

Effect of NPPF21 on the Partial Review: Fylde Council assessment for the Inspector

On 21st July 2021 the Planning Inspectorate intermediary (during the temporary absence of the Programme Officer) made the following request to the Council on behalf of the Inspector:

“The revised National Planning Policy Framework came into force on 20 July 2021. The Inspector examining the Partial Review of the Fylde Local Plan seeks the Council’s opinion on this and whether there are any possible implications for either the content of the plan or procedural arrangements moving forward.

*“Information regarding the revised Framework can be found on GOV.UK:
www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policyframework*

“The Inspector would be most grateful to receive a response as soon as possible.”

The 2021 Framework does not carry a further transitional arrangement relating to all of the changes made, in relation to the 2019 Framework. A transitional arrangement is provided specifically in relation to paragraph 22, but in relation to all other changes, there will be the requirement for the revisions made in the submitted Partial Review to accord with the new wording in the 2021 Framework, or be modified in order to accord, in order to meet the tests of soundness.

The Council has considered each of the changes made to the Framework through the 2021 version, in relation to the contents of the submitted Partial Review Schedule of Revisions SDPR01, as proposed for modification through the Council’s Draft Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications (as published¹ for consideration at the Council’s Planning Committee on 28th July 2021). It has also considered whether any of the changes in the 2021 Framework have impacts on those parts of the FLP32 that were not considered to be in scope (as they were not affected by earlier Framework changes). The individual changes are set out in Table 1 below, along with the Council’s commentary on the impact of each on the Partial Review, and on the wider FLP32. The Council does not consider that any change that affected a policy not included in SDPR01 would have the effect of making the submitted Partial Review unsound.

The Council considers that a Main Modification to Policy H6 should be made to ensure the soundness of the Partial Review. Otherwise, the changes have no implications for the soundness of the submitted Partial Review of the FLP32. Additional modifications should be made to Paragraph 1.5 and Paragraph 1.28 but these do not affect soundness.

1

<https://fylde.cmis.uk.com/fylde/MeetingsCalendar/tabid/70/ctl/ViewMeetingPublic/mid/397/Meeting/1266/Committee/20/Default.aspx>

Table 1: Changes to the Framework in NPPF21

Paragraph (NPPF19 number)	NPPF19	NPPF21	Council commentary on implications for Partial Review
7		Added text: <i>“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.”</i> Footnote 5 added: <i>“Transforming our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.”</i>	No implications for the Partial Review
8	<p>b) <i>“...and by fostering a well-designed and safe built environment,...”</i></p> <p>c) <i>“to contribute to protecting and enhancing”</i></p> <p><i>“helping to improve biodiversity”</i></p>	<p>b) <i>“...and by fostering well-designed, beautiful and safe places,...”</i></p> <p>c) <i>“to protect and enhance”</i></p> <p><i>“improving biodiversity”</i></p>	These changes are to the overall objectives of the planning system. The Partial Review and FLP32 fulfil the requirements in the new text, but the text is repeated within the FLP32 and Partial Review in Paragraph 1.5. The Council therefore proposes to make an additional modification to Paragraph 1.5 to revise the Partial Review to accord with the new text.
11	<p>Plan making</p> <p>a) <i>“plans should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area, and be sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change”</i></p>	<p>Plan making</p> <p>a) <i>“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”</i></p>	The FLP32 as revised by the Partial Review (as proposed for modification) does as required by the new Framework text. No revisions to the Partial Review or FLP32 are required.
20	<i>“...and quality of development,...”</i>	<i>“...and design quality of places,...”</i>	No implications for the Partial Review

Paragraph (NPPF19 number)	NPPF19	NPPF21	Council commentary on implications for Partial Review
22		<p>Adds <i>“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 delivery.16”</i></p> <p>Footnote 16 added: <i>“Transitional arrangements are set out in Annex 1.”</i></p>	<p>This change does not affect any of the revisions proposed in the Partial Review.</p> <p>Large scale development of the kind described is included in the FLP32, and a 30 year vision is not included. This element is covered by a transitional arrangement, and does not apply to the Partial Review, as it is already submitted. Therefore there are no implications for the Partial Review</p>
35		<p>d) (Consistent with national policy): adds: <i>“and other statements of national planning policy, where relevant”</i></p>	<p>The policies of the Partial Review and FLP32 are consistent with all relevant statements of national planning policy. However, the tests of soundness in paragraph 35 are repeated in Paragraph 1.28 of the FLP32 and the Partial Review. Accordingly, the Council proposes to make an additional modification to revise this text to be consistent.</p>
53	<p><i>“The use of Article 4 directions to remove national permitted development rights should be limited to situations where this 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).”</i></p> <p>(Remaining text retained as new para 54)</p>	<p><i>“The use of Article 4 directions to remove national permitted development rights should:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>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)</i> • <i>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</i> 	<p>This change does not affect any of the revisions proposed in the Partial Review.</p> <p>FLP32 paragraph 13.62 considers a situation where it may be appropriate to introduce Article 4 Directions in relation to locally listed buildings. The sentence is not prescriptive and is entirely compatible with the new wording.</p> <p>FLP32 paragraph 13.69 states that future Conservation Area appraisals and management plans will assess the appropriateness for new or revised Article</p>

Paragraph (NPPF19 number)	NPPF19	NPPF21	Council commentary on implications for Partial Review
		<p><i>directions to require planning permission for the demolition of local facilities)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>in all cases, be based on robust evidence, and apply to the smallest geographical area possible. “</i> 	<p>4 Directions. Again, this does not pre-empt the outcome of any such assessment which would be undertaken with reference to the new Framework text; the existing plan text is therefore wholly compatible with the updated Framework wording.</p>
64	<p><i>“Where major development involving the provision of housing is proposed, planning policies and decisions should expect at least 10% of the homes to be available for affordable home ownership...”</i></p>	<p>(now para 65) <i>“Where major development involving the provision of housing is proposed, planning policies and decisions should expect at least 10% of the total number of homes to be available for affordable home ownership...”</i></p>	<p>Change is to provide clarification but is already implicit; no implications for the Partial Review</p>
69	<p><i>“Neighbourhood planning groups should also consider the opportunities for allocating small and medium-sized sites...”</i></p>	<p>(Now para 70) <i>“Neighbourhood planning groups should also give particular consideration to the opportunities for allocating small and medium-sized sites...”</i></p>	<p>Not applicable to the Partial Review</p>
72	<p>c) <i>“set clear expectations for the quality of the development and how this can be maintained (such as by following Garden City principles), and ensure that a variety of homes to meet the needs of different groups in the community will be provided; “</i></p>	<p>(Now para 73) Add text: <i>“(including a genuine choice of transport modes)”</i> after <i>“supported by the necessary infrastructure and facilities”</i></p> <p>(73) c) <i>“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</i></p>	<p>This change does not affect any of the revisions proposed in the Partial Review.</p> <p>The sites that will provide larger scale development that are allocated in the FLP32 will be supported by a genuine choice of transport modes. No changes are required to the FLP32 to accord with the amended Framework wording.</p> <p>This change does not affect any of the revisions proposed in the Partial Review.</p> <p>Developers of the strategic sites allocated in the FLP32 are required by Policy M1 to produce masterplans and design codes for the sites in consultation with the</p>

Paragraph (NPPF19 number)	NPPF19	NPPF21	Council commentary on implications for Partial Review
		<i>beautiful homes to meet the needs of different groups in the community; “</i>	Council. No changes are required to the FLP32 to accord with the amended Framework wording.
79	<p>d) <i>“the development would involve the subdivision of an existing residential dwelling”</i></p> <p>e) <i>“the design is of exceptional quality, in that it: “- is truly outstanding or innovative, reflecting the highest standards...”</i></p>	<p>(Now para 80) d) <i>“the development would involve the subdivision of an existing residential building;”</i></p> <p>e) <i>“the design is of exceptional quality, in that it: “- is truly outstanding, reflecting the highest standards...”</i></p>	<p>Para 79 d) (as was) is taken up by the submission Partial Review, as a revision to Policy H6. A Main Modification is necessary to alter the wording of the revision in the submission Partial Review, so that it accords with the new Framework wording.</p> <p>Policy H6 is revised through the Partial Review. A further alteration through Main Modification is necessary to revise this text which forms part of the policy</p>
94	b) <i>“work with schools promoters,...”</i>	(Now para 95) b) <i>“work with school promoters,...”</i>	No implications for the Partial Review
New para 96	N/A	<i>“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.”</i>	No implications for the Partial Review
96	<i>“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....”</i>	(Now para 98) <i>“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....”</i>	No implications for the Partial Review

Paragraph (NPPF19 number)	NPPF19	NPPF21	Council commentary on implications for Partial Review
104	d) <i>“provide for high quality walking and cycling networks and supporting facilities such as cycle parking (drawing on Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans);”</i>	d) <i>“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);”</i>	No implications for the Partial Review
108		<p>Now para 110</p> <p>Additional criterion c) <i>“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 Code 46;”</i></p> <p>New footnote 46: <i>“Policies and decisions should not make use of or reflect the former Design Bulletin 32, which was withdrawn in 2007.”</i></p>	<p>This change does not affect any of the revisions proposed in the Partial Review. Associated elements of existing FLP32 policies GD7, T4 and M1 support the approach taken but it is not necessary to repeat the national policy in the plan. No changes are needed to accord with the additional criterion.</p> <p>Neither the Partial Review nor the FLP32 make reference to Design Bulletin 32.</p>
123		<p>(Now para 125)</p> <p>Add sentence at beginning: <i>“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.”</i></p>	<p>This change does not affect any of the revisions proposed in the Partial Review.</p> <p>Existing FLP32 Policy M1 includes requirements for masterplans and design codes on strategic sites.</p> <p>No changes are needed to accord with the new text.</p>
124	<i>“The creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to...”</i>	<p>Now para 126</p> <p><i>“The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to...”</i></p>	No implications for the Partial Review

Paragraph (NPPF19 number)	NPPF19	NPPF21	Council commentary on implications for Partial Review
125	<i>“Neighbourhood plans can play an important role...”</i>	<p>Now para 127</p> <p><i>“Neighbourhood planning groups can play an important role...”</i></p> <p>Added text at end: <i>“both through their own plans and by engaging in the production of design policy, guidance and codes by local planning authorities and developers”</i></p>	No implications for the Partial Review
126	<i>“To provide maximum clarity about design expectations at an early stage, plans or supplementary planning documents should use visual tools such as design guides and codes. These provide a framework for creating distinctive places, with a consistent and high quality standard of design. However their level of detail and degree of prescription should be tailored to the circumstances in each place, and should allow a suitable degree of variety where this would be justified.”</i>	<p>Now para 128</p> <p><i>“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.”</i></p>	<p>The paragraph introduces the requirement for the Council to produce design guides or codes. This change does not affect any of the revisions proposed in the Partial Review.</p> <p>The following paragraph deals with when they should be produced. No changes are needed to the FLP32 to accord with revised Framework text.</p>
New para 129		<i>“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</i>	<p>This change does not affect any of the revisions proposed in the Partial Review.</p> <p>The paragraph is not prescriptive about when design guides and codes should be produced and allows for production by developers in support of planning applications. The approach is consistent with the approach in FLP32 that promotes</p>

Paragraph (NPPF19 number)	NPPF19	NPPF21	Council commentary on implications for Partial Review
		<p><i>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.”</i></p>	<p>their production. No changes are needed for consistency with the new text.</p>
<p>New para 131</p>		<p><i>“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-lined⁵⁰, 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.”</i></p> <p>New footnote 50: <i>“Unless, in specific cases, there are clear, justifiable and compelling reasons why this would be inappropriate.”</i></p>	<p>This change does not affect any of the revisions proposed in the Partial Review. FLP32 policies support the delivery of street trees. No revisions are necessary; the FLP32 supports the delivery of the new policy.</p>
<p>130</p>	<p><i>“Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, taking into account any local design standards or style guides in plans or supplementary planning documents. Conversely, where the design of a development accords with clear expectations</i></p>	<p>Now para 134 <i>“Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design⁵², taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes. Conversely, significant weight should be given to:</i></p>	<p>This change does not affect any of the revisions proposed in the Partial Review. No revisions are required to the policies of the FLP32 to accord with these changes</p>

Paragraph (NPPF19 number)	NPPF19	NPPF21	Council commentary on implications for Partial Review
	<p><i>in plan policies, design should not be used by the decision-maker as a valid reason to object to development.”</i></p> <p><i>“Local planning authorities should also seek to ensure”</i></p>	<p><i>“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</i></p> <p><i>“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. “</i></p> <p>New footnote 52: <i>“Contained in the National Design Guide and National Model Design Code.”</i></p> <p>Now separate paragraph 135: <i>“Local planning authorities should seek to ensure”</i></p>	
131	Text incorporated with revision into new para 134, see para 130 above		See above
146	<i>“f) development brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order or Neighbourhood Development Order.”</i>	<p>Now para 150</p> <p><i>“f) development, including buildings, brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order or Neighbourhood Development Order.”</i></p>	No implications for the Partial Review
157	<i>“All plans should apply a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development – taking into account the current and future impacts of climate change...”</i>	<p>Now para 161</p> <p><i>“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...”</i></p>	<p>No implications for the Partial Review</p> <p>No implications for the Partial Review</p>

Paragraph (NPPF19 number)	NPPF19	NPPF21	Council commentary on implications for Partial Review
	<i>"c) using opportunities provided by new development to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding (where appropriate through the use of natural flood management techniques); and"</i>	<i>"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"</i>	
158	<i>"The aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding."</i>	Now para 162 <i>"The aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source."</i>	No implications for the Partial Review
159	<i>"...located in zones with a lower risk..."</i> <i>"...the Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification set out in national planning guidance."</i>	Now para 163 <i>"...located in areas with a lower risk..."</i> <i>"...the Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification set out in Annex 3."</i>	No implications for the Partial Review
160	<i>"For the exception test to be passed..."</i>	Now para 164 <i>"To pass the exception test..."</i>	No implications for the Partial Review
163	<i>"b) the development is appropriately flood resistant and resilient;"</i>	Now para 167 <i>"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;"</i>	This paragraph relates to the determination of planning applications. No implications for the Partial Review
172	<i>"The scale and extent of development within these designated areas should be limited."</i>	Now para 176 <i>"The scale and extent of development within all these designated areas should be limited, while development within their setting should be sensitively located and</i>	Relates to National Parks, The Broads and AONBs. No part of Fylde is within such an area or within its setting. No implications for the Partial Review

Paragraph (NPPF19 number)	NPPF19	NPPF21	Council commentary on implications for Partial Review
	<p><i>“Planning permission should be refused for major development⁵⁵ other than in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest.”</i></p>	<p><i>designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the designated areas.”</i></p> <p>Now new para 177:</p> <p><i>“When considering applications for development within National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, permission should be refused for major development⁶⁰ other than in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest.”</i></p>	
175	<p><i>“d) development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported; while opportunities to incorporate biodiversity improvements in and around developments should be encouraged, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity.”</i></p>	<p>Now para 180</p> <p><i>“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.”</i></p>	<p>This change does not affect any of the revisions proposed in the Partial Review.</p> <p>FLP32 accords with this in the specific case of overlap, in ENV2 b) ii), but that policy only applies to certain specific circumstances: the Framework applies more widely. There is no need to repeat national policy in local plans: therefore there is no need revise to accord with new Framework text.</p>
New para 198		<p><i>“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.”</i></p>	<p>No reference to this matter in the Partial Review or FLP32. No implications for the Partial Review</p>
204	<p><i>“c) safeguard mineral resources by defining Mineral Safeguarding Areas;...”</i></p>	<p>Now para 210</p> <p><i>“c) safeguard mineral resources by defining Mineral Safeguarding Areas and Mineral Consultation Areas⁷⁰;...”</i></p>	<p>No implications for the Partial Review</p>

Paragraph (NPPF19 number)	NPPF19	NPPF21	Council commentary on implications for Partial Review
		New footnote 70: <i>“Primarily in two tier areas as stated in Annex 2: Glossary”</i>	
205	<i>“f) consider how to meet any demand for small-scale extraction of building stone at, or close to, relic quarries needed for the repair of heritage assets, taking account of the need to protect designated sites; and”</i>	Now para 211 <i>“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”</i>	No implications for the Partial Review
212	<i>“Plans may also need to be revised to reflect policy changes which this replacement Framework has made. This should be progressed as quickly as possible, either through a partial revision or by preparing a new plan.”</i>	Now para 218 <i>“Plans may also need to be revised to reflect policy changes which this Framework has made.”</i>	These different wordings apply to different iterations of the Framework. The Partial Review makes revisions to reflect policy changes from NPPF12, but this document provides for revisions from NPPF19 to NPPF21, thereby making the Partial Review in accordance with the new text.
214	<i>“The policies in the previous Framework published in March 2012...”</i>	Now para 220 <i>“The policies in the original National Planning Policy Framework published in March 2012...”</i>	No implications for the Partial Review
New para 221		<i>“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 this version is published (for Spatial Development Strategies this would refer to consultation under section 335(2) of the Greater London Authority Act 1999).”</i>	The change to paragraph 22 does not affect any of the revisions proposed in the Partial Review. Large scale development of the kind described in paragraph 22 is included in the FLP32, and the required 30 year vision is not included. The transitional arrangement indicates that the policy in

Paragraph (NPPF19 number)	NPPF19	NPPF21	Council commentary on implications for Partial Review
			paragraph 22 does not apply to the Partial Review, as it is already submitted. Therefore there are no implications for the Partial Review.
215		<p>Now para 222</p> <p><i>“The Housing Delivery Test will apply the day following publication of the results, at which point they supersede previously published results. Until new Housing Delivery Test results are published, the previously published result should be used. For the purpose of footnote 8 in this Framework, delivery of housing which was substantially below the housing requirement means where the Housing Delivery Test results:</i></p> <p><i>“a) for years 2016/17 to 2018/19 (Housing Delivery Test: 2019 Measurement, published 13 February 2020), indicated that delivery was below 45% of housing required over the previous three years;</i></p> <p><i>“b) for years 2017/18 to 2019/20 (Housing Delivery Test: 2020 Measurement, published 19 January 2021), and in subsequent years indicate that delivery was below 75% of housing required over the previous three years. “</i></p>	No implications for the Partial Review
Glossary Article 4 direction		<p>New item in Glossary:</p> <p>“Article 4 direction: <i>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.”</i></p>	No implications for the Partial Review
Glossary	<i>“See previously developed land.”</i>	<i>“See Previously developed land.”</i>	No implications for the Partial Review

Paragraph (NPPF19 number)	NPPF19	NPPF21	Council commentary on implications for Partial Review
Brownfield land:			
Glossary Design guide		New item in Glossary: <i>“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.”</i>	No implications for the Partial Review
Glossary Green infrastructure	<i>“Green infrastructure: A network of multi-functional green space, urban and rural, which is capable of delivering a wide range of environmental and quality of life benefits for local communities.”</i>	<i>“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.”</i>	No implications for the Partial Review
Glossary Housing Delivery Test	<i>“Measures net additional dwellings provided...”</i>	<i>“Measures net homes delivered...”</i>	No implications for the Partial Review
Glossary Minerals resources of local and national importance	<i>“...silica sand (including high grade silica sands), cement raw materials...”</i>	<i>“...silica sand (including high grade silica sands), coal derived fly ash in single use deposits, cement raw materials...”</i>	No implications for the Partial Review
Glossary Mineral Consultation Area		New item in Glossary: <i>“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.”</i>	No implications for the Partial Review
Glossary		New item in Glossary:	No implications for the Partial Review

Paragraph (NPPF19 number)	NPPF19	NPPF21	Council commentary on implications for Partial Review
Recycled aggregates		<p>“Recycled aggregates: aggregates resulting from the processing of inorganic materials previously used in construction, e.g. construction and demolition waste.”</p>	
Glossary Secondary aggregates		<p>New item in Glossary:</p> <p>“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.”</p>	No implications for the Partial Review
Glossary Sustainable transport modes	<p>“...including walking and cycling, low and ultra low emission vehicles, car sharing and public transport.”</p>	<p>“...including walking and cycling, ultra low and zero emission vehicles, car sharing and public transport.”</p>	No implications for the Partial Review
Annex 3 Flood risk vulnerability classification		<p>New annex added:</p> <p>“ESSENTIAL INFRASTRUCTURE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<p>Transferred from PPG</p> <p>No implications for the Partial Review</p>

Paragraph (NPPF19 number)	NPPF19	NPPF21	Council commentary on implications for Partial Review
		<p><i>HIGHLY VULNERABLE</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Police and ambulance stations; fire stations and command centres; telecommunications installations required to be operational during flooding.</i> • <i>Emergency dispersal points.</i> • <i>Basement dwellings.</i> • <i>Caravans, mobile homes and park homes intended for permanent residential use.</i> • <i>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’.)</i> <p><i>MORE VULNERABLE</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Hospitals</i> • <i>Residential institutions such as residential care homes, children’s homes, social services homes, prisons and hostels.</i> • <i>Buildings used for dwelling houses, student halls of residence, drinking establishments, nightclubs and hotels.</i> • <i>Non–residential uses for health services, nurseries and educational establishments.</i> • <i>Landfill* and sites used for waste management facilities for hazardous waste.</i> • <i>Sites used for holiday or short-let caravans and camping, subject to a specific warning and evacuation plan.</i> 	

Paragraph (NPPF19 number)	NPPF19	NPPF21	Council commentary on implications for Partial Review
		<p><i>LESS VULNERABLE</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Police, ambulance and fire stations which are not required to be operational during flooding.</i> • <i>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.</i> • <i>Land and buildings used for agriculture and forestry.</i> • <i>Waste treatment (except landfill* and hazardous waste facilities).</i> • <i>Minerals working and processing (except for sand and gravel working).</i> • <i>Water treatment works which do not need to remain operational during times of flood.</i> • <i>Sewage treatment works, if adequate measures to control pollution and manage sewage during flooding events are in place.</i> • <i>Car parks.</i> <p><i>WATER-COMPATIBLE DEVELOPMENT</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Flood control infrastructure.</i> • <i>Water transmission infrastructure and pumping stations.</i> • <i>Sewage transmission infrastructure and pumping stations.</i> • <i>Sand and gravel working.</i> • <i>Docks, marinas and wharves.</i> • <i>Navigation facilities.</i> • <i>Ministry of Defence installations.</i> 	

Paragraph (NPPF19 number)	NPPF19	NPPF21	Council commentary on implications for Partial Review
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Ship building, repairing and dismantling, dockside fish processing and refrigeration and compatible activities requiring a waterside location.</i> • <i>Water-based recreation (excluding sleeping accommodation).</i> • <i>Lifeguard and coastguard stations.</i> • <i>Amenity open space, nature conservation and biodiversity, outdoor sports and recreation and essential facilities such as changing rooms.</i> • <i>Essential ancillary sleeping or residential accommodation for staff required by uses in this category, subject to a specific warning and evacuation plan.</i> <p><i>* Landfill is as defined in Schedule 10 of the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010."</i></p>	

