbon emissions.<sup>22</sup> It also  
32 inserts a new Section 2A into the Building Act 1984, which allows for  
33 regulations to be made that impose 'continuing requirements' on building  
34 owners and occupiers regardless of when the building was erected or  
35 whether other building works are ongoing. These powers are potentially  
36 far-reaching and would permit, for example, the making of regulations  
37 requiring all lofts to be insulated (McAdam, 2007). The Climate Change and  
38 Sustainable Energy Act 2006 further extended the powers under the Building  
39 Act 1984 by enabling regulations to be made under the act relating to the  
40 installation of micro generation technologies.<sup>23</sup> The act also  
41 extends the time limit for prosecution of those in breach of regulations  
42 specifically relating to the conservation of fuel and power.<sup>24</sup>

43 The Building Act 1984 allows for guidance documents to be approved and  
44 compliance with approved guidance creates a presumption that the works in  
45 question comply with the requirements of the act as provided for in The

*The quest for sustainable buildings 69*

1 Building Regulations. Part L guidance documents deal with the conservation  
2 of fuel and power<sup>25</sup> and these cover new dwellings, existing dwellings and  
3 new and existing buildings other than dwellings. Under The Building  
4 Regulations, target emission rates for buildings have to be set for new  
5 dwellings, and buildings over 1000 square metres must be brought up to Part  
6 L standard when renovated.<sup>26</sup> For new dwellings the government has  
7 committed to a programme by which regulations will demand 25 per cent  
8 lower carbon emissions by 2010, 44 per cent lower by 2013 and by 2016 all  
9 new dwellings should be zero carbon.<sup>27</sup> Thus, the Part L standard in building  
10 regulations will be incrementally raised over forthcoming years. New Part L  
11 guidance implementing the 25 per cent lower emissions requirement came  
12 into force in October 2010. For existing housing stock, it is arguable that the  
13 full potential of the Building Act and regulations made under it have not as  
14 yet been fully realized. The government has turned its attention to the prob-  
15 lem of tackling emissions from existing housing and a House of Commons  
16 Report was published on the subject in 2008.<sup>28</sup> The report sets out recom-  
17 mendations for improving energy efficiency in existing housing with a  
18 'shopping list' of recommended measures for government (Grekos, 2008).  
19 These include measures to encourage the take-up of home micro generation,  
20 requirements for consequential energy efficiency improvements in planning  
21 consent on extension of homes, new requirements for Energy Performance  
22 Certificates and the production of a 'Code for Existing Homes' along the  
23 lines of the 'Code for Sustainable Homes' (see below).

#### 4.4 The code for sustainable homes

27 The Sustainable Buildings Task Group first proposed a Code for Sustainable  
28 Buildings in 2004. The idea was that the voluntary code would be a catalyst  
29 for low-carbon, low-impact building and set vanguard eco-standards for the  
30 government to follow. The Code for Sustainable Homes was finally launched  
31 in December 2006 and the technical guide followed in April 2007. The code  
32 sets six standards of increasing rigour against which the whole home can be  
33 measured. A whole range of factors are considered alongside carbon dioxide  
34 emissions. There are nine design categories and the levels are rated from one  
35 to six stars. Level 6 (six stars) of the code, in terms of emissions, is 'true zero  
36 carbon'. The lowest, one-star level was, until 2010, more demanding than  
37 minimum standards for building regulations. However, new Part L  
38 standards came into force in October 2010 which equate to level three of the  
39 Code. The Part L standard for emissions from buildings will then be  
40 equivalent to level 3 (three stars) of the code.

41 At its inception, the code was a voluntary mechanism, but since May  
42 2008, sellers of new properties have been required to provide information to  
43 the purchaser on the rating of the building, either in the form of a code  
44 certificate or a statement of non-assessment. Also from 2008, achievement  
45 of code level 3 became mandatory for all publicly supported developments.

## 70 *Julie Adshead*

1 The first proposals for a code were intended to embrace both new homes and  
2 non-domestic buildings and calls continue for the code to be expanded in  
3 this respect (UKGBC, 2009) as well as for a similar code to be adopted for  
4 existing homes (see above). Although essentially still a voluntary system, as  
5 shall be demonstrated below, when used in tandem with the UK planning  
6 system it has the potential to drive up standards across the entirety of the  
7 nine design categories, and thus serve to increase the chances of reaching the  
8 overarching emission targets set by government in the Climate Change Act.  
9

### 10 11 **4.5 The UK planning regime**

12 A full account of the UK planning regime is beyond the remit of this chapter,  
13 but an overview of certain elements of UK planning law is helpful in  
14 understanding how the planning system may operate to drive up emissions  
15 performance.  
16

#### 17 **4.5.1 Development**

18  
19 The UK system is centred upon ‘development’. The key statute, the Town  
20 and Country Planning Act 1990, states that ‘Planning permission is required  
21 for the carrying out of any development of land’.<sup>29</sup> The definition of  
22 ‘development’ in the Act is extremely broad and encompasses both building  
23 operations and the change of use of buildings.  
24

25 Development . . . means the carrying out of building, engineering,  
26 mining or other operations in, on, over or under land, or the making of  
27 any material change in the use of any buildings or other land.<sup>30</sup>  
28

#### 29 **4.5.2 The development plan**

30  
31 UK planning is led by the development plan and reference to the plan will be  
32 the starting point in determining a planning application. Development plans  
33 are broad, giving general policy, aims, objectives and goals are generally  
34 permissive in nature. The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004  
35 introduced a new range of strategies and plans. The ‘Regional Spatial  
36 Strategy’ introduced under the 2004 Act has since been suspended by the  
37 current government, but the local development framework (including the  
38 development plan) continues to operate. The Planning and Compulsory  
39 Purchase Act states that  
40

41 regard is to be had to the development plan, the determination shall be  
42 made in accordance with the development plan unless material con-  
43 siderations indicate otherwise.<sup>31</sup>  
44  
45



#### 4.5.3 Material considerations

Although the development plan provides the starting point, it will not necessarily be the dominant determinant in the decision.<sup>32</sup> Material considerations can be taken into account and on occasion they can win out over the development plan.<sup>33</sup> There is no statutory definition or guidance as to what constitutes a material consideration. Certainly planning guidance, representations, as well as many other matters determined by case law, will be material considerations. Environmental considerations are just one of many possible elements to be brought into the balancing act in the determination of a planning application.

#### 4.5.4 Planning guidance

Planning guidance plays a pivotal role in the UK planning system. There are a range of guidance documents in place, which, as noted above, will constitute material considerations in the determination of a planning application. The statutory requirement in the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 for all plan making bodies to exercise their functions ‘with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development’ is reflected in the government’s Planning Policy Statement (PPS)1: Delivering Sustainable Development and its supplement, Planning Policy Statement: Planning and Climate Change as well as Planning Policy Statement 22: Renewable Energy. A new draft climate change planning policy statement was released in 2010,<sup>34</sup> which combines the policies currently set out in the supplement to PPS1 and PPS22.

#### 4.5.5 Planning conditions

Almost all planning determinations include conditions. The Town and Country Planning Act, 1990 allows the local planning authority to impose such conditions ‘as it thinks fit’.<sup>35</sup> Guidance is given in the act<sup>36</sup> and in the Secretary of State’s policy on conditions.<sup>37</sup> The courts have taken quite a restrictive view on planning conditions and, in the case of *Newbury District Council v Secretary of State for the Environment*,<sup>38</sup> it was held that conditions must

- be imposed for a planning purpose and not for an ulterior motive
- fairly and reasonably relate to the development permitted
- not be perverse (so unreasonable that no reasonable authority could have imposed them)

#### 4.5.6 General permitted development order

There are certain ways in which development can be permitted under statute and thus the need for a planning application is obviated. One such route is

72 *Julie Adshead*

1 available under the General Permitted Development Order.<sup>39</sup> There are a  
2 large number of development types listed in Schedule 2 that cover minor  
3 developments, developments carried out by public services and favoured  
4 activities (such as agriculture and forestry). Development consent may still  
5 be needed when projects exceed certain thresholds and the right to devel-  
6 opment can be withdrawn, for example, if an environmental impact assess-  
7 ment is required.  
8  
9

#### 0 **4.6 Planning and micro generation**

11 The 2007 Government White Paper 'Meeting the Energy Challenge'<sup>40</sup> recog-  
12 nized that planning consents are a major constraint on the implementation  
13 of a future energy strategy. Indeed the Scottish Executive has acknowledged  
14 that the planning system has the potential to act as a tool in opposing nuclear  
15 power (Dow, 2007). There is certainly little doubt that barriers have been  
16 encountered in the development of micro generation, but conversely the  
17 planning system has also been a driver behind the adoption of on-site  
18 renewable energy, which will have a significant role to play in delivering  
19 the government's 2016 zero carbon homes agenda (Sustainable Energy  
20 Partnership, 2007).  
21

##### 22 **4.6.1 The Merton Rule**

23  
24 The Merton Rule takes its name from Merton Council. It amounts to a  
25 borough-wide prescriptive planning policy for all buildings, which was  
26 developed and adopted by the council in 2003. The policy requires new  
27 developments to generate at least ten per cent of energy needs from on-site  
28 renewable technology. The normal threshold for application of the rule is  
29 ten homes or 1,000 square metres of non-residential development. The  
30 Merton policy has had a significant impact and was subsequently adopted  
31 by the Mayor of London and the majority of local authorities nationwide.  
32 Planning Policy Statement 22 on renewable energy expressly acknowledges  
33 the Merton Rule and advocates its adoption by local planning authorities  
34 and the encouragement of renewable energy projects through local planning  
35 documents.

36 However, the future of the rule is uncertain. Whilst Merton Council  
37 intends to extend the policy to cover all development in Merton and is  
38 considering whether it is appropriate to increase the percentage of the policy  
39 up to a 20 per cent requirement (Merton Council, 2010), it has been sug-  
40 gested (Sustainable Energy Partnership, 2007) that the rule was watered  
41 down in the 2007 Climate Change supplement to PPS1 by the removal of the  
42 requirement to consider renewable energy projects 'in all new develop-  
43 ments'. The emphasis also seems to have shifted from a requirement for a  
44 percentage of on-site renewable energy to consideration of the possibility  
45 of utilizing off-site renewable energy supplies. This latter development is

*The quest for sustainable buildings 73*

1 subject to criticism as, it is suggested that, linking new housing to off-site  
2 renewable energy developments provides no additional cut to carbon dioxide  
3 emissions (Sustainable Energy Partnership, 2007). The recent draft supple-  
4 ment to PPS1 essentially prohibits the adoption of the Merton Rule in the  
5 future, stating that

6  
7 [t]argets for application across a whole local authority area which are  
8 designed to secure a minimum level of decentralised energy use in new  
9 development will be unnecessary when the proposed 2013 revisions to  
0 Part L of the Building Regulations . . . are implemented.

11  
12 However, it should be noted that currently a disclaimer appears on the  
13 Department for Communities and Local Government website, where the  
14 draft PPS appears, warning that all the content is subject to review in the  
15 light of the recent change of government.

#### 16 17 **4.6.2 Permitted development order**

18  
19 One of the problems with micro generation and the planning system  
20 traditionally lies with local authorities taking different approaches to small  
21 household projects. For example, some allow small turbines on houses  
22 whereas some do not and similarly with solar panels, whilst allowed in some  
23 areas, other local authorities view panels as damaging to conservation areas  
24 (Dow, 2007). The Climate Change and Sustainable Energy Act 2006 allows  
25 for such differences in practice to be reduced through amendment to the  
26 permitted development order. After due consultation, the Secretary of State  
27 made an order<sup>41</sup> amending the General Permitted Development Order<sup>42</sup>  
28 allowing permitted development for the installation of domestic micro  
29 generation equipment. Within the framework of the restrictions and condi-  
30 tions outlined in the order, solar panels, heat pumps and biomass heating  
31 systems are all subject to the order. This should make it easier for households  
32 to install micro generation equipment because, in many cases, it will no  
33 longer be necessary to apply for planning permission. It should also lead to  
34 greater consistency across local authority areas.

#### 35 36 **4.7 Planning conditions and sustainable buildings**

37  
38 The supplement of Planning Policy Statement 1 on climate change urges  
39 planning authorities and developers to ‘engage constructively and imagi-  
40 natively to encourage the delivery of sustainable buildings’. The statement  
41 also acknowledges that ‘There will be situations where it could be appro-  
42 priate for planning authorities to anticipate levels of building sustainability  
43 in advance of those set out nationally’. Planning authorities are advised to  
44 focus on development area or site-specific opportunities and specify require-  
45 ments in terms of nationally recognized standards such as the Code for

## 74 *Julie Adshead*

1 Sustainable Homes. Some local planning authorities have sought to achieve  
2 the goal of driving up standards of sustainability in new domestic dwellings  
3 in their areas by recommending enhanced levels of performance and certifi-  
4 cation under recognized codes and schemes.

### 6 *4.7.1 Brighton and Hove City Council*

8 An example of this practice is to be found in the 'Model Planning Conditions  
9 and Informatives' of Brighton and Hove City Council. The model planning  
10 conditions state that, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local  
11 Planning Authority, no new-build residential development can commence  
12 without evidence that it will achieve a minimum code level 3 under the Code  
13 for Sustainable Homes. Furthermore (again, unless agreed in writing), the  
14 approved units cannot be occupied until a final code certificate is issued  
15 confirming the minimum code level 3 performance. Similarly, the model  
16 conditions state that unless agreed with the Local Planning Authority, no  
17 residential development involving existing buildings can commence unless it  
18 is certified that the development will achieve an 'Ecohomes' rating and no  
19 occupation can take place until a post construction certificate to this effect  
20 has been submitted to and approved by the authority. In a similar way,  
21 BREEAM registration, assessment, rating and confirmation are conditions  
22 of development and occupation for new build non-residential developments.  
23 Such conditions in planning determinations might, however, be open to  
24 challenge as is illustrated by the two following case studies.

### 26 *4.7.2 The former New Penny public house*

28 Planning permission had been granted subject to conditions for the con-  
29 struction of twelve new-build flats on the site of a former public house. An  
30 appeal was brought by the developers against the decision of Cheltenham  
31 Borough Council. One single condition to the planning permission was  
32 disputed. The condition in question stated that

34 prior to the commencement of development a scheme to demonstrate a  
35 reduction in carbon emissions to achieve a minimum level of code 3 of  
36 the Code for Sustainable Homes shall be submitted to and approved in  
37 writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be  
38 carried out and maintained in accordance with the details so approved.

40 The reasons given for the condition were to ensure compliance with  
41 national and regional objectives and the aims of local plan policy CP1  
42 regarding sustainable development. The latter policy stated that development  
43 would be permitted only where it took adequate account of the principles of  
44 sustainable development and it set out a number of criteria for this. The  
45 policy also stated a number of principles of sustainable development which

*The quest for sustainable buildings 75*

1 might be taken into account as material considerations in the determination  
2 of planning applications.

3 The appeal was allowed, the inspector concluding that the condition was  
4 imprecise and unreasonable and that it did not meet the tests set out in  
5 Circular 11/95. A new planning permission was granted without the  
6 disputed condition but retaining the relevant non-disputed conditions from  
7 the previous permission. The key reasons for allowing the appeal were as  
8 follows:  
9

- 10 • The Supplement to PPS1 (the Supplement), states that councils wishing  
11 to proceed in advance of the Government's timetable must set out their  
12 policies for sustainable developments in development planning docu-  
13 ments (DPDs) so as to ensure examination by an independent Inspector.  
14 Neither policy CP1, *Sustainable Development of the Cheltenham Local*  
15 *Plan Second Review* nor the Council's supplementary planning guidance  
16 documents relating to policy CP1 referred to the Code for Sustainable  
17 Homes.
- 18 • Paragraph 42 of the Supplement allows non-compliance with adopted  
19 DPD policies if this is not feasible or viable. The appellant argued that  
20 the development had not been designed to attain code level 3 and that  
21 fundamental changes, involving a different design to that which had  
22 been approved, would be required to achieve this. The cost involved, it  
23 was argued, would make the proposed development unviable. Little  
24 evidence was proved by the council to counter these claims.
- 25 • The approach set out in the Supplement indicates that conditions requir-  
26 ing compliance with level 3 of the code or above should only be imposed  
27 if the developer has demonstrated a willingness to comply. Condition 13  
28 was unreasonable without the developer's agreement to it.
- 29 • The developer had committed to construction of the flats in accordance  
30 with the Code to a level to be determined at the time of construction and  
31 to a number of measures of sustainable methods of construction. The  
32 Inspector concluded that the measures incorporated in the scheme  
33 met the sustainability objectives identified in policy CP1. It was also  
34 noted that it was normal to assess the code level of a development post-  
35 completion of the development rather than pre-commencement as  
36 required by condition 13.

(Appeal Decision, 2009)

#### 4.7.3 *Hut Cottage*

41 Planning permission had been granted subject to conditions for a replace-  
42 ment bungalow at Hut Cottage, a single-storey dwelling with outbuilding on  
43 a small and irregularly shaped plot of land abutting listed buildings and in a  
44 conservation area. Planning permission had been granted for a replacement  
45 bungalow in 2005, which had expired. A further application of 2008 seeking

76 *Julie Adshead*

1 renewal of the planning permission was for a proposed development iden-  
2 tical to the earlier scheme. When planning permission was granted it was  
3 subject to conditions, one of which was disputed in an appeal against the  
4 decision of Chelmsford Borough Council. The condition in dispute (No. 5)  
5 stated that, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning  
6 Authority:

- 7
- 8 a) the development hereby permitted shall be built to a minimum of Level
  - 9 3 of the Codes for Sustainable Homes (or its successor);
  - 10 b) No development shall take place until a Design Stage assessment (under
  - 11 the Code for Sustainable Homes or its successor) has been carried out
  - 12 and a copy of the summary score sheet and Interim Code Certificate
  - 13 have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning
  - 14 Authority;
  - 15 c) Prior to the first occupation of the dwelling, a copy of the summary score
  - 16 sheet and Post Construction Review Certificate (under the Code for
  - 17 Sustainable Homes or its successor) shall be submitted to the Local
  - 18 Planning Authority verifying that the agreed standards have been met.
  - 19

20 The reasons given for the condition were to achieve sustainable devel-  
21 opment in accordance with Policies CP11 and DC24 of the Adopted Core  
22 Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document  
23 (CSDCP) and the Sustainable Development Supplementary Planning  
24 Document (SPD). Policy CP11 provided guidance relating to energy and  
25 resource efficiency, renewable energy and recycling and Policy DC24 estab-  
26 lished criteria relating to energy-efficient design and the use of materials,  
27 including a requirement that all new dwellings should attain a minimum  
28 rating of Level 3 of the Code for Sustainable Homes or its successor.

29 The appeal was dismissed and the disputed condition was found to be  
30 reasonable and necessary. The reasons given by the inspector were as follows:

- 31
- 32 • There had been changes in policy in response to growing concerns
  - 33 surrounding global warming since the first permission was granted,
  - 34 which were reflected in the 2007 Supplement to PPS1. The Council's
  - 35 determination and conditions were guided by the policies within the
  - 36 CSDCP.
  - 37 • It was noted that the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004<sup>43</sup>
  - 38 states that regard must be had to the development plan unless material
  - 39 considerations indicate otherwise.
  - 40 • It was also noted that where planning permission expires, fresh
  - 41 applications should be judged against current planning considerations.<sup>44</sup>
  - 42 • The decision to reject the appeal was made notwithstanding the resul-  
43 tant financial implications and the voluntary nature of the Code for  
44 Sustainable Homes.
  - 45

(Appeal Decision, 2009)

## 4.8 The future of requirements for sustainable buildings in local planning

The two appeals outlined above deliver some interesting lessons if planning conditions are to be successfully utilized to attain higher standards than currently required under building regulations. Clearly, the requirement of attaining a particular level of an accepted national code such as the Code for Sustainable Homes is, in principle, acceptable (at least under current planning guidance). The key message to be drawn from the different outcomes of the two case studies above is that explicit reference to the code in question should be contained within the development plan document (DPD). The question as to whether requirement can be made for schemes of compliance to a level of performance pre-commencement rather than post-completion is less clear cut. To err on the side of caution local planning authorities might be best advised to stick to post-completion requirements in order to minimize the chances of successful appeal. It is interesting that in the Hut Cottage appeal, the fact that the condition was not imposed with the agreement of the developer was given little weight. Also, although the inspector noted the financial consequences of the imposition of condition No. 5, the issue of the feasibility and viability of compliance with level 3 of the code were not really explored in depth.

Although the future of the new draft supplement to PPS1 is uncertain, the draft policy on the local planning approach to setting requirements for sustainable buildings, as it is currently framed, would continue to allow requirements for a building's sustainability as long as they are set out in the DPD. The approach is, however, considerably more restrictive than that in the current supplement. Requirements should

relate to a development area or specific sites and not be applicable across a whole local authority area unless the justification for the requirement can be clearly shown to apply across the whole area.<sup>45</sup>

If this is retained in any new PPS, then it will be much harder for local authorities to adopt a requirement to meet elevated levels of a code across their whole area. Certainly they will have to provide clear and convincing justification within their DPD if this is to be the case.

## 4.9 Conclusions

The law surrounding climate change and energy efficiency is complex and multi-layered. This complexity is accentuated by the multiple aims involved and the fact that measures adopted do not always align to all of these. What is clear is that buildings are of central importance in realizing international and local goals to reduce levels of greenhouse gas emissions and thus help counter the threat of climate change. There are many ways of tackling the

78 *Julie Adshead*

1 reduction of emissions from buildings. Alternative energy sources, renew-  
 2 ables and energy efficiency are just some of these. Legislation will not provide  
 3 the whole solution, nor will one single legislative route.

4 Regulations adopted under the Building Act 1984 are clearly of key  
 5 importance in implementing the standards required of buildings in order to  
 6 meet the targeted reductions in carbon dioxide emissions and the ultimate  
 7 aim of carbon zero buildings. However, voluntary schemes, such as the Code  
 8 for Sustainable Homes, also have an important role to play. This is clearly  
 9 illustrated by the way in which the new Part L standards in the Building  
 0 Regulations mirror level 3 of the code as well as the way in which the code  
 11 has been used to drive up standards through the planning process.

12 New proposals for planning guidance appear to suggest that in some  
 13 respects the role of the planning system is done. The proposal is to outlaw  
 14 initiatives such as the 'Merton Rule' and restrict the requirements that can be  
 15 imposed at the planning stage on the sustainability of buildings. Whilst there  
 16 is doubtless some merit in having a single central level of control in the guise  
 17 of building regulations, the building control system operates in a different  
 18 way and at a different stage in the building life cycle to the planning regime.  
 19 Having a single central standard also ignores variations in local environments  
 20 and stifles the drive to strive for better standards and develop new and  
 21 affordable technologies, which have in the past been encouraged by voluntary  
 22 code ratings and compulsory on-site renewable energy requirements.

23 There is great uncertainty at the moment as to the direction that planning  
 24 law will take. The new UK government promises radical reform of the  
 25 planning system and has pledged through its proposed Decentralisation and  
 26 Localism Bill<sup>46</sup> to devolve greater powers to local authorities. Specifically, it  
 27 plans to abolish Regional Spatial Strategies and 'return decision-making  
 28 powers on housing and planning to local councils'.<sup>47</sup> It may, therefore, be  
 29 that the trend outlined above will be reversed and local communities and  
 30 their planning authorities will be able to lead the way in delivering alter-  
 31 native energy sources and sustainable buildings.

### 32 Notes

- 33
- 34
- 35 1 Following the Warm Homes and Energy Conservation Act 2000, 'fuel poverty'  
 36 is generally accepted as a consumer spend of more than 10 per cent per week of  
 37 income on energy.
- 38 2 United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (adopted 29 May  
 39 1992, entered into force 21 March 1994) 1771 UNTS 107.
- 40 3 Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate  
 41 Change (adopted 10 December 1997, entered into force 16 February 2005) 37  
 42 ILM 22.
- 43 4 Dir 2006/32 on energy end-use efficiency and energy services OJL 114 27.4.2006  
 44 p64–85.
- 45 5 Dir 2009/28 on the promotion of the use of energy from renewable sources OJL  
 140 5.6.2009 p16–62.
- 6 Dir 2002/91 on the energy performance of buildings OJL 1 4.1.2003 p65–71.



*The quest for sustainable buildings 79*

- 1 7 European Council of March, 2007, European Parliament Resolutions of 31
- 2 January 2008 and 3 February 2009.
- 3 8 Communication from the Commission, *Action Plan for Energy Efficiency:*
- 4 *Realising the Potential*, Brussels, 19.10.2006 COM (2006) 545 final.
- 5 9 Dir 2002/91, Articles 6 and 7.
- 6 10 Dir 2002/91, Article 8.
- 7 11 Dir 2002/91, Article 9.
- 8 12 Dir 2002/91, Article 13.
- 9 13 Dir 2002/91, Article 14.
- 0 14 Climate Change Act, 2008, Section 1.
- 1 15 SI 2009, No. 1259.
- 2 16 SI 2009 No. 1257.
- 3 17 Climate Change Act 2008, Section 4 (1).
- 4 18 Building a low-carbon economy – the UK’s contribution to tackling climate
- 5 change published on 1st December 2008.
- 6 19 Building Act 1984, Sections 1, 2, 2A and Schedule 1.
- 7 20 Sustainable and Secure Buildings Act 2004, Section 1 (1) (b).
- 8 21 Building Act 1984, Section 1A as inserted by Sustainable and Secure Buildings
- 9 Act 2004, Section 1 (3).
- 0 22 Sustainable and Secure Buildings Act 2004, Section 3 (7) (5).
- 1 23 Climate Change and Sustainable Energy Act 2006, Section 11.
- 2 24 *Ibid.*, Section 13.
- 3 25 Building Regulations 2000, Schedule 1.
- 4 26 Implementing Directive 2002/91 (Number 6, above).
- 5 27 Meaning that, during the course of a year, the net carbon emissions from all
- 6 energy use in the building is zero.
- 7 28 *Existing Housing and Climate Change*, House of Commons Communities and
- 8 Local Government Committee, Seventh Report of Session 2007/8, 2, April 2008.
- 9 29 Town and Country Planning Act, 1990, Section 57 (1).
- 0 30 *Ibid.*, Section 55 (1).
- 1 31 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, Section 38 (6).
- 2 32 City of Edinburgh Council v Secretary of State for Scotland [1998] JPL 224; R v
- 3 Leominster District Council ex parte Potheary [1998] JPL 335.
- 4 33 R (on the application of the Council for National Parks Ltd.) v Pembrokeshire
- 5 Coast NPA and ors. [2005] EWCA Civ 888.
- 6 34 Planning for a Low Carbon Future in a Changing Climate, 9 March 2010.
- 7 35 Town and Country Planning Act 1990, Section 70 (1).
- 8 36 *Ibid.*, Sections 72 and 75.
- 9 37 Circular 11/95.
- 0 38 [1981] AC 578.
- 1 39 Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development Order) 1995, SI
- 2 1995/418.
- 3 40 Meeting the Energy Challenge: A White Paper on Nuclear Power, Cm 7296, 10
- 4 January 2008.
- 5 41 The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment)
- 6 (England) Order 2008.
- 7 42 Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995.
- 8 43 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, Section 38 (6).
- 9 44 Circular 08/2005, Guidance on Changes to the Development Control System.
- 0 45 PPS: Planning for a Low Carbon Future in a Changing Climate, Part 2;
- 1 Consultation Draft, Policy LCF9.1 (i).
- 2 46 Queen’s Speech, 25/5/10.
- 3 47 Department for Communities and Local Government Draft Structural Reform
- 4 Plan, July 2010.
- 5

80 Julie Adshead

## References

- 1  
2  
3 Appeal Decision (2009) 'Appeal Ref: APP/W1525/A/09/2096523 Hut Cottage,  
4 Colemans Lane, Danbury, Chelmsford CM3 4DN' by Roger P Brown. Decision  
5 date 17 June 2009.  
6 Appeal Decision (2009) 'Appeal Ref: APP/B1605/a/09/2097989 Former New Penny  
7 Public House, 84 Gloucester Road, Cheltenham, Glos. GL51 8NZ' by Elaine  
8 Benson. Decision date 11 June 2009.  
9 Barker, T. *et al.* (2007) 'Climate Change 2007: Mitigation of Climate Change:  
10 Contribution of Working Group III to the Fourth Assessment Report of the  
11 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change', Cambridge University Press,  
12 Cambridge, Box 13.7, p 776.  
13 DECC (Department of Energy and Climate Change) (2010) 'Final Report 2008',  
14 [http://www.decc.gov.uk/en/content/cms/statistics/climate\\_change/gg\\_emissions/u\\_k\\_emissions/2008\\_final/2008\\_final.aspx](http://www.decc.gov.uk/en/content/cms/statistics/climate_change/gg_emissions/u_k_emissions/2008_final/2008_final.aspx), viewed 30.7.2010.  
15 den Elzen, M. (2008) 'Emission Reduction Trade-Offs for Meeting Concentration  
16 Targets', Bonn Climate Change Talks, IPCC workshop, UNFCCC SBSTA 28.  
17 Dow, S. (2007) 'Climate Change and Sustainable Energy Act 2006', *Environmental  
18 Law Review*, Volume 9 (4), pp 279–284.  
19 Energy Saving Trust 'Code for Sustainable Homes: New Build Housing', Briefing  
20 Note, <http://www.energysavingtrust.org.uk/housingbuildings>, viewed 30.7.2010.  
21 Grekos, M. (2008) 'House of Commons Report on Tackling Emissions from Existing  
22 Housing', *Journal of Planning and Environment Law* (8), pp 1123–1124.  
23 Grekos, M. (2009) 'Climate Change Act 2008', *Journal of Planning and  
24 Environment Law* Volume 4, pp 454–455.  
25 Hookins, D. and Stonehill, C. (2006) 'Energy Performance of Buildings Directive –  
26 Time for an Energetic Approach', *Landlord and Tenant Review*, Volume 10 (6),  
27 pp 175–180.  
28 McAdam, W.B. (2007), *Built Environment Carbon Emissions: A Policy Review*,  
29 MSc Construction Law and Arbitration Dissertation, Leeds Metropolitan  
30 University.  
31 Merton Council, <http://www.merton.gov.uk/living/planningpolicy/mertonrule>,  
32 viewed 30/7/2010  
33 Mittenenthal, L. (2009) 'Update on Progress Towards Enactment of Revised Energy  
34 Performance of Buildings Directive', *Environmental Liability*, Volume 17 (5),  
35 pp 78–79.  
36 Rajamani, L. (2009) 'Addressing the 'Post-Kyoto' Stress Disorder: Reflections on the  
37 Emerging Legal Architecture of the Climate Regime', *International and  
38 Comparative Law Quarterly*, Volume 58 (4), pp 803–834.  
39 Stallworthy, M. (2010) 'UK Climate Change Law: Securing a Low Carbon Economy  
40 by Recourse to Experts and Government Obligations?', Proceedings of RICS  
41 COBRA Conference, Paris, 2<sup>nd</sup> & 3<sup>rd</sup> September, 2010.  
42 Sustainable Energy Partnership (2007) 'The Merton Rule: The Orwellian World of  
43 Sir Humphrey, Minus Means Plus', [http://www.microgenscotland.org.uk/SEP\\_Broadsheet\\_2%5B2%5Dfinal16.10.pdf](http://www.microgenscotland.org.uk/SEP_Broadsheet_2%5B2%5Dfinal16.10.pdf), viewed 30.7.2010.  
44 Thomas, M. and Woodward J. (2010) 'Copenhagen: Hopenhagen? Unfortunately  
45 not', *European Lawyer*, (92), p 7.  
Townsend, H. (2009) 'The Climate Change Act 2008: Something to be Proud of  
After All?', *Journal of Planning and Environment Law* (7), pp 842–848.

*The quest for sustainable buildings* 81

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

UNDP (United Nations Development Programme) (2007/2008), 'Human Development Report, Fighting Climate Change: Human Solidarity in a Divided World', UNDP, [http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/HDR\\_20072008\\_EN\\_Complete.pdf](http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/HDR_20072008_EN_Complete.pdf), viewed: 30.7.2010.  
UKGBC (UK Green Building Council) 'Making the Case for a Code for Sustainable Buildings' March 2009.