

AGENDA SUPPLEMENT

Local Plan Working Group

To: Councillors B Burton (Chair), Ayre (Vice-Chair), Coles, Fenton, Fisher, D Myers, Orrell, Pavlovic, Ravilious, Smalley, Steward, Vassie, Wann, Baxter, Merrett, K Taylor and Steels-Walshaw

Date: Tuesday, 10 September 2024

Time: 5.30 pm

Venue: West Offices - Station Rise, York YO1 6GA

The Agenda for the above meeting was published on **Monday, 2 September 2024**. The attached additional documents are now available for the following agenda item:

- 5. Urgent Business** (Pages 1 - 186)
Any other business which the Chair considers urgent under the Local Government Act 1972.

Agenda Supplement 1: Proposed reforms to the National Planning Policy Framework Consultation and a verbal update on the Local Plan Examination

This agenda supplement was published on **Friday, 6 September 2024**.

This page is intentionally left blank



Meeting:	Local Plan Working Group
Meeting date:	10/09/2024
Report of:	Claire Foale, Interim Director for City Development
Portfolio of:	Cllr. M Pavlovic, Executive member for Housing, Planning and Safer Neighbourhoods.

Report: Proposed reforms to the National Planning Policy Framework Consultation

Subject of Report

1. City of York Council is a Local Planning Authority and has responsibility for planning within the authority area. The Government are consulting on reforms of the National Planning Policy Framework, which sets the overarching planning framework for plan-making and decision-making. Although a consultation at this stage, should the proposals be implemented there would be implications for planning in York.
2. This report sets out the key matters outlined in the consultation for consideration and discussion with members of the Local Plan Working Group to inform the Council's response to the consultation.

Benefits and Challenges

3. This national consultation on proposed reforms to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is open to responses until 24 September 2024. This approach allows all interested parties to submit a response to inform the national approach to planning.
4. The outcomes are subject to change following the Government's consideration of all consultation responses received. However, the Government are keen to enact changes quickly to align the

framework with their manifesto objectives; it is therefore anticipated that changes will be enacted by the end of 2024.

5. There a number of other challenges associated with consultation and implementation of a reformed planning framework:
 - i) The timing of the revised NPPF and other changes in relation to the adoption of York's emerging new Local Plan, currently in the final stages of independent Examination. The transitional arrangements set out for implementing policy changes and when these take effect will be an important consideration for planning across both plan-making and decision-taking. Currently, proposed transitional arrangements are clear that the Council will be able to continue to progress positively with the ongoing Examination of the Local Plan, and subject to any issues identified through this process, will be able to move to adopt the Local Plan;
 - ii) The documentation released includes a tracked change version of NPPF text. However, it is anticipated that further text modifications may be enacted to align with questions asked and their answers, where wording is not currently suggested. These further changes and whether they are to be consulted on is unknown.
 - iii) The changes may have significant resourcing impacts on planning policy and development services in York should they be implemented. Whilst the government have committed to the provision of more planning officers, the funding and the scope of this on service areas will need to be considered in further detail to inform service planning, when known.
6. There remains a commitment from Government to implement further planning reforms aligned to the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act (2023) regarding examination of Local Plans, supplementary planning documents and environmental assessment for example. We await the detail of this, including the relevant timescales for implementation and how this will dovetail with updates in the NPPF.

Policy Basis for Decision

7. The National Planning Policy Framework sets out the government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. This is the principle guidance for planning authorities in planning for future development and decision-making. It is supported by a suite of [Planning Practice Guidance](#)¹, which adds further details to the requirements set out therein. It is also supported by the delivery of other development plan documents, such as Neighbourhood Plans, which have their own legislative requirements.
8. The National Planning Policy Framework was revised in response to the [Levelling-up and Regeneration Bill: reforms to national planning policy consultation](#) on 19 December 2023; this was the fifth update since it was first introduced in 2012.
9. The Government has made clear that sustained economic growth is the only route to improving the prosperity of our country and the living standards of working people. Their approach to delivering this growth focuses on three pillars: stability, investment and reform. The Chancellor's speech on 8 July committed to consulting on reforms to the NPPF to take a different, growth-focused approach and this consultation seeks views on their proposed approach to revising the National Planning Policy Framework in order to achieve sustainable growth in the planning system. They consider that this will help to deliver their economic ambitions and their overall housing target of 1.5 million new homes.
10. The contents of this consultation supports the Council Plan and 10 year strategies where delivery is reliant on plan making and decision-taking as part of delivery. This is particularly relevant for the Economic and Climate Change Strategies.
11. It also relates to all of the administration's key manifesto pledges regarding Affordability, Environment, Equalities and Human Rights, and Health Inequalities in so far as the consultation is consulting on all aspects of the NPPF, which covers these policy areas in varying degrees of detail. The significance of this will be determined by the enacted changes resulting from this consultation.

¹ <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/planning-practice-guidance>

Financial Strategy Implications

12. There are no financial implications as result of considering or responding to this consultation.
13. Subject to the implementation of the revised NPPF following the consultation, there may be financial implications on York Council planning services. Work to scope the impact of a revised NPPF following the outcomes of this consultation will be considered in due course when these are understood.

Recommendation and Reasons

14. The Local Plan Working Group are asked:
 - i. To note the contents of the consultation and officer report;
 - ii. Provide feedback to inform the Council's response to the consultation.

Reason: To inform a Council response to the Government's consultation on Proposed Modifications to the National Planning Policy Framework by the deadline of 24 September 2024.

Background

15. The Government are seeking views on a reformed approach to the planning system. This consultation seeks to modify the National Planning Policy Framework to achieve sustainable growth in our planning system. They are also seeking views on a series of wider policy proposals in relation to increasing planning fees, local plan intervention criteria and appropriate thresholds for certain Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects. This aligns with their drive for sustained economic growth and are stated to be vital to delivering the Government's commitment to achieve economic growth and build 1.5 million new homes.
16. The proposed changes to the NPPF fall within several topic areas, which are detailed below. In summary, these are:
 - Reverse other changes to the NPPF made in December 2023 which are considered to be detrimental to housing supply. This includes the reintroduction of mandatory standard method for assessing housing need to ensure local plans are ambitious

enough to support the Government's manifesto commitment of 1.5 million new homes during this Parliament;

- Broaden the existing definition of brownfield land, setting a strengthened expectation that applications on brownfield land will be approved and that plans should promote an uplift in density in urban areas;
 - Identify grey belt land within the Green Belt, to be brought forward into the planning system through both plan and decision-making to meet development needs;
 - Improve the operation of 'the presumption' in favour of sustainable development, including safeguards to make sure its application cannot justify poor quality development;
 - Deliver affordable, well-designed homes, with new "golden rules" for land released in the Green Belt to ensure it delivers in the public interest;
 - Ensure that local planning authorities are able to prioritise the types of affordable homes their communities need;
 - Support economic growth in key sectors, aligned with the Government's industrial strategy and future local growth plans
 - Deliver community needs to support society and the creation of healthy places.
 - Support clean energy and the environment, including through support for onshore wind and renewables.
17. It should be noted that the consultation does not cover revisions to the Neighbourhood Planning process.

Assessing housing needs

18. The Ministerial Statement² and proposed modifications seek to reverse changes to the NPPF made in December 2023 regarding housing land supply. This means that mandatory housing targets are reintroduced and that there remains necessary a need to show

² Made by Angela Raynor, Deputy Prime Minister, on 30 July 2024: <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/deputy-prime-minister-on-changes-to-national-planning-policy>;

a 5 year housing supply (as opposed to a 4 years supply in specific circumstances).

19. The standard method for assessing the level of local housing need was originally introduced in 2018 and uses a formula to identify the minimum number of homes expected to be planned for based on household projections (produced by the Office for National Statistics), which are then adjusted to take account of affordability.
20. The current standard method housing need for York based on the existing formula equates to **1020 net additional homes per year**.
21. This consultation proposes a new standard method that uses a baseline set at a percentage of existing housing stock levels and using a stronger affordability multiplier. The result of this new standard method would result in the requirement for **1251 net additional homes per year** (see Annex C for a breakdown of this calculation).
22. This compared to the new Local Plan, currently in Examination, wherein policy requires at least **822 net additional homes per year** over the Plan period.
23. The proposed new standard method for housing results in an **increased housing requirement of 429 net additional homes** compared to the Local Plan requirement of 822 homes, or an **increase of 52.19%**.
24. In the context of the new Local Plan, it should be noted that planned delivery of our site allocations will currently result in an oversupply of housing against our average housing target given we have identified strategic sites which will continue to deliver post plan period. This may lessen the overall uplift required to be implemented.

Brownfield land, grey belt and the Green Belt

25. The revisions to the NPPF will require a local planning authority undertakes a Green Belt review where they cannot meet their identified housing, commercial or other need without altering Green Belt boundaries.
26. A sequential approach is proposed to the release of Green Belt land for development. This starts with the consideration of Previously Developed Land (PDL) and to assist in this para.154 of

the NPPF is to be amended to allow for the redevelopment of PDL with the only restriction being that it should not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt. The consultation further asks whether the definition of PDL in the glossary of the NPPF should be revised to include hardstanding and glasshouses.

27. Following the consideration of PDL in the Green Belt, attention would turn to land defined as grey belt. The proposed definition of grey belt³ is:

‘For the purposes of Plan-making and decision-making, grey belt is defined as land in the Green Belt comprising Previously Developed Land and any other parcels and/or areas of Green Belt land that make a limited contribution to the five Green Belt purposes (as defined in para 140 of this Framework) but excluding those areas or assets of particular importance listed in footnote 7 of this Framework (other than land designated as Green Belt).’

28. The consultation goes on to explain that land which makes a limited contribution to Green Belt purposes will:

a) Not strongly perform against any Green Belt purpose; and

b) Have at least one of the following features:

- i. Land containing substantial built development or which is fully enclosed by built form
- ii. Land which makes no or very little contribution to preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another
- iii. Land which is dominated by urban land uses, including physical developments
- iv. Land which contributes little to preserving the setting and special character of historic towns

29. Finally, once PDL and grey belt land have been considered, higher performing Green Belt sites, where these can be made sustainable, should be assessed.

30. The aim of the approach is to ensure that low quality Green Belt is identified first, while not restricting development of specific opportunities which could be made more sustainable. While it is made clear that local planning authorities should meet their

³ See [Proposed reforms to the National Planning Policy Framework and other changes to the planning system - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/proposed-reforms-to-the-national-planning-policy-framework-and-other-changes-to-the-planning-system), Chapter 5, para 9

development needs in full, the release of land should not be supported where doing so would fundamentally undermine the function of the Green Belt across the area of the plan.

31. While it is intended that Green Belt release takes place through the plan making process, the consultation recognises this will take time. In the short term, to support housing delivery, changes are proposed to support the release of Green Belt land through development management. This is detailed in a new paragraph 152 which identifies that housing and other development in the Green Belt is not inappropriate where it utilises grey belt in sustainable locations; and the authority cannot demonstrate a five year housing land supply, or failed the housing delivery test over the previous 3 years, or where there was a demonstrable need for land to be released for development of local, regional or national importance.
32. Where land is released from the Green Belt, either as PDL, grey belt or Green Belt, then development will have to comply with the golden rules as set out in new paragraph 155. These apply only to major development and require that:
 - Housing schemes provide at least 50% affordable housing with an appropriate proportion being Social Rent, and subject to viability;
 - Necessary improvements to local or national infrastructure are made; and
 - The provision of new, or improvements to existing, local green spaces that are accessible to the public.

Gypsies and Travellers

33. Proposed changes to support the release of Green Belt land are intended to address unmet needs for traveller sites. The exceptional circumstances under which Green Belt boundaries can be altered during the preparation or review of plans are now defined and include instances where an authority cannot meet its identified need for housing through other means, unless such alterations would undermine the function of the Green Belt across the plan area.
34. The sequential approach to Green Belt release, explained above, would apply and would allow for housing in the Green Belt to be

not inappropriate where it utilised grey belt in sustainable locations; and the authority could not demonstrate a five year housing land supply, or failed the housing delivery test over the previous 3 years, or where there was a demonstrable need for land to be released for development of local, regional or national importance. The 'golden rules' would apply. The consultation asks for views on how the assessment of need for traveller sites should be approached to determine whether a Green Belt review is required.

Viability

35. A new Annex 4 is proposed to the NPPF to clarify issues around viability in relation to Green Belt release and the golden rules. It suggests a national policy basis for adopting an Existing Use Value of the land plus a 'reasonable and proportionate premium' for the landowner when calculating benchmark land values (BLV) as part of a viability assessment. Locally set BLVs would then be informed by Local Plan policies. Where land transacted at a price above the nationally set BLV, it should then be assumed to be viable.

Housing mix

36. Changes are proposed to ensure that development provides the most appropriate mix of housing. This includes specifically socially rented housing within the mix of affordable housing and in accordance with identified local needs. Sites should contain a mix of tenures including ownership and rental as well as housing for specific groups.
37. The removal of the requirement to deliver 10% of housing on major sites as affordable home ownership. LAs are advised that this should be seen as an expectation to deliver a locally specific mix. The consultation also asks why insufficient small sites are being allocated and how this issue might be solved.

Strategic and regional planning

38. Issues such as meeting housing needs (including neighbours' unmet needs), strategic infrastructure and climate resilience are areas which are specifically identified to be addressed through the duty to cooperate. Para.24 is amended to address this and notes that effective strategic planning across boundaries will play a vital and increasing role in how sustainable growth is delivered.

39. New para.27 then makes clear that once the matters of collaboration have been identified, strategic policy makers should ensure that their plan policies are consistent with others where a strategic relationship exists unless there is a clear justification to the contrary.
40. The consultation notes that the Duty to Cooperate requirement is to be strengthened but also that short term measures to strengthen cross-boundary strategic planning will be introduced. New legislation will subsequently introduce formal strategic planning mechanisms with the intention to move to a model of universal strategic planning covering functional economic areas within this parliament. The model will support elected Mayors in overseeing the development and agreement of Spatial Development Strategies. No further detail has been provided of the form of the Spatial Development Strategies.

Local Plan Production

41. Plans at examination will continue to be examined under the version of the NPPF they were submitted under. However, as is the case in York, if the revised Local Housing Need (LHN) figure is more than 200 dwellings per annum higher than the annual housing requirement set out in the adopted version of the plan, upon introduction of the new plan-making system, the local planning authority will be required to begin preparation of a plan under the new system as soon as possible, or in line with any subsequent arrangements set out to manage the roll-out of the new system.
42. It is the intention to implement the new plan-making system as set out in the Levelling- up and Regeneration Act from summer or autumn 2025.

Design and character

43. Chapter 12 maintains the primacy of the National Model Design Code and support for design codes, in areas that provide the greatest opportunities for change, such as allocated sites. Reflecting the wider aspiration to drive housing and economic growth, there is an acknowledgement that design codes should also consider where, and in what circumstances, higher density development could be encouraged.

44. Removal of the references to 'beauty' and 'beautiful' (which is considered subjective), instead focusing on well-designed buildings and places.

Building a modern economy

45. The proposed change to para 86b now mandates local plans to set criteria and identify strategic sites for local and inward investment, where previously they were only required to do one or the other. This includes for the first time a requirement to plan and provide land to accommodate a range of commercial development which meets the need of the 'modern economy' (also enacted in changes to para 87): Laboratories, Gigafactories, Data Centres, Digital Infrastructure and Freight/Logistics.

Presumption in favour of sustainable development

46. Changes to para 11d, which include clarification both of the policies relevant to decision taking and to those in the Framework, seek to ensure that planning permissions are only granted where high standards are met; these are safeguards to ensure only high-quality schemes benefit from the presumption.

Supporting Renewable Development

47. The changes give emphasis and support for all forms of renewable and low carbon development:
- New para 161 b) mandates Local Authorities to identify in their Local Plans suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy sources, and supporting infrastructure where this would help secure the development (removing the prior 'consider identifying' phrase).
 - Para 164 guides LPAs to support planning applications for all forms of renewable and low carbon development and, at part a) significant weight should be given to the proposal's contribution to renewable energy generation and a net zero future.

Changes to Planning Fees

48. The proposals seek to address the funding shortfall experienced by many Local Authorities:
- Proposed fee increase for householder applications to £528 (from £258) to meet cost recovery levels (and seeking views on

whether a smaller increase to the householder fee (e.g. 50% increase) would be more appropriate).

- Seeking views on increasing fees for other application types such as prior approval and S73 applications.
- Introducing fees for applications with no fee at the moment such as demolition consent in a conservation area and Listed Building Consent.

49. There is also the potential for a locally set fee and two different models are suggested for how this might be calculated.

Consultation Analysis

50. Given the NPPF covers different technical topic areas, an internal officer workshop is being undertaken to inform a council response including officers from Strategic Planning Policy, Development Services, Design and Conservation, Housing, Health, Carbon reduction and Transport.

51. Officers are also attending a suite of national workshops run by the Planning Advisory Service and MHCLG wherein they are presenting on the proposed planning reforms and allowing discussion with colleagues from other authorities. This will help better understand and respond to the current consultation.

52. The Local Plan Working Group is invited to provide comments, both during the meeting, and separately by 12 September, to inform the council's response to government.

53. The government is inviting comment from all interested parties who can submit a response directly to government; details of how to submit a response is set out in the Government's consultation material (Annex A to this report)

Options Analysis and Evidential Basis

54. Local Plan Working Group are invited to consider the revised NPPF, with a response prepared collating the LPWG and officer comments for consideration by the Executive Member at their Decision Session on 23 September.

55. The Executive Member will be invited to decide whether:
- (i) To submit a Council response to the national consultation
 - (ii) To not submit a Council response to the national consultation
 - (iii) To submit the response proposed as drafted by officers without amendment
 - (iv) To amend the response proposed
56. Submitting a response to the consultation will help inform the Government's approach to modifying the NPPF and sets out the Council's understanding of the proposed changes, both in support and objection where necessary. Option (i) has therefore been recommended.
57. The government will review local responses in respect of changes to local housing need and growth expectation, and alongside this, multiple responses about wider issues. Members are advised that their comments will not necessarily be included in the final NPPF.
58. Whilst technical officers from across the council have compiled a response to the consultation, there may be further considerations arising from discussion at the meeting. Option (iv) is therefore recommended to allow modifications as a result of the Executive Members consideration of any discussion.

Organisational Impact and Implications

59. We are consulting on the Government's consultation ahead of drafting a response for consideration at the Executive Member Decision Session on 23 September. Input and discussion from the Local Plan Working Group will help to inform our response and understanding of implications arising.
60. However, it is important to note that the proposed reforms to the NPPF and associated reforms to the planning system, if implemented in their current form, will likely have a very significant impact on City of York Council's Planning Services.
61. With regard to the Development Management service, the key issue is that proposals would likely to lead to an increase in the number and complexity of speculative planning applications and planning appeals, which has resource and cost implications as a result of the increased housing requirement and in advance of further Green Belt Assessment.

62. With regard to the Strategic Planning Policy Service, whilst it is considered unlikely that the proposals place a significant risk to the timeframe for the adoption of the current draft Local Plan (currently at examination), as a result of the proposed transitional arrangements there is a significant risk to the Council that it would need to progress a Local Plan review at the earliest opportunity, which has significant resource and cost implications.

Risks and Mitigations

63. There are no risks anticipated with responding to this national consultation on proposed reform to planning.
64. There is the risk that by not responding, York’s views will not be taken into account in the government’s final considerations.
65. There are risks associated with the proposed revisions in the NPPF itself. Where appropriate, these will be highlighted in the consultation response to government.

Wards Impacted

66. All wards would be potentially impacted by revised requirements set out in the planning reforms.

Contact details

For further information please contact the authors of this Decision Report.

Author

Name:	Alison Cooke
Job Title:	Head of Strategic Planning Policy
Service Area:	Strategic Planning Policy, City Development
Telephone:	01904 551467
Report approved:	Yes
Date:	06/09/2024

Co-author

Name:	Becky Eades
Job Title:	Head of Planning and Development Services
Service Area:	Development Services, Directorate for Transport, Planning and Environment
Telephone:	01904 551627
Report approved:	Yes
Date:	06/09/2024

Background papers

Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government's consultation: [Proposed reforms to the National Planning Policy Framework and other changes to the planning system - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/proposed-reforms-to-the-national-planning-policy-framework-and-other-changes-to-the-planning-system)

Including:

- [Proposed reforms to the National Planning Policy Framework and other changes to the planning system](https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/proposed-reforms-to-the-national-planning-policy-framework-and-other-changes-to-the-planning-system)
- [National Planning Policy Framework: draft text for consultation](https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/national-planning-policy-framework-draft-text-for-consultation)
- [Outcome of the proposed revised method \[for housing requirements\]](https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/outcome-of-the-proposed-revised-method-for-housing-requirements).

Officer Decision 18/10/2023: [Response to the Government's consultation titled "Plan-making reforms: consultation on implementation" on behalf of City of York Council \(47\)](#). This decision was made in consultation with the Executive Member for Housing, Planning & Safer Communities.

Annexes

- Annex A: Government proposals for reform of the planning system and other planning changes consultation (MHCLG, July 2024).
- Annex B: National Planning Policy Framework: draft text for consultation (MHCLG, 2024)
- Annex C: Outcome of the proposed revised method for housing requirements for York (MHCLG, 2024).

Abbreviations

BVL	Benchmark land value
LHN	Local Housing Need
LA	Local Authority
LPA	Local Planning Authority
LPWG	Local Plan Working Group
MHCLG	Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
PDL	Previously developed land

[Home](#) > [Housing, local and community](#) > [Planning and building](#)

> [Planning reform](#)

> [Proposed reforms to the National Planning Policy Framework and other changes to the planning system](#)

[Ministry of
Housing,
Communities &
Local Government](#)

Open consultation

Proposed reforms to the National Planning Policy Framework and other changes to the planning system

Published 30 July 2024

Applies to England

Contents

[Scope of consultation](#)

[Basic Information](#)

[How to respond](#)

[Chapter 1 – Introduction](#)

[Chapter 2 – Policy objectives](#)

[Chapter 3 – Planning for the homes we need](#)

Chapter 4 – A new Standard Method for assessing housing needs

Chapter 5 – Brownfield, grey belt and the Green Belt

Chapter 6 – Delivering affordable, well-designed homes and places

Chapter 7 – Building infrastructure to grow the economy

Chapter 8 – Delivering community needs

Chapter 9 – Supporting green energy and the environment

Chapter 10 – Changes to local plan intervention criteria

Chapter 11 – Changes to planning application fees and cost recovery for local authorities related to Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects

Chapter 12 – The future of planning policy and plan making

Chapter 13 – Public Sector Equality Duty

Chapter 14 – Table of questions

Chapter 15 – About this consultation



© Crown copyright 2024

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3 or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: psi@nationalarchives.gov.uk.

Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

This publication is available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/proposed-reforms-to-the-national-planning-policy-framework-and-other-changes-to-the-planning-system/proposed-reforms-to-the-national-planning-policy-framework-and-other-changes-to-the-planning-system>

Scope of consultation

Topic of this consultation

This consultation seeks views on our proposed approach to revising the National Planning Policy Framework in order to achieve sustainable growth in our planning system. We are also seeking views on a series of wider policy proposals in relation to increasing planning fees, local plan intervention criteria and appropriate thresholds for certain Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects.

Scope of this consultation

The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government is seeking views on how we might revise national planning policy to support our wider objectives. Full details on the scope of consultation are found within chapter 1. Chapter 14 contains a table of all questions within this document and signposts their relevant scope. In responding to this consultation, we would appreciate comments on any potential impacts on protected groups under the Public Sector Equality Duty. A consultation question on this is found in chapter 13.

Geographical scope

These proposals relate to England only.

Basic Information

Body/bodies responsible for the consultation

The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government

Duration

This consultation will begin on Tuesday 30 July 2024 at 2pm and close at 11.45pm on Tuesday 24 September 2024.

Enquiries

For any enquiries about the consultation please contact:

PlanningPolicyConsultation@communities.gov.uk

How to respond

Citizen Space is the department's online consultation portal and our preferred route for receiving consultation responses. We strongly encourage responses are made via Citizen Space, particularly from organisations with access to online facilities such as local planning authorities, representative bodies and businesses. Consultations receive a high-level of interest across many sectors. Using the online survey greatly assists our analysis of the responses, enabling more efficient and effective consideration of the issues raised.

[Respond via Citizen Space \(https://consult.levellingup.gov.uk/planning/planning-reform\)](https://consult.levellingup.gov.uk/planning/planning-reform)

If you cannot respond via Citizen Space, you may send your response by email to: PlanningPolicyConsultation@communities.gov.uk

Written responses should be sent to:

Planning Policy Consultation Team
Planning Directorate – Planning Policy Division
Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government
Floor 3, Fry Building
2 Marsham Street
London
SW1P 4DF

When you reply, it would be very useful if you please confirm whether you are replying as an individual or submitting an official response on behalf of an organisation and include:

- your name

- your position (if applicable)
- the name of organisation (if applicable)

Please make it clear which question or paragraph number each comment relates to and ensure that the text of your response is in a format that allows copying of individual sentences or paragraphs, to help us when considering your view on particular issues. Thank you for taking time to submit responses to this consultation. Your views will help improve and shape our national planning policies.

Chapter 1 – Introduction

1. The Government has made clear that sustained economic growth is the only route to improving the prosperity of our country and the living standards of working people. Our approach to delivering this growth will focus on three pillars: stability, investment and reform.

2. Nowhere is decisive reform needed more urgently than in our planning system. The December 2023 changes to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) were disruptive to the sector and detrimental to housing supply. The Chancellor’s speech on 8 July committed to consulting on reforms to the NPPF to take a different, growth-focused approach.

3. Today, we set out specific changes we propose to make immediately to the NPPF following this consultation. These changes – amending the planning framework, and universal, ambitious local plan coverage – are vital to deliver the Government’s commitments to achieve economic growth and build 1.5 million new homes. Specifically, they will:

a. make the standard method for assessing housing needs mandatory, requiring local authorities to plan for the resulting housing need figure, planning for a lower figure only when they can demonstrate hard constraints and that they have exhausted all other options;

b. reverse other changes to the NPPF made in December 2023 which were detrimental to housing supply;

c. implement a new standard method and calculation to ensure local plans are ambitious enough to support the Government’s manifesto commitment of 1.5 million new homes in this Parliament;

d. broaden the existing definition of brownfield land, set a strengthened expectation that applications on brownfield land will be approved and that plans should promote an uplift in density in urban areas;

- e. identify grey belt land within the Green Belt, to be brought forward into the planning system through both plan and decision-making to meet development needs;
- f. improve the operation of ‘the presumption’ in favour of sustainable development, to ensure it acts as an effective failsafe to support housing supply, by clarifying the circumstances in which it applies; and, introducing new safeguards, to make clear that its application cannot justify poor quality development;
- g. deliver affordable, well-designed homes, with new “golden rules” for land released in the Green Belt to ensure it delivers in the public interest;
- h. make wider changes to ensure that local planning authorities are able to prioritise the types of affordable homes their communities need on all housing development and that the planning system supports a more diverse housebuilding sector;
- i. support economic growth in key sectors, aligned with the Government’s industrial strategy and future local growth plans, including laboratories, gigafactories, datacentres, digital economies and freight and logistics – given their importance to our economic future;
- j. deliver community needs to support society and the creation of healthy places; and
- k. support clean energy and the environment, including through support for onshore wind and renewables.

4. The proposed changes are explained in this document and set out in an accompanying draft NPPF. The Government will respond to this consultation and publish NPPF revisions before the end of the year, so that policy changes can take effect as soon as possible.

5. Alongside these specific changes, the document also calls for views on:

- a. whether to reform the way that the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIP) regime applies to onshore wind, solar, data centres, laboratories, gigafactories and water projects, as the first step of the Government’s NSIP reform plans;
- b. whether the local plan intervention policy criteria should be updated or removed, so the Government can intervene where necessary to ensure housing delivery; and
- c. proposals to increase some planning fees, including for householder applications, so that local planning authorities are properly resourced to support a sustained increase in development and improve performance.

6. Finally, it sets out how and when we expect every local planning authority to rapidly create a clear, ambitious local plan for high quality housebuilding and economic growth.

Chapter 2 – Policy objectives

1. **By fixing the foundations of our economy we can rebuild Britain and make every part of our country better off; decisive reform to the planning system is urgently needed to achieve that.** New homes create jobs and investment in construction and ensure people can afford to live where they wish and access high-quality, productive jobs. And yet planning permissions for new homes have fallen to a record low. Clean energy lowers the cost of living and the cost of doing business, but the average time taken to approve large infrastructure projects has grown to more than four years. Commercial development lets businesses expand and support the economy, but the existing planning framework makes no reference to the specific types of development our modern economy needs.
2. **Our antiquated planning system delays too many of these projects, stymieing Britain’s ability to grow its way to prosperity.**
3. **We will take the difficult decisions necessary to build what Britain needs.** That includes 1.5 million homes in England over the next five years, and crucial energy, water and commercial projects.
4. **Our objectives for reform build on our manifesto commitments.** We will:
 - a. **get Britain building again**, to build new homes, create jobs, and deliver new and improved infrastructure;
 - b. **take a brownfield first approach and then release low quality grey belt land**, while preserving the Green Belt;
 - c. **boost affordable housing**, to deliver the biggest increase in social and affordable housebuilding in a generation;
 - d. **bring home ownership into reach**, especially for young first-time buyers;
 - e. **extract more public value from development**, including through infrastructure, amenity, and transport benefits and, where necessary, through use of strengthened compulsory purchase powers;
 - f. **ensure communities continue to shape housebuilding in their areas**, demanding universal local plan coverage from all local planning authorities, while making full use of intervention powers to build the houses we need if this is not achieved;

g. **promote a more strategic approach to planning**, by strengthening cross-boundary collaboration, ahead of legislation to introduce mandatory mechanisms for strategic planning;

h. **support the development needed for a modern economy**, to prepare the way for our modern industrial strategy; and

i. **unlock new sources of clean energy**, supporting our mission to deliver clean energy by 2030.

5. Delivering those objectives starts with local planning authorities planning for sufficient homes, commercial development and wider infrastructure in their local plan. Local plans clearly spell out to developers and communities where development will and will not take place, bringing certainty to all parties. They are also the mechanism through which local communities can have their say in how homes are built. It is unacceptable for local planning authorities to not make a local plan.

6. Those plans need to be suitably ambitious to build 1.5 million new homes. We are therefore making the standard method the mandatory starting point for planning for homes, implementing a revised standard method so that councils will plan to achieve the delivery of the homes we need, and reversing other damaging changes to planning policy which disrupted the sector and stifled supply.

7. They also require us to take a strategic approach to releasing land. We are committed to preserving the Green Belt, but its current design can protect poor quality sites while communities face acute shortages of housing. We will empower authorities to release Previously Developed Land and low quality grey belt sites to ensure enough land is made available for new homes – while continuing to ensure that brownfield development is prioritised and that development is in sustainable locations.

8. We must deliver more affordable, well-designed homes quickly. We are changing national policy to support more affordable housing, including more for Social Rent, and implementing golden rules to ensure development in the Green Belt is in the public interest. Promoting a more diverse tenure mix will support the faster build out we need.

9. We must grow the economy and support green energy. Commercial development in Britain has been stymied by a lack of support for key growth industries; we propose to support them. Britain has the potential to be a clean energy superpower, cutting bills for local people and businesses alike – we will support this.

10. Alongside reforms to planning policy, we are taking decisions to quickly reform the wider system in support of these objectives. We are expanding the NSIP regime so that it can support our drive for more clean energy, as the first step of our NSIP reforms. We are reforming local plan

intervention so that if plans are not in place, the Government can intervene to ensure housing delivery. We are reforming planning fees so that local planning authorities are properly resourced to support a sustained increase in development.

11. We will act swiftly to implement these reforms to bring stability and certainty to the sector. The last Government's reforms to planning policy in December 2023 were damaging for housing supply, disrupting plan-making and undermining investor confidence. We are therefore acting swiftly to reverse many of these changes, and implement our manifesto commitments, so that local councils, developers and investors understand exactly how we expect the planning system to function, over this parliament and beyond. Alongside the changes we have set out here, we will complete our set of planning policy changes through consulting on National Development Management Policies, and bring forward the Planning and Infrastructure Bill to accelerate the delivery of high quality infrastructure and housing.

12. We expect immediate action. We are keen to engage with all stakeholders to understand the impacts of these reforms. The Deputy Prime Minister will write to all local planning authorities making clear that we expect universal coverage of local plans, and reviews of Green Belt boundaries where necessary to meet housing need. In this consultation, we have therefore set out exactly how local planning authorities should proceed to make ambitious local plans as quickly as possible.

Chapter 3 – Planning for the homes we need

1. We are starting with how we plan for homes, because that is where we believe the system needs to start, and that is where our communities are feeling the inadequacies of our planning system most. The Government believes that decisions about what to build and where should reflect local views, and planning should be about how to deliver the housing an area needs - not whether to do so at all.

2. We are therefore seeking views on reversing changes made to the NPPF by the previous Government in December 2023. Those changes run counter to this Government's ambitions on increasing housing supply, so it is important that we quickly reverse them and allow local planning authorities to get on and plan for growth.

Importance of planning to meet housing needs

3. We are proposing minor wording changes to paragraphs 1 and 60 of the NPPF. The changes proposed are to remove 'sufficient' in the context of providing for housing in paragraph 1, and to revise the final sentence of paragraph 60. These changes would make clearer the importance of planning to meeting housing needs.

Advisory starting point and alternative approaches

4. Paragraph 61 was revised to set out that 'The outcome of the standard method is an advisory starting-point for establishing a housing requirement'. Changes to the NPPF also provided further context on the exceptional circumstances where the use of alternative approaches to assess housing needs may be appropriate. **We propose reversing these changes.**

5. We propose making it very clear that local planning authorities should use the standard method to assess housing needs, by removing reference to the exceptional circumstances in which the use of alternative approaches to assess housing need may be appropriate. The current policy adds uncertainty about when to use the standard method and can delay plan progress as local planning authorities seek to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances apply. The current approach also provides too much leeway to local planning authorities to not meet their housing needs in full, risking our ambitions for housing growth. Removing these opt outs will stop debates about the right number of homes to plan for and support authorities to get on with plan making.

6. Local planning authorities will be expected to make all efforts to allocate land in line with their housing need as per the standard method. Authorities would be able to justify a lower housing requirement than the figure the method sets on the basis of local constraints on land and delivery, such as existing National Park, protected habitats and flood risk areas, but would (as now) have to evidence and justify their approach through local plan consultation and examination. All local planning authorities will need to demonstrate they have taken all possible steps, including optimising density, sharing need with neighbouring authorities, and reviewing Green Belt boundaries, before a lower housing requirement will be considered.

7. There will be some specific circumstances in which local planning authorities have to use an alternative approach – for example, because the data used in the method is not available. We propose that further guidance on this small number of specific circumstances will be set out in Planning Practice Guidance.

Question 1

Do you agree that we should reverse the December 2023 changes made to paragraph 61?

Question 2

Do you agree that we should remove reference to the use of alternative approaches to assessing housing need in paragraph 61 and the glossary of the NPPF?

Urban uplift

8. Paragraph 62 was added to provide policy on the application of the standard method urban uplift. This sets out that the urban uplift should normally be accommodated within the cities and urban centres where the uplift applies, except in certain specific circumstances.

9. We propose reversing this change and deleting this paragraph. We support the principle of directing housing growth to our larger urban areas, but the existing approach provides a poor basis for this. First, the method we are consulting on (as set out in chapter 4) more appropriately distributes growth to a wider range of urban areas without the need for a specific urban adjustment. Second, as set out later in this chapter, we are clear that urban centres should be working together across their wider regions to accommodate need. Third, as also set out later in this chapter, we are not only strengthening the existing Duty to Cooperate requirement but proposing to introduce effective new mechanisms for cross-boundary strategic planning. This will include short term measures which will strengthen cross-boundary co-operation, ahead of introducing formal strategic planning mechanisms through new legislation. It is our intention to move to a model of universal strategic planning covering functional economic areas within the next five years.

Question 3

Do you agree that we should reverse the December 2023 changes made on the urban uplift by deleting paragraph 62?

Character and density

10. Paragraph 130 was added to the NPPF to explain that local character can be taken into account when local planning authorities consider their ability to meet their housing needs. The policy sets out that significant uplifts in density may be inappropriate if this would result in development wholly out of character with the existing area. Local planning authorities are required to use authority-wide design codes to evidence the impact on character.

11. **We propose reversing this change and deleting paragraph 130 in its entirety.** We are clear that local planning authorities should identify opportunities for maximising the efficient use of land, especially in areas well served by transport and other infrastructure. By restricting density, the existing policy is likely to have longer term negative impacts on achieving sustainable patterns of development and on meeting expectations on future housing supply. Alongside this reversal, we propose **strengthening expectations that plans should promote an uplift in density in urban areas.**

12. We intend to support this by **focusing on ensuring development plans support the efficient use of land at appropriate densities.** Rather than district-wide design coding, we want to focus local planning authority efforts on the preparation of localised design codes, masterplans and guides for areas of most change and most potential – including regeneration sites, areas of intensification, urban extensions and the development of large new communities.

Question 4

Do you agree that we should reverse the December 2023 changes made on character and density and delete paragraph 130?

Question 5

Do you agree that the focus of design codes should move towards supporting spatial visions in local plans and areas that provide the greatest opportunities for change such as greater density, in particular the development of large new communities?

Strengthening and reforming the presumption in favour of sustainable development ('the presumption')

13. It is our intention that changes to the approach to meeting housing needs, will, over time, ensure that plans identify enough land to deliver the homes our communities need. However, with less than a third of places with up-to-date plans, it is important that land that has not been allocated in a plan can be brought forward for development when needed, particularly in the short term.

14. The presumption, set out in paragraph 11 of the NPPF, allows for this. The primary function of the presumption is to provide a fallback to encourage planning permission to be granted where plan policies are not up-to-date, including where there is an insufficient supply of land. It broadly does this in two ways. It brings land into scope of potential development where it has not been specifically allocated for development (e.g. a site on the edge of existing settlements), or where land is allocated for another purpose (e.g. where

housing may be proposed on a site allocated for employment uses). Additionally, it 'tilts the balance' towards approval by making clear that permission should be granted unless doing so would cut across protections for safeguarded areas, like National Parks and habitat sites, or the adverse impacts would 'significantly and demonstrably' outweigh the benefits when assessed against the NPPF taken as a whole.

15. Introducing more demanding targets and reinstating the requirement to demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply at all times is likely to bring more local planning authorities into the scope of the presumption in the short-term. This is necessary to ensure that we urgently address the issue of chronic undersupply of land that has underpinned the housing crisis and support our drive to deliver 1.5 million new homes over the next five years.

16. In addition to this, we are proposing to make changes to clarify the primary role that the presumption is intended to play in addressing inadequate land supply. Currently, the presumption is triggered when there are 'no relevant development plan policies', or those which are 'most important for determining the application are out-of-date'. The question of what policies are 'most important' has been the subject of extensive debate and litigation. To bring clarity, we propose making clear that the relevant policies are those for the supply of land.

17. We have also heard concerns that some developers have used the presumption to promote low quality, unsustainable development. We are clear that the presumption cannot offer a route to creating poor quality places, and so we are proposing changes to the presumption to add explicit reference to the need to consider locational and design policies, as well as policies relating to the delivery of affordable housing, when the presumption is engaged. These safeguards will mean that schemes that rely on the presumption to secure approval will meet the high standards we expect of all development.

Question 6

Do you agree that the presumption in favour of sustainable development should be amended as proposed?

Restoring the 5-Year Housing Land Supply (5YHLS)

18. Prior to December 2023, the 5-year housing land supply required local planning authorities to annually identify and update a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide a minimum of five years' worth of housing. This was tested against the housing requirement in their local plan or, where no up-to-date plan was in place, local housing need. Where local planning authorities could not demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply, they were

subject to the presumption in favour of sustainable development, described above. The policy helped ensure that authorities maintained a future pipeline of housing.

19. In December 2023, several changes were made to 5-year housing land supply policy which weakened this as the fallback route to encourage planning permission to be granted where plan policies are not up-to-date. The NPPF currently states that where a local planning authority has an up-to-date plan which meets certain criteria, it is exempt from having to continually demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply while that plan remains up-to-date. Where authorities are in the late stages of plan making, they need only demonstrate a 4-year housing land supply. We have heard concerns that these policies are undermining supply. The logic for making these changes was incentivising plan development – to ‘protect’ authorities from the presumption where they have a well-developed or up-to-date plan. But this means that if circumstances change over the 5-year lifetime of an up-to-date plan, and allocations turn out not to be deliverable, it is harder for new development to come forward and there is no clear mechanism for making up the shortfall.

20. To address this, **we propose reversing these changes** and re-establishing the requirement for all local planning authorities, regardless of local plan status, to continually demonstrate 5 years of specific, deliverable sites for housing. We are also proposing to remove the wording on past oversupply in paragraph 77, which was introduced to set out that previous over-supply could be set against upcoming supply. Given the chronic need for housing we see in all areas, we should celebrate strong delivery records without diluting future ambitions.

21. These changes will be pro-supply measures, ensuring a pipeline of deliverable sites is maintained at all times.

Question 7

Do you agree that all local planning authorities should be required to continually demonstrate 5 years of specific, deliverable sites for decision making purposes, regardless of plan status?

Question 8

Do you agree with our proposal to remove wording on national planning guidance in paragraph 77 of the current NPPF?

Restoring the 5% buffer

22. The Framework currently requires local planning authorities to include a buffer of 20% on top of their 5-year housing land supply where there has been

significant under delivery of housing over the previous 3 years, as measured through the Housing Delivery Test. Prior to December 2023, authorities were also required to include a buffer of 5% on top of their 5-year housing land supply, in order to account for fluctuations, or 10% where the authority wanted to confirm its 5-year housing land supply for a year through an Annual Position Statement or recently adopted plan.

23. We propose reversing this change and reintroducing the 5% buffer.

This will be added to all 5-year housing land supply calculations in decision making and plan making, and provide an important buffer of sites, ensuring choice and competition in the market. We also are proposing to remove the option for local planning authorities to 'fix' their 5-year housing land supply through Annual Position Statements which is a policy that has been little used. We consider that any authority with sufficient evidence to confirm its forward supply through this process should in any case be able to demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply. The 20% buffer would also remain. As it is now, this will only be applied where an authority significantly under delivers against their housing requirement as measured through the HDT or local housing need where relevant.

Question 9

Do you agree that all local planning authorities should be required to add a 5% buffer to their 5-year housing land supply calculations?

Question 10

If yes, do you agree that 5% is an appropriate buffer, or should it be a different figure?

Question 11

Do you agree with the removal of policy on Annual Position Statements?

Maintaining effective co-operation and the move to strategic planning

24. The Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023 will revoke the Duty to Cooperate in relation to the reformed plan making system. However, the Duty remains a legal requirement under the current local plans system and will continue to apply to local plans progressed within the current system.

25. The Government was clear in its manifesto that housing need in England cannot be met without planning for growth on a larger than local scale, and that it will be necessary to introduce effective new mechanisms for cross-boundary

strategic planning. This will play a vital role in delivering sustainable growth and addressing key spatial issues – including meeting housing needs, delivering strategic infrastructure, growing the economy, and improving climate resilience. Strategic planning will also be important in the delivery of Local Growth Plans and Local Nature Recovery Strategies.

26. We will therefore take the steps necessary to enable universal coverage of strategic planning within this Parliament, which we will formalise in legislation. This model will support elected Mayors in overseeing the development and agreement of Spatial Development Strategies (SDSs) for their areas. The Government will also explore the most effective arrangements for developing SDSs outside of mayoral areas, in order that we can achieve universal coverage in England, recognising that we will need to consider both the appropriate geographies to use to cover functional economic areas, and the right democratic mechanisms for securing agreement. Across all areas, these arrangements will encourage partnership working but we are determined to ensure that, whatever the circumstances, SDSs can be concluded and adopted. The Government will work with local leaders and the wider sector to consult on, develop and test these arrangements in the months ahead before legislation is introduced, including consideration of the capacity and capabilities needed such as geospatial data and digital tools.

27. We also want to ensure that in the short term we are making the most of opportunities for greater collaboration between authorities, so we propose amending **the ‘maintaining effective co-operation’ section of the NPPF to ensure that the right engagement is occurring on the sharing of unmet housing need and other strategic issues where plans are being progressed**. This will apply to local plans, minerals, waste plans and to spatial development strategies, and would be introduced in changes to paragraphs 24-27 of the existing NPPF. This change will apply in conjunction with the Duty to Cooperate in the current plan making system.

28. In addition, separate from the NPPF, we will work in concert with Mayoral Combined Authorities to explore extending existing powers to develop an SDS, which will not rely on new primary legislation, and so allow us to get a head start. We intend to identify priority groupings of other authorities where strategic planning – and in particular the sharing of housing need requirements – would provide particular benefits, setting a clear expectation of cooperation that we will help to structure and support this, and to use powers of intervention where necessary.

Question 12

Do you agree that the NPPF should be amended to further support effective co-operation on cross boundary and strategic planning matters?

29. Over recent years there have been concerns that plans containing strategic scale proposals and associated infrastructure can require implementation over

a long period, making it more difficult to provide evidence of deliverability and viability. We want the planning system to enable such long term and ambitious planning, while recognising that such plans need to be grounded and realistic. We do not have a firm proposal to address this point, so instead ask the following open question.

Question 13

Should the tests of soundness be amended to better assess the soundness of strategic scale plans or proposals?

Question 14

Do you have any other suggestions relating to the proposals in this chapter?

Chapter 4 – A new Standard Method for assessing housing needs

Alongside reversing the previous Government’s changes to the NPPF, including to restore the standard method for assessing housing needs as mandatory, we are proposing a new standard method. A revised method will support this Government’s ambition to deliver 1.5 million homes over the next five years, underpin growth in all corners of the country, and provide greater certainty to the key stakeholders involved in planning for housing – including local planning authorities, communities, developers, and landowners.

The current standard method for assessing local housing need

1. The current standard method (first introduced in 2018) identifies the minimum number of homes that a local planning authority should plan for in its area. The NPPF makes clear that the outcome of the standard method should inform the preparation of local plans and establishing a housing requirement for the area.
2. The current method comprises a baseline of household projections (produced by the Office for National Statistics) which are then adjusted to take account of affordability. In some circumstances that figure is then capped to limit the increase, and finally an urban uplift (35%) is applied to our 20 most populous urban local planning authorities. It is designed to sum to 300,000 at a national level.

3. The use of household projections in the current standard method has attracted criticism from across the sector. Household projections are volatile, and subject to change every few years, making it difficult for local planning authorities to plan for housing over their Plan periods (10-15 years). To guard against regular shifts, the previous government opted to lock in 2014-projections, rather than updating the formula to incorporate more recent updates. This means the dataset is now ten years old and is no longer fit for purpose in reflecting current housing needs. By projecting forward past trends, household projections have also resulted in artificially low projections in some places, particularly where overcrowding and concealed households have suppressed household formation, which generally happens in the least affordable parts of the country.

4. We are therefore proposing a revised standard method which aligns more closely with the Government's aspirations for the housing market. This new method will provide stability and certainty for all stakeholders, seek to address the issues with the current approach, and support a more ambitious house building strategy.

The Government's proposed approach

5. Our new approach is based on four principles for reform. The new method must:

- a. support the Government's **ambition** to deliver 1.5 million new homes over the next five years;
- b. provide greater **certainty** to the sector through more stable and predictable housing numbers;
- c. achieve a more balanced **distribution** of homes across the country, by directing homes to where they are most needed and least affordable, and ensure that all areas contribute to meeting the country's housing needs, rather than radically undershooting local ambition in some areas of the country; and
- d. be **straightforward** to understand and apply – so that the method can be easily replicated, be updated in line with the most recent publicly available data, and speed up plan making.

6. That standard method will result in a local planning authority-wide number, on which basis the authority must then plan. The local area will then decide how and where in their authority that need is best met in accordance with national policy, engaging with local communities. The standard method provides the basis for plan making, not the final housing requirement – and we are absolutely clear that authorities may justify planning for a lower number only where they can evidence hard constraints to the Planning Inspectorate

7. We therefore propose a new standard method that:

- a. uses a **baseline set at a percentage of existing housing stock levels**, designed to provide a stable baseline that drives a level of delivery proportionate to the existing size of settlements, rebalancing the national distribution to better reflect the growth ambitions across the Midlands and North;
- b. tops up this baseline by focusing on those areas that are facing the greatest affordability pressures, using a **stronger affordability multiplier** to increase this baseline in proportion to price pressures; and
- c. **removes arbitrary caps and additions** so that the approach is driven by an objective assessment of need.

Setting a new headline target

8. We will not deliver our target of 1.5 million homes if too little land is allocated. It is clear that the current level of ambition is too low: our analysis suggests that housing requirements in adopted plans only add up to approximately 230,000 homes per annum^{[\[footnote 1\]](#)} and the latest OBR forecast indicates that this year the number of net additions will fall below 200,000 homes^{[\[footnote 2\]](#)}.

9. We are starting from a point that falls far short of the homes that are needed so we need to act decisively if we are to ramp up new supply. We are therefore boosting the overall target to a level that provides resilience, building capacity into the system to catch up. However, while we are clear that local planning authorities must use the output of the new standard method as their starting point for determining their housing requirement and must make all efforts to allocate land in line with it, there will be some places where it is not possible to meet that need, despite taking all possible steps, including optimising density, sharing need with neighbouring authorities, and reviewing Green Belt boundaries. Given that, we must build room into the formula, to account for the fact that we will not see a one-to-one relationship between targets and allocations.

Step 1 – Setting the baseline – providing stability and certainty through housing stock

10. Housing stock is more stable and predictable than household projections and does not vary significantly over time. Using stock will ensure that all areas, as a minimum, are contributing a share of the national total, proportionate to the

size of their current housing market. Basing the approach on stock also helps to reinforce development in existing urban areas, thereby ensuring that new homes can maximise existing infrastructure such as public transport, schools, medical facilities and shops.

11. We propose 0.8% of existing housing stock in each local planning authority as the baseline starting point. The most robust data source of stock levels is the annually published **Dwelling stock estimates by local authority districts** [\[footnote 3\]](#) **and the most recent data published at the time should be used.** On average, housing stock has grown nationally by 0.89% per year over the last 10 years. Using a figure of 0.8% therefore provides a level of increase in all areas that is consistent with average housing growth over time, a baseline which banks the average status quo level of delivery, to then be built on through affordability-focused uplifts.

Question 15

Do you agree that Planning Practice Guidance should be amended to specify that the appropriate baseline for the standard method is housing stock rather than the latest household projections?

Step 2 – Adjusting for affordability

12. High and rapidly increasing house prices indicate an imbalance between the supply of and demand for new homes, making homes less affordable. The worsening affordability of homes is the best evidence that supply is failing to keep up with demand.

13. The current method incorporates an adjustment for housing affordability, and we are proposing the new method continues to use affordability to adjust the stock baseline. This will be similar to the current approach, using **workplace-based median house price to median earnings ratio** [\[footnote 4\]](#), but with two specific changes.

14. First, we propose **increasing the significance of affordability** by revising the affordability adjustment. This would mean that the baseline stock figure is adjusted upwards in areas where house prices are more than four times higher than earnings: for every 1% above that 4:1 ratio, **the multiplier increases to 0.6%** (the current method multiplier is 0.25%). This will increase the importance of housing affordability in assessing needs which will help direct more homes to where they are most needed. Second, it is proposed that **average affordability over the three most recent years for which data is available** will be used. Using an average, rather than just the most recent datapoint, will help smooth out changes in affordability and will provide further stability and certainty in inputs and outputs of the method.

15. The proposed affordability adjustment is as follows:

$$\text{Adjustment Factor} = \frac{(\text{Three year average affordability ratio}) - 4}{4} \times 0.6$$

Accessible text version

$$\text{Adjustment Factor} = ((\text{Three year average affordability ratio}) - 4) / 4 \times 0.6$$

16. The workplace-based median house price to median earnings ratio is a nationally recognised and robust publicly available national statistic. It reflects the relationship between local house prices and earnings and is relatively stable over time. We have also considered how evidence on rental costs can be taken account of through the model. Although we have not proposed incorporating this into the model, we would welcome views on the appropriateness and feasibility of reflecting rental affordability alongside house price affordability in the model.

17. Unlike the previous method, **the new standard method does not have a cap applied to limit the level of increase for individual authorities.** Under the current method, numbers are capped at 40% above either the previous local plan figure or the projection-derived baseline. To significantly boost the supply of homes and address the past undersupply as quickly as possible, a significant change of approach is needed. An artificial cap of the levels of housing need does not align with these ambitions. In no longer applying a cap, the resultant housing need is the level of need that authorities should be planning to release land for, according to their specific circumstances.

18. **Removing the urban uplift.** This adjustment to the method was added in 2020, to increase the need figures for local planning authorities with areas which contain the largest proportion of population of one of the top 20 major towns and cities. There are two key issues with this. First, with the exception of London, the uplift is applied only to the local planning authorities in each city with the largest population; for example, in Manchester the uplift is only applied to Manchester City Council and not the whole urban area of Manchester. This is at odds with the ways that cities work: urban cores do not function in isolation from their hinterlands, but instead work as broader housing and employment markets, and that will increasingly be the case, as we extend further powers to city leaders and introduce formal strategic planning powers, as set out above. Second, focusing on a top 20 introduces an arbitrary cut off, with towns and cities important to our future growth, like Oxford and Cambridge, not on the list. For these reasons, we have developed a formula designed to raise ambition across a much longer list of urban authorities.

Proposed method formula:

$$LHN_t = Dwelling\ stock_{t-1} \times 0.8\% \times (1 + Adjustment\ Factor)$$

$$Adjustment\ Factor = \frac{(Three\ year\ average\ affordability\ ratio) - 4}{4} \times 0.6$$

Accessible text version

$$LHN_t = Dwelling\ stock_{(t-1)} \times 0.8\% \times (1 + Adjustment\ Factor)$$

$$Adjustment\ Factor = ((Three\ year\ average\ affordability\ ratio) - 4) / 4 \times 0.6$$

Question 16

Do you agree that using the workplace-based median house price to median earnings ratio, averaged over the most recent 3 year period for which data is available to adjust the standard method's baseline, is appropriate?

Question 17

Do you agree that affordability is given an appropriate weighting within the proposed standard method?

Question 18

Do you consider the standard method should factor in evidence on rental affordability? If so, do you have any suggestions for how this could be incorporated into the model?

Result of the revised standard method

19. The new formula drives a distribution that matches up to our ambition for all parts of the country.

a. An ambitious but credible target for London: the existing formula loads a third of all national need in London, with a target of nearly 100,000 homes per annum. This is nearly three times the existing level of delivery. While we must significantly ramp up numbers in the capital, setting a target that is removed from reality just shifts numbers away from areas where they can be delivered.

b. Supporting growth across the rest of the country: the new formula increases targets across all other regions relative to the existing standard method. Currently, large parts of the north and midlands are set targets well

below their existing delivery levels: in 37 local planning authorities housing delivery is at least double their targets. This does not make sense in a world where all but one local planning authority area has a house price to earnings ratio of more than four, putting a mortgage out of reach for the average earner. The new approach corrects this, increasing ambition across the board.

c. **Maximising delivery in urban areas:** the new formula increases targets by more than 30% across our Mayoral Combined Authorities, relative to the existing standard method. This better aligns with the ambition of our local leaders, and^[footnote 5] will maximise agglomeration benefits by increasing the contribution new housing makes to economic growth. This approach will also make the most of our transport hubs, support the objectives of brownfield-first and gently densifying urban areas, including building upwards where appropriate.

We will publish the outcome of the revised method on GOV.UK.

Question 19

Do you have any additional comments on the proposed method for assessing housing needs?

Chapter 5 – Brownfield, grey belt and the Green Belt

1. We have been clear that development must look to brownfield first, prioritising the development of previously used land wherever possible. To support this, we will make the targeted changes set out below, including making clear that **the default answer to brownfield development should be “yes”, as the first step on the way to delivering brownfield passports.**

2. But brownfield development alone will not be enough to meet our housing need. **To deliver the homes and commercial development this country needs, we are proposing the targeted release of grey belt land.** This government recognises the important role the Green Belt plays in preventing urban sprawl and remains committed to its continued protection - but we must review the post-war Green Belt policy to make sure it better meets the needs of present and future generations. Without altering the general extent or purpose of the Green Belt, our proposed changes will support local planning authorities facing acute housing and development pressures to meet their needs, while securing environmental improvements, affordable housing and other infrastructure upgrades communities care about.

3. Instead of the haphazard release we see under the status quo, release will be strategic and underpinned by clear safeguards. We propose to make changes to the NPPF to make clear that, where a local planning authority is unable to meet housing, commercial or other needs after fully considering all opportunities to make effective and efficient use of brownfield and wider opportunities, it should undertake a Green Belt review. This review should look to release poor quality grey belt land from the Green Belt through both plan-making and decision-making to meet local needs. This release will be subject to the sustainable development principles that underpin national planning policy, and to clear 'golden rules' as set out later in this chapter.

4. The Green Belt serves a specific planning purpose, in terms of preserving openness and preventing sprawl, but is not an environmental designation or a marker of any environmental importance. Much of it is inaccessible to the public and of poor ecological status. We want our proposal to not simply offset the loss of Green Belt land, but to bring about positive improvements for the quality and enjoyment of the environment. We propose a two-stage process for doing this. First, land that is safeguarded by existing environmental designations, for example National Parks, National Landscapes and Sites of Special Scientific Interest, will maintain its current protections. Second, any development on land released from the Green Belt must bring benefits, via not only mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain, but also through new rules that will secure improved access to good quality greenspace.

Being clear that brownfield development is acceptable in principle

5. We have been clear that brownfield land must be the first port of call. We want to make clear that the principle of development should not be in question on brownfield land, and so we are consulting on an amendment to paragraph 124c out of the current NPPF, reinforcing the expectation that development proposals on previously developed land are viewed positively. This makes clear that the default answer to brownfield development should be yes.

Question 20

Do you agree that we should make the proposed change set out in paragraph 124c, as a first step towards brownfield passports?

Making it easier to develop Previously Developed Land

6. The first step when reviewing Green Belt land should be Previously Developed Land (PDL): it makes no sense to provide special protections for sites that have, for example, housed petrol stations or car parks. For that reason, we propose that we relax the restrictions that are currently applied to PDL and limited infilling in the Green Belt in paragraph 154g of the current NPPF, to make clear that development is 'not inappropriate' where it would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt. The requirements of our golden rules, set out later in this chapter, are intended to apply to release of PDL.

7. We are also interested in whether it would be beneficial to expand the definition of PDL in the NPPF to include hardstanding and glasshouses. We want to understand how expanding this definition might affect the availability of horticultural land, so would welcome views on how to ensure that there remains sufficient incentive for the development and maintenance of glasshouses for horticultural production.

Question 21

Do you agree with the proposed change to paragraph 154g of the current NPPF to better support the development of PDL in the Green Belt?

Question 22

Do you have any views on expanding the definition of PDL, while ensuring that the development and maintenance of glasshouses for horticultural production is maintained?

Defining the grey belt

8. As set out above, we must look to a wider set of low-performing sites where this is necessary. We propose defining grey belt land as Green Belt land which makes a limited contribution to the Green Belt's purposes, as set out in paragraph 143 of the current NPPF. To maintain existing environmental protections, we propose excluding land of environmental value from the definition, or assets of particular importance, as set out in footnote 7 of the NPPF. We are interested in whether additional exclusions are necessary, such as areas identified in draft or published Local Nature Recovery Strategies, that could become of particular importance for biodiversity.

9. To support a **consistent and transparent approach to identifying land, we propose inserting a new definition of grey belt land into the glossary of the NPPF**. This will provide criteria for assessing whether land makes a limited contribution to the Green Belt purposes. This definition will read as follows:

Grey belt: For the purposes of Plan-making and decision-making, grey belt is defined as land in the Green Belt comprising Previously Developed Land and any other parcels and/or areas of Green Belt land that make a limited contribution to the five Green Belt purposes (as defined in para 140 of this Framework) but excluding those areas or assets of particular importance listed in footnote 7 of this Framework (other than land designated as Green Belt).

10. We are interested in whether further support is needed to assist authorities in judging whether land makes a limited contribution to the Green Belt purposes. We propose incorporating the following into the glossary appended to the NPPF but welcome views on the most effective way of providing this guidance: Land which makes a limited contribution to the Green Belt purposes will:

- a) Not strongly perform against any Green Belt purpose; and
- b) Have at least one of the following features:
 - i. Land containing substantial built development or which is fully enclosed by built form
 - ii. Land which makes no or very little contribution to preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another
 - iii. Land which is dominated by urban land uses, including physical developments
 - iv. Land which contributes little to preserving the setting and special character of historic towns

11. We have chosen to avoid prescribing specific and quantifiable measures of terms such as “substantial built development” at this point. However, we are interested in whether respondents believe more specific criteria or further guidance are needed.

12. We want this approach to protect land which makes a strong contribution to any Green Belt purposes, while allowing authorities to consider a range of Green Belt land based on its merits for potential development.

13. We want to ensure that our definition of grey belt land acts to accurately identify land with a high sustainable development potential, while also avoiding providing incentives to allow the degradation of existing Green Belt Land. We believe that defining the grey belt in terms of its contribution to the purposes should help to prevent this, but we are interested in whether additional protections or requirements are necessary.

14. We do not want our proposals to undermine existing protections for best and most versatile agricultural land. Our proposals do not remove the requirement for planning policies and decisions to recognise the benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and, where significant development of

agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality should be preferred.

15. We are clear that sustainability remains an overarching objective and that development in the grey belt should meet the expectations set out in the NPPF, around effective use of land and access to transport.

Question 23

Do you agree with our proposed definition of grey belt land? If not, what changes would you recommend?

Question 24

Are any additional measures needed to ensure that high performing Green Belt land is not degraded to meet grey belt criteria?

Question 25

Do you agree that additional guidance to assist in identifying land which makes a limited contribution of Green Belt purposes would be helpful? If so, is this best contained in the NPPF itself or in planning practice guidance?

Question 26

Do you have any views on whether our proposed guidance sets out appropriate considerations for determining whether land makes a limited contribution to Green Belt purposes?

Question 27

Do you have any views on the role that Local Nature Recovery Strategies could play in identifying areas of Green Belt which can be enhanced?

Land release through plan-making

Green Belt reviews

16. Under the existing NPPF, there is no requirement for local planning authorities to review Green Belt where they fall short of housing need. Instead, local planning authorities may choose to review and alter Green Belt boundaries where exceptional circumstances are fully justified. We propose correcting that, to **require local planning authorities to undertake a review where an authority cannot meet its identified housing, commercial or other need without altering Green Belt boundaries.**

A sequential approach

17. We remain clear that brownfield sites should be prioritised, and our proposed changes to developing PDL in the Green Belt (outlined above) reinforce this commitment. **To support release in the right places, we propose a sequential test to guide release.** This will ask authorities to give first consideration to PDL within in the Green Belt, before moving on to other grey belt sites, and finally to higher performing Green Belt sites where these can be made sustainable. As set out above, land that is safeguarded by existing environmental designations, for example National Parks, National Landscapes and Sites of Special Scientific Interest, will maintain its protections.

18. The aim of this approach is to ensure that low quality Green Belt is identified first, while not restricting development of specific opportunities which could be made more sustainable (for example, on land around train stations). This is in recognition that not all PDL or 'Grey Belt' will be in the most suitable or sustainable location for development. As such, it is right that local planning authorities are empowered to make decisions that best support the development needs and sustainability objectives of their area through the plan-making process. There is clear expectation that local planning authorities should seek to meet their development needs in full. However, we remain clear that the release of land should **not be supported where doing so would fundamentally undermine the function of the Green Belt across the area of the plan as a whole.** We propose changes to paragraph 147 of the NPPF to achieve this approach.

Question 28

Do you agree that our proposals support the release of land in the right places, with previously developed and grey belt land identified first, while allowing local planning authorities to prioritise the most sustainable development locations?

Question 29

Do you agree with our proposal to make clear that the release of land should not fundamentally undermine the function of the Green Belt across the area of the plan as a whole?

Allowing Development on the Green Belt through Decision Making

19. To ensure that in the short term we are best supporting the delivery of housing need, in advance of local planning authorities getting updated Local Plans in place and Green Belt reviews underway, we also propose changes that

support the release of Green Belt land outside the plan making process. We propose to insert a new paragraph in the NPPF which will make clear that, in instances where a local planning authority cannot demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply or is delivering less than 75% against the Housing Delivery Test, or where there is unmet commercial or other need, **development on the Green Belt will not be considered inappropriate** when it is on sustainable 'grey belt' land, where golden rules for major development are satisfied, and where development would not fundamentally undermine the function of the Green Belt across the area of the plan as a whole.

20. Our proposal limits release via this route to grey belt, including PDL — reaffirming our commitment to a plan-led system by maintaining restrictions on the release of wider Green Belt land. It would, as now, be possible for other Green Belt land to be released outside the plan-making process where 'very special circumstances' exist, but such cases would remain exceptional.

Question 30

Do you agree with our approach to allowing development on Green Belt land through decision making? If not, what changes would you recommend?

Supporting release of Green Belt land for commercial and other development.

21. In recognition of the important role commercial and other types of development play in supporting wider social and economic objectives, we propose supporting the release of Green Belt land to meet other development needs (alongside residential development) through both plan-making and decision-making routes. We have provided draft text illustrating how local planning authorities should consider the need for commercial and other development sites, making clear that golden rules should apply, but we welcome views on how to deliver the underlying objective of securing clear public benefits for non-housing development.

Question 31

Do you have any comments on our proposals to allow the release of grey belt land to meet commercial and other development needs through plan-making and decision-making, including the triggers for release?

Planning Policy for Traveller Sites

22. We intend our proposals to support the release of Green Belt Land to address unmet needs for traveller sites. We are therefore seeking views on how the proposals under the NPPF would apply to traveller sites, particularly concerning the sequential test to guide release, the definition of grey belt and PDL, and proposals that are considered not to be inappropriate development.

Question 32

Do you have views on whether the approach to the release of Green Belt through plan and decision-making should apply to traveller sites, including the sequential test for land release and the definition of PDL?

Question 33

Do you have views on how the assessment of need for traveller sites should be approached, in order to determine whether a local planning authority should undertake a Green Belt review?

Golden rules to ensure public benefit

23. The Government has committed to introducing 'golden rules' to ensure that major development on land released from the Green Belt benefits both communities and nature. This will build on our wider commitment for exemplary design, so that the following are required where land is released through plans or individual planning decisions:

- a. in the case of schemes involving the provision of housing, at least 50% affordable housing, with an appropriate proportion being Social Rent, subject to viability;
- b. necessary improvements to local or national infrastructure, including delivery of new schools, GP surgeries, transport links, care homes and nursery places, to deliver well-designed, connected places, recognising that local leaders are best placed to identify the infrastructure that their communities need; and
- c. the provision of new, or improvements to existing, local green spaces that are accessible to the public – where residential development is involved, new residents should be able to access good quality green spaces within a short walk of their homes, whether through onsite provision or through access to offsite facilities.

Delivering affordable housing

24. The Government is proposing a target of 50% affordable housing on land released from the Green Belt for residential development. The Government is committed to delivering more genuinely affordable housing tenures, such as Social Rent. However, we also recognise that for the purposes of place-making, a balance of tenures is required. For that reason, we propose that the tenure split across affordable housing delivered under the golden rules should be for local authorities to decide.

Question 34

Do you agree with our proposed approach to the affordable housing tenure mix?

Question 35

Should the 50 per cent target apply to all Green Belt areas (including previously developed land in the Green Belt), or should the Government or local planning authorities be able to set lower targets in low land value areas?

Delivering improved public access to green space

25. We are clear that release of 'grey belt' land must benefit communities and nature. We know that accessible green space is an integral part of making quality places so the **golden rules will include delivering access to good quality green spaces and nature**. We will bolster the environmental requirements that are already in place for new developments, such as Biodiversity Net Gain, by setting out additional requirements including an **objective for new residents to be able to access good quality green spaces within a short walk of their homes**.

26. We expect local planning authorities to specify clear policies on green space requirements in plans, for which they can draw on Natural England's Green Infrastructure Framework and the National Model Design Code. The former provides guidance on national standards for green infrastructure and latter provides detailed guidance on the production of design codes, guides and policies to promote successful design, including for green infrastructure and access to nature.

27. Where authorities do not have specific policies in place, we propose to make clear that schemes in the Green Belt must provide quality green space which reflects relevant nationally-recognised standards.

Question 36

Do you agree with the proposed approach to securing benefits for nature and public access to green space where Green Belt release occurs?

Green Belt land and Benchmark Land Values

28. Green Belt land can deliver more affordable housing, infrastructure and environmental contributions, as the value of the land in its existing use is generally low and the Green Belt designation reduces the hope value associated with the prospect of securing planning permission. However, we recognise that the contributions that can be secured from development will vary between areas, and between individual sites: some areas have lower house prices; some sites will have abnormal costs; Community Infrastructure Levy rates vary between those local planning authorities which charge it; and some sites may have a higher value in their existing use. For this reason, we believe that it is necessary to allow the limited use of viability assessments, where negotiation is genuinely needed for development to come forward, particularly in relation to affordable housing requirements. However, this cannot be an excuse to inflate landowner or developer profits at the expense of the public good.

29. Approaches that government could take to ensure the appropriate use of viability include the following options.

a. Government sets benchmark land values to be used in viability assessments. When assessing whether a scheme is viable, it is necessary to make an allowance for the amount of money to be paid to the landowner. This should currently be set by the local planning authority. Government could set indicative benchmark land values for land released from the Green Belt through national policy, to inform the policies developed on benchmark land value by local planning authorities. These should be set at a fair level, allowing for a premium above the existing use, but reflecting the need for policy delivery against the golden rules. Different approaches to benchmark land value are likely to be appropriate for agricultural land, and for previously developed land.

b. Government sets policy parameters so that where land transacts at a price above benchmark land value, policy requirements should be assumed to be viable. As part of this approach, Government sets out that if land has been sold (or optioned) at a price which exceeds the nationally set benchmark land value, viability negotiation should not be undertaken. Under this approach, the planning authority should not be seeking higher contributions (e.g. 60 per cent affordable housing), but equally the developer should not be seeking lower contributions (e.g. 40 per cent affordable housing), as this would represent a transfer of value from the public to private landholders. Therefore, planning permissions would not generally be granted for proposed developments where land transacts above benchmark land value, and cannot comply with policy.

c. Government sets out that where development proposals comply with benchmark land value requirements, and a viability negotiation to reduce policy delivery occurs, a late-stage review should be undertaken. This would build on the approach to be taken by the Greater London Authority, and tests actual costs and revenues against the assumptions made in the initial

viability assessment. If, for example, the development is more viable than initially assumed, due to a rise in house prices, then additional contributions can be secured, to bring the development closer to or up to policy compliance.

30. Benchmark land values are generally set as a multiple of agricultural use values, which are typically in the region of £20,000 - £25,000 per hectare, and as a percentage uplift on non-agricultural brownfield use values. We also note that views of appropriate premia above existing use values vary: for agricultural land, a recent academic paper^[footnote 6] suggested BLVs of three times existing use value; the Letwin Review of Build Out^[footnote 7] suggested ten times existing use value; Lichfields found that local planning authorities set BLVs of between 10- and 40-times existing use value^[footnote 8]. These BLVs do not necessarily relate to Green Belt land, which is subject to severe restrictions on development, and **Government is particularly interested in the impact of setting BLV at the lower end of this spectrum.**

31. The Government considers that limited Green Belt release, prioritising grey belt, will provide an excellent opportunity for landowners to sell their land at a fair price, while supporting the development of affordable housing, infrastructure and access to nature. Where such land is not brought forward for development on a voluntary basis, the Government is considering how bodies such as local planning authorities, combined authorities, and Homes England could take a proactive role in the assembly of the land to help bring forward policy compliant schemes, supported where necessary by compulsory purchase powers, with compensation being assessed under the statutory no-scheme principle rules set out in Part 2 of the Land Compensation Act 1961.

32. In such cases, these rules would operate to exclude any increases or decreases in value of land caused by the compulsory purchase scheme, or by the prospect of it, and valuation of the prospect of planning permission ('hope value') for alternative development would reflect the golden rules outlined in the NPPF. Use of compulsory purchase powers may also include use of directions to secure 'no hope value' compensation where appropriate and justified in the public interest. A comprehensive justification for a no hope value direction (e.g., which includes a high proportion of vital affordable housing being delivered) will strengthen the argument that a direction is in the public interest. This would align with the Government's aspiration for high levels of affordable housing to be delivered on these sites.

Question 37

Do you agree that Government should set indicative benchmark land values for land released from or developed in the Green Belt, to inform local planning authority policy development?

Question 38

How and at what level should Government set benchmark land values?

Question 39

To support the delivery of the golden rules, the Government is exploring a reduction in the scope of viability negotiation by setting out that such negotiation should not occur when land will transact above the benchmark land value. Do you have any views on this approach?

Question 40

It is proposed that where development is policy compliant, additional contributions for affordable housing should not be sought. Do you have any views on this approach?

Question 41

Do you agree that where viability negotiations do occur, and contributions below the level set in policy are agreed, development should be subject to late-stage viability reviews, to assess whether further contributions are required? What support would local planning authorities require to use these effectively?

Question 42

Do you have a view on how golden rules might apply to non-residential development, including commercial development, travellers sites and types of development already considered 'not inappropriate' in the Green Belt?

Question 43

Do you have a view on whether the golden rules should apply only to 'new' Green Belt release, which occurs following these changes to the NPPF? Are there other transitional arrangements we should consider, including, for example, draft plans at the regulation 19 stage?

Question 44

Do you have any comments on the proposed wording for the NPPF (Annex 4)?

Question 45

Do you have any comments on the proposed approach set out in paragraphs 31 and 32?

Question 46

Do you have any other suggestions relating to the proposals in this chapter?

Chapter 6 – Delivering affordable, well-designed homes and places

1. **This chapter seeks views on changes to planning policy to support affordable housing delivery.** We will deliver the biggest increase in social and affordable housebuilding in a generation. As part of our plan to do so, we are strengthening planning obligations to ensure new developments provide more affordable homes and supporting councils and housing associations to build their capacity and make a greater contribution to affordable housing supply through the changes proposed below.

2. **This chapter is also seeking views on changes to further reform the NPPF in line with the Government’s objectives for the planning system.** These include changes to promote mixed tenure development, community development, small sites, and design. These changes are designed to support our objectives of a more diverse housing market, that delivers homes more quickly and better responds to the range of needs of communities.

Delivering affordable housing

Improving the existing system of developer contributions

3. We want to deliver the much-needed affordable housing local communities need and the wider infrastructure that will mitigate the impacts of new development. We believe the best way to achieve this will be to focus on improving the existing system of developer contributions, which means the Government is not implementing the Infrastructure Levy as introduced in the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023. As part of this, we will look to set clear planning policy requirements on Green Belt land.

Delivering the right mix of affordable housing

4. The Government believes that local areas are best placed to decide the right mix of affordable housing for their communities, including a mix of affordable homes for ownership and rent. The NPPF already sets the expectation that when establishing housing requirements, local planning authorities consider the needs of different groups in the community. Currently, this does not include those who require Social Rent. Similarly, policy says that local policies should specify the type of affordable housing required, but does not specify tenure breakdown. To support our objectives around boosting delivery of Social Rent while leaving local planning authorities in the driving seat, we propose **setting an expectation that housing needs assessments explicitly consider the needs of those requiring Social Rent and that authorities specify their expectations on Social Rent delivery as part of broader affordable housing policies.** We expect that many areas will give priority to Social Rent in

the affordable housing mix they seek, in line with their local needs, and this is something we strongly support, but we will not be prescriptive; it is for local leaders to determine the balance that meets the needs of their communities.

5. In line with this, we propose removing the prescriptive requirements relating to affordable home ownership products. Currently, home ownership products are prioritised over homes for affordable rent, with particular priority given to First Homes. We are clear that we must take steps to boost home ownership and the actions set out in this document will do just that – but the prescriptive prioritisation of these particular types of affordable housing in existing policy is not the right approach. It can force unhelpful trade-offs, especially in areas where, for example, Social Rent and Affordable Rent are most needed. For this reason, **we propose removing the requirement to deliver at least 10% of the total number of homes on major sites as affordable home ownership**, as set out in paragraph 66 of the current NPPF. **We also propose removing the requirement that a minimum of 25% of affordable housing units secured through developer contributions should be First Homes**, as set out in the ‘Affordable Homes Update’ Written Ministerial Statement of 24 May 2021. First Homes would remain a type of affordable housing and an option for delivery where local planning authorities judge this to be appropriate for local needs, including through First Homes exception sites and through s106 developer contributions, and we propose reflecting this in the NPPF Glossary definition of affordable housing. We are also proposing to remove Starter Homes from the same definition given First Homes was a replacement for this scheme.

Question 47

Do you agree with setting the expectation that local planning authorities should consider the particular needs of those who require Social Rent when undertaking needs assessments and setting policies on affordable housing requirements?

Question 48

Do you agree with removing the requirement to deliver 10% of housing on major sites as affordable home ownership?

Question 49

Do you agree with removing the minimum 25% First Homes requirement?

Question 50

Do you have any other comments on retaining the option to deliver First Homes, including through exception sites?

6. Delivering sites with a mix of tenures can provide a range of benefits, including creating diverse communities as well as supporting the timely build out of sites. This can include a mixture of ownership and rental tenures, including rented affordable housing and build to rent, as well as housing designed for specific groups such as older people's housing and student accommodation, and plots sold for custom or self-build.

7. To promote a delivery of mixed use sites, and the realisation of these benefits, we propose to introduce a new policy that expects local planning authorities to take a positive approach to them through both plans and decisions.

Question 51

Do you agree with introducing a policy to promote developments that have a mix of tenures and types?

Supporting majority affordable housing developments

8. While we want to promote a mix of tenures on developments, we also acknowledge that there will be circumstances where developments that are predominately (or exclusively) single tenure will be appropriate and should be supported. In particular, we want to make clear that development that delivers a high percentage of Social Rent (or other affordable housing tenures) should be supported.

9. We also know that predominately or exclusively affordable housing developments can raise concerns, given evidence around the benefits of mixed communities. Through this consultation we are seeking views on how to best promote sites of this type, while ensuring that adequate safeguards are in place that avoid unintended consequences (for example whether there is an appropriate maximum size for schemes of this nature). We are also seeking views on the best approach for supporting affordable housing developments within rural areas.

Question 52

What would be the most appropriate way to promote high percentage Social Rent/affordable housing developments?

Question 53

What safeguards would be required to ensure that there are not unintended consequences? For example, is there a maximum site size where development of this nature is appropriate?

Question 54

What measures should we consider to better support and increase rural affordable housing?

Meeting the needs of looked after children

10. The Government believes that every child should have a loving, secure home close to their communities. To achieve this Government priority, it is necessary to ensure that an appropriate amount and type of accommodation for looked after children, in the right locations, is planned for and provided. The Department for Education's definition of a looked-after child is: 'A child is looked after by a local authority if they are provided with accommodation for a continuous period of more than 24 hours (section 20 Children Act 1989) or are subject to a care order (defined in section 22(1) Children Act 1989).

11. To support the provision of this type of housing, we are proposing to include explicit reference to looked after children in paragraph 63 of the current NPPF, which sets out that the housing needs for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies. This amendment supports the written ministerial statement on planning for accommodation for looked after children made on 23 May 2023.

Question 55

Do you agree with the changes proposed to paragraph 63 of the existing NPPF?

Delivering a diverse range of homes and high-quality places

Strengthening support for community-led development

12. Community-led housing is delivered by community land trusts, housing co-operatives and other community-based groups seeking to help meet local housing need. By virtue of the support that it engenders from the local community, the community-led approach is often able to provide housing on sites that are unavailable to mainstream commercial housebuilders or are commercially unattractive.

13. Through the 2023 review of the NPPF, a number of amendments were made to enable planning authorities to support community-led housing. **We are proposing to strengthen those provisions by:**

a. including within the definition of 'community-led development' housing that is developed by a group originally set up for a purpose other than housebuilding;

and

b. removing the size limit for community-led exception sites, where an alternative limit is established through the development plan.

Question 56

Do you agree with these changes?

14. We are also seeking views on whether changes are needed to the definition of 'affordable housing for rent' in the Framework glossary to make it easier for organisations that are not Registered Providers, for example community-led developers and almshouses, to develop new affordable homes. This is intended to inform our approach to National Development Management Policies.

Question 57

Do you have views on whether the definition of 'affordable housing for rent' in the Framework glossary should be amended? If so, what changes would you recommend?

Making the small site allocation mandatory

15. Small and medium sized builders are essential to meeting our housing expectations and supporting local economies. They also build out the majority of small sites. Their business models often rely on identifying and securing small sites and building them out quickly. The Government is concerned that SME housebuilders are not able to access the small sites that they need, and that local planning authorities are not bringing forward small sites in their plans to the level set out in the NPPF.

16. We know that most authorities preparing plans have been unable to identify enough small sites to reach the current 10% NPPF local plan allocation expectation, and the Government is concerned this is hindering local SMEs ability to identify sites to bring forward, build out, and for their businesses to grow. We would like to gather views on why authorities are unable to identify 10% small sites, welcoming views on measures to strengthen small site policy through the NPPF, and in particular:

a. whether the 10% small site allocation should be required in all cases (removing the current caveat that there may be some places where strong reasons exist which mean this cannot be achieved);

b. what would be required to implement this more stringent approach, if pursued;

c. whether a definition distinguishing between small and medium sites would improve clarity; and

d. whether requiring authority-specific small-site strategies would help implement the 10% allocation.

Question 58

Do you have views on why insufficient small sites are being allocated, and on ways in which the small site policy in the NPPF should be strengthened?

Requiring “well designed” development

17. The NPPF was updated in December 2023 to include six additional references to the term ‘beauty’ and ‘beautiful’ when relating to well-designed development. This is further to five references to ‘beautiful’ places already set out within the September 2023 NPPF.

18. The Government recognises the importance of beauty in the built environment as an important objective of well-designed places. However, as recognised by previous consultees, including further references to ‘beauty’ and ‘beautiful’ may result in inconsistency in how it is applied in decision-making, as many find the term subjective and difficult to define. There is already a clear framework through policy and guidance on how to achieve well-designed places (as set out in the National Design Guide and National Model Design Code - NMDC), to enable this to be decided by local planning authorities, working together with developers and the community, which is accepted and understood by communities and the built environment sector.

19. We propose to **reverse the changes made in 2023 to the Framework that reference beauty and beautiful in relation to well-designed development.**

20. **We also propose to make small amendments to the changes made in 2023 to paragraph 138 of the existing Framework** to clarify the original intention for this wording to reflect that the National Model Design Code is now in widespread use and that the NMDC or where available local design guides and codes, prepared in line with the national guidance, is the primary means of assessing and improving the design of development.

Question 59

Do you agree with the proposals to retain references to well-designed buildings and places, but remove references to ‘beauty’ and ‘beautiful’ and to amend paragraph 138 of the existing Framework?

Supporting upward extensions

21. Paragraph 124(e) of the Framework was updated in 2023 to include detailed wording to encourage the development of mansard roofs as an

appropriate form of upward extension, to recognise their value in delivering urban intensification where appropriate.

22. The Government is in favour of such schemes. However, the current wording places a disproportionate emphasis on one type of upwards extension development.

23. To make very clear that national policy is strongly supportive of all upward extensions, including mansard roofs, we are consulting on amendments to paragraph 124(e). We propose to refer explicitly to mansard roofs within paragraph 124(e) as one appropriate form of upwards extension that national policy supports. We also propose to retain and amend current policy to ensure that a condition of simultaneous development should not be imposed on an application for multiple upward extensions of any type unless there is an exceptional justification, to generate the same level of support for upwards extensions for other schemes that it has for mansard roofs.

Question 60

Do you agree with proposed changes to policy for upwards extensions?

Question 61

Do you have any other suggestions relating to the proposals in this chapter?

Chapter 7 – Building infrastructure to grow the economy

1. The Chancellor's speech on 8 July set out the importance of ensuring the UK remained a stable place for business to invest. Alongside delivering 1.5 million new homes, it is essential that the planning system is reformed to build the infrastructure needed to power our economy for the future and support our forthcoming industrial strategy. It is vital that planning policies reflect our broad economic and infrastructure priorities, including supporting rapidly advancing commercial opportunities which will be the foundation of the UK's future: data centres, gigafactories and laboratories.

2. This chapter outlines how the proposed NPPF changes aim to help support investment and construction of key modernised industries to support economic growth. It also seeks views on whether to go further by reflecting these priorities in the NSIP regime. Given this regime is reserved for infrastructure projects of national significance, it is right to consider whether the definition of those projects remains fit for purpose given recent technological advancements and

industrial innovation. This would be one of the first steps in this government's plan to reform the NSIP regime to speed up delivery of critical infrastructure, ahead of further measures to be delivered through the Planning and Infrastructure Bill.

Building a modern economy

3. Alongside supporting housing, this NPPF is proposing changes to the planning system to drive greater commercial development in those sectors which will be the engine of the UK's economy in the future. Our proposed changes to the planning system are intended to provide particular support for the following key industries:

- a. Laboratories: access to laboratory space is essential to the UK's research and development activities, keeping the UK at the cutting edge of research-intensive sectors such as the life sciences. Scaling up the right lab space to meet growing needs in our world leading clusters is critical to economic growth. It attracts talent and underpins the development of many groundbreaking new discoveries such as precision medicines or quantum technologies.
- b. Gigafactories: battery cell manufacturing plants, commonly called 'gigafactories' (when capacity exceeds 1GWh of cells), are essential for the electric vehicle supply chain. By accelerating domestic battery making capacity, we will give our manufacturing sector the certainty it needs to flourish.
- c. Digital Infrastructure: digital infrastructure, including data centres, drive growth across the economy by connecting businesses and public services thereby enabling them to be more efficient and productive. A data centre is a facility hosting networked computer servers that store and process data at scale, enables AI deployment and hosts all cloud-based data. Data centres produce an estimated £4.6bn in revenue each year in the UK (2021) and are forecast to support a UK tech sector worth an additional £41.5bn and 678,000 jobs by 2025.
- d. Freight and Logistics: this sector is fundamental to the UK's economic growth and productivity, contributing £84.9 billion in Gross Value Added each year^[footnote 9] and employing nearly 1.2 million people^[footnote 10]. The freight and logistics sector depends upon a national network of storage and distribution infrastructure to enable local, regional, national and international operations.

Changes to the NPPF to support these modern economies

4. To support these key growth industries and others, **we are proposing updates to existing paragraphs 86b) and 87 of the existing NPPF.**

5. The proposed changes to paragraph 86 b) seek to ensure the planning system meets the needs of a modern and changing economy, by making it easier to build laboratories, gigafactories, data centres and digital infrastructure, and the facilities needed to support the wider supply chain. The proposed changes would create a positive expectation that suitable sites for these types of modern economy uses are identified in local plans.

6. The additions proposed to existing paragraph 87 of the NPPF apply to both plan making and planning decisions, and set more explicit expectations about the commercial requirements that require particular recognition.

a. The proposed changes in paragraph 87 a) aim to further support the development of knowledge, creative, high technology and data-driven sectors, by giving more explicit recognition of the need to support proposals for new or upgraded facilities and infrastructure (including data centres and electricity network grid connections) that are key to the growth of these industries.

b. We are proposing wording in paragraph 87 b) to ensure supply chains, transport innovation and decarbonisation are considered, in terms of the locational requirements of the storage and distribution sectors. These proposals aim to support the growth of the freight and logistics sector by encouraging decarbonisation, adaptation to changing patterns of global trade, and adoption of new and emerging technologies across its transport, distribution and storage operations.

c. New wording proposed in paragraph 87 c) aims to support the expansion or modernisation of other key growth industries by consulting on an expectation that additional commercial sites (outside of those identified in paragraphs 87 a) and 87 b)) are identified in plans and positively considered in planning decisions, when they are of local, regional or national importance, and to further support economic growth and resilience.

Question 62

Do you agree with the changes proposed to paragraphs 86 b) and 87 of the existing NPPF?

Question 63

Are there other sectors you think need particular support via these changes? What are they and why?

7. We propose deleting existing NPPF footnote 44, given the Industrial Strategy of the previous government is now out of date.

Directing data centres, gigafactories, and laboratories into the NSIP consenting regime process

8. In addition to the change of wording proposed above, we want to test whether the Government should go further by enabling digital infrastructure projects to opt into the NSIP regime.

9. Where proposed projects are within the main fields of infrastructure covered in the Planning Act 2008 (namely energy, transport, water, waste water, waste), but below the thresholds set out in the 2008 Act, the relevant Secretary of State may, on request, direct a project into the regime under section 35 of the Act. Section 35 was amended in 2013 so that certain business and commercial developments (prescribed under regulations) such as offices, sports, leisure, and tourism, which are of a substantial size or have significant economic impact or are important for driving growth, could be directed (on request) into the regime (subject to conditions).

10. To support the proposed changes to paragraphs 86 b) and 87 in the NPPF set out in this Chapter, there is the potential for data centres, gigafactories and laboratories to be prescribed as a type of business and commercial NSIP and be directed into the NSIP consenting regime through section 35 direction, on request and subject to certain conditions.

Question 64

Would you support the prescription of data centres, gigafactories, and/or laboratories as types of business and commercial development which could be capable (on request) of being directed into the NSIP consenting regime?

Question 65

If the direction power is extended to these developments, should it be limited by scale, and what would be an appropriate scale if so?

Question 66

Do you have any other suggestions relating to the proposals in this chapter?

Chapter 8 – Delivering community needs

1. Meeting community needs goes beyond providing homes and jobs. Our society needs to be supported by a range of services and facilities to be sustainable, and to support healthy living. The Government's manifesto highlighted a number of current issues, ranging from overcrowding in prisons to a lack of access to affordable childcare. In turn, creating healthy communities has a role to play in reducing the burden upon public infrastructure, and as part

of this the Government is committed to promoting active travel and tackling childhood obesity.

2. This chapter seeks views on changes to the NPPF to support the provision of public infrastructure and to create sustainable, healthy communities.

Public infrastructure

3. There is a pressing need to improve the provision and modernisation of key public services infrastructure such as hospitals and criminal justice facilities. In recognition of that, we propose to add to the wording in NPPF paragraph 100 to make clear that significant weight should be placed on the importance of facilitating new, expanded, or upgraded public service infrastructure when considering proposals for development.

Question 67

Do you agree with the changes proposed to paragraph 100 of the existing NPPF?

4. The Government recognises that to support the delivery of a modern economy we need to establish a workforce equipped with the skills necessary for the future. Ensuring the availability of a sufficient choice of post-16 education places has an important role to play in this. We are therefore proposing to incorporate reference to post-16 places to paragraph 99 of the existing NPPF to support the delivery of this type of education provision.

5. Furthermore, the Government recognises that access to affordable childcare is important for parents seeking to rejoin the workforce, and our manifesto committed to opening an additional 3,000 nurseries to support this objective. High-quality early education is also crucial to transforming the life chances of children. To support this commitment and the provision of childcare facilities, we are proposing to include reference to early year places to paragraph 99 of the existing NPPF.

Question 68

Do you agree with the changes proposed to paragraph 99 of the existing NPPF?

A 'vision-led' approach to transport planning

6. Our transport infrastructure plays a vital role in creating sustainable communities and supporting economic growth. The NPPF sets out that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stage of plan-making and development proposals, to ensure that impacts are recognised and addressed.

7. At present, planning for travel too often follows a simplistic 'predict and provide' pattern, with insufficient regard for the quality of places being created or whether the transport infrastructure which is planned is fully justified. Challenging the default assumption of automatic traffic growth, where places are designed for a 'worst case' peak hour scenario, can drive better outcomes for residents and the environment. It means working with residents, local planning authorities and developers to set a vision for how we want places to be, and designing the transport and behavioural interventions to help us achieve this vision. This approach is known as 'vision-led' transport planning and, unlike the traditional 'predict and provide' approach, it focuses on the outcomes desired, and planning for achieving them. To support this approach, we are proposing to make amendments to paragraphs 114 and 115 of the existing NPPF. To support the implementation of this updated policy, we will publish updated guidance alongside the policy coming into effect.

Question 69

Do you agree with the changes proposed to paragraphs 114 and 115 of the existing NPPF?

Promoting healthy communities

8. The Government is committed to taking action on public health and reducing health inequalities. Local planning authorities are already able to develop policies to support local strategies to improve health and wellbeing, but there is considerable variation in the extent to which they do so. We want to consider ways in which the planning system can do more to support the creating of healthy communities. This includes tackling obesity, encouraging active travel and supporting a healthy childhood, such as through more consistent approaches to controlling hot food takeaways near schools. As part of this consultation, we are seeking views on whether and how national policy could provide greater direction and clarity on the promotion of health through local plans and planning decisions.

Question 70

How could national planning policy better support local authorities in (a) promoting healthy communities and (b) tackling childhood obesity?

Question 71

Do you have any other suggestions relating to the proposals in this chapter?

Chapter 9 – Supporting green energy and the environment

1. This chapter seeks views on revisions to the NPPF to increase support for renewable energy schemes, tackle climate change and safeguard environmental resources. Ensuring the transition to clean power will help boost Britain's energy independence, reduce energy bills, support high-skilled jobs and tackle the climate crisis. Boosting the delivery of renewable energy is also vital to meet the Government's commitment to reaching zero carbon electricity generation by 2030. Onshore wind and solar are cheap, efficient and quick to build technologies that are an important part of the energy mix. Between them, they account for over a half of renewable electricity generating capacity in the UK. We know that we will need more if we are to deliver on our clean power mission.

2. That is why this chapter also considers what changes should be made to the NSIP regime to meet our ambitions to deliver green energy, supplementing those that will be brought forward through the Planning and Infrastructure Bill. The NSIP regime provides a route to consent the largest renewable energy projects in the country. Nearly 60% of projects currently moving through the consenting system to decision are related to renewable energy. The Secretary of State for Energy recently consented to three large scale solar farms through this planning route - Gate Burton in Lincolnshire, Mallard Pass in Lincolnshire and Rutland and Sunnica in Suffolk and Cambridgeshire. They will collectively hold a capacity of around 1.35 GWs, which is enough to power almost 400,000 homes.

3. It is vital developers use the most efficient planning route to consent their energy projects so that we can make the UK a clean energy superpower. This is why we are consulting on whether technological advancements mean that we should change the thresholds at which projects can be considered nationally significant. Beyond this, we will legislate to make changes to accelerate existing processes, to speed up delivery of critical infrastructure. Through the Bill, we will simplify the consenting process for major infrastructure projects and enable relevant, new and improved National Policy Statements to come forward, establishing a review process that provides the opportunity for them to be updated every five years, giving increased certainty to developers and communities.

Supporting onshore wind

4. The Government has committed to radically increasing onshore wind energy by 2030. **On 8 July, the Chancellor announced that footnotes 57 and 58 to paragraph 163 of the existing NPPF, which placed additional tests on onshore wind schemes would no longer apply to decisions.** These tests meant proposals for onshore wind projects could only be considered acceptable if:

a. they were in areas allocated in a local or development plan or through Local Development Orders, Neighbourhood Development Orders and Community Right to Build Orders; and

b. the proposal had proven community support (unless brought forward by Neighbourhood Development Orders or Community Right to Build Orders).

5. In effect, this created a very high bar for consent to be granted; it led to very significant under-delivery of onshore wind schemes. The changes announced by the Chancellor seek to promote the delivery of onshore wind projects to meet the target set to double generation from onshore wind by 2030.

Bringing onshore wind back into the NSIP regime

6. The Chancellor's announcement on Monday 8 July included a commitment to consult on bringing onshore wind back into the NSIP regime. **To fulfil this commitment, this consultation therefore proposes that onshore wind is re-integrated into the NSIP regime.**

Question 72

Do you agree that large onshore wind projects should be reintegrated into the NSIP regime?

Supporting renewable deployment

Strengthening the NPPF

7. We are proposing amendments to existing paragraph 163 to direct decision makers to give significant weight to the benefits associated with renewable and low carbon energy generation, and proposals' contribution to meeting a net zero future. In doing so, this aims to increase the likelihood of local planning

authorities granting permission to renewable energy schemes and contribute to reaching zero carbon electricity generation by 2030.

8. Further amendments to paragraph 160 seek to set a stronger expectation that authorities proactively identify sites for renewable and low carbon development when producing plans, where it is likely that in allocating a site, it would help secure development.

9. Development of renewables may be proposed in sensitive areas which may include valuable habitats that provide carbon sequestration, including peatlands which are critical for mitigation and adaptation, and provide key habitats for biodiversity. While these changes seek to promote the delivery of renewable energy schemes, proposals would still be subject to the policy requirements set out in the framework alongside other environmental safeguards.

Question 73

Do you agree with the proposed changes to the NPPF to give greater support to renewable and low carbon energy?

Question 74

Some habitats, such as those containing peat soils, might be considered unsuitable for renewable energy development due to their role in carbon sequestration. Should there be additional protections for such habitats and/or compensatory mechanisms put in place?

Setting the NSIP threshold for solar generating stations and onshore wind

10. The Planning Act 2008 determines the threshold at which solar and onshore wind projects are considered Nationally Significant Infrastructure. When the Act was introduced it provided that consenting decisions in respect of solar and onshore wind projects with a generating capacity of more than 50 megawatts (MW) would be determined by the Secretary of State under the NSIP regime.

11. However, advances in technology since 2008 mean that solar panels are now more efficient, enabling a greater MW yield per site. Onshore wind turbines are now also larger and more powerful, with the capacity of contemporary turbines as much as two times greater than when the threshold was originally set. The costs of onshore wind and solar have fallen significantly and large scale onshore wind and solar projects are now estimated to be among the cheapest forms of electricity generation in the UK today^[footnote 11]. Under contemporary technological specifications, cheaper and smaller-scale onshore wind and solar projects are captured by the 50MW threshold.

12. The original intention behind the categorisation of certain projects as 'nationally significant' under the Planning Act 2008 was to identify the largest and most important projects and put them through the NSIP system rather than

the local Town and Country Planning system. With the changes in technology that have taken place since, many small or medium-sized projects now exceed the existing 'nationally significant' threshold. This can be a barrier to the accelerated and streamlined deployment of these two cheap electricity generating technologies at scales below what most people would consider to be nationally significant.

13. There is evidence to suggest that, in the case of solar, this is causing a market distortion. Analysis of the Renewable Energy Planning Database shows that a large proportion of ground-mounted solar capacity entering the planning system is being clustered at a capacity just below the current 50MW NSIP threshold. [\[footnote 12\]](#) This is corroborated by our engagement with the industry, which indicates that solar projects are under-sizing their capacity to avoid the increased costs and timelines associated with determination through the NSIP regime.

14. While these are not so significant as to be an absolute barrier, the capping of solar projects below the 50MW threshold implies that they are not proportionate to the size and scale of contemporary 50MW solar farms. On the other hand, there are a significant number of solar projects sized over 150MW that are being determined via the NSIP regime. This implies that the economies of scale for these projects are such that the greater co-ordination of consents that the NSIP regime allows remains attractive.

15. Given that evidence, we are proposing to:

a. set the threshold at which onshore wind projects are determined as Nationally Significant at 100MW; and

b. increase the threshold at which solar projects are determined as Nationally Significant to 150MW.

16. This could ensure that projects are required to follow a proportionate process to secure consent. Potentially allowing projects that fall beneath these thresholds to move through the local planning system, given they are less complex and geographically spread out, could result in faster consenting, and at lower cost. By increasing these thresholds to a level that more accurately reflects contemporary deployment of projects that can be considered 'large-scale' and 'nationally significant,' due to their scale or complexity, those projects can truly benefit from the economies of scale which the NSIP regime was designed to facilitate .

Question 75

Do you agree that the threshold at which onshore wind projects are deemed to be Nationally Significant and therefore consented under the NSIP regime should be changed from 50 megawatts (MW) to 100MW?

Question 76

Do you agree that the threshold at which solar projects are deemed to be Nationally Significant and therefore consented under the NSIP regime should be changed from 50MW to 150MW?

Question 77

If you think that alternative thresholds should apply to onshore wind and/or solar, what would these be?

Tackling climate change

17. Climate change is one of the greatest challenges facing the world today, and the planning system can play a powerful role in helping to mitigate and adapt to its effects. The steps that we have taken to unblock onshore wind development, and the proposals in this consultation to do more to support renewable energy more generally, are just one part of the change required to fulfil planning's potential.

18. We are keen to understand the range of ways in which stronger action can be taken. We also know that putting our climate ambitions into practice is likely to pose some technical challenges: for example, the response to the NPPF consultation launched in December 2022 showed significant support in principle for the use of carbon assessments, but also raised questions about its delivery. We would like to use this consultation to gather further views on how climate change can be reflected in strengthened policy.

19. A key aspect of climate change adaptation is managing the increasing risks posed by flood events, whether at the coast or inland. We have heard that aspects of current planning policy for flood risk could be clearer or more proportionate, and so would welcome views on potential improvements.

Question 78

In what specific, deliverable ways could national planning policy do more to address climate change mitigation and adaptation?

Question 79

What is your view of the current state of technological readiness and availability of tools for accurate carbon accounting in plan-making and planning decisions, and what are the challenges to increasing its use?

Question 80

Are any changes needed to policy for managing flood risk to improve its effectiveness?

Question 81

Do you have any other comments on actions that can be taken through planning to address climate change?

Availability of agricultural land for food production

20. In December 2023, a footnote was added that made the availability of agricultural land for food production an explicit consideration in determining if sites are appropriate for development. This added to the existing NPPF expectation that planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Best and most versatile land is defined as grades 1-3a in the agricultural land classification.

21. We have been clear that food security is important for our national security, and that safeguarding Best and Most Versatile agricultural land is an important consideration. Prior to this addition national policy was already clear that, where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality. This safeguard is important to retain, but it is less clear that December's additional text provided a material benefit – especially as it gives no indication of how authorities are to assess and weigh the availability of agricultural land when making planning decisions. To avoid uncertainty, we are therefore proposing to remove the text added to this footnote in December 2023.

22. We therefore propose removing the following text from the footnote: “The availability of agricultural land used for food production should be considered, alongside other policies in this Framework, when deciding what sites are most appropriate for development.”

Question 82

Do you agree with removal of this text from the footnote?

Question 83

Are there other ways in which we can ensure that development supports and does not compromise food production?

National Landscapes

23. National Landscapes is the new name for legally designated Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, AONBs. The draft NPPF has been amended to reflect this new terminology.

Supporting water resilience

24. There is a growing gap in our water supplies that will rise to five billion litres a day by 2050.^[footnote 13] Immediate action is required to make sure we are able to fill this gap. A twin track approach to improving water supply resilience is required. This involves action to reduce water company leaks and improve water efficiency, and delivering new water resources infrastructure, such as reservoirs.

Improving the current thresholds for water resources developments in the NSIP regime

25. We are considering how we can provide water undertakers with greater certainty on the planning route for their new strategic water infrastructure, to support faster delivery, helping to address the issues we are increasingly seeing with water scarcity and quality. We are aware that areas of the Planning Act 2008^[footnote 14] in relation to water infrastructure projects could be amended to ensure projects of national importance are captured within the NSIP regime.

26. We believe that the Planning Act 2008 could be amended to bring into the definition of NSIP:

- a. water infrastructure projects that are designed to be used intermittently but provide significant peak water supplies during droughts;
- b. the construction, maintenance or operation of water infrastructure by a third party on behalf of a water undertaker;
- c. water recycling, which will be an important option for securing water supplies and one that is commonly used around the world;^[footnote 15] and
- d. infrastructure which transfers treated drinking water.

Question 84

Do you agree that we should improve the current water infrastructure provisions in the Planning Act 2008, and do you have specific suggestions for how best to do this?

Question 85

Are there other areas of the water infrastructure provisions that could be improved? If so, can you explain what those are, including your proposed changes?

Question 86

Do you have any other suggestions relating to the proposals in this chapter?

Chapter 10 – Changes to local plan intervention criteria

- 1. This chapter seeks views on whether to update the local plan intervention policy criteria or to remove the criteria.** Local plans are critical to ensure the delivery of the homes, infrastructure and commercial development local communities need, while protecting and enhancing valued assets. The Government is committed to taking tough action to ensure authorities have up-to-date local plans in place, supporting local democratic engagement with how, not if, necessary development should happen. Where authorities fail, the law provides powers for the Government to take action to ensure that plans are progressed and are in place.
- 2. Currently, decisions on intervention are made in line with relevant legal provisions and on the basis of intervention policy criteria set out in 2017 Housing White Paper.** These criteria have been used on several occasions over the past seven years.
- 3. We are considering updating them to better align with Government's priorities for planning to be a key driver for growth.** We want future intervention action to be swift and proportionate; justified by the local circumstances. We want to ensure that the Secretary of State has the flexibility, in a range of possible scenarios, to ensure that communities around the country can benefit from the positive changes that local plans provide.

Removal of the local plan intervention policy criteria

- 4. The existing intervention powers, set out in Part 2 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 ("the 2004 Act") were carried over from the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.** These powers existed for at least 27

years without accompanying policy criteria. The current legal provisions contain tests that apply in certain circumstances.

5. For example, Section 27(1) of the 2004 Act sets out that intervention action may be taken if the Secretary of State thinks that a local planning authority is failing or omitting to do anything it is necessary for it to do in connection with the preparation, revision, or adoption of a development plan document.

6. If the policy criteria were to be withdrawn and not replaced, Ministers would approach any future decisions on intervention with substance, rigour, and an open mind, and in the context of relevant legal tests. Local planning authorities would also be given the opportunity to set out any exceptional circumstances that might be relevant.

Revision of the local plan intervention policy criteria

7. An alternative option would be to revise the policy criteria. Under this scenario, the following proposed new policy criteria would apply in addition to the legal tests set out in the 2004 Act.

8. Local planning authorities that fail to do what is required to get their plan in place, or keep it up to date, would be at risk of government intervention. A range of intervention options exist, from the issuing of plan-making directions through to the removal of plan-making powers, where the Secretary of State would arrange for a plan to be prepared in consultation with local people, and then brought into force. Decisions on intervention should have regard to:

a. local development needs; b. sub regional, regional, and national development needs; or c. plan progress.

The Secretary of State will give planning authorities an opportunity to put forward any exceptional circumstances in relation to intervention action.

9. Should these criteria be confirmed, they would be applied flexibly. They would be matters to which the Secretary of State would “have regard”, along with any other material considerations. The relative weight afforded to the different criteria would be determined by the Secretary of State, depending on the circumstances of the relevant area, and aligned with relevant statutory powers and obligations.

10. These proposed criteria would be applicable to decisions taken under intervention powers set out in sections 21, 26, 27, 27A and 28A of the 2004 Act. They would also apply to decisions on local plan and minerals and waste plan intervention taken under sections 15GA, 15H, 15HA, 15HB, 15HD, 15I of the 2004 Act (when amended by the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023).

Question 87

Do you agree that we should we replace the existing intervention policy criteria with the revised criteria set out in this consultation?

Question 88

Alternatively, would you support us withdrawing the criteria and relying on the existing legal tests to underpin future use of intervention powers?

Chapter 11 – Changes to planning application fees and cost recovery for local authorities related to Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects

1. This chapter seeks views on whether to raise planning application fees, and whether to introduce statutory cost recovery for local planning authorities for their role in applications for development consent under the NSIP regime.

Changes to planning application fees

2. Local planning authorities need to be appropriately resourced to provide a high-quality planning service and timely planning decisions to support the Government's priorities for economic growth, infrastructure and housing delivery. Planning application fees provide income to local planning authorities to support the delivery of their development management service. They are set nationally and, taking one year with another, are not permitted to exceed the cost to a local planning authority to process and determine a planning application. Local planning authorities are expected to spend these fees on delivering their development management services.

3. **Current planning fee levels do not generate enough income to cover the full cost of some planning applications.** In December 2023, planning application fees were increased by 35% for major applications and 25% for all other applications. Despite this increase, it is estimated that there remains an overall funding shortfall for local planning authority development management services of £262 million, based on the most recent local government spending data.

4. Those applications with the greatest shortfalls account for the majority of applications received by local planning authorities. For example, householder applications account for 52% of all planning applications received by local planning authorities. The fee for householder applications is £258 per application, but based on the evidence this is not sufficient to cover the full costs in most cases. In comparison, the fees for major applications, which account for 3% of all applications received, are estimated to broadly meet cost recovery levels. Overall, it is estimated that 80% of planning applications received account for only 20% of fee income. This leaves many local planning authorities, particularly those who receive few large major applications, vulnerable to large funding shortfalls.

5. We want to reduce this funding shortfall by ensuring that planning application fees cover the estimated costs to local planning authorities of determining those applications. This would ensure that planning departments are better resourced and would support greater financial sustainability for local planning authorities by reducing the current pressure on wider council budgets, funded by the local taxpayer, that are relied upon by many authorities to cover funding shortfalls.

6. By increasing planning fees, it is expected that local planning authorities will have more of the resources they need to determine applications within the required statutory periods. This is essential in achieving our ambitions for housing delivery and economic growth.

7. If we proceed, we will monitor the performance of local planning authorities through the Planning Performance Dashboard and quarterly planning statistics and will review the planning performance designation regime to ensure that local planning authorities who are under-performing are held to account.

Proposed fee increase for householder applications

8. The current fee for householder applications is £258. However, we understand that the costs to local planning authorities to process these applications is significantly higher. This has an impact on the resourcing of local planning authorities, as for most, householder applications represent the greatest proportion of applications received. **We therefore propose that the fee for householder applications should be increased to meet cost recovery levels.** We estimate that, to meet broad cost recovery levels, householder application fees should be increased to £528.

9. Increasing the householder fee to estimated cost recovery levels would represent a high increase compared to previous increases. We recognise there is a balance to be struck between managing costs for applicants and reducing the funding shortfall for local planning authorities. A cost recovery level householder fee would still be low when compared to other professional fees associated with an application, and is estimated to represent less than 1% of the average overall costs of carrying out the development itself. Homeowners also benefit from a range of permitted development rights which allow

householders to improve and extend their homes without the need to apply for planning permission. We therefore suggest that the increased fee would not deter development or increase the likelihood of unauthorised development, but we would like to obtain views on whether a smaller increase to the householder fee (e.g. 50% increase) would be more appropriate.

10. It is anticipated that an increase in householder application fees could be delivered through affirmative regulations by the end of the year, subject to available parliamentary time.

Question 89

Do you agree with the proposal to increase householder application fees to meet cost recovery?

Question 90

If no, do you support increasing the fee by a smaller amount (at a level less than full cost recovery) and if so, what should the fee increase be? For example, a 50% increase to the householder fee would increase the application fee from £258 to £387.

If Yes, please explain in the text box what you consider an appropriate fee increase would be.

Question 91

If we proceed to increase householder fees to meet cost recovery, we have estimated that to meet cost-recovery, the householder application fee should be increased to £528. Do you agree with this estimate?

Yes

No – it should be higher than £528

No – it should be lower than £528

No - there should be no fee increase

Don't know

If No, please explain in the text box below and provide evidence to demonstrate what you consider the correct fee should be.

Proposed fee increase for other planning applications

11. In addition to householder applications, other applications where the estimated costs to local planning authorities are greater than the fee received are applications for prior approval before exercising certain permitted development rights, section 73 applications for the variation or removal of conditions to a planning permission, and applications for the approval of details reserved by condition.

12. As part of the proposals for implementing the new section 73B route introduced in the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023 (to enable material variations to planning permissions), we have already consulted on the application fees for the new Section 73B route, as well as changing the fee for section 73 applications to align with this. The consultation included seeking views on increasing the fee for major applications due to the complexity of dealing with these types of application. We have completed initial analysis of the consultation responses on this proposal. The majority of respondents were broadly in support of setting a higher fee for section 73 applications and aligning this with the fee set for 73B applications for major development, reflecting the work entailed with dealing with these types of applications. To inform any final decision on this fee, we are working with the Planning Advisory Service to collect evidence from local planning authorities on the cost of dealing with these types of applications.

13. However, we are interested in views on other application types (excluding section 73 and section 73B applications) where we have been told the current fee does not cover the cost to the local planning authority of processing and determining these applications, and on what the fee should be. It would be helpful if evidence, through benchmarking of fees and costs, can be provided in support of your response.

Question 92

Are there any applications for which the current fee is inadequate? Please explain your reasons and provide evidence on what you consider the correct fee should be.

Fees for applications where there is currently no charge

14. There are some applications which are not currently subject to fees. These include listed building consents, consent to undertake relevant demolition in a conservation area, and works to trees that are protected because they are located in a conservation area or by a Tree Preservation Order. Fees are not charged for these applications, principally for the reason that owners cannot opt out of these designations and such designations confer burdens with regard to preservation and maintenance that are in the public interest. However, each of these applications incurs costs to local planning authorities. They often require additional publicity, and consideration by technical experts such as heritage and conservation or tree officers. This cost burden is felt most strongly in local planning authorities with a high proportion of these applications.

15. We are interested in views on whether a fee should be charged for any of these applications, or any other applications which do not currently charge a fee. This could be to cover the full cost or a small flat administration fee only to cover the administration, consultation and publicity costs of applications.

Question 93

Are there any application types for which fees are not currently charged but which should require a fee? Please explain your reasons and provide evidence on what you consider the correct fee should be.

Localisation of planning application fees

16. An increase in fees for householder applications and other applications would help boost local planning authority resourcing, but we know that nationally set fees do not always reflect the full costs for all local planning authorities.

17. Allowing local planning authorities to set their own fees would enable authorities to cover the actual costs specific to that authority in determining planning applications. It would also introduce greater accountability and transparency to the planning fees system, as local planning authorities would need to be able to demonstrate their charges are justifiable and based on cost.

18. However, we recognise that localisation of planning fees could lead to greater variance between local planning authorities, as well as complexity for applicants and the development sector, who may pay different fees for the same category of development for different local planning authorities. It would also place additional burdens on local planning authorities who would be required to publish and regularly review their own fee schedules.

19. Through this consultation we would like to seek views on two possible models for localisation of planning fees.

Model 1 – Full Localisation

20. Full Localisation assumes that fees would no longer be set nationally. Instead, all local planning authorities would have to set their own planning fees, within the existing fee categories and exemptions set by the Secretary of State. This would allow local planning authorities to set their own fee levels to achieve, but not exceed, cost recovery while providing some level of certainty over the different categories of development and general principles which apply to all applications.

Model 2 – Local Variation (from default national fee)

21. Local Variation would maintain a nationally set default fee but give local planning authorities the option to vary the fees within prescribed limits where they consider the nationally set fee does not meet their actual costs. Unlike full localisation, this model would not place a mandatory duty on all local planning authorities to set their own fees if they are content that the nationally-set fee will cover their costs, but would allow authorities who wish to set their own fees, within the existing fee categories and exemptions set by the Secretary of State,

to have discretion to do so. This could be for all fees, or just select fee categories if local planning authorities wish to be selective in which fees should be set locally.

22. Localisation of planning fees would require primary legislation to establish the broad enabling powers, through the Planning and Infrastructure Bill, subject to Parliamentary timings. We would then set out in regulations the principal requirements for local planning authorities, which would include establishing a charging schedule.

Question 94

Do you consider that each local planning authority should be able to set its own (non-profit making) planning application fee?

Please give your reasons in the text box below.

Question 95

What would be your preferred model for localisation of planning fees?

Full Localisation – Placing a mandatory duty on all local planning authorities to set their own fee.

Local Variation – Maintain a nationally-set default fee and giving local planning authorities the option to set all or some fees locally.

Neither

Don't Know

Please give your reasons in the text box below.

Increasing fees to fund wider planning services

23. Currently planning fees can only be charged at a level which covers the cost to a local planning authority in determining planning applications. However, there are wider planning services, for example plan-making and enforcement, heritage and conservation and design services, for which no fees are charged. These services therefore have to be funded through other council budgets. The costs to delivering these wider services was estimated to be approximately £384 million in 2022-2023.

24. It is estimated that to cover the costs of the wider planning services all existing planning fees would need to increase by 157%. Increasing planning fees, whether set centrally or through local fee setting, to a level above the costs of determining planning applications to fund wider planning services would require primary legislation.

25. Increasing planning fees to cover the costs of other planning services would provide additional income for local planning authorities but would result in much

higher fees which could risk deterring some development. It could also be argued that wider planning services represent a public service that should be paid for by other council budgets, funded by the taxpayer, not by individual applicants.

26. We are interested in views on the principle of allowing planning fees to fund wider planning services and if so, what would an appropriate increase be and should this apply to all applications or, for example, just applications for major development. We are also interested in views on what functions within the wider planning services could be funded through planning fees.

Question 96

Do you consider that planning fees should be increased, beyond cost recovery, for planning applications services, to fund wider planning services?

If yes, please explain what you consider an appropriate increase would be and whether this should apply to all applications or, for example, just applications for major development?

Question 97

What wider planning services, if any, other than planning applications (development management) services, do you consider could be paid for by planning fees?

Cost recovery for local authorities related to NSIP

27. Hosting and neighbouring local authorities play an important role in the development consent order process, which is critical to building infrastructure to grow the economy (see Chapter 7). Although development consent order decisions are not made by local planning authorities, they play a crucial role in the development consent order process. Their role is critical to enabling government objectives for infrastructure to be delivered in a way which takes account of local impacts and context. Applicants are required to consult local planning authorities under section 42 of the Planning Act 2008, and authorities help to secure effective connections to local infrastructure, identify and mitigate local impacts, and address the impact of construction and operation of major projects on local communities and the environment. Local authorities are often responsible for monitoring and enforcing Development Consent Order requirements and provisions and any relevant section 106 infrastructure obligations.

28. Evidence from local authorities has highlighted that engagement with the development consent process can be time-consuming and resource intensive. Local authorities do not currently have a statutory power to charge fees for their services in relation to applications for development consent orders, and have limited capacity to resource the work needed to support the development proposals that understand and respond to local needs and issues. While local authorities can seek to negotiate planning performance agreements with applicants, which can provide funding for an agreed level of service, these can be uncertain and lead to lengthy negotiations which can slow an authority's ability to resource work in a timely and effective way.

29. Under section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 applicants are required to consult those local authorities listed under section 43 of the Act on proposed applications for development consent under the NSIP regime. This includes host local authorities (both upper and lower tier authorities), districts and unitary authorities which border a host district or unitary authority, and upper tier authorities which border a host upper tier or unitary authority. These are sometimes referred to as ABCD authorities (under section 43 of the Act, authorities are referred to as A, B, C or D authorities; further guidance has been provided by the Planning Inspectorate^[footnote 16]). Additionally, under section 120 of the Act an order granting development consent may impose requirements in connection with the development. This may include requirements to obtain the approval of the Secretary of State or 'any other person' (which includes local planning authorities). In practice, responsibility for the work done for approval (or discharge of requirements) is often undertaken by local authorities.

30. Under section 54A of the Act, the Secretary of State may make regulations for public authorities to charge fees in relation to any advice, information or other assistance provided in connection with applications or proposed applications for development consent orders or any other prescribed matter relating to NSIP. The Infrastructure Planning (Fees) (Amendment) Regulations 2024 inserted Regulation 12A into the Infrastructure Planning (Fees) Regulations 2010 (as amended). This enables a limited number of prescribed public authorities (but not including local authorities) to charge fees for the provision of relevant services in connection with NSIP in accordance with a statement published on its website which sets out the fees and services (and subject to certain other procedural requirements).

31. We are considering whether to make provision to allow host upper and lower tier (or unitary) local authorities to be able to recover costs for relevant services provided in relation to applications, and proposed applications, for development consent under the Planning Act 2008, using the power at section 54A of the Act. This could enable host authorities to charge fees, payable by applicants, in relation to the relevant services they provide in relation to applications (and proposed applications) for development consent. This would particularly support them in their role as a statutory consultee and in relation to the discharge of requirements. We are interested in views on what limitations, if any, should be set in regulations or through guidance in relation to local planning authorities' ability to recover costs (e.g. a

set amount or prescribed maximum for the fee, or limitations on what relevant services such fees could be recoverable for), and what the impacts of full or partial cost recovery are likely to be for local authorities and applicants.

32. We consider that fee charging, under section 54A, would be most appropriate for host lower and upper tier, or unitary, authorities ('B' and 'C' authorities under section 43 of the Act). As the impacts of individual proposals can vary significantly on a case-by-case basis, depending on the nature and location of the proposal, we consider that planning performance agreements remain the most appropriate mechanism for neighbouring authorities ('A' and 'D' authorities) to recover costs. In addition, we are considering whether host authorities should be able to waive fees where a planning performance agreement is in place, to provide a more flexible approach where this would be more appropriate based on the specific circumstances of an individual development proposal.

Question 98

Do you consider that cost recovery for relevant services provided by local authorities in relation to applications for development consent orders under the Planning Act 2008, payable by applicants, should be introduced?

Question 99

If yes, please explain any particular issues that the Government may want to consider, in particular which local planning authorities should be able to recover costs and the relevant services which they should be able to recover costs for, and whether host authorities should be able to waive fees where planning performance agreements are made.

Question 100

What limitations, if any, should be set in regulations or through guidance in relation to local authorities' ability to recover costs?

Question 101

Please provide any further information on the impacts of full or partial cost recovery are likely to be for local planning authorities and applicants. We would particularly welcome evidence of the costs associated with work undertaken by local authorities in relation to applications for development consent.

Question 102

Do you have any other suggestions relating to the proposals in this chapter?

Chapter 12 – The future of planning policy and plan making

- 1. This chapter sets out how local planning authorities should prepare local plans in response to this revised framework.** Our objective is to drive local plans to adoption as quickly as possible, to progress towards our ambition of achieving universal plan coverage and ensure plans contribute positively to our ambition of delivering 1.5m homes.
- 2. Local planning authorities should continue to progress their plans to adoption under the existing system without delay.** Authorities without an up-to-date plan should not stop work on a plan with the intention of preparing a plan under the new system. Authorities that have an up-to-date plan in place will be in the best possible position to steer growth in their area to areas supported by their communities and lay the foundations for a plan-led system.
- 3. We recognise the barriers to progress plan-makers have faced in recent years. To ensure that we achieve complete coverage of up-to-date plans as soon as possible we re-affirm our commitment to supporting local planning authorities in responding to these proposed policy changes and getting plans in place.** This might include targeted support for those required to rework plans at pace, or more tailored support to meet the individual circumstances of different places.

Transitional arrangements for emerging plans in preparation

- 4. We propose transitional arrangements to maintain the progress of plans at more advanced stages of preparation, while maximising proactive planning for the homes our communities need.** These will apply differently depending on what stage of preparation the plan has reached and the extent to which it is meeting the Government's housing growth aspirations. These transitional arrangements are set out in Annex 1 of the NPPF and outlined below.
- 5. To provide stability and certainty for plans at latter stages of scrutiny,** those plans at examination will continue to be examined under the version of the NPPF they were submitted under. However, if the revised LHN figure is more than 200 dwellings per annum higher than the annual housing requirement set out in the adopted version of the plan, upon introduction of the new plan-making system, the local planning authority will be required to begin preparation of a plan under the new system as soon as possible, or in line with any subsequent arrangements set out to manage the roll-out of the new system.

6. To help local planning authorities with advanced plans to proceed to examination at pace and support the Government's ambition to build more homes, those plans that have reached Regulation 19 publication stage but not yet been submitted for examination one month after the revised framework is published, with a gap of no more than 200 dwellings per annum between the local planning authority's revised LHN figure and its proposed housing requirement (as set out in the Publication version of the plan), should also progress to examination under the version of the NPPF it has used when preparing the plan thus far. [\[footnote 17\]](#)

7. However, those with a more significant gap of over 200 dwellings per annum between the local planning authority's revised LHN figure and the emerging housing requirement will need to revise its plan in line with the revised NPPF before submitting the plan for examination no more than 18 months after the publication of the revised NPPF. **We recognise that these arrangements would require some local planning authorities to undertake unforeseen additional work and reopen engagement with communities. Therefore, the Government will provide direct funding support to help these authorities progress their plans to examination quickly.**

8. All plans at earlier stages of preparation - (i.e. plans that have not yet reached Regulation 19 stage one month after the revised NPPF is published) - should be prepared against the revised version of the NPPF and progressed as quickly as possible.

9. Where there is an "operative" [\[footnote 18\]](#) Spatial Development Strategy (SDS) in place that is less than 5 years old, the SDS will continue to provide the housing requirement for relevant emerging local plans.

10. Minor and technical amendments to the existing NPPF transitional arrangements have also been proposed to ensure accuracy.

Question 103

Do you agree with the proposed transitional arrangements? Are there any alternatives you think we should consider?

Further plan-making reforms

11. It is currently our intention to implement the new plan-making system as set out in the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act from summer or autumn 2025. We anticipate that all current system plans that are not subject to the transitional arrangements set out above will need to be submitted for examination under the existing 2004 Act system no later than December 2026. This, coupled with the transitional arrangements, represent a significant

extension to the previous proposals^[^19], with the potential to benefit plans that are at earlier stages of preparation, and providing more time for local planning authorities to reflect on the revised NPPF and progress positive plans that will stand up to scrutiny at examination. Further details of the Government's intentions around plan-making reform will be published in due course.

Summary

12. Through these proposed transitional arrangements, the intention is to provide absolute clarity to local planning authorities preparing local plans, making clear which version of the NPPF should be used for their preparation and examination, and to set out the overall direction of travel for further reform of the system so authorities can start to plan for this.

Question 104

Do you agree with the proposed transitional arrangements?

Future changes to the NPPF

13. National policy, like plans, needs to be accessible and user friendly. The creation of National Development Management Policies, the Act's digital reforms, supporting work to embed common data standards and the use of digital platforms all bring opportunities to improve the way that national policies are presented and used. For example, it would help local planning authorities producing digital local plans, and those using them, if national policies were in a format that enabled them to be accessed in an integrated way.

14. We therefore intend to explore the creation of a more accessible and interactive, web-based set of national policies (both in the form of National Development Management Policies and national policies for plan-making). PDF versions of policies would be retained for those who need them. As we develop our approach to revising national policy, taking into account the responses to this consultation, we will engage with the sector to inform our approach (e.g. through user research).

15. At present, National Planning Policy for Waste and Planning Policy for Traveller Sites sit alongside the NPPF. As part of the wider changes to national planning policy that would be required through implementing the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act – and in particular the creation of National Development Management Policies – we will consider how policies for these matters should

be set out in future, including which aspects need to form part of the suite of proposals for National Development Management Policies.

Question 105

Do you have any other suggestions relating to the proposals in this chapter?

Chapter 13 – Public Sector Equality Duty

1. We would like to hear about any potential impacts of any of the above proposals on businesses, or of any differential impact on persons with a relevant protected characteristic as defined by the Equality Act 2010 compared to persons without that protected characteristic, together with any appropriate mitigation measures, which may assist in deciding final policy approaches in due course.

Question 106

Do you have any views on the impacts of the above proposals for you, or the group or business you represent and on anyone with a relevant protected characteristic? If so, please explain who, which groups, including those with protected characteristics, or which businesses may be impacted and how. Is there anything that could be done to mitigate any impact identified?

Chapter 14 – Table of questions

Question 1: Do you agree that we should reverse the December 2023 changes made to paragraph 61?

Question 2: Do you agree that we should remove reference to the use of alternative approaches to assessing housing need in paragraph 61 and the glossary of the NPPF?

Question 3: Do you agree that we should reverse the December 2023 changes made on the urban uplift by deleting paragraph 62?

Question 4: Do you agree that we should reverse the December 2023 changes made on character and density and delete paragraph 130?

Question 5: Do you agree that the focus of design codes should move towards supporting spatial visions in local plans and areas that provide the greatest opportunities for change such as greater density, in particular the development of large new communities?

Question 6: Do you agree that the presumption in favour of sustainable development should be amended as proposed?

Question 7: Do you agree that all local planning authorities should be required to continually demonstrate 5 years of specific, deliverable sites for decision making purposes, regardless of plan status?

Question 8: Do you agree with our proposal to remove wording on national planning guidance in paragraph 77 of the current NPPF?

Question 9: Do you agree that all local planning authorities should be required to add a 5% buffer to their 5-year housing land supply calculations?

Question 10: If yes, do you agree that 5% is an appropriate buffer, or should it be a different figure?

Question 11: Do you agree with the removal of policy on Annual Position Statements?

Question 12: Do you agree that the NPPF should be amended to further support effective co-operation on cross boundary and strategic planning matters?

Question 13: Should the tests of soundness be amended to better assess the soundness of strategic scale plans or proposals?

Question 14: Do you have any other suggestions relating to the proposals in this chapter?

Question 15: Do you agree that Planning Practice Guidance should be amended to specify that the appropriate baseline for the standard method is housing stock rather than the latest household projections?

Question 16: Do you agree that using the workplace-based median house price to median earnings ratio, averaged over the most recent 3 year period for which data is available to adjust the standard method's baseline, is appropriate?

Question 17: Do you agree that affordability is given an appropriate weighting within the proposed standard method?

Question 18: Do you consider the standard method should factor in evidence on rental affordability? If so, do you have any suggestions for how this could be incorporated into the model?

Question 19: Do you have any additional comments on the proposed method for assessing housing needs?

Question 20: Do you agree that we should make the proposed change set out in paragraph 124c, as a first step towards brownfield passports?

Question 21: Do you agree with the proposed change to paragraph 154g of the current NPPF to better support the development of PDL in the Green Belt?

Question 22: Do you have any views on expanding the definition of PDL, while ensuring that the development and maintenance of glasshouses for horticultural production is maintained?

Question 23: Do you agree with our proposed definition of grey belt land? If not, what changes would you recommend?

Question 24: Are any additional measures needed to ensure that high performing Green Belt land is not degraded to meet grey belt criteria?

Question 25: Do you agree that additional guidance to assist in identifying land which makes a limited contribution of Green Belt purposes would be helpful? If so, is this best contained in the NPPF itself or in planning practice guidance?

Question 26: Do you have any views on whether our proposed guidance sets out appropriate considerations for determining whether land makes a limited contribution to Green Belt purposes?

Question 27: Do you have any views on the role that Local Nature Recovery Strategies could play in identifying areas of Green Belt which can be enhanced?

Question 28: Do you agree that our proposals support the release of land in the right places, with previously developed and grey belt land identified first, while allowing local planning authorities to prioritise the most sustainable development locations?

Question 29: Do you agree with our proposal to make clear that the release of land should not fundamentally undermine the function of the Green Belt across the area of the plan as a whole?

Question 30: Do you agree with our approach to allowing development on Green Belt land through decision making? If not, what changes would you recommend?

Question 31: Do you have any comments on our proposals to allow the release of grey belt land to meet commercial and other development needs through plan-making and decision-making, including the triggers for release?

Question 32: Do you have views on whether the approach to the release of Green Belt through plan and decision-making should apply to traveller sites, including the sequential test for land release and the definition of PDL?

Question 33: Do you have views on how the assessment of need for traveller sites should be approached, in order to determine whether a local planning authority should undertake a Green Belt review?

Question 34: Do you agree with our proposed approach to the affordable housing tenure mix?

Question 35: Should the 50 per cent target apply to all Green Belt areas (including previously developed land in the Green Belt), or should the Government or local planning authorities be able to set lower targets in low land value areas?

Question 36: Do you agree with the proposed approach to securing benefits for nature and public access to green space where Green Belt release occurs?

Question 37: Do you agree that Government should set indicative benchmark land values for land released from or developed in the Green Belt, to inform local planning authority policy development?

Question 38: How and at what level should Government set benchmark land values?

Question 39: To support the delivery of the golden rules, the Government is exploring a reduction in the scope of viability negotiation by setting out that such negotiation should not occur when land will transact above the benchmark land value. Do you have any views on this approach?

Question 40: It is proposed that where development is policy compliant, additional contributions for affordable housing should not be sought. Do you have any views on this approach?

Question 41: Do you agree that where viability negotiations do occur, and contributions below the level set in policy are agreed, development should be subject to late-stage viability reviews, to assess whether further contributions are required? What support would local planning authorities require to use these effectively?

Question 42: Do you have a view on how golden rules might apply to non-residential development, including commercial development, travellers sites and types of development already considered 'not inappropriate' in the Green Belt?

Question 43: Do you have a view on whether the golden rules should apply only to 'new' Green Belt release, which occurs following these changes to the

NPPF? Are there other transitional arrangements we should consider, including, for example, draft plans at the regulation 19 stage?

Question 44: Do you have any comments on the proposed wording for the NPPF (Annex 4)?

Question 45: Do you have any comments on the proposed approach set out in paragraphs 31 and 32?

Question 46: Do you have any other suggestions relating to the proposals in this chapter?

Question 47: Do you agree with setting the expectation that local planning authorities should consider the particular needs of those who require Social Rent when undertaking needs assessments and setting policies on affordable housing requirements?

Question 48: Do you agree with removing the requirement to deliver 10% of housing on major sites as affordable home ownership?

Question 49: Do you agree with removing the minimum 25% First Homes requirement?

Question 50: Do you have any other comments on retaining the option to deliver First Homes, including through exception sites?

Question 51: Do you agree with introducing a policy to promote developments that have a mix of tenures and types?

Question 52: What would be the most appropriate way to promote high percentage Social Rent/affordable housing developments?

Question 53: What safeguards would be required to ensure that there are not unintended consequences? For example, is there a maximum site size where development of this nature is appropriate?

Question 54: What measures should we consider to better support and increase rural affordable housing?

Question 55: Do you agree with the changes proposed to paragraph 63 of the existing NPPF?

Question 56: Do you agree with these changes?

Question 57: Do you have views on whether the definition of 'affordable housing for rent' in the Framework glossary should be amended? If so, what changes would you recommend?

Question 58: Do you have views on why insufficient small sites are being allocated, and on ways in which the small site policy in the NPPF should be strengthened?

Question 59: Do you agree with the proposals to retain references to well-designed buildings and places, but remove references to 'beauty' and 'beautiful' and to amend paragraph 138 of the existing Framework?

Question 60: Do you agree with proposed changes to policy for upwards extensions?

Question 61: Do you have any other suggestions relating to the proposals in this chapter?

Question 62: Do you agree with the changes proposed to paragraphs 86 b) and 87 of the existing NPPF?

Question 63: Are there other sectors you think need particular support via these changes? What are they and why?

Question 64: Would you support the prescription of data centres, gigafactories, and/or laboratories as types of business and commercial development which could be capable (on request) of being directed into the NSIP consenting regime?

Question 65: If the direction power is extended to these developments, should it be limited by scale, and what would be an appropriate scale if so?

Question 66: Do you have any other suggestions relating to the proposals in this chapter?

Question 67: Do you agree with the changes proposed to paragraph 100 of the existing NPPF?

Question 68: Do you agree with the changes proposed to paragraph 99 of the existing NPPF?

Question 69: Do you agree with the changes proposed to paragraphs 114 and 115 of the existing NPPF?

Question 70: How could national planning policy better support local authorities in (a) promoting healthy communities and (b) tackling childhood obesity?

Question 71: Do you have any other suggestions relating to the proposals in this chapter?

Question 72: Do you agree that large onshore wind projects should be reintegrated into the NSIP regime?

Question 73: Do you agree with the proposed changes to the NPPF to give greater support to renewable and low carbon energy?

Question 74: Some habitats, such as those containing peat soils, might be considered unsuitable for renewable energy development due to their role in carbon sequestration. Should there be additional protections for such habitats and/or compensatory mechanisms put in place?

Question 75: Do you agree that the threshold at which onshore wind projects are deemed to be Nationally Significant and therefore consented under the NSIP regime should be changed from 50 megawatts (MW) to 100MW?

Question 76: Do you agree that the threshold at which solar projects are deemed to be Nationally Significant and therefore consented under the NSIP regime should be changed from 50MW to 150MW?

Question 77: If you think that alternative thresholds should apply to onshore wind and/or solar, what would these be?

Question 78: In what specific, deliverable ways could national planning policy do more to address climate change mitigation and adaptation?

Question 79: What is your view of the current state of technological readiness and availability of tools for accurate carbon accounting in plan-making and planning decisions, and what are the challenges to increasing its use?

Question 80: Are any changes needed to policy for managing flood risk to improve its effectiveness?

Question 81: Do you have any other comments on actions that can be taken through planning to address climate change?

Question 82: Do you agree with removal of this text from the footnote?

Question 83: Are there other ways in which we can ensure that development supports and does not compromise food production?

Question 84: Do you agree that we should improve the current water infrastructure provisions in the Planning Act 2008, and do you have specific suggestions for how best to do this?

Question 85: Are there other areas of the water infrastructure provisions that could be improved? If so, can you explain what those are, including your proposed changes?

Question 86: Do you have any other suggestions relating to the proposals in this chapter?

Question 87: Do you agree that we should we replace the existing intervention policy criteria with the revised criteria set out in this consultation?

Question 88: Alternatively, would you support us withdrawing the criteria and relying on the existing legal tests to underpin future use of intervention powers?

Question 89: Do you agree with the proposal to increase householder application fees to meet cost recovery?

Question 90: If no, do you support increasing the fee by a smaller amount (at a level less than full cost recovery) and if so, what should the fee increase be? For example, a 50% increase to the householder fee would increase the application fee from £258 to £387.

If Yes, please explain in the text box what you consider an appropriate fee increase would be.

Question 91: If we proceed to increase householder fees to meet cost recovery, we have estimated that to meet cost-recovery, the householder application fee should be increased to £528. Do you agree with this estimate?

Yes

No – it should be higher than £528

No – it should be lower than £528

no - there should be no fee increase

Don't know

If No, please explain in the text box below and provide evidence to demonstrate what you consider the correct fee should be.

Question 92: Are there any applications for which the current fee is inadequate? Please explain your reasons and provide evidence on what you consider the correct fee should be.

Question 93: Are there any application types for which fees are not currently charged but which should require a fee? Please explain your reasons and provide evidence on what you consider the correct fee should be.

Question 94: Do you consider that each local planning authority should be able to set its own (non-profit making) planning application fee? Please give your reasons in the text box below.

Question 95: What would be your preferred model for localisation of planning fees?

Full Localisation – Placing a mandatory duty on all local planning authorities to set their own fee.

Local Variation – Maintain a nationally-set default fee and giving local planning authorities the option to set all or some fees locally.

Neither
Don't Know

Please give your reasons in the text box below.

Question 96: Do you consider that planning fees should be increased, beyond cost recovery, for planning applications services, to fund wider planning services?

If yes, please explain what you consider an appropriate increase would be and whether this should apply to all applications or, for example, just applications for major development?

Question 97: What wider planning services, if any, other than planning applications (development management) services, do you consider could be paid for by planning fees?

Question 98: Do you consider that cost recovery for relevant services provided by local authorities in relation to applications for development consent orders under the Planning Act 2008, payable by applicants, should be introduced?

Question 99: If yes, please explain any particular issues that the Government may want to consider, in particular which local planning authorities should be able to recover costs and the relevant services which they should be able to recover costs for, and whether host authorities should be able to waive fees where planning performance agreements are made.

Question 100: What limitations, if any, should be set in regulations or through guidance in relation to local authorities' ability to recover costs?

Question 101: Please provide any further information on the impacts of full or partial cost recovery are likely to be for local planning authorities and applicants. We would particularly welcome evidence of the costs associated with work undertaken by local authorities in relation to applications for development consent.

Question 102: Do you have any other suggestions relating to the proposals in this chapter?

Question 103: Do you agree with the proposed transitional arrangements? Are there any alternatives you think we should consider?

Question 104: Do you agree with the proposed transitional arrangements?

Question 105: Do you have any other suggestions relating to the proposals in this chapter?

Question 106: Do you have any views on the impacts of the above proposals for you, or the group or business you represent and on anyone with a relevant

protected characteristic? If so, please explain who, which groups, including those with protected characteristics, or which businesses may be impacted and how. Is there anything that could be done to mitigate any impact identified?

Chapter 15 – About this consultation

This consultation document and consultation process have been planned to adhere to the Consultation Principles issued by the Cabinet Office.

Representative groups are asked to give a summary of the people and organisations they represent, and where relevant who else they have consulted in reaching their conclusions when they respond.

Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal data, may be published or disclosed in accordance with the access to information regimes (these are primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA), the Data Protection Act 2018 (DPA), the EU General Data Protection Regulation, and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004).

If you want the information that you provide to be treated as confidential, please be aware that, as a public authority, the Department is bound by the Freedom of Information Act and may therefore be obliged to disclose all or some of the information you provide. In view of this it would be helpful if you could explain to us why you regard the information you have provided as confidential. If we receive a request for disclosure of the information we will take full account of your explanation, but we cannot give an assurance that confidentiality can be maintained in all circumstances. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on the Department.

The Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (MHCLG) will process your personal data in accordance with the law and in the majority of circumstances this will mean that your personal data will not be disclosed to third parties. A full privacy notice is included below.

Individual responses will not be acknowledged unless specifically requested.

Your opinions are valuable to us. Thank you for taking the time to read this document and respond.

Are you satisfied that this consultation has followed the Consultation Principles? If not or you have any other observations about how we can improve the process, please contact us via the [complaints procedure](https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/ministry-of-housing-communities-local-government/about/complaints-procedure) (<https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/ministry-of-housing-communities-local-government/about/complaints-procedure>).

Personal data

The following is to explain your rights and give you the information you are entitled to under the Data Protection Act 2018.

Note that this section only refers to your personal data (your name address and anything that could be used to identify you personally) not the content of your response to the consultation.

1. The identity of the data controller and contact details of our Data Protection Officer

The Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (MHCLG) is the data controller. The Data Protection Officer can be contacted at dataprotection@levellingup.gov.uk or by writing to the following address:

Data Protection Officer
Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government
Fry Building
2 Marsham Street
London
SW1P 4DF

2. Why we are collecting your personal data

Your personal data is being collected as an essential part of the consultation process, so that we can contact you regarding your response and for statistical purposes. We may also use it to contact you about related matters.

We will collect your IP address if you complete a consultation online. We may use this to ensure that each person only completes a survey once. We will not use this data for any other purpose.

Sensitive types of personal data

Please do not share [special category](https://ico.org.uk/for-organisations/guide-to-data-protection/guide-to-the-general-data-protection-regulation-gdpr/lawful-basis-for-processing/special-category-data/#scd1) (https://ico.org.uk/for-organisations/guide-to-data-protection/guide-to-the-general-data-protection-regulation-gdpr/lawful-basis-for-processing/special-category-data/#scd1) personal data or criminal offence data if we have not asked for this unless absolutely necessary for the purposes of your consultation response. By 'special category personal data,' we mean information about a living individual's:

- race
- ethnic origin
- political opinions
- religious or philosophical beliefs
- trade union membership
- genetics

- biometrics
- health (including disability-related information)
- sex life; or
- sexual orientation.

By ‘criminal offence data,’ we mean information relating to a living individual’s criminal convictions or offences or related security measures.

3. Our legal basis for processing your personal data

The collection of your personal data is lawful under article 6(1)(e) of the UK General Data Protection Regulation as it is necessary for the performance by MHCLG of a task in the public interest/in the exercise of official authority vested in the data controller. Section 8(d) of the Data Protection Act 2018 states that this will include processing of personal data that is necessary for the exercise of a function of the Crown, a Minister of the Crown or a government department i.e. in this case a consultation.

4. With whom we will be sharing your personal data

MHCLG may appoint a ‘data processor’, acting on behalf of the Department and under our instruction, to help analyse the responses to this consultation. Where we do

we will ensure that the processing of your personal data remains in strict accordance with the requirements of the data protection legislation.

5. For how long we will keep your personal data, or criteria used to determine the retention period.

Your personal data will be held for two years from the closure of the consultation, unless we identify that its continued retention is unnecessary before that point.

6. Your rights, e.g. access, rectification, erasure

The data we are collecting is your personal data, and you have considerable say over what happens to it. You have the right:

- a. to see what data we have about you
- b. to ask us to stop using your data, but keep it on record
- c. to ask to have your data corrected if it is incorrect or incomplete
- d. to object to our use of your personal data in certain circumstances
- e. to lodge a complaint with the independent Information Commissioner (ICO) if you think we are not handling your data fairly or in accordance with the law. You

can contact the ICO at <https://ico.org.uk/> (<https://ico.org.uk/>), or telephone 0303 123 1113.

Please contact us at the following address if you wish to exercise the rights listed above, except the right to lodge a complaint with the ICO: dataprotection@levellingup.gov.uk or

Knowledge and Information Access Team
Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government
Fry Building
2 Marsham Street
London
SW1P 4DF


7. Your personal data will not be sent overseas.

8. Your personal data will not be used for any automated decision making.

9. Your personal data will be stored in a secure government IT system

We use a third-party system, Citizen Space, to collect consultation responses. In the first instance your personal data will be stored on their secure UK-based server. Your personal data will remain on the Citizen Space server and/or be transferred to our secure government IT system for two years of retention before it is deleted.

-
1. Based on the sum of the annual average housing requirement across the entire plan duration, in the most recently adopted plan for each authority, including joint plans. Calculated using data provided to MHCLG from the Planning Inspectorate and local planning authorities.
 2. From the March 2024 OBR forecast which is published at UK level. If the proportion delivered in England remains the same as in recent years this would imply less than 200k new homes in England in 2024-25.
 3. [Dwelling stock \(including vacants\) - GOV.UK](https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/dwelling-stock-including-vacants) (<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/dwelling-stock-including-vacants>) (Table 125)
 4. [House price to workplace-based earnings ratio - Office for National Statistics](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/housing/datasets/ratioofhousepricetoworkplacebasedearningslowerquartileandmedian) ([ons.gov.uk](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/housing/datasets/ratioofhousepricetoworkplacebasedearningslowerquartileandmedian)) (<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/housing/datasets/ratioofhousepricetoworkplacebasedearningslowerquartileandmedian>)
 5. [Bramley G. HOUSING REQUIREMENTS IN ENGLAND REVISITED.pdf](https://pure.hw.ac.uk/ws/portalfiles/portal/113960635/Bramley_G._HOUSING_REQUIREMENTS_IN_ENGLAND_REVISITED.pdf) ([hw.ac.uk](https://pure.hw.ac.uk/ws/portalfiles/portal/113960635/Bramley_G._HOUSING_REQUIREMENTS_IN_ENGLAND_REVISITED.pdf)) (https://pure.hw.ac.uk/ws/portalfiles/portal/113960635/Bramley_G._HOUSING_REQUIREMENTS_IN_ENGLAND_REVISITED.pdf)

6. [Independent Review of Build Out - Final Report](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5bd6eb3940f0b6051e77b6a6/Letwin_review_web_version.pdf)
(https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5bd6eb3940f0b6051e77b6a6/Letwin_review_web_version.pdf)
 7. [fine-margins_viability-assessments-in-planning-and-plan-making.pdf](https://lichfields.uk/media/6509/fine-margins_viability-assessments-in-planning-and-plan-making.pdf)
([lichfields.uk](https://lichfields.uk/media/6509/fine-margins_viability-assessments-in-planning-and-plan-making.pdf)) (https://lichfields.uk/media/6509/fine-margins_viability-assessments-in-planning-and-plan-making.pdf)
 8. Annual Business Survey, 2024
 9. Business Register and Employment Survey, 2023
 10. [Electricity generation costs 2023 - GOV.UK](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/electricity-generation-costs-2023)
(<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/electricity-generation-costs-2023>)
 11. Analysis conducted in July 2024 using the Renewable Electricity Planning Database and Planning Inspectorate website by looking at the number of ground-mounted solar projects entering the planning system in England.
 12. [A review of England's revised draft regional and water resources management plans - GOV.UK](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/a-review-of-englands-draft-regional-and-water-resources-management-plans) (<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/a-review-of-englands-draft-regional-and-water-resources-management-plans>)
 13. Ss27-28A of the [Planning Act 2008](https://www.legislation.gov.uk) ([legislation.gov.uk](https://www.legislation.gov.uk))
(<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2008/29/part/3/crossheading/water>)
 14. Water Recycling - Drinking Water Inspectorate (dwi.gov.uk)
 15. [Further guidance on](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nationally-significant-infrastructure-projects-advice-note-two-the-role-of-local-authorities-in-the-development-consent-process/advice-note-two-the-role-of-local-authorities-in-the-development-consent-process) (<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nationally-significant-infrastructure-projects-advice-note-two-the-role-of-local-authorities-in-the-development-consent-process/advice-note-two-the-role-of-local-authorities-in-the-development-consent-process>) the role of local authorities in the development consent process, including on ABCD authorities
 16. In line with any other arrangements set out for plan-making in Annex 1: Implementation
 17. "Operative" means "published under the terms of the GLA Act 1999 and is the equivalent of "adopted"
 18. [Plan-making reforms: consultation on implementation, July 2023](https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/plan-making-reforms-consultation-on-implementation)
(<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/plan-making-reforms-consultation-on-implementation>)
-
- 

OGI

All content is available under the Open Government Licence v3.0, except where otherwise stated

© Crown copyright

This page is intentionally left blank



Ministry of Housing,
Communities &
Local Government

National Planning Policy Framework



© Crown copyright 2024

Copyright in the typographical arrangement rests with the Crown.

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence visit <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3/>

This document/publication is also available on our website at www.gov.uk/mhclg

If you have any enquiries regarding this document/publication, email correspondence@communities.gov.uk or write to us at:

Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government
Fry Building
2 Marsham Street
London
SW1P 4DF
Telephone: 030 3444 0000

For all our latest news and updates follow us on Twitter:
<http://twitter.com/mhclg>

Contents

1. Introduction	4
2. Achieving sustainable development	5
3. Plan-making	8
4. Decision-making	13
5. Delivering a sufficient supply of homes	17
6. Building a strong, competitive economy	24
7. Ensuring the vitality of town centres	26
8. Promoting healthy and safe communities	28
9. Promoting sustainable transport	31
10. Supporting high quality communications	34
11. Making effective use of land	36
12. Achieving well-designed and beautiful places	39
13. Protecting Green Belt land	42
14. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change	46
15. Conserving and enhancing the natural environment	52
16. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment	57
17. Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals	61
Annex 1: Implementation	65
Annex 2: Glossary	67
Annex 3: Flood risk vulnerability classification	77
<u>Annex 4: Viability in relation to Green Belt release</u>	<u>84</u>

1. Introduction

1. The National Planning Policy Framework sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these should be applied¹. It provides a framework within which locally-prepared plans can provide for ~~sufficient~~ housing and other development in a sustainable manner. Preparing and maintaining up-to-date plans should be seen as a priority in meeting this objective.
2. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan², unless material considerations indicate otherwise³. The National Planning Policy Framework must be taken into account in preparing the development plan, and is a material consideration in planning decisions. Planning policies and decisions must also reflect relevant international obligations and statutory requirements.
3. The Framework should be read as a whole (including its footnotes and annexes). General references to planning policies in the Framework should be applied in a way that is appropriate to the type of plan being produced, taking into account policy on plan-making in chapter 3.
4. The Framework should be read in conjunction with the Government's planning policy for traveller sites, and its planning policy for waste. When preparing plans or making decisions on applications for these types of development, regard should also be had to the policies in this Framework, where relevant.
5. The Framework does not contain specific policies for nationally significant infrastructure projects. These are determined in accordance with the decision-making framework in the Planning Act 2008 (as amended) and relevant national policy statements for major infrastructure, as well as any other matters that are relevant (which may include the National Planning Policy Framework). National policy statements form part of the overall framework of national planning policy, and may be a material consideration in preparing plans and making decisions on planning applications.
6. Other statements of government policy may be material when preparing plans or deciding applications, such as relevant Written Ministerial Statements and endorsed recommendations of the National Infrastructure Commission. ~~This includes the Written Ministerial Statement on Affordable Homes Update (24 May 2021) which contains policy on First Homes.~~

¹ This document replaces the previous version of the National Planning Policy Framework published in ~~September~~ December 2023.

² This includes local and neighbourhood plans that have been brought into force and any spatial development strategies produced by combined authorities or elected Mayors (see Glossary).

³ Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. Achieving sustainable development

7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, including the provision of homes, commercial development, and supporting infrastructure in a sustainable manner. At a very high level, the objective of sustainable development can be summarised as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs⁴. At a similarly high level, members of the United Nations – including the United Kingdom – have agreed to pursue the 17 Global Goals for Sustainable Development in the period to 2030. These address social progress, economic well-being and environmental protection⁵.
8. Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways (so that opportunities can be taken to secure net gains across each of the different objectives):
 - a) **an economic objective** – to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure;
 - b) **a social objective** – to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering well-designed, beautiful and safe places, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities' health, social and cultural well-being; and
 - c) **an environmental objective** – to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy.
9. These objectives should be delivered through the preparation and implementation of plans and the application of the policies in this Framework; they are not criteria against which every decision can or should be judged. Planning policies and decisions should play an active role in guiding development towards sustainable solutions, but in doing so should take local circumstances into account, to reflect the character, needs and opportunities of each area.
10. So that sustainable development is pursued in a positive way, at the heart of the Framework is a **presumption in favour of sustainable development** (paragraph 11)

The presumption in favour of sustainable development

⁴ Resolution 42/187 of the United Nations General Assembly.

⁵ Transforming our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

11. Plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

For **plan-making** this means that:

- a) all plans should promote a sustainable pattern of development that seeks to: meet the development needs of their area; align growth and infrastructure; improve the environment; mitigate climate change (including by making effective use of land in urban areas) and adapt to its effects;
- b) strategic policies should, as a minimum, provide for objectively assessed needs for housing and other uses, as well as any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas⁶, unless:
 - i. the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area⁷; or
 - ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.

For **decision-taking** this means:

- c) approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or
- d) where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies for the supply of land⁸ which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date⁹, granting permission unless:
 - i. the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed⁷; or
 - ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole, in particular those

⁶ As established through statements of common ground (see paragraph 287).

⁷ The policies referred to are those in this Framework (rather than those in development plans) relating to: habitats sites (and those sites listed in paragraph 187) and/or designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest; land designated as Green Belt, Local Green Space, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, a National Park (or within the Broads Authority) or defined as Heritage Coast; irreplaceable habitats; designated heritage assets (and other heritage assets of archaeological interest referred to in footnote 742); and areas at risk of flooding or coastal change.

⁸ Policies for the supply of land are those which set an overall requirement and/or make allocations and allowances for windfall sites for the area and type of development concerned.

⁹ This includes, for applications involving the provision of housing, situations where: ~~(a) the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply (or a four year supply, if applicable, as set out in paragraph 226) of deliverable housing sites (with the appropriate a buffer, if applicable, as set out in paragraph 7677) and does not benefit from the provisions of paragraph 76;~~ or (b) where the Housing Delivery Test indicates that the delivery of housing was substantially below (less than 75% of) the housing requirement over the previous three years.

for the location and design of development (as set out in chapters 9 and 12) and for securing affordable homes.

12. The presumption in favour of sustainable development does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision-making. Where a planning application conflicts with an up-to-date development plan (including any neighbourhood plans that form part of the development plan), permission should not usually be granted. Local planning authorities may take decisions that depart from an up-to-date development plan, but only if material considerations in a particular case indicate that the plan should not be followed.
13. The application of the presumption has implications for the way communities engage in neighbourhood planning. Neighbourhood plans should support the delivery of strategic policies contained in local plans or spatial development strategies; and should shape and direct development that is outside of these strategic policies.
14. In situations where the presumption (at paragraph 11d) applies to applications involving the provision of housing, the adverse impact of allowing development that conflicts with the neighbourhood plan is likely to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, provided the following apply:
 - a) the neighbourhood plan became part of the development plan five years or less before the date on which the decision is made; and
 - b) the neighbourhood plan contains policies and allocations to meet its identified housing requirement (see paragraphs 67-68);

3. Plan-making

15. The planning system should be genuinely plan-led. Succinct and up-to-date plans should provide a positive vision for the future of each area; a framework for meeting housing needs and addressing other economic, social and environmental priorities; and a platform for local people to shape their surroundings.
16. Plans should:
 - a) be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development¹⁰;
 - b) be prepared positively, in a way that is aspirational but deliverable;
 - c) be shaped by early, proportionate and effective engagement between plan-makers and communities, local organisations, businesses, infrastructure providers and operators and statutory consultees;
 - d) contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals;
 - e) be accessible through the use of digital tools to assist public involvement and policy presentation; and
 - f) serve a clear purpose, avoiding unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area (including policies in this Framework, where relevant).

The plan-making framework

17. The development plan must include strategic policies to address each local planning authority's priorities for the development and use of land in its area¹¹. These strategic policies can be produced in different ways, depending on the issues and opportunities facing each area. They can be contained in:
 - a) joint or individual local plans, produced by authorities working together or independently (and which may also contain non-strategic policies); and/or
 - b) a spatial development strategy produced by an elected Mayor or combined authority, where plan-making powers have been conferred.
18. Policies to address non-strategic matters should be included in local plans that contain both strategic and non-strategic policies, and/or in local or neighbourhood plans that contain just non-strategic policies.
19. The development plan for an area comprises the combination of strategic and non-strategic policies which are in force at a particular time.

¹⁰ This is a legal requirement of local planning authorities exercising their plan-making functions (section 39(2) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

¹¹ Section 19(1B-1E) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

Strategic policies

20. Strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places ~~(to ensure outcomes support beauty and placemaking)~~, and make sufficient provision¹² for:
- a) housing (including affordable housing), employment, retail, leisure and other commercial development;
 - b) infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat);
 - c) community facilities (such as health, education and cultural infrastructure); and
 - d) conservation and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment, including landscapes and green infrastructure, and planning measures to address climate change mitigation and adaptation.
21. Plans should make explicit which policies are strategic policies¹³. These should be limited to those necessary to address the strategic priorities of the area (and any relevant cross-boundary issues), to provide a clear starting point for any non-strategic policies that are needed. Strategic policies should not extend to detailed matters that are more appropriately dealt with through neighbourhood plans or other non-strategic policies.
22. Strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum 15 year period from adoption¹⁴, to anticipate and respond to long-term requirements and opportunities, such as those arising from major improvements in infrastructure. Where larger scale developments such as new settlements or significant extensions to existing villages and towns form part of the strategy for the area, policies should be set within a vision that looks further ahead (at least 30 years), to take into account the likely timescale for delivery¹⁵.
23. Broad locations for development should be indicated on a key diagram, and land-use designations and allocations identified on a policies map. Strategic policies should provide a clear strategy for bringing sufficient land forward, and at a sufficient rate, to address objectively assessed needs over the plan period, in line with the presumption in favour of sustainable development. This should include planning for and allocating sufficient sites to deliver the strategic priorities of the area (except insofar as these needs can be demonstrated to be met more appropriately through other mechanisms, such as brownfield registers or non-strategic policies)¹⁶.

Maintaining effective cooperation

¹² In line with the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

¹³ Where a single local plan is prepared the non-strategic policies should be clearly distinguished from the strategic policies.

¹⁴ Except in relation to town centre development, as set out in chapter 7.

¹⁵ Transitional arrangements are set out in Annex 1.

¹⁶ For spatial development strategies, allocations, land use designations and a policies map are needed only where the power to make allocations has been conferred.

24. Effective strategic planning across local planning authority boundaries will play a vital and increasing role in how sustainable growth is delivered and key spatial issues, including meeting housing needs, delivering strategic infrastructure, and building economic and climate resilience, are addressed. Local planning authorities and county councils (in two-tier areas) are continue to be under a duty to cooperate with each other, and with other prescribed bodies, on strategic matters that cross administrative boundaries.
25. Strategic policy-making authorities should collaborate to identify the relevant strategic matters which they need to address in their plans. They should also engage with their local communities and relevant bodies including ~~Local Enterprise Partnerships~~, Local Nature Partnerships, the Marine Management Organisation, county councils, infrastructure providers, elected Mayors and combined authorities (in cases where Mayors or combined authorities do not have plan-making powers).
26. Effective and on-going joint working between strategic policy-making authorities and relevant bodies is integral to the production of a positively prepared and justified strategy. In particular, joint working should help to determine where additional infrastructure is necessary, and whether development needs that cannot be met wholly within a particular plan area could be met elsewhere.
27. Once the matters which require collaboration have been identified, strategic policy-making authorities should make sure that their plan policies are consistent with those of other bodies where a strategic relationship exists on these matters, and with the relevant investment plans of infrastructure providers, unless there is a clear justification to the contrary. In particular their plans should ensure that:
- a) a consistent approach is taken to planning the delivery of major infrastructure, such as major transport services/projects, utilities, waste, minerals, environmental improvement and resilience, and strategic health, education and social infrastructure (such as hospitals, universities, major schools, major sports facilities and criminal justice accommodation);
 - b) unmet development needs from neighbouring areas are accommodated in accordance with paragraph 11b; and
 - c) any allocation or designation which cuts across the boundary of plan areas, or has significant implications for neighbouring areas, is appropriately managed by all relevant authorities.
- ~~27-28.~~ In order to demonstrate effective and on-going joint working, strategic policy-making authorities should prepare and maintain one or more statements of common ground, documenting the cross-boundary matters being addressed and progress in cooperating to address these. These should be produced using the approach set out in national planning guidance, and be made publicly available throughout the plan-making process to provide transparency. Plans come forward at different times, and there may be a degree of uncertainty about the future direction of relevant development plans or plans of infrastructure providers. In such circumstances strategic policy-making authorities and Inspectors will need to come to an informed decision on the basis of available information, rather than

waiting for a full set of evidence from other authorities.

Non-strategic policies

~~28~~29. Non-strategic policies should be used by local planning authorities and communities to set out more detailed policies for specific areas, neighbourhoods or types of development. This can include allocating sites, the provision of infrastructure and community facilities at a local level, establishing design principles, conserving and enhancing the natural and historic environment and setting out other development management policies.

~~29~~30. Neighbourhood planning gives communities the power to develop a shared vision for their area. Neighbourhood plans can shape, direct and help to deliver sustainable development, by influencing local planning decisions as part of the statutory development plan. Neighbourhood plans should not promote less development than set out in the strategic policies for the area, or undermine those strategic policies¹⁷.

~~30~~31. Once a neighbourhood plan has been brought into force, the policies it contains take precedence over existing non-strategic policies in a local plan covering the neighbourhood area, where they are in conflict; unless they are superseded by strategic or non-strategic policies that are adopted subsequently.

Preparing and reviewing plans

~~31~~32. The preparation and review of all policies should be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence. This should be adequate and proportionate, focused tightly on supporting and justifying the policies concerned, and take into account relevant market signals.

~~32~~33. Local plans and spatial development strategies should be informed throughout their preparation by a sustainability appraisal that meets the relevant legal requirements¹⁸. This should demonstrate how the plan has addressed relevant economic, social and environmental objectives (including opportunities for net gains). Significant adverse impacts on these objectives should be avoided and, wherever possible, alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued. Where significant adverse impacts are unavoidable, suitable mitigation measures should be proposed (or, where this is not possible, compensatory measures should be considered).

~~33~~34. Policies in local plans and spatial development strategies should be reviewed to assess whether they need updating at least once every five years, and should then be updated as necessary¹⁹. Reviews should be completed no later than five years from the adoption date of a plan, and should take into account changing

¹⁷ Neighbourhood plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in any development plan that covers their area.

¹⁸ The reference to relevant legal requirements refers to Strategic Environmental Assessment. Neighbourhood plans may require Strategic Environmental Assessment, but only where there are potentially significant environmental effects.

¹⁹ Reviews at least every five years are a legal requirement for all local plans (Regulation 10A of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012).

circumstances affecting the area, or any relevant changes in national policy. Relevant strategic policies will need updating at least once every five years if their applicable local housing need figure has changed significantly; and they are likely to require earlier review if local housing need is expected to change significantly in the near future.

Development contributions

~~34~~35. Plans should set out the contributions expected from development. This should include setting out the levels and types of affordable housing provision required, along with other infrastructure (such as that needed for education, health, transport, flood and water management, green and digital infrastructure). Such policies should not undermine the deliverability of the plan.

Examining plans

~~35~~36. Local plans and spatial development strategies are examined to assess whether they have been prepared in accordance with legal and procedural requirements, and whether they are sound. Plans are 'sound' if they are:

- a) **Positively prepared** – providing a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area's objectively assessed needs²⁰; and is informed by agreements with other authorities, so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated where it is practical to do so and is consistent with achieving sustainable development;
- b) **Justified** – an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence;
- c) **Effective** – deliverable over the plan period, and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common ground; and
- d) **Consistent with national policy** – enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in this Framework and other statements of national planning policy, where relevant.

~~36~~37. These tests of soundness will be applied to non-strategic policies²¹ in a proportionate way, taking into account the extent to which they are consistent with relevant strategic policies for the area.

~~37~~38. Neighbourhood plans must meet certain 'basic conditions' and other legal requirements²² before they can come into force. These are tested through an independent examination before the neighbourhood plan may proceed to referendum.

²⁰ Where this relates to housing, such needs should be assessed using a clear and justified method, as set out in paragraph ~~62~~4 of this Framework

²¹ Where these are contained in a local plan.

²² As set out in paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

4. Decision-making

~~38~~39. Local planning authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way. They should use the full range of planning tools available, including brownfield registers and permission in principle, and work proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. Decision-makers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible.

Pre-application engagement and front-loading

~~39~~40. Early engagement has significant potential to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the planning application system for all parties. Good quality pre-application discussion enables better coordination between public and private resources and improved outcomes for the community.

~~40~~41. Local planning authorities have a key role to play in encouraging other parties to take maximum advantage of the pre-application stage. They cannot require that a developer engages with them before submitting a planning application, but they should encourage take-up of any pre-application services they offer. They should also, where they think this would be beneficial, encourage any applicants who are not already required to do so by law to engage with the local community and, where relevant, with statutory and non-statutory consultees, before submitting their applications.

~~41~~42. The more issues that can be resolved at pre-application stage, including the need to deliver improvements in infrastructure and affordable housing, the greater the benefits. For their role in the planning system to be effective and positive, statutory planning consultees will need to take the same early, pro-active approach, and provide advice in a timely manner throughout the development process. This assists local planning authorities in issuing timely decisions, helping to ensure that applicants do not experience unnecessary delays and costs.

~~42~~43. The participation of other consenting bodies in pre-application discussions should enable early consideration of all the fundamental issues relating to whether a particular development will be acceptable in principle, even where other consents relating to how a development is built or operated are needed at a later stage. Wherever possible, parallel processing of other consents should be encouraged to help speed up the process and resolve any issues as early as possible.

~~43~~44. The right information is crucial to good decision-making, particularly where formal assessments are required (such as Environmental Impact Assessment, Habitats Regulations assessment and flood risk assessment). To avoid delay, applicants should discuss what information is needed with the local planning authority and expert bodies as early as possible.

~~44~~45. Local planning authorities should publish a list of their information requirements for applications for planning permission. These requirements should be kept to the minimum needed to make decisions, and should be reviewed at least every

two years. Local planning authorities should only request supporting information that is relevant, necessary and material to the application in question.

~~45.46.~~ Local planning authorities should consult the appropriate bodies when considering applications for the siting of, or changes to, major hazard sites, installations or pipelines, or for development around them.

~~46.47.~~ Applicants and local planning authorities should consider the potential for voluntary planning performance agreements, where this might achieve a faster and more effective application process. Planning performance agreements are likely to be needed for applications that are particularly large or complex to determine.

Determining applications

~~47.48.~~ Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Decisions on applications should be made as quickly as possible, and within statutory timescales unless a longer period has been agreed by the applicant in writing.

~~48.49.~~ Local planning authorities may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

- a) the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced its preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);
- b) the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and
- c) the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to this Framework (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given)²³.

~~49.50.~~ However, in the context of the Framework – and in particular the presumption in favour of sustainable development – arguments that an application is premature are unlikely to justify a refusal of planning permission other than in the limited circumstances where both:

- a) the development proposed is so substantial, or its cumulative effect would be so significant, that to grant permission would undermine the plan-making process by predetermining decisions about the scale, location or phasing of new development that are central to an emerging plan; and
- b) the emerging plan is at an advanced stage but is not yet formally part of the development plan for the area.

~~50.51.~~ Refusal of planning permission on grounds of prematurity will seldom be justified

²³ During the transitional period for emerging plans, consistency should be tested against the version of the Framework as applicable, as set out in Annex 1.

where a draft plan has yet to be submitted for examination; or – in the case of a neighbourhood plan – before the end of the local planning authority publicity period on the draft plan. Where planning permission is refused on grounds of prematurity, the local planning authority will need to indicate clearly how granting permission for the development concerned would prejudice the outcome of the plan-making process.

Tailoring planning controls to local circumstances

~~51.~~52. Local planning authorities are encouraged to use Local Development Orders to set the planning framework for particular areas or categories of development where the impacts would be acceptable, and in particular where this would promote economic, social or environmental gains for the area.

~~52.~~53. Communities can use Neighbourhood Development Orders and Community Right to Build Orders to grant planning permission. These require the support of the local community through a referendum. Local planning authorities should take a proactive and positive approach to such proposals, working collaboratively with community organisations to resolve any issues before draft orders are submitted for examination.

~~53.~~54. The use of Article 4 directions to remove national permitted development rights should:

- a) where they relate to change from non-residential use to residential use, be limited to situations where an Article 4 direction is necessary to avoid wholly unacceptable adverse impacts (this could include the loss of the essential core of a primary shopping area which would seriously undermine its vitality and viability, but would be very unlikely to extend to the whole of a town centre)
- b) in other cases, be limited to situations where an Article 4 direction is necessary to protect local amenity or the well-being of the area (this could include the use of Article 4 directions to require planning permission for the demolition of local facilities)
- c) in all cases, be based on robust evidence, and apply to the smallest geographical area possible.

~~54.~~55. Similarly, planning conditions should not be used to restrict national permitted development rights unless there is clear justification to do so.

Planning conditions and obligations

~~55.~~56. Local planning authorities should consider whether otherwise unacceptable development could be made acceptable through the use of conditions or planning obligations. Planning obligations should only be used where it is not possible to address unacceptable impacts through a planning condition.

~~56.~~57. Planning conditions should be kept to a minimum and only imposed where they are necessary, relevant to planning and to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects. Agreeing conditions early is beneficial to all parties involved in the process and can speed up decision-

making. Conditions that are required to be discharged before development commences should be avoided, unless there is a clear justification²⁴.

~~57:~~58. Planning obligations must only be sought where they meet all of the following tests²⁵:

1. necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
2. directly related to the development; and
3. fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

~~58:~~59. Where up-to-date policies have set out the contributions expected from development, planning applications that comply with them should be assumed to be viable. It is up to the applicant to demonstrate whether particular circumstances justify the need for a viability assessment at the application stage. The weight to be given to a viability assessment is a matter for the decision maker, having regard to all the circumstances in the case, including whether the plan and the viability evidence underpinning it is up to date, and any change in site circumstances since the plan was brought into force. All viability assessments, including any undertaken at the plan-making stage, should reflect the recommended approach in national planning guidance, including standardised inputs, and should be made publicly available.

Enforcement

~~59:~~60. Effective enforcement is important to maintain public confidence in the planning system. Enforcement action is discretionary, and local planning authorities should act proportionately in responding to suspected breaches of planning control. They should consider publishing a local enforcement plan to manage enforcement proactively, in a way that is appropriate to their area. This should set out how they will monitor the implementation of planning permissions, investigate alleged cases of unauthorised development and take action where appropriate.

²⁴ Sections 100ZA(4-6) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 will require the applicant's written agreement to the terms of a pre-commencement condition, unless prescribed circumstances apply.

²⁵ Set out in Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.

5. Delivering a sufficient supply of homes

~~60-61.~~ To support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay. The overall aim should be to meet ~~as much of~~ an area's identified housing need ~~as possible~~, including with an appropriate mix of housing types for the local community.

~~61-62.~~ To determine the minimum number of homes needed, strategic policies should be informed by a local housing need assessment, conducted using the standard method in national planning guidance. ~~The outcome of the standard method is an advisory starting point for establishing a housing requirement for the area (see paragraph 67 below). There may be exceptional circumstances, including relating to the particular demographic characteristics of an area²⁶ which justify an alternative approach which to assessing housing need; in which case the alternative approach should also reflect current and future demographic trends and market signals.~~ In addition to the local housing need figure, any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas should also be taken into account in establishing the amount of housing to be planned for²⁷.

~~62.~~ ~~The standard method incorporates an uplift which applies to certain cities and urban centres, as set out in national planning guidance. This uplift should be accommodated within those cities and urban centres themselves except where there are voluntary cross boundary redistribution agreements in place, or where it would conflict with the policies in this Framework²⁸.~~

63. Within this context of establishing need, the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies. These groups should include (but are not limited to) those who require affordable housing (including Social Rent); families with children; looked after children²⁹; older people (including those who require retirement housing, housing-with-care and care homes); students; people with disabilities; service families; travellers³⁰; people who rent their homes and people wishing to commission or build their own homes³¹.

~~²⁶ Such particular demographic characteristics could, for example, include areas that are islands with no land bridge that have a significant proportion of elderly residents.~~

²⁷ Transitional arrangements are set out in Annex 1

~~²⁸ In doing so, strategic policies should promote an effective use of land and optimise site densities in accordance with chapter 11. This is to ensure that homes are built in the right places, to prioritise brownfield and other under-utilised urban sites, to utilise existing infrastructure, and to allow people to live near the services they rely on, making travel patterns more sustainable.~~

²⁹ Evidence of need for looked after children can be found in the relevant Local Authority's Children's Social Care Sufficiency Strategy.

³⁰ Planning Policy for Traveller Sites sets out how travellers' housing needs should be assessed for those covered by the definition in Annex 1 of that document.

³¹ Under section 1 of the Self Build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015, local authorities are required to keep a register of those seeking to acquire serviced plots in the area for their own self-build and custom house building. They are also subject to duties under sections 2 and 2A of the Act to have regard to this and to give enough

64. Where a need for affordable housing is identified, planning policies should specify the type of affordable housing required (including the minimum proportion of Social Rent homes required)³², and expect it to be met on-site unless:
- off-site provision or an appropriate financial contribution in lieu can be robustly justified; and
 - the agreed approach contributes to the objective of creating mixed and balanced communities.
65. Provision of affordable housing should not be sought for residential developments that are not major developments, other than in designated rural areas (where policies may set out a lower threshold of 5 units or fewer). To support the re-use of brownfield land, where vacant buildings are being reused or redeveloped, any affordable housing contribution due should be reduced by a proportionate amount³³.
66. Where major development involving the provision of housing is proposed, planning policies and decisions should expect that the mix of affordable housing required meets identified local needs, across both affordable housing for rent and affordable home ownership tenures. at least 10% of the total number of homes to be available for affordable home ownership³⁴; ~~unless this would exceed the level of affordable housing required in the area, or significantly prejudice the ability to meet the identified affordable housing needs of specific groups. Exemptions to this 10% requirement should also be made where the site or proposed development:~~
- ~~provides solely for Build to Rent homes;~~
 - ~~provides specialist accommodation for a group of people with specific needs (such as purpose-built accommodation for the elderly or students);~~
 - ~~is proposed to be developed by people who wish to build or commission their own homes; or~~
 - ~~a) is exclusively for affordable housing, an entry-level a community-led development exception site or a rural exception site.~~
67. Strategic policy-making authorities should establish a housing requirement figure for their whole area, which shows the extent to which their identified housing need (and any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas) can be met over the plan period. The requirement may be higher than the identified housing need if, for example, it includes provision for neighbouring areas, or reflects growth ambitions linked to economic development or infrastructure investment. Within this overall requirement, strategic policies should also set out a housing requirement for designated neighbourhood areas which reflects the overall strategy for the pattern

suitable development permissions to meet the identified demand. Self and custom-build properties could provide market or affordable housing.

³² Applying the definition in Annex 2 to this Framework.

³³ Equivalent to the existing gross floorspace of the existing buildings. This does not apply to vacant buildings which have been abandoned.

³⁴ ~~As part of the overall affordable housing contribution from the site.~~

and scale of development and any relevant allocations³⁵. Once the strategic policies have been adopted, these figures should not need re-testing at the neighbourhood plan examination, unless there has been a significant change in circumstances that affects the requirement.

68. Where it is not possible to provide a requirement figure for a neighbourhood area³⁶, the local planning authority should provide an indicative figure, if requested to do so by the neighbourhood planning body. This figure should take into account factors such as the latest evidence of local housing need, the population of the neighbourhood area and the most recently available planning strategy of the local planning authority.
69. Mixed tenure sites can provide a range of benefits including creating diverse communities and supporting timely build out rates and local planning authorities should support their development through their policies and decisions. Mixed tenure sites can include a mixture of ownership and rental tenures, including rented affordable housing and build to rent, as well as housing designed for specific groups such as older people's housing and student accommodation, and plots sold for custom or self-build.

Identifying land for homes

69.70. Strategic policy-making authorities should have a clear understanding of the land available in their area through the preparation of a strategic housing land availability assessment. From this, planning policies should identify a sufficient supply and mix of sites, taking into account their availability, suitability and likely economic viability. Planning policies should identify a supply of:

- a) specific, deliverable sites for five years following the intended date of adoption³⁷; and
- b) specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth, for the subsequent years 6-10 and, where possible, for years 11-15 of the remaining plan period.

70.71. Small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area, and are often built-out relatively quickly. To promote the development of a good mix of sites local planning authorities should:

- a) identify, through the development plan and brownfield registers, land to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare; unless it can be shown, through the preparation of relevant plan policies, that there are strong reasons why this 10% target cannot be achieved;

³⁵ Except where a Mayoral, combined authority or high-level joint plan is being prepared as a framework for strategic policies at the individual local authority level; in which case it may be most appropriate for the local authority plans to provide the requirement figure.

³⁶ Because a neighbourhood area is designated at a late stage in the strategic policy-making process, or after strategic policies have been adopted; or in instances where strategic policies for housing are out of date.

³⁷ With an appropriate buffer, as set out in paragraph 767. See Glossary for definitions of deliverable and developable.

- b) seek opportunities, through policies and decisions, to support small sites to come forward for community-led development for housing and self-build and custom-build housing;
- c) use tools such as area-wide design assessments, permission in principle and Local Development Orders to help bring small and medium sized sites forward;
- d) support the development of windfall sites through their policies and decisions – giving great weight to the benefits of using suitable sites within existing settlements for homes; and
- e) work with developers to encourage the sub-division of large sites where this could help to speed up the delivery of homes.

~~71.72.~~ Neighbourhood planning groups should also give particular consideration to the opportunities for allocating small and medium-sized sites (of a size consistent with paragraph ~~710a~~) suitable for housing in their area.

~~72.73.~~ Where an allowance is to be made for windfall sites as part of anticipated supply, there should be compelling evidence that they will provide a reliable source of supply. Any allowance should be realistic having regard to the strategic housing land availability assessment, historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends. Plans should consider the case for setting out policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens, for example where development would cause harm to the local area.

~~73.74.~~ Local planning authorities should support the development of exception sites, or community-led development³⁸ (as defined in Annex 2) on sites that would not otherwise be suitable as rural exception sites. These sites should be on land which is not already allocated for housing and should:

- a) comprise community-led development that includes one or more types of affordable housing as defined in Annex 2 of this Framework. A proportion of market homes may be allowed on the site at the local planning authority's discretion, for example where essential to enable the delivery of affordable units without grant funding; and
- b) be adjacent to existing settlements, existing settlements, proportionate in size to them³⁹, not compromise the protection given to areas or assets of particular importance in this Framework⁴⁰, and comply with any local design policies and standards.

~~74.75.~~ The supply of large numbers of new homes can often be best achieved through planning for larger scale development, such as new settlements or significant extensions to existing villages and towns, provided they are well located and

³⁸-This exception site policy does not replace the First Homes exception policy set out in the Affordable Homes Update Written Ministerial Statement, dated 24 May 2021, which remains extant policy.

³⁹ Community-led development exception sites should not be larger than one hectare in size or exceed 5% of the size of the existing settlement, unless specific provision to exceed these limits is made in the development plan.

⁴⁰ i.e. the areas referred to in footnote 7.

designed, and supported by the necessary infrastructure and facilities (including a genuine choice of transport modes). Working with the support of their communities, and with other authorities if appropriate, strategic policy-making authorities should identify suitable locations for such development where this can help to meet identified needs in a sustainable way. In doing so, they should:

- a) consider the opportunities presented by existing or planned investment in infrastructure, the area's economic potential and the scope for net environmental gains;
- b) ensure that their size and location will support a sustainable community, with sufficient access to services and employment opportunities within the development itself (without expecting an unrealistic level of self-containment), or in larger towns to which there is good access;
- c) set clear expectations for the quality of the places to be created and how this can be maintained (such as by following Garden City principles); and ensure that appropriate tools such as masterplans and design guides or codes are used to secure a variety of well-designed and beautiful homes to meet the needs of different groups in the community;
- d) make a realistic assessment of likely rates of delivery, given the lead-in times for large scale sites, and identify opportunities for supporting rapid implementation (such as through joint ventures or locally-led development corporations)⁴¹; and
- e) consider whether it is appropriate to establish Green Belt around or adjoining new developments of significant size.

Maintaining supply and delivery

~~75-76.~~ Strategic policies should include a trajectory illustrating the expected rate of housing delivery over the plan period, and all plans should consider whether it is appropriate to set out the anticipated rate of development for specific sites. Local planning authorities should ~~monitor their deliverable land supply against their housing requirement, as set out in adopted strategic policies~~ identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide a minimum of five years' worth of housing⁴² against their housing requirement set out in adopted strategic policies, or against their local housing need where the strategic policies are more than five years old⁴³. The supply of specific deliverable sites should in addition include a buffer (moved forward from later in the plan period) of:

⁴¹ The delivery of large scale developments may need to extend beyond an individual plan period, and the associated infrastructure requirements may not be capable of being identified fully at the outset. Anticipated rates of delivery and infrastructure requirements should, therefore, be kept under review and reflected as policies are updated.

⁴² For the avoidance of doubt, a five year supply of deliverable sites for travellers – as defined in Annex 1 to Planning Policy for Traveller Sites – should be assessed separately, in line with the policy in that document.

⁴³ Unless these strategic policies have been reviewed and found not to require updating. Where local housing need is used as the basis for assessing whether a five year supply of specific deliverable sites exists, it should be calculated using the standard method set out in national planning guidance.

a) 5% to ensure choice and competition in the market for land; or

~~b) 10% where the local planning authority wishes to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable sites through an annual position statement or recently adopted plan, to account for any fluctuations in the market during that year; or~~
b) 20% where there has been significant under delivery of housing over the previous three years, to improve the prospect of achieving the planned supply⁴⁴.

~~76. Local planning authorities are not required to identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide a minimum of five years' worth of housing for decision making purposes if the following criteria are met:~~

~~a. their adopted plan is less than five years old; and~~

~~b. that adopted plan identified at least a five year supply of specific, deliverable sites at the time that its examination concluded.~~

~~77. In all other circumstances, local planning authorities should identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide either a minimum of five years' worth of housing or a minimum of four years' worth of housing if the provisions in paragraph 226 apply. The supply should be demonstrated against either the housing requirement set out in adopted strategic policies, or against the local housing need where the strategic policies are more than five years old. Where there has been significant under delivery of housing over the previous three years the supply of specific deliverable sites should in addition include a buffer of 20% (moved forward from later in the plan period). National planning guidance provides further information on calculating the housing land supply, including the circumstances in which past shortfalls or over supply can be addressed.~~

~~78. Where the criteria in paragraph 76 are not met, a local planning authority may confirm the existence of a five year supply of deliverable housing sites (with a 20% buffer, if applicable through an annual position statement which:~~

~~a) has been produced through engagement with developers and others who have an impact on delivery, and been considered by the Secretary of State; and~~

~~b) incorporates the recommendation of the Secretary of State, where the position on specific sites could not be agreed during the engagement process.~~

⁴⁴ This will be measured against the Housing Delivery Test, where this indicates that delivery was below 85% of the housing requirement.

~~79.~~77. To maintain the supply of housing, local planning authorities should monitor progress in building out sites which have permission. Where the Housing Delivery Test indicates that delivery has fallen below the local planning authority's housing requirement over the previous three years, the following policy consequences should apply:

- a) where delivery falls below 95% of the requirement over the previous three years, the authority should prepare an action plan to assess the causes of under-delivery and identify actions to increase delivery in future years;
- b) where delivery falls below 85% of the requirement over the previous three years, the authority should include a buffer of 20% to their identified supply of specific deliverable sites as set out in paragraph ~~76.~~77 of this framework, in addition to the requirement for an action plan.
- c) where delivery falls below 75% of the requirement over the previous three years, the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies, as set out in footnote ~~98.~~98 of this Framework, in addition to the requirements for an action plan and 20% buffer.

~~80.~~78. The Housing Delivery Test consequences set out above will apply the day following the annual publication of the Housing Delivery Test results, at which point they supersede previously published results. Until new Housing Delivery Test results are published, the previously published result should be used.

~~81.~~79. To help ensure that proposals for housing development are implemented in a timely manner, local planning authorities should consider imposing a planning condition providing that development must begin within a timescale shorter than the relevant default period, where this would expedite the development without threatening its deliverability or viability. For major development involving the provision of housing, local planning authorities should also assess why any earlier grant of planning permission for a similar development on the same site did not start.

Rural housing

~~82.~~80. In rural areas, planning policies and decisions should be responsive to local circumstances and support housing developments that reflect local needs, including proposals for community-led development for housing. Local planning authorities should support opportunities to bring forward rural exception sites that will provide affordable housing to meet identified local needs, and consider whether allowing some market housing on these sites would help to facilitate this.

~~83.~~81. To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby.

~~84.~~82. Planning policies and decisions should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside unless one or more of the following circumstances apply:

- a) there is an essential need for a rural worker, including those taking majority control of a farm business, to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside;
- b) the development would represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset or would be appropriate enabling development to secure the future of heritage assets;
- c) the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and enhance its immediate setting;
- d) the development would involve the subdivision of an existing residential building; or
- e) the design is of exceptional quality, in that it:
 - is truly outstanding, reflecting the highest standards in architecture, and would help to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas; and
 - would significantly enhance its immediate setting, and be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area.

6. Building a strong, competitive economy

~~85-83.~~ Planning policies and decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. Significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development. The approach taken should allow each area to build on its strengths, counter any weaknesses and address the challenges of the future. This is particularly important where Britain can be a global leader in driving innovation⁴⁵, and in areas with high levels of productivity, which should be able to capitalise on their performance and potential.

~~86-84.~~ Planning policies should:

- a) set out a clear economic vision and strategy which positively and proactively encourages sustainable economic growth, having regard to Local Industrial Strategies and other local policies for economic development and regeneration;
- b) set criteria, ~~or~~ and identify strategic sites, for local and inward investment to match the strategy and to meet anticipated needs over the plan period. Appropriate sites for commercial development which meet the needs of a modern economy should be identified, including suitable locations for uses such as laboratories, gigafactories, data centres, digital infrastructure, freight and logistics.
- c) seek to address potential barriers to investment, such as inadequate infrastructure, services or housing, or a poor environment; and
- d) be flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated in the plan, allow for new and flexible working practices (such as live-work accommodation), and to enable a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances.

~~87-85.~~ Planning policies and decisions should recognise and address the specific locational requirements of different sectors. This includes making provision for:

- a) clusters or networks of knowledge and data-driven, creative or high technology industries; and for new, expanded or upgraded facilities and infrastructure that are needed to support the growth of these industries (including data centres and grid connections);
- b) storage and distribution operations at a variety of scales and in suitably accessible locations, that allow for the efficient and reliable handling of goods, especially where this is needed to support the supply chain, transport innovation and decarbonisation;
- c) the expansion or modernisation of other industries of local, regional or national importance to support economic growth and resilience.

⁴⁵ ~~The Government's Industrial Strategy sets out a vision to drive productivity improvements across the UK, identifies a number of Grand Challenges facing all nations, and sets out a delivery programme to make the UK a leader in four of these: artificial intelligence and big data; clean growth; future mobility; and catering for an ageing society. HM Government (2017) Industrial Strategy: Building a Britain fit for the future.~~

Supporting a prosperous rural economy

~~88~~-86. Planning policies and decisions should enable:

- a) the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well-designed, ~~beautiful~~ new buildings;
- b) the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses;
- c) sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments which respect the character of the countryside; and
- d) the retention and development of accessible local services and community facilities, such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, open space, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship.

~~89~~-87. Planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads and exploits any opportunities to make a location more sustainable (for example by improving the scope for access on foot, by cycling or by public transport). The use of previously developed land, and sites that are physically well-related to existing settlements, should be encouraged where suitable opportunities exist.

7. Ensuring the vitality of town centres

~~90~~88. Planning policies and decisions should support the role that town centres play at the heart of local communities, by taking a positive approach to their growth, management and adaptation. Planning policies should:

- a) define a network and hierarchy of town centres and promote their long-term vitality and viability – by allowing them to grow and diversify in a way that can respond to rapid changes in the retail and leisure industries, allows a suitable mix of uses (including housing) and reflects their distinctive characters;
- b) define the extent of town centres and primary shopping areas, and make clear the range of uses permitted in such locations, as part of a positive strategy for the future of each centre;
- c) retain and enhance existing markets and, where appropriate, re-introduce or create new ones;
- d) allocate a range of suitable sites in town centres to meet the scale and type of development likely to be needed, looking at least ten years ahead. Meeting anticipated needs for retail, leisure, office and other main town centre uses over this period should not be compromised by limited site availability, so town centre boundaries should be kept under review where necessary;
- e) where suitable and viable town centre sites are not available for main town centre uses, allocate appropriate edge of centre sites that are well connected to the town centre. If sufficient edge of centre sites cannot be identified, policies should explain how identified needs can be met in other accessible locations that are well connected to the town centre; and
- f) recognise that residential development often plays an important role in ensuring the vitality of centres and encourage residential development on appropriate sites.

~~91~~89. Local planning authorities should apply a sequential test to planning applications for main town centre uses which are neither in an existing centre nor in accordance with an up-to-date plan. Main town centre uses should be located in town centres, then in edge of centre locations; and only if suitable sites are not available (or expected to become available within a reasonable period) should out of centre sites be considered.

~~92~~90. When considering edge of centre and out of centre proposals, preference should be given to accessible sites which are well connected to the town centre. Applicants and local planning authorities should demonstrate flexibility on issues such as format and scale, so that opportunities to utilise suitable town centre or edge of centre sites are fully explored.

~~93~~91. This sequential approach should not be applied to applications for small scale rural offices or other small scale rural development.

94.92. When assessing applications for retail and leisure development outside town centres, which are not in accordance with an up-to-date plan, local planning authorities should require an impact assessment if the development is over a proportionate, locally set floorspace threshold (if there is no locally set threshold, the default threshold is 2,500m² of gross floorspace). This should include assessment of:

- a) the impact of the proposal on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in a centre or centres in the catchment area of the proposal; and
- b) the impact of the proposal on town centre vitality and viability, including local consumer choice and trade in the town centre and the wider retail catchment (as applicable to the scale and nature of the scheme).

95.93. Where an application fails to satisfy the sequential test or is likely to have significant adverse impact on one or more of the considerations in paragraph 924, it should be refused.

8. Promoting healthy and safe communities

96.94. Planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places ~~and beautiful buildings~~ which:

- a) promote social interaction, including opportunities for meetings between people who might not otherwise come into contact with each other – for example through mixed-use developments, strong neighbourhood centres, street layouts that allow for easy pedestrian and cycle connections within and between neighbourhoods, and active street frontages;
- b) are safe and accessible, so that crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion – for example through the use of ~~beautiful~~, well-designed, clear and legible pedestrian and cycle routes, and high quality public space, which encourage the active and continual use of public areas; and
- c) enable and support healthy lifestyles, especially where this would address identified local health and well-being needs – for example through the provision of safe and accessible green infrastructure, sports facilities, local shops, access to healthier food, allotments and layouts that encourage walking and cycling.

97.95. To provide the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, planning policies and decisions should:

- a) plan positively for the provision and use of shared spaces, community facilities (such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, open space, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship) and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments;
- b) take into account and support the delivery of local strategies to improve health, social and cultural well-being for all sections of the community;
- c) guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the community's ability to meet its day-to-day needs;
- d) ensure that established shops, facilities and services are able to develop and modernise, and are retained for the benefit of the community; and
- e) ensure an integrated approach to considering the location of housing, economic uses and community facilities and services.

98.96. Planning policies and decisions should consider the social, economic and environmental benefits of estate regeneration. Local planning authorities should use their planning powers to help deliver estate regeneration to a high standard.

99.97. It is important that a sufficient choice of ~~early years, school and post-16~~ places ~~is~~ are available to meet the needs of existing and new communities. Local planning authorities should take a proactive, positive and collaborative approach to meeting this requirement, and to development that will widen choice in education. They should:

- a) give great weight to the need to create, expand or alter early years, schools and post 16 facilities through the preparation of plans and decisions on applications; and
- b) work with early years, school and post-16 promoters, delivery partners and statutory bodies to identify and resolve key planning issues before applications are submitted.

~~400.98.~~ To ensure faster delivery of other public service infrastructure such as further education colleges, hospitals and criminal justice accommodation, local planning authorities should also work proactively and positively with promoters, delivery partners and statutory bodies to plan for required facilities and resolve key planning issues before applications are submitted. Significant weight should be placed on the importance of new, expanded or upgraded public service infrastructure when considering proposals for development.

~~401.99.~~ Planning policies and decisions should promote public safety and take into account wider security and defence requirements by:

- a) anticipating and addressing possible malicious threats and natural hazards, especially in locations where large numbers of people are expected to congregate⁴⁶. Policies for relevant areas (such as town centre and regeneration frameworks), and the layout and design of developments, should be informed by the most up-to-date information available from the police and other agencies about the nature of potential threats and their implications. This includes appropriate and proportionate steps that can be taken to reduce vulnerability, increase resilience and ensure public safety and security; and
- b) recognising and supporting development required for operational defence and security purposes, and ensuring that operational sites are not affected adversely by the impact of other development proposed in the area.

Open space and recreation

~~402.100.~~ Access to a network of high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and physical activity is important for the health and well-being of communities, and can deliver wider benefits for nature and support efforts to address climate change. Planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the need for open space, sport and recreation facilities (including quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses) and opportunities for new provision. Information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sport and recreational provision is needed, which plans should then seek to accommodate.

~~403.101.~~ Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless:

⁴⁶ This includes transport hubs, night-time economy venues, cinemas and theatres, sports stadia and arenas, shopping centres, health and education establishments, places of worship, hotels and restaurants, visitor attractions and commercial centres.

- a) an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or
- b) the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or
- c) the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the benefits of which clearly outweigh the loss of the current or former use.

~~404.~~102. Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users, for example by adding links to existing rights of way networks including National Trails.

~~405.~~103. The designation of land as Local Green Space through local and neighbourhood plans allows communities to identify and protect green areas of particular importance to them. Designating land as Local Green Space should be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services. Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared or updated, and be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period.

~~406.~~104. The Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green space is:

- a) in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;
- b) demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and
- c) local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.

~~407.~~105. Policies for managing development within a Local Green Space should be consistent with those for Green Belts.

9. Promoting sustainable transport

~~408~~.106. Transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, so that:

- a) the potential impacts of development on transport networks can be addressed;
- b) opportunities from existing or proposed transport infrastructure, and changing transport technology and usage, are realised – for example in relation to the scale, location or density of development that can be accommodated;
- c) opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use are identified and pursued;
- d) the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure can be identified, assessed and taken into account – including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains; and
- e) patterns of movement, streets, parking and other transport considerations are integral to the design of schemes, and contribute to making high quality places.

~~409~~.107. The planning system should actively manage patterns of growth in support of these objectives. Significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. This can help to reduce congestion and emissions, and improve air quality and public health. However, opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, and this should be taken into account in both plan-making and decision-making.

~~440~~.108. Planning policies should:

- a) support an appropriate mix of uses across an area, and within larger scale sites, to minimise the number and length of journeys needed for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities;
- b) be prepared with the active involvement of local highways authorities, other transport infrastructure providers and operators and neighbouring councils, so that strategies and investments for supporting sustainable transport and development patterns are aligned;
- c) identify and protect, where there is robust evidence, sites and routes which could be critical in developing infrastructure to widen transport choice and realise opportunities for large scale development;
- d) provide for attractive and well-designed walking and cycling networks with supporting facilities such as secure cycle parking (drawing on Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans);

- e) provide for any large scale transport facilities that need to be located in the area⁴⁷, and the infrastructure and wider development required to support their operation, expansion and contribution to the wider economy. In doing so they should take into account whether such development is likely to be a nationally significant infrastructure project and any relevant national policy statements; and
- f) recognise the importance of maintaining a national network of general aviation airfields, and their need to adapt and change over time – taking into account their economic value in serving business, leisure, training and emergency service needs, and the Government's General Aviation Strategy⁴⁸.

~~111.109.~~ If setting local parking standards for residential and non-residential development, policies should take into account:

- a) the accessibility of the development;
- b) the type, mix and use of development;
- c) the availability of and opportunities for public transport;
- d) local car ownership levels; and
- e) the need to ensure an adequate provision of spaces for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles.

~~112.110.~~ Maximum parking standards for residential and non-residential development should only be set where there is a clear and compelling justification that they are necessary for managing the local road network, or for optimising the density of development in city and town centres and other locations that are well served by public transport (in accordance with chapter 11 of this Framework). In town centres, local authorities should seek to improve the quality of parking so that it is convenient, safe and secure, alongside measures to promote accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists.

~~113.111.~~ Planning policies and decisions should recognise the importance of providing adequate overnight lorry parking facilities, taking into account any local shortages, to reduce the risk of parking in locations that lack proper facilities or could cause a nuisance. Proposals for new or expanded distribution centres should make provision for sufficient lorry parking to cater for their anticipated use.

Considering development proposals

~~114.112.~~ In assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that:

⁴⁷ Policies for large scale facilities should, where necessary, be developed through collaboration between strategic policy-making authorities and other relevant bodies. Examples of such facilities include ports, airports, interchanges for rail freight, public transport projects and roadside services. The primary function of roadside services should be to support the safety and welfare of the road user (and most such proposals are unlikely to be nationally significant infrastructure projects).

⁴⁸ Department for Transport (2015) *General Aviation Strategy*.

- a) ~~appropriate opportunities~~ A vision led approach to promote promoting sustainable transport modes can be – or have been – taken up, given is taken, taking account of the type of development and its location;
- b) safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users;
- c) the design of streets, parking areas, other transport elements and the content of associated standards reflects current national guidance, including the National Design Guide and the National Model Design Code⁴⁹; and
- d) any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree through a vision led approach.

113.115. Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe, in all tested scenarios.

114.116. Within this context, applications for development should:

- a) give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas; and second – so far as possible – to facilitating access to high quality public transport, with layouts that maximise the catchment area for bus or other public transport services, and appropriate facilities that encourage public transport use;
- b) address the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport;
- c) create places that are safe, secure and attractive – which minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles, avoid unnecessary street clutter, and respond to local character and design standards;
- d) allow for the efficient delivery of goods, and access by service and emergency vehicles; and
- e) be designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations.

115.117. All developments that will generate significant amounts of movement should be required to provide a travel plan, and the application should be supported by a transport statement or transport assessment so that the likely impacts of the proposal can be assessed.

⁴⁹ Policies and decisions should not make use of or reflect the former Design Bulletin 32, which was withdrawn in 2007.

10. Supporting high quality communications

~~118.~~116. Advanced, high quality and reliable communications infrastructure is essential for economic growth and social well-being. Planning policies and decisions should support the expansion of electronic communications networks, including next generation mobile technology (such as 5G) and full fibre broadband connections. Policies should set out how high quality digital infrastructure, providing access to services from a range of providers, is expected to be delivered and upgraded over time; and should prioritise full fibre connections to existing and new developments (as these connections will, in almost all cases, provide the optimum solution).

~~119.~~117. The number of radio and electronic communications masts, and the sites for such installations, should be kept to a minimum consistent with the needs of consumers, the efficient operation of the network and providing reasonable capacity for future expansion. Use of existing masts, buildings and other structures for new electronic communications capability (including wireless) should be encouraged. Where new sites are required (such as for new 5G networks, or for connected transport and smart city applications), equipment should be sympathetically designed and camouflaged where appropriate.

~~120.~~118. Local planning authorities should not impose a ban on new electronic communications development in certain areas, impose blanket Article 4 directions over a wide area or a wide range of electronic communications development, or insist on minimum distances between new electronic communications development and existing development. They should ensure that:

- a) they have evidence to demonstrate that electronic communications infrastructure is not expected to cause significant and irremediable interference with other electrical equipment, air traffic services or instrumentation operated in the national interest; and
- b) they have considered the possibility of the construction of new buildings or other structures interfering with broadcast and electronic communications services.

~~121.~~119. Applications for electronic communications development (including applications for prior approval under the General Permitted Development Order) should be supported by the necessary evidence to justify the proposed development. This should include:

- a) the outcome of consultations with organisations with an interest in the proposed development, in particular with the relevant body where a mast is to be installed near a school or college, or within a statutory safeguarding zone surrounding an aerodrome, technical site or military explosives storage area; and
- b) for an addition to an existing mast or base station, a statement that self-certifies that the cumulative exposure, when operational, will not exceed International Commission guidelines on non-ionising radiation protection; or

- c) for a new mast or base station, evidence that the applicant has explored the possibility of erecting antennas on an existing building, mast or other structure and a statement that self-certifies that, when operational, International Commission guidelines will be met.

~~422.120.~~ Local planning authorities must determine applications on planning grounds only. They should not seek to prevent competition between different operators, question the need for an electronic communications system, or set health safeguards different from the International Commission guidelines for public exposure.

11. Making effective use of land

~~123.~~121. Planning policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions. Strategic policies should set out a clear strategy for accommodating objectively assessed needs, in a way that makes as much use as possible of previously-developed or 'brownfield' land⁵⁰.

~~124.~~122. Planning policies and decisions should:

- a) encourage multiple benefits from both urban and rural land, including through mixed use schemes and taking opportunities to achieve net environmental gains – such as developments that would enable new habitat creation or improve public access to the countryside;
- b) recognise that some undeveloped land can perform many functions, such as for wildlife, recreation, flood risk mitigation, cooling/shading, carbon storage or food production;
- c) give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes and other identified needs, proposals for which should be regarded as acceptable in principle, and support appropriate opportunities to remediate despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated or unstable land;
- d) promote and support the development of under-utilised land and buildings, especially if this would help to meet identified needs for housing where land supply is constrained and available sites could be used more effectively (for example converting space above shops, and building on or above service yards, car parks, lock-ups and railway infrastructure)⁵¹; and
- e) support opportunities to use the airspace above existing residential and commercial premises for new homes. In particular, they should allow upward extensions – including mansard roofs – where the development would be consistent with the prevailing ~~height and~~ form of neighbouring properties and the overall street scene, is well- designed (including complying with any local design policies and standards), and can maintain safe access and egress for occupiers. ~~They should also allow mansard roof extensions on suitable properties⁵² where their external appearance harmonises with the original building, including extensions to terraces where one or more of the terraced houses already has a mansard. Where there was a tradition of mansard construction locally at the time of the building's construction, the extension should emulate it with respect to external appearance.~~ A condition of simultaneous development should not be imposed on an application for multiple mansard upward extensions unless there is an exceptional justification.

⁵⁰ Except where this would conflict with other policies in this Framework, including causing harm to designated sites of importance for biodiversity.

⁵¹ As part of this approach, plans and decisions should support efforts to identify and bring back into residential use empty homes and other buildings, supported by the use of compulsory purchase powers where appropriate.

⁵² ~~See glossary for further details.~~

~~125.~~123. Local planning authorities, and other plan-making bodies, should take a proactive role in identifying and helping to bring forward land that may be suitable for meeting development needs, including suitable sites on brownfield registers or held in public ownership, using the full range of powers available to them. This should include identifying opportunities to facilitate land assembly, supported where necessary by compulsory purchase powers, where this can help to bring more land forward for meeting development needs and/or secure better development outcomes.

~~126.~~124. Planning policies and decisions need to reflect changes in the demand for land. They should be informed by regular reviews of both the land allocated for development in plans, and of land availability. Where the local planning authority considers there to be no reasonable prospect of an application coming forward for the use allocated in a plan:

- a) it should, as part of plan updates, reallocate the land for a more deliverable use that can help to address identified needs (or, if appropriate, deallocate a site which is undeveloped); and
- b) in the interim, prior to updating the plan, applications for alternative uses on the land should be supported, where the proposed use would contribute to meeting an unmet need for development in the area.

~~127.~~125. Local planning authorities should also take a positive approach to applications for alternative uses of land which is currently developed but not allocated for a specific purpose in plans, where this would help to meet identified development needs. In particular, they should support proposals to:

- a) use retail and employment land for homes in areas of high housing demand, provided this would not undermine key economic sectors or sites or the vitality and viability of town centres, and would be compatible with other policies in this Framework; and
- b) make more effective use of sites that provide community services such as schools and hospitals, provided this maintains or improves the quality of service provision and access to open space.

Achieving appropriate densities

~~128.~~126. Planning policies and decisions should support development that makes efficient use of land, taking into account:

- a) the identified need for different types of housing and other forms of development, and the availability of land suitable for accommodating it;
- b) local market conditions and viability;
- c) the availability and capacity of infrastructure and services – both existing and proposed – as well as their potential for further improvement and the scope to promote sustainable travel modes that limit future car use;
- d) the desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character and setting

(including residential gardens), or of promoting regeneration and change; and

- e) the importance of securing well-designed ~~and beautiful~~, attractive and healthy places.

~~129.~~ 127. Area-based character assessments, design guides and codes and masterplans can be used to help ensure that land is used efficiently while also creating beautiful and sustainable places. Where there is an existing or anticipated shortage of land for meeting identified housing needs, it is especially important that planning policies and decisions avoid homes being built at low densities, and ensure that developments make optimal use of the potential of each site. In these circumstances:

- a) plans should contain policies to optimise the use of land in their area and meet as much of the identified need for housing as possible. This will be tested robustly at examination, and should include the use of minimum density standards for city and town centres and other locations that are well served by public transport. These standards should seek a significant uplift in the average density of residential development within these areas, unless it can be shown that there are strong reasons why this would be inappropriate;
- b) the use of minimum density standards should also be considered for other parts of the plan area. It may be appropriate to set out a range of densities that reflect the accessibility and potential of different areas, rather than one broad density range; and
- c) local planning authorities should refuse applications which they consider fail to make efficient use of land, taking into account the policies in this Framework. In this context, when considering applications for housing, authorities should take a flexible approach in applying policies or guidance relating to daylight and sunlight, where they would otherwise inhibit making efficient use of a site (as long as the resulting scheme would provide acceptable living standards).

~~130. In applying paragraphs 129a and b above to existing urban areas, significant uplifts in the average density of residential development may be inappropriate if the resulting built form would be wholly out of character with the existing area. Such circumstances should be evidenced through an authority wide design code which is adopted or will be adopted as part of the development plan.~~

12. Achieving well-designed ~~and beautiful~~ places

~~131-128.~~ The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. Being clear about design expectations, and how these will be tested, is essential for achieving this. So too is effective engagement between applicants, communities, local planning authorities and other interests throughout the process.

~~132-129.~~ Plans should, at the most appropriate level, set out a clear design vision and expectations, so that applicants have as much certainty as possible about what is likely to be acceptable. Design policies should be developed with local communities so they reflect local aspirations, and are grounded in an understanding and evaluation of each area's defining characteristics. Neighbourhood planning groups can play an important role in identifying the special qualities of each area and explaining how this should be reflected in development, both through their own plans and by engaging in the production of design policy, guidance and codes by local planning authorities and developers.

~~133-130.~~ To provide maximum clarity about design expectations at an early stage, all local planning authorities should prepare design guides or codes consistent with the principles set out in the National Design Guide and National Model Design Code, and which reflect local character and design preferences. Design guides and codes provide a local framework for creating beautiful and distinctive places with a consistent and high quality standard of design. Their geographic coverage, level of detail and degree of prescription should be tailored to the circumstances and scale of change in each place, and should allow a suitable degree of variety.

~~134-131.~~ Design guides and codes can be prepared at an area-wide, neighbourhood or site-specific scale, and to carry weight in decision-making should be produced either as part of a plan or as supplementary planning documents. Landowners and developers may contribute to these exercises, but may also choose to prepare design codes in support of a planning application for sites they wish to develop. Whoever prepares them, all guides and codes should be based on effective community engagement and reflect local aspirations for the development of their area, taking into account the guidance contained in the National Design Guide and the National Model Design Code. These national documents should be used to guide decisions on applications in the absence of locally produced design guides or design codes.

~~135-132.~~ Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

- a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;
- b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;

- c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);
- d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;
- e) optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks; and
- f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users⁵³; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

~~136-133.~~ Trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments, and can also help mitigate and adapt to climate change. Planning policies and decisions should ensure that new streets are tree-lined⁵⁴, that opportunities are taken to incorporate trees elsewhere in developments (such as parks and community orchards), that appropriate measures are in place to secure the long-term maintenance of newly-planted trees, and that existing trees are retained wherever possible. Applicants and local planning authorities should work with highways officers and tree officers to ensure that the right trees are planted in the right places, and solutions are found that are compatible with highways standards and the needs of different users.

~~137-134.~~ Design quality should be considered throughout the evolution and assessment of individual proposals. Early discussion between applicants, the local planning authority and local community about the design and style of emerging schemes is important for clarifying expectations and reconciling local and commercial interests. Applicants should work closely with those affected by their proposals to evolve designs that take account of the views of the community. Applications that can demonstrate early, proactive and effective engagement with the community should be looked on more favourably than those that cannot.

~~138-135.~~ Local planning authorities should ensure that they have access to, and make appropriate use of, tools and processes for assessing and improving the design of development. ~~The National Model Design Code is the primary basis means of doing so should be through for~~ the preparation and use of local design codes, ~~in line with the National Model Design Code~~. For assessing proposals there is a range of tools including workshops to engage the local community, design advice and review arrangements, and assessment frameworks such as Building for a Healthy Life⁵⁵. These are of most benefit if used as early as possible in the evolution of schemes, and are particularly important for significant projects such as large scale housing and mixed use developments. In assessing applications, local planning

⁵³ Planning policies for housing should make use of the Government's optional technical standards for accessible and adaptable housing, where this would address an identified need for such properties. Policies may also make use of the nationally described space standard, where the need for an internal space standard can be justified.

⁵⁴ Unless, in specific cases, there are clear, justifiable and compelling reasons why this would be inappropriate.

⁵⁵ Birkbeck D and Kruczkowski S et al (2020) *Building for a Healthy Life*

authorities should have regard to the outcome from these processes, including any recommendations made by design review panels.

~~139.~~136. Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design⁵⁶, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes. Conversely, significant weight should be given to:

- a) development which reflects local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes; and/or
- b) outstanding or innovative designs which promote high levels of sustainability, or help raise the standard of design more generally in an area, so long as they fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings.

~~140.~~137. Local planning authorities should ensure that relevant planning conditions refer to clear and accurate plans and drawings which provide visual clarity about the design of the development, and are clear about the approved use of materials where appropriate. This will provide greater certainty for those implementing the planning permission on how to comply with the permission and a clearer basis for local planning authorities to identify breaches of planning control. Local planning authorities should also seek to ensure that the quality of approved development is not materially diminished between permission and completion, as a result of changes being made to the permitted scheme (for example through changes to approved details such as the materials used).

~~141.~~138. The quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed. A separate consent process within the planning system controls the display of advertisements, which should be operated in a way which is simple, efficient and effective. Advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts.

⁵⁶ Contained in the National Design Guide and National Model Design Code.

13. Protecting Green Belt land

~~142.139.~~ The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.

~~143.140.~~ Green Belt serves five purposes:

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

~~144.141.~~ The general extent of Green Belts across the country is already established. New Green Belts should only be established in exceptional circumstances, for example when planning for larger scale development such as new settlements or major urban extensions. Any proposals for new Green Belts should be set out in strategic policies, which should:

- a) demonstrate why normal planning and development management policies would not be adequate;
- b) set out whether any major changes in circumstances have made the adoption of this exceptional measure necessary;
- c) show what the consequences of the proposal would be for sustainable development;
- d) demonstrate the necessity for the Green Belt and its consistency with strategic policies for adjoining areas; and
- e) show how the Green Belt would meet the other objectives of the Framework.

~~145.142.~~ Once established, there is no requirement for Green Belt boundaries should only to be altered reviewed or changed when plans are being prepared or updated. Authorities may choose to review and alter Green Belt boundaries where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified, in which case proposals for changes should be made only through the preparation or updating of plans plan-making process. Exceptional circumstances include, but are not limited to, instances where an authority cannot meet its identified need for housing, commercial or other development through other means. In these circumstances authorities should review Green Belt boundaries and propose alterations to meet these needs in full, unless the review provides clear evidence that such alterations would fundamentally undermine the function of the Green Belt across the area of

the plan as a whole. Strategic policies should establish the need for any changes to Green Belt boundaries, having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so they can endure beyond the plan period. Where a need for changes to Green Belt boundaries has been established through strategic policies, detailed amendments to those boundaries may be made through non- strategic policies, including neighbourhood plans.

~~146.~~143. Before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the strategic policy-making authority should be able to demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development. This will be assessed through the examination of its strategic policies, which will take into account the preceding paragraph, and whether the strategy:

- a) makes as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land;
- b) optimises the density of development in line with the policies in chapter 11 of this Framework, including whether policies promote a significant uplift in minimum density standards in town and city centres and other locations well served by public transport; and
- c) has been informed by discussions with neighbouring authorities about whether they could accommodate some of the identified need for development, as demonstrated through the statement of common ground.

~~147.~~144. When drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries, the need to promote sustainable patterns of development should be taken into account. Strategic policy-making authorities should consider the consequences for sustainable development of channelling development towards urban areas inside the Green Belt boundary, towards towns and villages inset within the Green Belt or towards locations beyond the outer Green Belt boundary. Where ~~it has been concluded that~~ it is necessary to release Green Belt land for development, plans should give first consideration to previously-developed land in sustainable locations, then consider grey belt land in sustainable locations which is not already previously-developed, and only then consider other sustainable Green Belt locations. They should also set out ways in which the impact of removing land from the Green Belt can be offset through compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land.

~~148.~~145. When defining Green Belt boundaries, plans should:

- a) ensure consistency with the development plan's strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development;
- b) not include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open;
- c) where necessary, identify areas of safeguarded land between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer-term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period;
- d) make clear that the safeguarded land is not allocated for development at the present time. Planning permission for the permanent development of

safeguarded land should only be granted following an update to a plan which proposes the development;

- e) be able to demonstrate that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the plan period; and
- f) define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent.

~~149.~~146. If it is necessary to restrict development in a village primarily because of the important contribution which the open character of the village makes to the openness of the Green Belt, the village should be included in the Green Belt. If, however, the character of the village needs to be protected for other reasons, other means should be used, such as conservation area or normal development management policies, and the village should be excluded from the Green Belt.

~~150.~~147. Once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. Where Green Belt land is released for development through plan preparation or review, development proposals on the land concerned should deliver the contributions set out in paragraph 155 below.

~~151.~~148. The National Forest and Community Forests offer valuable opportunities for improving the environment around towns and cities, by upgrading the landscape and providing for recreation and wildlife. The National Forest Strategy and an approved Community Forest Plan may be a material consideration in preparing development plans and in deciding planning applications. Any development proposals within the National Forest and Community Forests in the Green Belt should be subject to the normal policies for controlling development in Green Belts.

Proposals affecting the Green Belt

~~152.~~149. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

~~153.~~150. When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

~~154.~~151. A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:

- a) buildings for agriculture and forestry;
- b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;

- c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;
- d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;
- e) limited infilling in villages;
- f) limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites); and
- g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt.:
 - ~~not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or~~
 - ~~not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority.~~

152. In addition to the above, housing, commercial and other development in the Green Belt should not be regarded as inappropriate where:

- a. The development would utilise grey belt land in sustainable locations, the contributions set out in paragraph 155 below are provided, and the development would not fundamentally undermine the function of the Green Belt across the area of the plan as a whole; and
- b. The local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites (with a buffer, if applicable, as set out in paragraph 76) or where the Housing Delivery Test indicates that the delivery of housing was below 75% of the housing requirement over the previous three years; or there is a demonstrable need for land to be released for development of local, regional or national importance.
- c. Development is able to meet the planning policy requirements set out in paragraph 155.

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

- a) mineral extraction;
- b) engineering operations;
- c) local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location;
- d) the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and

substantial construction;

- e) material changes in the use of land (such as changes of use for outdoor sport or recreation, or for cemeteries and burial grounds); and
- f) development, including buildings, brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order or Neighbourhood Development Order.

~~156.~~154. When located in the Green Belt, elements of many renewable energy projects will comprise inappropriate development. In such cases developers will need to demonstrate very special circumstances if projects are to proceed. Such very special circumstances may include the wider environmental benefits associated with increased production of energy from renewable sources.

155. Where major development takes place on land which has been released from the Green Belt through plan preparation or review, or on sites in the Green Belt permitted through development management, the following contributions should be made:

- a. In the case of schemes involving the provision of housing, at least 50% affordable housing [with an appropriate proportion being Social Rent], subject to viability;
- b. Necessary improvements to local or national infrastructure; and
- c. The provision of new, or improvements to existing, green spaces that are accessible to the public. Where residential development is involved, the objective should be for new residents to be able to access good quality green spaces within a short walk of their home, whether through onsite provision or through access to offsite spaces.

156. Regarding the provision of green space, development proposals should meet local standards where these exist in local plans, for example local planning policies on access to green space and / or urban greening factors. Where no locally specific standards exist, development proposals should meet national standards relevant to the development. These include Natural England standards on accessible green space and urban greening factor and Green Flag criteria.

157. Additional guidance on viability considerations for development in the Green Belt is provided in Annex 4.

14. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

~~157-158.~~ The planning system should support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate, taking full account of flood risk and coastal change. It should help to: shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience; encourage the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings; and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure.

Planning for climate change

~~158-159.~~ Plans should take a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change, taking into account the long-term implications for flood risk, coastal change, water supply, biodiversity and landscapes, and the risk of overheating from rising temperatures⁵⁷. Policies should support appropriate measures to ensure the future resilience of communities and infrastructure to climate change impacts, such as providing space for physical protection measures, or making provision for the possible future relocation of vulnerable development and infrastructure.

~~159-160.~~ New development should be planned for in ways that:

- a) avoid increased vulnerability to the range of impacts arising from climate change. When new development is brought forward in areas which are vulnerable, care should be taken to ensure that risks can be managed through suitable adaptation measures, including through the planning of green infrastructure; and
- b) can help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, such as through its location, orientation and design. Any local requirements for the sustainability of buildings should reflect the Government's policy for national technical standards.

~~160-161.~~ To help increase the use and supply of renewable and low carbon energy and heat, plans should:

- a) provide a positive strategy for energy from these sources, that maximises the potential for suitable development, and their future re-powering and life extension, while ensuring that adverse impacts are addressed appropriately (including cumulative landscape and visual impacts);
- b) ~~consider identifying~~ identify suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy sources, and supporting infrastructure, where this would help secure their development; and
- c) identify opportunities for development to draw its energy supply from decentralised, renewable or low carbon energy supply systems and for co-locating potential heat customers and suppliers.

⁵⁷ In line with the objectives and provisions of the Climate Change Act 2008.

~~161. Local planning authorities should support community-led initiatives for renewable and low carbon energy, including developments outside areas identified in local plans or other strategic policies that are being taken forward through neighbourhood planning.~~

162. In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should expect new development to:

- a) comply with any development plan policies on local requirements for decentralised energy supply unless it can be demonstrated by the applicant, having regard to the type of development involved and its design, that this is not feasible or viable; and
- b) take account of landform, layout, building orientation, massing and landscaping to minimise energy consumption.

163. ~~In determining planning applications~~ Local planning authorities should also give significant weight to the need to support energy efficiency and low carbon heating improvements to existing buildings, both domestic and non-domestic (including through installation of heat pumps and solar panels where these do not already benefit from permitted development rights). Where the proposals would affect conservation areas, listed buildings or other relevant designated heritage assets, local planning authorities should also apply the policies set out in chapter 16 of this Framework.

164. ~~In determining planning applications~~ Local planning authorities should support planning applications for all forms of renewable and low carbon development. When determining planning applications⁵⁸ for ~~renewable and low carbon~~ these developments, local planning authorities should:

- a) not require applicants to demonstrate the overall need for renewable or low carbon energy, and give significant weight to the proposal's contribution to renewable energy generation and a net zero future;
- b) recognise that even small-scale and community-led projects provide a valuable contribution to significant cutting greenhouse gas emissions;
- c) in the case of applications for the repowering and life-extension of existing renewable sites, give significant weight to the benefits of utilising an established site, ~~and approve the application if its impacts are (or can be made) acceptable~~⁵⁹.

⁵⁸ ~~Wind energy development involving one or more turbines can also be permitted through Local Development Orders, Neighbourhood Development Orders and Community Right to Build Orders. In the case of Local Development Orders, it should be demonstrated that the planning impacts identified by the affected local community have been appropriately addressed and the proposal has community support.~~

⁵⁹ ~~Except for applications for the repowering and life-extension of existing wind turbines, a planning application for wind energy development involving one or more turbines should not be considered acceptable unless it is in an area identified as suitable for wind energy development in the development plan or a supplementary planning document; and, following consultation, it can be demonstrated that the planning impacts identified by the affected local community have been appropriately addressed and the proposal has community support.~~

165. Once suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy have been identified in plans, local planning authorities should expect subsequent applications for commercial scale projects outside these areas to demonstrate that the proposed location meets the criteria used in identifying suitable areas.

Planning and flood risk

165. Inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere.
166. Strategic policies should be informed by a strategic flood risk assessment, and should manage flood risk from all sources. They should consider cumulative impacts in, or affecting, local areas susceptible to flooding, and take account of advice from the Environment Agency and other relevant flood risk management authorities, such as lead local flood authorities and internal drainage boards.
167. All plans should apply a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development – taking into account all sources of flood risk and the current and future impacts of climate change – so as to avoid, where possible, flood risk to people and property. They should do this, and manage any residual risk, by:
- a) applying the sequential test and then, if necessary, the exception test as set out below;
 - b) safeguarding land from development that is required, or likely to be required, for current or future flood management;
 - c) using opportunities provided by new development and improvements in green and other infrastructure to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding, (making as much use as possible of natural flood management techniques as part of an integrated approach to flood risk management); and
 - d) where climate change is expected to increase flood risk so that some existing development may not be sustainable in the long-term, seeking opportunities to relocate development, including housing, to more sustainable locations.
168. The aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding. The strategic flood risk assessment will provide the basis for applying this test. The sequential approach should be used in areas known to be at risk now or in the future from any form of flooding.
169. If it is not possible for development to be located in areas with a lower risk of flooding (taking into account wider sustainable development objectives), the exception test may have to be applied. The need for the exception test will depend on the potential vulnerability of the site and of the development proposed, in line with the Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification set out in Annex 3.

170. The application of the exception test should be informed by a strategic or site-specific flood risk assessment, depending on whether it is being applied during plan production or at the application stage. To pass the exception test it should be demonstrated that:
- a) the development would provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh the flood risk; and
 - b) the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall.
171. Both elements of the exception test should be satisfied for development to be allocated or permitted.
172. Where planning applications come forward on sites allocated in the development plan through the sequential test, applicants need not apply the sequential test again. However, the exception test may need to be reapplied if relevant aspects of the proposal had not been considered when the test was applied at the plan-making stage, or if more recent information about existing or potential flood risk should be taken into account.
173. When determining any planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere. Where appropriate, applications should be supported by a site-specific flood-risk assessment⁶⁰. Development should only be allowed in areas at risk of flooding where, in the light of this assessment (and the sequential and exception tests, as applicable) it can be demonstrated that:
- a) within the site, the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk, unless there are overriding reasons to prefer a different location;
 - b) the development is appropriately flood resistant and resilient such that, in the event of a flood, it could be quickly brought back into use without significant refurbishment;
 - c) it incorporates sustainable drainage systems, unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate;
 - d) any residual risk can be safely managed; and
 - e) safe access and escape routes are included where appropriate, as part of an agreed emergency plan.
174. Applications for some minor development and changes of use⁶¹ should not be

⁶⁰ A site-specific flood risk assessment should be provided for all development in Flood Zones 2 and 3. In Flood Zone 1, an assessment should accompany all proposals involving: sites of 1 hectare or more; land which has been identified by the Environment Agency as having critical drainage problems; land identified in a strategic flood risk assessment as being at increased flood risk in future; or land that may be subject to other sources of flooding, where its development would introduce a more vulnerable use.

⁶¹ This includes householder development, small non-residential extensions (with a footprint of less than 250m²)

subject to the sequential or exception tests but should still meet the requirements for site-specific flood risk assessments set out in footnote ⁵⁹.

175. Major developments should incorporate sustainable drainage systems unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate. The systems used should:
- a) take account of advice from the lead local flood authority;
 - b) have appropriate proposed minimum operational standards;
 - c) have maintenance arrangements in place to ensure an acceptable standard of operation for the lifetime of the development; and
 - d) where possible, provide multifunctional benefits.

Coastal change

176. In coastal areas, planning policies and decisions should take account of the UK Marine Policy Statement and marine plans. Integrated Coastal Zone Management should be pursued across local authority and land/sea boundaries, to ensure effective alignment of the terrestrial and marine planning regimes.
177. Plans should reduce risk from coastal change by avoiding inappropriate development in vulnerable areas and not exacerbating the impacts of physical changes to the coast. They should identify as a Coastal Change Management Area any area likely to be affected by physical changes to the coast, and:
- a) be clear as to what development will be appropriate in such areas and in what circumstances; and
 - b) make provision for development and infrastructure that needs to be relocated away from Coastal Change Management Areas.
178. Development in a Coastal Change Management Area will be appropriate only where it is demonstrated that:
- d) it will be safe over its planned lifetime and not have an unacceptable impact on coastal change;
 - e) the character of the coast including designations is not compromised;
 - f) the development provides wider sustainability benefits; and
 - g) the development does not hinder the creation and maintenance of a continuous signed and managed route around the coast⁶².
179. Local planning authorities should limit the planned lifetime of development in a Coastal Change Management Area through temporary permission and restoration conditions, where this is necessary to reduce a potentially unacceptable level of

and changes of use; except for changes of use to a caravan, camping or chalet site, or to a mobile home or park home site, where the sequential and exception tests should be applied as appropriate.

⁶² As required by the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009.

future risk to people and the development.

15. Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

180. Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:
- h) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan);
 - i) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland;
 - j) maintaining the character of the undeveloped coast, while improving public access to it where appropriate;
 - k) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures;
 - l) preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Development should, wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as air and water quality, taking into account relevant information such as river basin management plans; and
 - m) remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate.
181. Plans should: distinguish between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites; allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value, where consistent with other policies in this Framework⁶³; take a strategic approach to maintaining and enhancing networks of habitats and green infrastructure; and plan for the enhancement of natural capital at a catchment or landscape scale across local authority boundaries.
182. Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues. The conservation and enhancement of wildlife and cultural heritage are also important considerations in these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks

⁶³ Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality. ~~The availability of agricultural land used for food production should be considered, alongside the other policies in this Framework, when deciding what sites are most appropriate for development.~~

and the Broads⁶⁴. The scale and extent of development within all these designated areas should be limited, while development within their setting should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the designated areas.

183. When considering applications for development within National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, permission should be refused for major development⁶⁵ other than in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of:
- a) the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy;
 - b) the cost of, and scope for, developing outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and
 - c) any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated.
184. Within areas defined as Heritage Coast (and that do not already fall within one of the designated areas mentioned in paragraph 182), planning policies and decisions should be consistent with the special character of the area and the importance of its conservation. Major development within a Heritage Coast is unlikely to be appropriate, unless it is compatible with its special character.

Habitats and biodiversity

185. To protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should:
- a) Identify, map and safeguard components of local wildlife-rich habitats and wider ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity⁶⁶; wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them; and areas identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation⁶⁷; and
 - b) promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity.

⁶⁴ *English National Parks and the Broads: UK Government Vision and Circular 2010* provides further guidance and information about their statutory purposes, management and other matters.

⁶⁵ For the purposes of paragraphs 182 and 183, whether a proposal is 'major development' is a matter for the decision maker, taking into account its nature, scale and setting, and whether it could have a significant adverse impact on the purposes for which the area has been designated or defined.

⁶⁶ Circular 06/2005 provides further guidance in respect of statutory obligations for biodiversity and geological conservation and their impact within the planning system.

⁶⁷ Where areas that are part of the Nature Recovery Network are identified in plans, it may be appropriate to specify the types of development that may be suitable within them.

186. When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles:
- a) if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused;
 - b) development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and which is likely to have an adverse effect on it (either individually or in combination with other developments), should not normally be permitted. The only exception is where the benefits of the development in the location proposed clearly outweigh both its likely impact on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest, and any broader impacts on the national network of Sites of Special Scientific Interest;
 - c) development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons⁶⁸ and a suitable compensation strategy exists; and
 - d) development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported; while opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity or enhance public access to nature where this is appropriate.
187. The following should be given the same protection as habitats sites:
- a) potential Special Protection Areas and possible Special Areas of Conservation;
 - b) listed or proposed Ramsar sites⁶⁹; and
 - c) sites identified, or required, as compensatory measures for adverse effects on habitats sites, potential Special Protection Areas, possible Special Areas of Conservation, and listed or proposed Ramsar sites.
188. The presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply where the plan or project is likely to have a significant effect on a habitats site (either alone or in combination with other plans or projects), unless an appropriate assessment has concluded that the plan or project will not adversely affect the integrity of the habitats site.

⁶⁸ For example, infrastructure projects (including nationally significant infrastructure projects, orders under the Transport and Works Act and hybrid bills), where the public benefit would clearly outweigh the loss or deterioration of habitat.

⁶⁹ Potential Special Protection Areas, possible Special Areas of Conservation and proposed Ramsar sites are sites on which Government has initiated public consultation on the scientific case for designation as a Special Protection Area, candidate Special Area of Conservation or Ramsar site.

Ground conditions and pollution

189. Planning policies and decisions should ensure that:
- a) a site is suitable for its proposed use taking account of ground conditions and any risks arising from land instability and contamination. This includes risks arising from natural hazards or former activities such as mining, and any proposals for mitigation including land remediation (as well as potential impacts on the natural environment arising from that remediation);
 - b) after remediation, as a minimum, land should not be capable of being determined as contaminated land under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990; and
 - c) adequate site investigation information, prepared by a competent person, is available to inform these assessments.
190. Where a site is affected by contamination or land stability issues, responsibility for securing a safe development rests with the developer and/or landowner.
191. Planning policies and decisions should also ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development. In doing so they should:
- a) mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development – and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and the quality of life⁷⁰;
 - b) identify and protect tranquil areas which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason; and
 - c) limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation.
192. Planning policies and decisions should sustain and contribute towards compliance with relevant limit values or national objectives for pollutants, taking into account the presence of Air Quality Management Areas and Clean Air Zones, and the cumulative impacts from individual sites in local areas. Opportunities to improve air quality or mitigate impacts should be identified, such as through traffic and travel management, and green infrastructure provision and enhancement. So far as possible these opportunities should be considered at the plan-making stage, to ensure a strategic approach and limit the need for issues to be reconsidered when determining individual applications. Planning decisions should ensure that any new development in Air Quality Management Areas and Clean Air Zones is consistent with the local air quality action plan.

⁷⁰ See Explanatory Note to the *Noise Policy Statement for England* (Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs, 2010).

193. Planning policies and decisions should ensure that new development can be integrated effectively with existing businesses and community facilities (such as places of worship, pubs, music venues and sports clubs). Existing businesses and facilities should not have unreasonable restrictions placed on them as a result of development permitted after they were established. Where the operation of an existing business or community facility could have a significant adverse effect on new development (including changes of use) in its vicinity, the applicant (or 'agent of change') should be required to provide suitable mitigation before the development has been completed.
194. The focus of planning policies and decisions should be on whether proposed development is an acceptable use of land, rather than the control of processes or emissions (where these are subject to separate pollution control regimes). Planning decisions should assume that these regimes will operate effectively. Equally, where a planning decision has been made on a particular development, the planning issues should not be revisited through the permitting regimes operated by pollution control authorities.

16. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

195. Heritage assets range from sites and buildings of local historic value to those of the highest significance, such as World Heritage Sites which are internationally recognised to be of Outstanding Universal Value⁷¹. These assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations⁷².
196. Plans should set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. This strategy should take into account:
- d) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets, and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
 - e) the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring;
 - f) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness; and
 - g) opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of a place.
197. When considering the designation of conservation areas, local planning authorities should ensure that an area justifies such status because of its special architectural or historic interest, and that the concept of conservation is not devalued through the designation of areas that lack special interest.
198. Local planning authorities should maintain or have access to a historic environment record. This should contain up-to-date evidence about the historic environment in their area and be used to:
- h) assess the significance of heritage assets and the contribution they make to their environment; and
 - i) predict the likelihood that currently unidentified heritage assets, particularly sites of historic and archaeological interest, will be discovered in the future.

⁷¹ Some World Heritage Sites are inscribed by UNESCO to be of natural significance rather than cultural significance; and in some cases they are inscribed for both their natural and cultural significance.

⁷² The policies set out in this chapter relate, as applicable, to the heritage-related consent regimes for which local planning authorities are responsible under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as well as to plan-making and decision-making.

199. Local planning authorities should make information about the historic environment, gathered as part of policy-making or development management, publicly accessible.

Proposals affecting heritage assets

200. In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.
201. Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.
202. Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of, or damage to, a heritage asset, the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision.
203. In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:
- a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
 - b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
 - c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.
204. In considering any applications to remove or alter a historic statue, plaque, memorial or monument (whether listed or not), local planning authorities should have regard to the importance of their retention in situ and, where appropriate, of explaining their historic and social context rather than removal.

Considering potential impacts

205. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.
206. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:
- a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;
 - b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional⁷³.
207. Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:
- a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and
 - b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and
 - c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and
 - d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.
208. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
209. The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

⁷³ Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest, which are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments, should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets.

210. Local planning authorities should not permit the loss of the whole or part of a heritage asset without taking all reasonable steps to ensure the new development will proceed after the loss has occurred.
211. Local planning authorities should require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible⁷⁴. However, the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted.
212. Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites, and within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the asset (or which better reveal its significance) should be treated favourably.
213. Not all elements of a Conservation Area or World Heritage Site will necessarily contribute to its significance. Loss of a building (or other element) which makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site should be treated either as substantial harm under paragraph x or less than substantial harm under paragraph x, as appropriate, taking into account the relative significance of the element affected and its contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site as a whole.
214. Local planning authorities should assess whether the benefits of a proposal for enabling development, which would otherwise conflict with planning policies but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset, outweigh the disbenefits of departing from those policies.

⁷⁴ Copies of evidence should be deposited with the relevant historic environment record, and any archives with a local museum or other public depository.

17. Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals

215. It is essential that there is a sufficient supply of minerals to provide the infrastructure, buildings, energy and goods that the country needs. Since minerals are a finite natural resource, and can only be worked where they are found, best use needs to be made of them to secure their long-term conservation.
216. Planning policies should:
- a) provide for the extraction of mineral resources of local and national importance, but not identify new sites or extensions to existing sites for peat extraction;
 - b) so far as practicable, take account of the contribution that substitute or secondary and recycled materials and minerals waste would make to the supply of materials, before considering extraction of primary materials, whilst aiming to source minerals supplies indigenously;
 - c) safeguard mineral resources by defining Mineral Safeguarding Areas and Mineral Consultation Areas⁷⁵; and adopt appropriate policies so that known locations of specific minerals resources of local and national importance are not sterilised by non-mineral development where this should be avoided (whilst not creating a presumption that the resources defined will be worked);
 - d) set out policies to encourage the prior extraction of minerals, where practical and environmentally feasible, if it is necessary for non-mineral development to take place;
 - e) safeguard existing, planned and potential sites for: the bulk transport, handling and processing of minerals; the manufacture of concrete and concrete products; and the handling, processing and distribution of substitute, recycled and secondary aggregate material;
 - f) set out criteria or requirements to ensure that permitted and proposed operations do not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment or human health, taking into account the cumulative effects of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or a number of sites in a locality;
 - g) when developing noise limits, recognise that some noisy short-term activities, which may otherwise be regarded as unacceptable, are unavoidable to facilitate minerals extraction; and
 - h) ensure that worked land is reclaimed at the earliest opportunity, taking account of aviation safety, and that high quality restoration and aftercare of mineral sites takes place.
217. When determining planning applications, great weight should be given to the benefits of mineral extraction, including to the economy⁷⁶. In considering proposals

⁷⁵ Primarily in two tier areas as stated in Annex 2: Glossary

⁷⁶ Except in relation to the extraction of coal, where the policy at paragraph 223 of this Framework applies.

for mineral extraction, minerals planning authorities should:

- a) as far as is practical, provide for the maintenance of landbanks of non-energy minerals from outside National Parks, the Broads, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and World Heritage Sites, scheduled monuments and conservation areas;
- b) ensure that there are no unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment, human health or aviation safety, and take into account the cumulative effect of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or from a number of sites in a locality;
- c) ensure that any unavoidable noise, dust and particle emissions and any blasting vibrations are controlled, mitigated or removed at source⁷⁷, and establish appropriate noise limits for extraction in proximity to noise sensitive properties;
- d) not grant planning permission for peat extraction from new or extended sites;
- e) provide for restoration and aftercare at the earliest opportunity, to be carried out to high environmental standards, through the application of appropriate conditions. Bonds or other financial guarantees to underpin planning conditions should only be sought in exceptional circumstances;
- f) consider how to meet any demand for the extraction of building stone needed for the repair of heritage assets, taking account of the need to protect designated sites; and
- g) recognise the small-scale nature and impact of building and roofing stone quarries, and the need for a flexible approach to the duration of planning permissions reflecting the intermittent or low rate of working at many sites.

218. Local planning authorities should not normally permit other development proposals in Mineral Safeguarding Areas if it might constrain potential future use for mineral working.

Maintaining supply

219. Minerals planning authorities should plan for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates by:

- a) preparing an annual Local Aggregate Assessment, either individually or jointly, to forecast future demand, based on a rolling average of 10 years' sales data and other relevant local information, and an assessment of all supply options (including marine dredged, secondary and recycled sources);
- b) participating in the operation of an Aggregate Working Party and taking the advice of that party into account when preparing their Local Aggregate Assessment;
- c) making provision for the land-won and other elements of their Local Aggregate

⁷⁷ National planning guidance on minerals sets out how these policies should be implemented.

Assessment in their mineral plans, taking account of the advice of the Aggregate Working Parties and the National Aggregate Co-ordinating Group as appropriate. Such provision should take the form of specific sites, preferred areas and/or areas of search and locational criteria as appropriate;

- d) taking account of any published National and Sub National Guidelines on future provision which should be used as a guideline when planning for the future demand for and supply of aggregates;
- e) using landbanks of aggregate minerals reserves principally as an indicator of the security of aggregate minerals supply, and to indicate the additional provision that needs to be made for new aggregate extraction and alternative supplies in mineral plans;
- f) maintaining landbanks of at least 7 years for sand and gravel and at least 10 years for crushed rock, whilst ensuring that the capacity of operations to supply a wide range of materials is not compromised⁷⁸;
- g) ensuring that large landbanks bound up in very few sites do not stifle competition; and
- h) calculating and maintaining separate landbanks for any aggregate materials of a specific type or quality which have a distinct and separate market.

220. Minerals planning authorities should plan for a steady and adequate supply of industrial minerals by:

- a) co-operating with neighbouring and more distant authorities to ensure an adequate provision of industrial minerals to support their likely use in industrial and manufacturing processes;
- b) encouraging safeguarding or stockpiling so that important minerals remain available for use;
- c) maintaining a stock of permitted reserves to support the level of actual and proposed investment required for new or existing plant, and the maintenance and improvement of existing plant and equipment⁷⁹; and
- d) taking account of the need for provision of brick clay from a number of different sources to enable appropriate blends to be made.

⁷⁸ Longer periods may be appropriate to take account of the need to supply a range of types of aggregates, locations of permitted reserves relative to markets, and productive capacity of permitted sites.

⁷⁹ These reserves should be at least 10 years for individual silica sand sites; at least 15 years for cement primary (chalk and limestone) and secondary (clay and shale) materials to maintain an existing plant, and for silica sand sites where significant new capital is required; and at least 25 years for brick clay, and for cement primary and secondary materials to support a new kiln.

Oil, gas and coal exploration and extraction

221. Minerals planning authorities should:

- a) when planning for on-shore oil and gas development, clearly distinguish between, and plan positively for, the three phases of development (exploration, appraisal and production), whilst ensuring appropriate monitoring and site restoration is provided for;
- b) encourage underground gas and carbon storage and associated infrastructure if local geological circumstances indicate its feasibility;
- c) indicate any areas where coal extraction and the disposal of colliery spoil may be acceptable;
- d) encourage the capture and use of methane from coal mines in active and abandoned coalfield areas; and
- e) provide for coal producers to extract separately, and if necessary stockpile, fireclay so that it remains available for use.

222. When determining planning applications, minerals planning authorities should ensure that the integrity and safety of underground storage facilities are appropriate, taking into account the maintenance of gas pressure, prevention of leakage of gas and the avoidance of pollution.

223. Planning permission should not be granted for the extraction of coal unless:

- a) the proposal is environmentally acceptable, or can be made so by planning conditions or obligations; or
- b) if it is not environmentally acceptable, then it provides national, local or community benefits which clearly outweigh its likely impacts (taking all relevant matters into account, including any residual environmental impacts).

Annex 1: Implementation

For the purposes of decision-making

224. The policies in this Framework are material considerations which should be taken into account in dealing with applications from the day of its publication⁸⁰. Plans may also need to be revised to reflect policy changes which this Framework has made.
225. However, existing policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to the publication of this Framework. Due weight should be given to them, according to their degree of consistency with this Framework (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).
- ~~226. From the date of publication of this revision of the Framework, for decision-making purposes only, certain local planning authorities will only be required to identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide a minimum of four years' worth of housing (with a buffer, if applicable, as set out in paragraph 77) against the housing requirement set out in adopted strategic policies, or against local housing need where the strategic policies are more than five years old⁸⁴, instead of a minimum of five years as set out in paragraph 77 of this Framework. This policy applies to those authorities which have an emerging local plan that has either been submitted for examination or has reached Regulation 18 or Regulation 19 (Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012) stage, including both a policies map and proposed allocations towards meeting housing need. This provision does not apply to authorities who are not required to demonstrate a housing land supply, as set out in paragraph 76. These arrangements will apply for a period of two years from the publication date of this revision of the Framework.~~

For the purposes of plan-making

- ~~226. The policies in this Framework (published on [publication date]) will apply for the purpose of preparing local plans⁸² from [publication date + one month] unless one or more of the following apply:~~

~~⁸⁰ As an exception to this, the policy contained in paragraph 76 and the related reference in footnote 8 of this Framework should only be taken into account as a material consideration when dealing with applications made on or after the date of publication of this version of the Framework.~~

~~⁸⁴ Unless these strategic policies have been reviewed and found not to require updating. Where local housing need is used as the basis for assessing whether a four year supply of specific deliverable sites exists, it should be calculated using the standard method set out in national planning guidance.~~

~~⁸² Under the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.~~

- a. the emerging annual housing requirement⁸³ in a local plan that reaches or has reached Regulation 19⁸⁴ (pre-submission stage) on or before [publication date + one month] is no more than 200 dwellings below the published relevant Local Housing Need figure⁸⁵;
- b. the local plan is a Part 2 plan that does not introduce new strategic policies setting the housing requirement unless the relevant Local Plan Part 1 has been prepared applying the policies in this version of the Framework;
- c. the local plan is or has been submitted for examination under Regulation 22⁸⁶ on or before [publication date + one month].

Where a, b or c applies, the plan will be examined under the relevant previous version of the Framework⁸⁷

227. Where paragraph 226 c) applies, local plans that reach adoption with an annual housing requirement⁸⁴ that is more than 200 dwellings lower than the relevant published Local Housing Need figure⁸⁶ will be expected to commence plan-making in the new plan-making system at the earliest opportunity to address the shortfall in housing need.
228. After applying the policies of this version of the Framework, local plans that have reached Regulation 19 (pre-submission stage) on or before [publication date + one month] with an emerging⁸⁸ annual housing requirement⁸⁴ that is more than 200 dwellings lower than the relevant Local Housing Need⁸⁶ figure should proceed to examination⁸⁹ within a maximum of 18 months from [publication date].
229. For Spatial Development Strategies, this Framework applies to strategies that reach consultation under section 335(2) of the Greater London Authority Act 1999 on or after [publication date + one month]. Strategies that reach this stage on or before this date will be examined under the relevant previous version of the Framework.
- ~~229. For the purposes of the policy on renewable and low carbon energy and heat in plans in paragraph 160 apply to plans that have reached Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (pre-submission) stage, or that reach this stage within three months, of the publication~~

⁸³ Defined as the total housing requirement, divided by the number of years in the plan period. The housing requirement can include any unmet need arrangements. Where a joint local plan is in preparation, to determine whether a shortfall exists between the emerging annual housing requirement and the relevant Local Housing Need figure, any shortfall should be apportioned to each local authority equally to determine whether a shortfall exceeds 200 dwellings per annum. Where there is an operative Spatial Development Strategy (SDS) that is less than 5 years old, the SDS will continue to provide the housing requirement for relevant emerging local plans.

⁸⁴ Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012

⁸⁵ As published on [insert date] at [insert web link].

⁸⁶ Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012

⁸⁷ The policies in the version of this Framework (published on 19 December 2023) may apply for the purpose of preparing plans that reach or reached Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (pre-submission) stage between 19 March 2024 and [publication date plus one month].

⁸⁸ Set out in the most recent Regulation 19 (pre-submission stage) consultation.

⁸⁹ Meaning the plan has reached Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

~~of the previous version. For Spatial Development Strategies, paragraph to strategies that have reached consultation under section 335(2) of the Greater London Authority Act 1999, or that within three months of the date of publication of the previous version of this Framework published on 5 September 2023.~~

a.

~~226.230.~~ -For the purposes of the policy on larger-scale development in paragraph 22, this applies only to plans that have not reached Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (pre-submission) stage at the point the previous version of this Framework was published on 20 July 2021 (for Spatial Development Strategies this would refer to consultation under section 335(2) of the Greater London Authority Act 1999).

~~230.~~ The policies in this Framework (published on 19 December 2023) will apply for the purpose of examining plans, where those plans reach regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (pre-submission) stage after 19 March 2024. Plans that reach pre-submission consultation on or before this date will be examined under the relevant previous version of the Framework in accordance with the above arrangements. For Spatial Development Strategies, this Framework applies to strategies that have reached consultation under section 335(2) of the Greater London Authority Act 1999 after 19 March 2024. Strategies that reach this stage on or before this date will be examined under the relevant previous version of the Framework in accordance with the above arrangements. Where plans or strategies are withdrawn or otherwise do not proceed to become part of the development plan, the policies contained in this Framework will apply to any subsequent plan or strategy produced for the area concerned.

~~227.231.~~ The policies in the original National Planning Policy Framework published in March 2012 will apply for the purpose of examining plans, where those plans were submitted on or before 24 January 2019, unless such plans are withdrawn or otherwise do not proceed to become part of the development plan.

~~228.232.~~ Where plans or strategies are withdrawn or otherwise do not proceed to become part of the development plan, the policies contained in this Framework will apply to any subsequent plan or strategy produced for the area concerned.

~~229.233.~~ The Government will continue to explore with individual areas the potential for planning freedoms and flexibilities, for example where this would facilitate an increase in the amount of housing that can be delivered.

Annex 2: Glossary

Affordable housing: housing for sale or rent, for those whose needs are not met by the market (including housing that provides a subsidised route to home ownership and/or is for essential local workers); and which complies with one or more of the following definitions⁹⁰:

a) **Affordable housing for rent:** meets all of the following conditions: (a) the rent is set in accordance with the Government's rent policy for Social Rent or Affordable Rent, or is at least 20% below local market rents (including service charges where applicable); (b) the landlord is a registered provider, except where it is included as part of a Build to Rent scheme (in which case the landlord need not be a registered provider); and (c) it includes provisions to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households, or for the subsidy to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision. For Build to Rent schemes affordable housing for rent is expected to be the normal form of affordable housing provision (and, in this context, is known as Affordable Private Rent).

b) **First Homes:** is as set out in the 'Affordable Homes Update' Written Ministerial Statement dated 24 May 2021. First Homes come forward through the First Homes exception sites and through developer contributions.

~~**Starter homes:** is as specified in Sections 2 and 3 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016 and any secondary legislation made under these sections. The definition of a starter home should reflect the meaning set out in statute and any such secondary legislation at the time of plan preparation or decision-making. Where secondary legislation has the effect of limiting a household's eligibility to purchase a starter home to those with a particular maximum level of household income, those restrictions should be used.~~

b)c) **Discounted market sales housing:** is that sold at a discount of at least 20% below local market value. Eligibility is determined with regard to local incomes and local house prices. Provisions should be in place to ensure housing remains at a discount for future eligible households.

e)d) **Other affordable routes to home ownership:** is housing provided for sale that provides a route to ownership for those who could not achieve home ownership through the market. It includes shared ownership, relevant equity loans, other low cost homes for sale (at a price equivalent to at least 20% below local market value) and rent to buy (which includes a period of intermediate rent). Where public grant funding is provided, there should be provisions for the homes to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households, or for any receipts to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision, or refunded to Government or the relevant authority specified in the funding agreement.

Air quality management areas: Areas designated by local authorities because they are not likely to achieve national air quality objectives by the relevant deadlines.

Ancient or veteran tree: A tree which, because of its age, size and condition, is of exceptional biodiversity, cultural or heritage value. All ancient trees are veteran trees. Not

⁹⁰ This definition should be read in conjunction with relevant policy contained in the Affordable Homes Update Written Ministerial Statement published on 24 May 2021.

all veteran trees are old enough to be ancient, but are old relative to other trees of the same species. Very few trees of any species reach the ancient life-stage.

Ancient woodland: An area that has been wooded continuously since at least 1600 AD. It includes ancient semi-natural woodland and plantations on ancient woodland sites (PAWS).

~~**Annual position statement:** A document setting out the 5-year housing land supply position on 1st April each year, prepared by the local planning authority in consultation with developers and others who have an impact on delivery.~~

Archaeological interest: There will be archaeological interest in a heritage asset if it holds, or potentially holds, evidence of past human activity worthy of expert investigation at some point.

Article 4 direction: A direction made under [Article 4 of the Town and Country Planning \(General Permitted Development\) \(England\) Order 2015](#) which withdraws permitted development rights granted by that Order.

Best and most versatile agricultural land: Land in grades 1, 2 and 3a of the Agricultural Land Classification.

Brownfield land: See Previously developed land.

Brownfield land registers: Registers of previously developed land that local planning authorities consider to be appropriate for residential development, having regard to criteria in the Town and Country Planning (Brownfield Land Registers) Regulations 2017. Local planning authorities will be able to trigger a grant of permission in principle for residential development on suitable sites in their registers where they follow the required procedures.

Build to Rent: Purpose built housing that is typically 100% rented out. It can form part of a wider multi-tenure development comprising either flats or houses, but should be on the same site and/or contiguous with the main development. Schemes will usually offer longer tenancy agreements of three years or more, and will typically be professionally managed stock in single ownership and management control.

Climate change adaptation: Adjustments made to natural or human systems in response to the actual or anticipated impacts of climate change, to mitigate harm or exploit beneficial opportunities.

Climate change mitigation: Action to reduce the impact of human activity on the climate system, primarily through reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Coastal change management area: An area identified in plans as likely to be affected by physical change to the shoreline through erosion, coastal landslip, permanent inundation or coastal accretion.

Community forest: An area identified through the England Community Forest Programme to revitalise countryside and green space in and around major conurbations.

Community Right to Build Order: An Order made by the local planning authority (under

the Town and Country Planning Act 1990) that grants planning permission for a site-specific development proposal or classes of development.

Community-led developments: A development instigated and taken forward by a not-for-profit organisation ~~set up and that is~~ primarily for the purpose of meeting the housing needs of its members and the wider local community, rather than being a primarily commercial enterprise. The organisation is created, managed and democratically controlled by its members. It may take any one of various legal forms including a community land trust, housing co-operative and community benefit society. Membership of the organisation is open to all beneficiaries and prospective beneficiaries of that organisation. The organisation should own, manage or steward the homes in a manner consistent with its purpose, for example through a mutually supported arrangement with a Registered Provider of Social Housing. The benefits of the development to the specified community should be clearly defined and consideration given to how these benefits can be protected over time, including in the event of the organisation being wound up.

Competent person (to prepare site investigation information): A person with a recognised relevant qualification, sufficient experience in dealing with the type(s) of pollution or land instability, and membership of a relevant professional organisation.

Conservation (for heritage policy): The process of maintaining and managing change to a heritage asset in a way that sustains and, where appropriate, enhances its significance.

Decentralised energy: Local renewable and local low carbon energy sources.

Deliverable: To be considered deliverable, sites for housing should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years. In particular:

- a) sites which do not involve major development and have planning permission, and all sites with detailed planning permission, should be considered deliverable until permission expires, unless there is clear evidence that homes will not be delivered within five years (for example because they are no longer viable, there is no longer a demand for the type of units or sites have long term phasing plans).
- b) where a site has outline planning permission for major development, has been allocated in a development plan, has a grant of permission in principle, or is identified on a brownfield register, it should only be considered deliverable where there is clear evidence that housing completions will begin on site within five years.

Design code: A set of illustrated design requirements that provide specific, detailed parameters for the physical development of a site or area. The graphic and written components of the code should build upon a design vision, such as a masterplan or other design and development framework for a site or area.

Design guide: A document providing guidance on how development can be carried out in accordance with good design practice, often produced by a local authority.

Designated heritage asset: A World Heritage Site, Scheduled Monument, Listed Building, Protected Wreck Site, Registered Park and Garden, Registered Battlefield or Conservation Area designated under the relevant legislation.

Designated rural areas: National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and areas designated as 'rural' under Section 157 of the Housing Act 1985.

Developable: To be considered developable, sites should be in a suitable location for housing development with a reasonable prospect that they will be available and could be viably developed at the point envisaged.

Development plan: Is defined in section 38 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, and includes adopted local plans, neighbourhood plans that have been made and published spatial development strategies, together with any regional strategy policies that remain in force. Neighbourhood plans that have been approved at referendum are also part of the development plan, unless the local planning authority decides that the neighbourhood plan should not be made.

Edge of centre: For retail purposes, a location that is well connected to, and up to 300 metres from, the primary shopping area. For all other main town centre uses, a location within 300 metres of a town centre boundary. For office development, this includes locations outside the town centre but within 500 metres of a public transport interchange. In determining whether a site falls within the definition of edge of centre, account should be taken of local circumstances.

Environmental impact assessment: A procedure to be followed for certain types of project to ensure that decisions are made in full knowledge of any likely significant effects on the environment.

Essential local workers: Public sector employees who provide frontline services in areas including health, education and community safety – such as NHS staff, teachers, police, firefighters and military personnel, social care and childcare workers.

General aviation airfields: Licenced or unlicenced aerodromes with hard or grass runways, often with extensive areas of open land related to aviation activity.

Geodiversity: The range of rocks, minerals, fossils, soils and landforms.

Green infrastructure: A network of multi-functional green and blue spaces and other natural features, urban and rural, which is capable of delivering a wide range of environmental, economic, health and wellbeing benefits for nature, climate, local and wider communities and prosperity.

Grey belt: For the purposes of plan-making and decision-making, 'grey belt' is defined as land in the green belt comprising Previously Developed Land and any other parcels and/or areas of Green Belt land that make a limited contribution to the five Green Belt purposes (as defined in para 140 of this Framework), but excluding those areas or assets of particular importance listed in footnote 7 of this Framework (other than land designated as Green Belt).

Habitats site: Any site which would be included within the definition at regulation 8 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 for the purpose of those regulations, including candidate Special Areas of Conservation, Sites of Community Importance, Special Areas of Conservation, Special Protection Areas and any relevant Marine Sites.

Heritage asset: A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. It includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).

Heritage coast: Areas of undeveloped coastline which are managed to conserve their natural beauty and, where appropriate, to improve accessibility for visitors.

Historic environment: All aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and places through time, including all surviving physical remains of past human activity, whether visible, buried or submerged, and landscaped and planted or managed flora.

Historic environment record: Information services that seek to provide access to comprehensive and dynamic resources relating to the historic environment of a defined geographic area for public benefit and use.

Housing Delivery Test: Measures net homes delivered in a local authority area against the homes required, using national statistics and local authority data. The Secretary of State will publish the Housing Delivery Test results for each local authority in England annually.

International, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity: All international sites (Special Areas of Conservation, Special Protection Areas, and Ramsar sites), national sites (Sites of Special Scientific Interest) and locally designated sites including Local Wildlife Sites.

Irreplaceable habitat: Habitats which would be technically very difficult (or take a very significant time) to restore, recreate or replace once destroyed, taking into account their age, uniqueness, species diversity or rarity. They include ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees, blanket bog, limestone pavement, sand dunes, salt marsh and lowland fen.

Local Development Order: An Order made by a local planning authority (under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990) that grants planning permission for a specific development proposal or classes of development.

Local Enterprise Partnership: A body, designated by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government, established for the purpose of creating or improving the conditions for economic growth in an area.

Local housing need: The number of homes identified as being needed through the application of the standard method set out in national planning guidance ~~(or, in the context of preparing strategic policies only, this may be calculated using a justified alternative approach as provided for in paragraph 61 of this Framework).~~

Local Nature Partnership: A body, designated by the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, established for the purpose of protecting and improving the natural environment in an area and the benefits derived from it.

Local planning authority: The public authority whose duty it is to carry out specific

planning functions for a particular area. All references to local planning authority include the district council, London borough council, county council, Broads Authority, National Park Authority, the Mayor of London and a development corporation, to the extent appropriate to their responsibilities.

Local plan: A plan for the future development of a local area, drawn up by the local planning authority in consultation with the community. In law this is described as the development plan documents adopted under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. A local plan can consist of either strategic or non-strategic policies, or a combination of the two.

Main town centre uses: Retail development (including warehouse clubs and factory outlet centres); leisure, entertainment and more intensive sport and recreation uses (including cinemas, restaurants, drive-through restaurants, bars and pubs, nightclubs, casinos, health and fitness centres, indoor bowling centres and bingo halls); offices; and arts, culture and tourism development (including theatres, museums, galleries and concert halls, hotels and conference facilities).

Major development⁹¹: For housing, development where 10 or more homes will be provided, or the site has an area of 0.5 hectares or more. For non-residential development it means additional floorspace of 1,000m² or more, or a site of 1 hectare or more, or as otherwise provided in the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

Major hazard sites, installations and pipelines: Sites and infrastructure, including licensed explosive sites and nuclear installations, around which Health and Safety Executive (and Office for Nuclear Regulation) consultation distances to mitigate the consequences to public safety of major accidents may apply.

Mansard roof: A type of roof that is characterised by two slopes, the lower steep and the upper shallow. It is generally regarded as a suitable type of roof extension for buildings which are part of a terrace of at least three buildings and at least two stories tall, with a parapet running the entire length of the front façade (reference: Create Streets, 2021, *Living Tradition*).

Minerals resources of local and national importance: Minerals which are necessary to meet society's needs, including aggregates, brickclay (especially Etruria Marl and fireclay), silica sand (including high grade silica sands), coal derived fly ash in single use deposits, cement raw materials, gypsum, salt, fluorspar, shallow and deep-mined coal, oil and gas (including conventional and unconventional hydrocarbons), tungsten, kaolin, ball clay, potash, polyhalite and local minerals of importance to heritage assets and local distinctiveness.

Mineral Consultation Area: a geographical area based on a Mineral Safeguarding Area, where the district or borough council should consult the Mineral Planning Authority for any proposals for non-minerals development.

Mineral Safeguarding Area: An area designated by minerals planning authorities which covers known deposits of minerals which are desired to be kept safeguarded from unnecessary sterilisation by non-mineral development.

⁹¹ Other than for the specific purposes of paragraphs 182 and 183 in this Framework.

National trails: Long distance routes for walking, cycling and horse riding.

Natural Flood Management: managing flood and coastal erosion risk by protecting, restoring and emulating the natural 'regulating' function of catchments, rivers, floodplains and coasts.

Nature Recovery Network: An expanding, increasingly connected, network of wildlife-rich habitats supporting species recovery, alongside wider benefits such as carbon capture, water quality improvements, natural flood risk management and recreation. It includes the existing network of protected sites and other wildlife rich habitats as well as and landscape or catchment scale recovery areas where there is coordinated action for species and habitats.

Neighbourhood Development Order: An Order made by a local planning authority (under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990) through which parish councils and neighbourhood forums can grant planning permission for a specific development proposal or classes of development.

Neighbourhood plan: A plan prepared by a parish council or neighbourhood forum for a designated neighbourhood area. In law this is described as a neighbourhood development plan in the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

Non-strategic policies: Policies contained in a neighbourhood plan, or those policies in a local plan that are not strategic policies.

Older people: People over or approaching retirement age, including the active, newly-retired through to the very frail elderly; and whose housing needs can encompass accessible, adaptable general needs housing through to the full range of retirement and specialised housing for those with support or care needs.

Open space: All open space of public value, including not just land, but also areas of water (such as rivers, canals, lakes and reservoirs) which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation and can act as a visual amenity.

Original building: A building as it existed on 1 July 1948 or, if constructed after 1 July 1948, as it was built originally.

Out of centre: A location which is not in or on the edge of a centre but not necessarily outside the urban area.

Out of town: A location out of centre that is outside the existing urban area.

Outstanding universal value: Cultural and/or natural significance which is so exceptional as to transcend national boundaries and to be of common importance for present and future generations. An individual Statement of Outstanding Universal Value is agreed and adopted by the UNESCO World Heritage Committee for each World Heritage Site.

People with disabilities: People have a disability if they have a physical or mental impairment, and that impairment has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on their ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities. These persons include, but are not limited to, people with ambulatory difficulties, blindness, learning difficulties, autism and mental health needs.

Permission in principle: A form of planning consent which establishes that a site is suitable for a specified amount of housing-led development in principle. Following a grant of permission in principle, the site must receive a grant of technical details consent before development can proceed.

Planning condition: A condition imposed on a grant of planning permission (in accordance with the Town and Country Planning Act 1990) or a condition included in a Local Development Order or Neighbourhood Development Order.

Planning obligation: A legal agreement entered into under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to mitigate the impacts of a development proposal.

Playing field: The whole of a site which encompasses at least one playing pitch as defined in the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

Previously developed land: Land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land (although it should not be assumed that the whole of the curtilage should be developed) and any associated fixed surface infrastructure. This excludes: land that is or was last occupied by agricultural or forestry buildings; land that has been developed for minerals extraction or waste disposal by landfill, where provision for restoration has been made through development management procedures; land in built-up areas such as residential gardens, parks, recreation grounds and allotments; and land that was previously developed but where the remains of the permanent structure or fixed surface structure have blended into the landscape.

Primary shopping area: Defined area where retail development is concentrated.

Priority habitats and species: Species and Habitats of Principal Importance included in the England Biodiversity List published by the Secretary of State under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006.

Ramsar sites: Wetlands of international importance, designated under the 1971 Ramsar Convention.

Renewable and low carbon energy: Includes energy for heating and cooling as well as generating electricity. Renewable energy covers those energy flows that occur naturally and repeatedly in the environment – from the wind, the fall of water, the movement of the oceans, from the sun and also from biomass and deep geothermal heat. Low carbon technologies are those that can help reduce emissions (compared to conventional use of fossil fuels).

Rural exception sites: Small sites used for affordable housing in perpetuity where sites would not normally be used for housing. Rural exception sites seek to address the needs of the local community by accommodating households who are either current residents or have an existing family or employment connection. A proportion of market homes may be allowed on the site at the local planning authority's discretion, for example where essential to enable the delivery of affordable units without grant funding.

Recycled aggregates: aggregates resulting from the processing of inorganic materials previously used in construction, e.g. construction and demolition waste.

Safeguarding zone: An area defined in Circular 01/03: *Safeguarding aerodromes, technical sites and military explosives storage areas*, to which specific safeguarding provisions apply.

Secondary aggregates: aggregates from industrial wastes such as glass (cullet), incinerator bottom ash, coal derived fly ash, railway ballast, fine ceramic waste (pitcher), and scrap tyres; and industrial and minerals by-products, notably waste from china clay, coal and slate extraction and spent foundry sand. These can also include hydraulically bound materials.

Self-build and custom-build housing: Housing built by an individual, a group of individuals, or persons working with or for them, to be occupied by that individual. Such housing can be either market or affordable housing. A legal definition, for the purpose of applying the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 (as amended), is contained in section 1(A1) and (A2) of that Act.

Setting of a heritage asset: The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.

Significance (for heritage policy): The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. The interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting. For World Heritage Sites, the cultural value described within each site's Statement of Outstanding Universal Value forms part of its significance.

Special Areas of Conservation: Areas defined by regulation 3 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 which have been given special protection as important conservation sites.

Special Protection Areas: Areas classified under regulation 15 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 which have been identified as being of international importance for the breeding, feeding, wintering or the migration of rare and vulnerable species of birds.

Site investigation information: Includes a risk assessment of land potentially affected by contamination, or ground stability and slope stability reports, as appropriate. All investigations of land potentially affected by contamination should be carried out in accordance with established procedures (such as BS10175 Investigation of Potentially Contaminated Sites – Code of Practice).

Site of Special Scientific Interest: Sites designated by Natural England under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.

Spatial development strategy: A plan containing strategic policies prepared by a Mayor or a combined authority. It includes the London Plan (prepared under provisions in the Greater London Authority Act 1999) and plans prepared by combined authorities that have been given equivalent plan-making functions by an order made under the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (as amended).

Stepping stones: Pockets of habitat that, while not necessarily connected, facilitate the movement of species across otherwise inhospitable landscapes.

Strategic environmental assessment: A procedure (set out in the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004) which requires the formal environmental assessment of certain plans and programmes which are likely to have significant effects on the environment.

Strategic policies: Policies and site allocations which address strategic priorities in line with the requirements of Section 19 (1B-E) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

Strategic policy-making authorities: Those authorities responsible for producing strategic policies (local planning authorities, and elected Mayors or combined authorities, where this power has been conferred). This definition applies whether the authority is in the process of producing strategic policies or not.

Supplementary planning documents: Documents which add further detail to the policies in the development plan. They can be used to provide further guidance for development on specific sites, or on particular issues, such as design. Supplementary planning documents are capable of being a material consideration in planning decisions but are not part of the development plan.

Sustainable transport modes: Any efficient, safe and accessible means of transport with overall low impact on the environment, including walking and cycling, ultra low and zero emission vehicles, car sharing and public transport.

Town centre: Area defined on the local authority's policies map, including the primary shopping area and areas predominantly occupied by main town centre uses within or adjacent to the primary shopping area. References to town centres or centres apply to city centres, town centres, district centres and local centres but exclude small parades of shops of purely neighbourhood significance. Unless they are identified as centres in the development plan, existing out-of-centre developments, comprising or including main town centre uses, do not constitute town centres.

Transport assessment: A comprehensive and systematic process that sets out transport issues relating to a proposed development. It identifies measures required to improve accessibility and safety for all modes of travel, particularly for alternatives to the car such as walking, cycling and public transport, and measures that will be needed deal with the anticipated transport impacts of the development.

Transport statement: A simplified version of a transport assessment where it is agreed the transport issues arising from development proposals are limited and a full transport assessment is not required.

Travel plan: A long-term management strategy for an organisation or site that seeks to deliver sustainable transport objectives and is regularly reviewed.

Wildlife corridor: Areas of habitat connecting wildlife populations.

Windfall sites: Sites not specifically identified in the development plan.

Annex 3: Flood risk vulnerability classification

ESSENTIAL INFRASTRUCTURE

- Essential transport infrastructure (including mass evacuation routes) which has to cross the area at risk.
- Essential utility infrastructure which has to be located in a flood risk area for operational reasons, including infrastructure for electricity supply including generation, storage and distribution systems; and water treatment works that need to remain operational in times of flood.
- Wind turbines.
- Solar farms

HIGHLY VULNERABLE

- Police and ambulance stations; fire stations and command centres; telecommunications installations required to be operational during flooding.
- Emergency dispersal points.
- Basement dwellings.
- Caravans, mobile homes and park homes intended for permanent residential use.
- Installations requiring hazardous substances consent. (Where there is a demonstrable need to locate such installations for bulk storage of materials with port or other similar facilities, or such installations with energy infrastructure or carbon capture and storage installations, that require coastal or water-side locations, or need to be located in other high flood risk areas, in these instances the facilities should be classified as 'Essential Infrastructure'.)

MORE VULNERABLE

- Hospitals
- Residential institutions such as residential care homes, children's homes, social services homes, prisons and hostels.
- Buildings used for dwelling houses, student halls of residence, drinking establishments, nightclubs and hotels.
- Non-residential uses for health services, nurseries and educational establishments.
- Landfill* and sites used for waste management facilities for hazardous waste.
- Sites used for holiday or short-let caravans and camping, subject to a specific warning and evacuation plan.

LESS VULNERABLE

- Police, ambulance and fire stations which are not required to be operational during flooding.

- Buildings used for shops; financial, professional and other services; restaurants, cafes and hot food takeaways; offices; general industry, storage and distribution; non-residential institutions not included in the 'more vulnerable' class; and assembly and leisure.
- Land and buildings used for agriculture and forestry.
- Waste treatment (except landfill* and hazardous waste facilities).
- Minerals working and processing (except for sand and gravel working).
- Water treatment works which do not need to remain operational during times of flood.
- Sewage treatment works, if adequate measures to control pollution and manage sewage during flooding events are in place.
- Car parks.

WATER-COMPATIBLE DEVELOPMENT

- Flood control infrastructure.
- Water transmission infrastructure and pumping stations.
- Sewage transmission infrastructure and pumping stations.
- Sand and gravel working.
- Docks, marinas and wharves.
- Navigation facilities.
- Ministry of Defence installations.
- Ship building, repairing and dismantling, dockside fish processing and refrigeration and compatible activities requiring a waterside location.
- Water-based recreation (excluding sleeping accommodation).
- Lifeguard and coastguard stations.
- Amenity open space, nature conservation and biodiversity, outdoor sports and recreation and essential facilities such as changing rooms.
- Essential ancillary sleeping or residential accommodation for staff required by uses in this category, subject to a specific warning and evacuation plan.

* Landfill is as defined in Schedule 10 of the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010.

Annex 4: Viability in relation to Green Belt release

- 1) To determine land value for a viability assessment, a benchmark land value should be established on the basis of the existing use value (EUV) of the land, plus a reasonable and proportionate premium for the landowner. For the purposes of plan-making and decision-taking, it is considered that a benchmark land value of [xxxx] allows an appropriate premium for landowners. Local planning authorities should set benchmark land values informed by this, and by local material considerations.
- 2) When determining planning applications, if land released from Green Belt is transacted above the benchmark land value and cannot deliver policy-compliant development, then planning permission should not be granted, subject to other material considerations.
- 3) Where policy compliant development can be delivered, viability assessment should not be undertaken, irrespective of the price at which land is transacted, and higher levels of affordable housing should not be sought on the grounds of viability.
- 4) Where land is transacted below the benchmark land value but still cannot deliver policy-compliant development, it is up to the applicant to demonstrate whether particular circumstances justify the need for a viability assessment at the application stage. The weight to be given to a viability assessment is a matter for the decision maker, having regard to all the circumstances in the case, including whether the plan and the viability evidence underpinning it is up to date, and any change in site circumstances since the plan was brought into force. Where a viability negotiation to reduce policy delivery has been undertaken, a late-stage review should be conducted to assess whether further contributions are required.

Annex C: Outcome of the proposed revised method for housing requirements.

C1.1 The proposed formula is set out in chapter 4 of the consultation document¹ (as presented in Annex A to this report).

C1.2 The figure for York presented in their table 'Outcomes of the proposed revised method':

ONS Code	Local Authority Name	Region	Current Method	Proposed Method	Average Annual Net additions (2020/21-2022/23)
E06000014	York	Yorkshire and The Humber	1,020	1,251	476

C1.3 For York, the requirement is calculated as follows:

		Information source
Stock as at 2023	91,505	Live tables on dwelling stock ² ; see Table 125
0.8 % stock	732.04	
3yr average (2021-2023) affordability ratio	8.726	House price to workplace-based earnings ratio ³ ; see Table 5c
Affordability adjustment	1.70890	Calculation: (affordability ratio-4)/4)*0.6+1
Total Housing requirement	1,251	Calculation: 732.04 x 1.70890

¹ <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/proposed-reforms-to-the-national-planning-policy-framework-and-other-changes-to-the-planning-system/proposed-reforms-to-the-national-planning-policy-framework-and-other-changes-to-the-planning-system>

² <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/live-tables-on-dwelling-stock-including-vacants>

³

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/housing/datasets/ratioofhousepricetoworkplacebasedearningslowerquartileandmedian>

This page is intentionally left blank