

1. Home (<https://www.gov.uk/>)
 2. Housing, local and community (<https://www.gov.uk/housing-local-and-community>)
 3. Planning and building (<https://www.gov.uk/housing-local-and-community/planning-and-building>)
 4. Housing design and sustainability (<https://www.gov.uk/housing-local-and-community/housing-design-and-sustainability>)
 5. National Planning Policy Framework and National Model Design Code: consultation proposals (<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/national-planning-policy-framework-and-national-model-design-code-consultation-proposals>)
- Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (<https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/ministry-of-housing-communities-and-local-government>)

Consultation outcome

Government response to the National Planning Policy Framework and National Model Design Code: consultation proposals

Updated 20 July 2021

Contents

Introduction

Overview

Q1: Do you agree with the changes proposed in Chapter 2 “Achieving Sustainable Development”?

Q2: Do you agree with the changes proposed in Chapter 3 “Plan making”?

Q3: Do you agree with the changes proposed in Chapter 4 “Decision making”?

Q4: Do you agree with the changes proposed in Chapter 5 “Delivering a sufficient supply of homes”?

Q5: Do you agree with the changes proposed in Chapter 8 “Promoting healthy and safe communities”?

Q6: Do you agree with the changes proposed in Chapter 9 “Promoting sustainable transport”?

Q7: Do you agree with the changes proposed in Chapter 11 “Making effective use of land”?

Q8: Do you agree with the changes proposed in Chapter 12 “Achieving well designed places”?

Q9: Do you agree with the changes proposed in Chapter 13 “Protecting the Green Belt”?

Q10: Do you agree with the changes proposed in Chapter 14 “Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change”?

Q11: Do you agree with the changes proposed in Chapter 15 “Conserving and enhancing the natural environment”?

Q12: Do you agree with the changes proposed in Chapter 16 “Conserving and enhancing the historic

environment”?

Q13: Do you agree with the changes proposed in Chapter 17 “Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals”?

Annex 1: Implementation

Q14: Do you have any comments on the changes proposed in Annex 2 “Glossary”?

Q15: We would be grateful for your views on the National Model Design Code, in terms of a) the content of the guidance b) the application and use of the guidance c) the approach to community engagement

Q16: We would be grateful for your comments on any potential impacts under the Public Sector Equality Duty

[Print this page](#)



© Crown copyright 2021

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](https://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3) (<https://www.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/national-planning-policy-framework-and-national-model-design-code-consultation-proposals/outcome/government-response-to-the-national-planning-policy-framework-and-national-model-design-code-consultation-proposals>

Introduction

On 30 January 2021, the government invited views on draft revisions to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). These changes were proposed to implement policy changes in response to the Building Better Building Beautiful Commission's 'Living with beauty' report (<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/living-with-beauty-report-of-the-building-better-building-beautiful-commission>).

We also took this opportunity to make a number of environment-related changes, including amendments on flood risk in response to initial findings from our review of flood risk with Defra, and climate change. The amendments also included a small number of very minor changes arising from legal cases, primarily to clarify the policy. A few minor factual changes were also made to remove out-of-date text (for example, the early thresholds for the Housing Delivery Test), to reflect a recent change made by a Written Ministerial Statement about retaining and explaining statues, and an update on the use of Article 4 directions.

The consultation also sought views on the draft National Model Design Code and the accompanying Guidance Notes, which together provide detailed guidance on the production of design codes, guides and policies to promote successful design. We sought views on the content of the documents, their application in practice and the approach to community consultation processes for developing local design codes.

The consultation ended on 27 March 2021 and all responses have been carefully considered. The government has made a number of important changes in response to the consultation, as set out in the various sections of this document.

The Framework that comes into force today is a reflection of our commitment to making beauty and place making a strategic theme in national planning policy. Our changes make clear that development that is not well designed should be refused and that 'good design and beautiful places' should be at the centre of plan making and decision making.

These changes do not represent a wholesale revision of the National Planning Policy Framework, nor do they reflect proposals for wider planning reform as set out in the Planning for the Future consultation document. A fuller review of the Framework is likely to be required in due course to reflect those wider reforms, subject to decisions on how they are to be taken forward.

Amendments to the National Model Design Code reflect the importance of providing guidance for creating healthy, environmentally responsive, sustainable and distinctive places with a consistent and high-quality standard of design.

Overview

There were 1,178 responses to the draft revised Framework and draft National Model Design Code consultation. Not all respondents answered every question. All responses have been analysed and given full consideration in the preparation of the final Framework. We are grateful to everyone who took the time to respond.

The table below provides a breakdown of the general consultation responses by type of respondent.

Table 1. Types of consultation respondent

Types of respondent	Number of responses
---------------------	---------------------

Types of respondent	Number of responses
Private individuals	398
Local authorities	230
Neighbourhood planning groups/town or parish councils	73
Developers	33
Private sector organisations	44
Professional bodies	37
Interest groups/voluntary organisations	237
Other	126
Total	1,178

The responses included a number of campaign responses on specific issues. The table below provides a breakdown of the overall number of responses including campaigns.

Table 2. Campaign responses

Campaigns	Number of responses
Climate change – specifically in relation to Chapter 2 of the Framework	151
Street trees – specifically in relation to Chapter 12 of the Framework	59
Total	210

This document provides a summary of the consultation responses received. It does not attempt to capture every point made, nor does it cover comments on aspects of policy that fall outside the scope of the consultation. This document sets out the changes the government has made in response to points raised in the consultation and where the government has not made changes, the reasons are explained.

Please note that the paragraph numbers in the final Framework are slightly different to those in the consultation draft. This is owing to the addition of a new paragraph 96 in the final Framework. Where we refer to paragraph numbers below, we have clarified in brackets whether we are referring to the paragraph in the consultation draft, or the final Framework.

The government has had regard to its responsibilities under the Equality Act 2010 during the preparation of the Framework.

Q1: Do you agree with the changes proposed in Chapter 2 “Achieving Sustainable Development”?

Question 1 response

A total of 650 respondents answered yes/no to this question. Of those, 436 (67%) said they did agree with the changes proposed in Chapter 2, 214 (33%) said they did not.

689 respondents provided substantive comments. Points raised include:

- there was general support for the principle of bringing the commitment to meet the 17 Global Goals for Sustainable Development into the Framework. Some responses considered that more should be done to embed the goals throughout the Framework
- the strengthening of the environmental objectives was welcomed by most respondents, though some developers thought it now meant the objectives were 'imbalanced'
- some responses constructively suggested specific measures to deliver against the new wording, for example with regard to whole life carbon assessments
- many respondents expressed concern that the objectives would be hard to deliver without effective control due to paragraph 11d and changes to Permitted Development Rights
- 151 almost identical responses were received calling for changes to explicitly include Climate Change Act commitments to net zero
- throughout the consultation, a number of respondents commented that "beauty" was too broad a phrase and requested a definition of "beauty" or "beautiful" within the Glossary

Government response

The government welcomes the support for the proposed changes to Chapter 2, in particular, the recognition of our commitment to pursue the United Nation's 17 Global Goals for Sustainable Development, and the strengthening of environmental objectives.

The proposals we consulted on were primarily intended to implement the government's response to the Building Better Building Beautiful Commission's recommendations, and to make a small number of other minor but necessary changes to clarify or update the wording. These changes do not represent a wholesale revision of the National Planning Policy Framework, nor do they reflect proposals for wider planning reform set out in the Planning for the Future consultation document.

National planning policies already recognise the importance of sustainable development and make clear that reducing carbon emissions should be considered in plan and decision making. The government is considering how the planning system can further support our commitment to reaching net zero, including through the planning reform programme. Our response to the Planning for the Future White Paper, setting out next steps on these reforms, will be published in due course. It is our intention to do a fuller review of the Framework to ensure it contributes to climate change mitigation/adaptation as fully as possible, as set out in the White Paper.

On the use of the term "beautiful", this has been included in the Framework in response to the recommendations of the Building Better, Building Beautiful Commission. This should be read as a high-level statement of ambition rather than a policy test. The government would encourage local planning authorities, communities and developers to work together to decide what beautiful homes, buildings and places should look like in their area. This should be reflected in local plans, neighbourhood plans, design guides and codes, taking into account government guidance on design.

Q2: Do you agree with the changes proposed in Chapter 3 "Plan making"?

Question 2 response

A total of 525 respondents answered yes/no to this question. Of those, 356 (68%) said they did agree with the changes proposed in Chapter 3, 169 (32%) said they did not. While more respondents did answer 'Yes' to the question, the comments then reflected some disagreement with some of the detail of the changes proposed.

There was considerable support for the changes to Chapter 3 across the sector. Local Planning Authorities, Neighbourhood Planning Groups and Developers all provided considerable support to the changes (71%, 72% and 73% respectively).

489 respondents provided substantive comments. The main points raised include:

- of those respondents that provided a substantive comment on the changes to paragraph 20, there was strong support for the changes made to the paragraph across the sector – in particular, the replacement of the word 'development' with 'places' gained considerable support
- long-term vision for major urban extensions and new settlements was welcomed, however a need was identified for clarification on what evidence base is required for a 30-year vision
- some commented that a definition of 'larger-scale development' would also be welcomed to provide clarity on what sites will require a 30-year vision. A need was identified for clarity on whether the 30-year vision applies to other policies contained within local plans. 61% of the local planning authorities that provided a substantive comment in relation to paragraph 22 either disagreed with the change or supported in principle but sought further clarification on what this change would mean in the current plan-making process
- some concern was raised across the sector regarding the changes to paragraph 35(d) and the inclusion of 'other statements of national policy'. A clear list of what 'other statements of national policy' are would be welcomed by respondents in order to provide clarification
- of the respondents that provided a substantive response to the changes made to paragraph 35(d), some respondents did not agree with the proposed changes to paragraph 35(d) on the basis that Written Ministerial Statements are not subject to consultation and can be released at any time in the plan-making process

Government response

The government has carefully considered the suggestion to provide a definition of 'larger-scale development'. The definition of 'larger-scale development' will depend on local context, scale and setting. Government is of the view that the local planning authority is best placed to determine the appropriate scale and this will be tested at examination. However, reflecting the comments received, we have revised paragraph 22 to more clearly indicate the types of 'larger-scale development' that could be considered in the context of a 30-year vision, as recommended by the Building Better, Building Beautiful Commission.

With regard to the request made by some responses for clarification around the evidence base needed to support a 30-year vision, the government will consider whether further clarification might be required in guidance. Given the concerns raised about the impacts of this policy on current plan making, the government is introducing a transitional arrangement to ensure that plans that have reached Regulation 19 (Pre-Submission) stage / section 335(2) of the Greater London Authority Act 1999 at the point this new Framework is published will not have to reflect this change in their evidence base.

The government has also carefully considered the responses asking for clarification on what 'other statements of national planning policy' are. Given paragraph 6 of the Framework provides examples of other sources of national planning policy, we do not consider that further clarification is necessary. Our change to paragraph 35(d) is intended to reflect and clarify the current position, that in considering whether plans are sound, the most up to date national planning policies should be taken into account.

Q3: Do you agree with the changes proposed in Chapter 4 “Decision making”?

Question 3 response

A total of 599 respondents answered yes/no to this question. Of those, 163 (27%) said they did agree with the changes proposed in Chapter 4, 436 (73%) said they did not.

613 respondents provided substantive comments, including some who had not provided a yes/no answer to the question. Of these, 187 respondents provided comment on the proposed options. Of those respondents who expressed a preference for the options proposed, 171 (91%) preferred Option 1, 13 preferred Option 2 and 3 wanted both options.

Of those respondents who expressed support for the changes proposed, there was endorsement for the need for more tightly defined geographical areas. Of the two options proposed there was significant support for Option 1 on the basis that this wording allowed for greater consideration of local circumstances.

Of those respondents who did not agree with the proposals, the following points were raised:

- no evidence had been presented to justify any change
- the Article 4 process was rigorous and not widely used, so didn't need to be changed
- the proposals raised the bar too high, and prevented local authorities planning positively for their areas, undermining local democracy
- the changes would limit a local authority's ability to plan strategically for their area
- the changes would impact negatively on high streets, design quality, the historic environment, employment opportunities, ability to control houses of multiple occupancy
- there needed to be a clear definition of any new terms used

Of those who commented specifically on whether Article 4 directions should apply to the smallest geographical area possible, 42 agreed and 63 disagreed. The main points raised were that Article 4 directions should be drawn to the smallest area possible, but this shouldn't result in local authorities having to secure multiple Article 4 directions rather than one larger one where this is more appropriate.

Government response

The government has considered the responses to the consultation and has refined the new Article 4 policy wording. The new policy ensures an appropriate balance between delivering a higher threshold to protect smaller geographical areas, whilst maintaining local flexibility in defining these areas.

In particular, the new Framework wording will clarify that Article 4 directions can be made where this would prevent wholly unacceptable adverse impacts from the conversion to residential use, such as the loss of the essential core of a primary shopping area in ways which would seriously undermine its vitality and viability. It will also clarify that conversion to residential use excludes change of use from a

house to a small house of multiple occupation, by specifying that the original use must be non-residential. Finally, it will set out the need for robust evidence to justify the purpose of the Article 4 direction and to ensure that it is applied to the smallest geographical area possible.

The new Article 4 policy allows local authorities to protect valued local facilities, where that is appropriate and based on robust evidence, but balanced to continue to allow greater flexibility of use and the delivery of new homes through permitted development rights, outside of these areas.

Q4: Do you agree with the changes proposed in Chapter 5 “Delivering a sufficient supply of homes”?

Question 4 response

A total of 515 respondents answered yes/no to this question. Of those, 351 (68%) said they did agree with the changes proposed in Chapter 5, 164 (32%) said they did not.

511 respondents provided substantive comments.

There was considerable support amongst those who commented further for most of the proposed changes, except for changes to the paragraph on affordable housing and the use of the term “beautiful”. Points raised include:

- there was general support from developers (86%) and local authorities (61%) for the proposed changes to paragraph 65. The addition of ‘total homes’ seemed to provide welcome clarification that provision of affordable housing should be focussed on affordable home ownership. There was a lack of support from the general public (76%) who were concerned that policy doesn’t go far enough to accommodate different types of affordable housing
- some respondents raised concern about the proposals in paragraph 70 on the basis that they considered that it would take the focus away from large sites
- there was wide support for explicit focus on sustainable and active transport modes in paragraph 73. Respondents were generally keen to have more specific wording on what is considered to be a genuine choice of transport modes
- there was an overall lack of support around inclusion of the term “beautiful” as strategic policy in paragraph 73(c)
- few respondents commented on the limited change in paragraph 80(d). Over half of those who commented contested the change in wording from “dwelling” to “building”. The main concern was that the term “building” could be open to interpretation
- there were a mix of views on the proposed changes to paragraph 80(e). Some considered that the deletion of innovative doesn’t mean innovative builds won’t be encouraged, but rather that they must be innovative and outstanding

Government response

The government welcomes the overall support for the proposed changes to Chapter 5. We have carefully considered the detailed comments received and conclude that the proposed changes to Chapter 5 should be implemented as proposed in the consultation.

While some respondents raised concern that the changes in paragraph 70 might take the focus away from large sites, the government is satisfied that the policy clearly sets out that small, medium and large sites can be allocated in this way, but that small and medium sites should be given particular

consideration.

The government has considered whether the wording in paragraph 73 should be more specific but has concluded that the term “genuine choice” is consistent with the rest of the Framework, and any further information should be set out in guidance.

On the use of the term ‘beautiful’, this has been included in the Framework in response to the recommendations of the Building Better, Building Beautiful Commission. This should be read as a high-level statement of ambition rather than a policy test. The government would encourage local planning authorities, communities and developers to work together to decide what beautiful homes, buildings and places should look like in their area. This should be reflected in local plans, neighbourhood plans, design guides and codes, taking into account government guidance on design.

Few respondents commented on changes to paragraph 80(d), and where they did there was a lack of consensus around the use of the term “building”. There was also a lack of consensus around the deletion of the term “innovative”. However, the government is satisfied that the change in wording of paragraph 80(e) does not discourage the development of innovative isolated homes, rather it ensures that these homes are of outstanding design, while still allowing innovation.

Q5: Do you agree with the changes proposed in Chapter 8 “Promoting healthy and safe communities”?

Question 5 response

There were 551 responses to this question. In the responses, 480 (87%) of respondents agreed with the changes proposed in Chapter 8, while 71 (13%) said they did not. The responses to this question therefore show strong support for the proposed changes to Chapter 8.

Points raised include:

- support for the proposed changes
- support in principle, but concern that some elements of the proposed changes may be subjective or open to differing interpretations in practice. This was particularly relevant to the proposed term “attractive”
- some support for placing greater emphasis on the role of biodiversity in relation to open space. In particular, suggested amendments included supporting the retention of existing trees and natural features, and supporting the use of quantitative standards where appropriate, such as provided by Natural England, and other metrics
- support in principle, with some interest in placing greater weight on design considerations in relation to the proposed paragraph 92(b). In particular, respondents raised the need for cycle and walking infrastructure to be inclusive of different age groups and disabled people, and that the proposals should ensure such infrastructure is considered safe for all users

Government response

There was significant support for the proposed changes to Chapter 8. The government considers that the term “attractive” in Chapter 8, paragraph 92(b) is consistent with the terminology in the Guidance Notes for Design Codes. However, for consistency with paragraph 106(d) (of the final Framework), paragraph 92(b) has been amended to also refer to “well-designed” pedestrian and cycle routes, and high quality public space.

Other changes proposed, such as the role of biodiversity in open space and inclusivity will be considered as part of the planned long-term review of the Framework and updates to Planning Practice Guidance on transport, expected in due course. The government therefore concludes that the proposed changes to Chapter 8 should be implemented as proposed in the consultation.

The final version of the Framework includes a new paragraph (96) which was not included within the consultation draft. This has been included following the government's consultation on Supporting housing and public service infrastructure (<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/supporting-housing-delivery-and-public-service-infrastructure>) where the government set out its intention to expand existing paragraph 94 to ensure faster delivery of other public service infrastructure developments.

As part of that consultation, there were 561 responses to this question, with strong cross-sector support which recognised that public service providers delivering these key developments would need to engage with local planning authorities at an early stage, so that the right information was available to enable decisions to be made more quickly. In the government response to that consultation, we set out our intention to extend the policy on pre-application for applications for significant public service development as part of the next revision of the NPPF. The addition of new paragraph 96 makes clear that local planning authorities are expected to take a proactive approach to engaging with key delivery bodies and other stakeholders at the pre-application stage.

Q6: Do you agree with the changes proposed in Chapter 9 “Promoting sustainable transport”?

Question 6 response

A total of 512 respondents answered yes/no part to this question, with 436 providing a comment. 85% of the respondents agreed with the changes proposed in Chapter 9, while 15% did not. Points raised include:

- respondents expressed support for the proposed changes to Chapter 9. The changes to paragraph 105(d) (of the consultation draft) were praised for encouraging active travel and highlighting the importance of secure parking. Clarifications on removing outdated guidance (Design Bulletin 32) in footnote 45 were supported, as were changes to 109(c) (of the consultation draft) for reasons such as ensuring active travel is better designed
- however, some respondents did not agree with the proposal to not reference the Manual for Streets (MfS) guidance in footnote 45. Some commented that MfS should be referenced in the Framework. Reasons for including a reference to the MfS, included this remaining national guidance.
- one local authority raised concerns with the national guidance as referenced in paragraph 109(c) (of the consultation draft) not being applicable to all local areas and some authorities requested additional or modified text to reference local design codes and guides. Some developers shared this view, outlining that national guidance should be considered alongside site specific factors and local design codes
- Neighbourhood Planning Bodies commented that the changes to 109(c) (of the consultation draft) did not appropriately reference rural living, where car ownership may be higher and public transport links may be poor
- some respondents commented that Chapter 9 could go further to encourage people to walk and cycle, including specific requests for references to cycling infrastructure design guidance and connections to existing cycle networks and multi-modal hubs

- others made specific wording comments, such as requesting “attractive” was added to paragraph 105(d) (of the consultation draft) as per the reference in paragraph 92(b), suggesting that the terminology in both these paragraphs should be consistent

Government response

The government welcomes the range of responses received for this Chapter and the support received for the proposed changes.

We consider that the term “attractive” should be added to Chapter 9, paragraph 106(d) (of the final Framework) to reflect consultation comments received and to be consistent with the terminology in the Guidance Notes for Design Codes. Given this change, the reference to “high quality” is considered unnecessary and has been removed.

The government has considered the comments on the Manual for Streets Guidance reference in footnote 45. This guidance is currently in the process of being updated, so will be considered for inclusion in the Framework again at a later date. Manual for Streets is currently referenced in the National Design Guide and the National Model Design Code. The government has made it clear that policies and decisions should not make use of or reflect the former Design Bulletin 32, which was withdrawn in 2007.

The government has concluded that no other changes to Chapter 9 are necessary at this stage as the key themes raised by respondents are either appropriately addressed in published national design guidance or other sections of the consulted Framework, and/or will be considered as part of the wider, longer-term revisions to the Framework and proposed national guidance updates.

Q7: Do you agree with the changes proposed in Chapter 11 “Making effective use of land”?

Question 7 response

A total of 463 respondents answered yes/no to this question. Of those, 374 (81%) said they did agree with the changes proposed in Chapter 11, 89 (19%) said they did not.

396 respondents provided substantive comments. Points raised include:

- some respondents raised concern that there was an assumption that efficient use of land equates to high density of housing, and asked for an acknowledgement of other efficient uses of land
- some respondents also commented that the wording proposed in paragraph 124 (of the consultation draft) was too passive to lead to positive change
- a number of respondents raised concern about the level of resources to allow local authorities to undertake this work
- some respondents suggested that the final version of the Framework includes reference to “design codes” rather than “codes” to ensure clarity
- a number of respondents raised concern about the inclusion of “beautiful” in this chapter

Government response

The government welcomes the considerable support for the proposed changes to Chapter 11. We have considered comments that Chapter 11 may be interpreted as an assumption that efficient use of land equates to high density housing. The government considers that the wording in paragraph 119 (of the final Framework) makes clear that efficient use of land isn't solely defined as high density housing development. This paragraph remains unchanged in the final Framework.

The government has considered whether the wording in Chapter 11 should be strengthened or clarified further, and has amended the wording in paragraph 125 (of the final Framework) to refer to "design codes" and to replace the term "can be helpful" with "can be used to help ensure".

On the use of the term "beautiful", this has been included in the Framework in response to the recommendations of the Building Better, Building Beautiful Commission. This should be read as a high-level statement of ambition rather than a policy test. The government would encourage local planning authorities, communities and developers to work together to decide what beautiful homes, buildings and places should look like in their area. This should be reflected in local plans, neighbourhood plans, design guides and codes, taking into account government guidance on design.

The government recognises there are a number of concerns surrounding local authority resources. We are exploring a resources and skills strategy, and options to introduce a new planning fee structure to support changes proposed.

Q8: Do you agree with the changes proposed in Chapter 12 "Achieving well designed places"?

Question 8 response

A total of 578 respondents answered yes/no to this question. Of those, 403 (70%) said they did agree with the changes proposed in Chapter 12, 175 (30%) said they did not.

650 respondents provided substantive comments.

On street trees, the majority of responses were in favour of the proposed policy on tree-lined streets. The proposed amendment was welcomed for recognising that trees make an important contribution to beautiful, liveable places, human well-being, biodiversity, air quality and climate adaptation. However, responses also pointed out that not all places which are thought of as well-designed, such as historic towns, had tree-lined streets.

A range of other issues were raised including:

- the need to balance new trees with the other needs for streets including highway safety, accessibility, and provision of utilities
- the need for flexibility in the policy, in terms of allowing for variety in the character of new streets, the viability of particular development proposals, and so housing delivery is not compromised by the need to accommodate trees
- the need to ensure trees were carefully chosen, located and maintained
- the need for highway authorities to support the provision of new trees, and for further resources to adopt and maintain new trees
- trees should be provided in a variety of locations within a new development, not just on streets, and policy should also seek the provision of hedgerows
- responses highlighted the need to protect existing trees, as well as providing new trees. There were calls for the test set out at footnote 49 (in the consultation draft) to be applied to existing trees

On design codes, of those responses that expressed a view, the majority were supportive of the policy changes. There was general support for the proposed changes relating to design codes. However, a number of issues were raised including:

- the need for clarity on the geographic coverage of design codes
- The role of developers and neighbourhood planning bodies in design codes
- the need for design codes to be deliverable in terms of viability
- the need for local authorities to have resources to be able to prepare design codes
- design codes need to allow for an element of variety, not hinder innovation
- the need for clarity on the relationship between new design codes and adopted design policies
- whether the National Model Design Code (NMDC) is able to be used in relation to decisions on planning applications

The changes proposed at paragraph 133 (of the consultation Framework) on refusing development that is not well-designed and giving weight to good design, were broadly welcomed. A number of issues were raised in relation to these changes including the following:

- responses highlighted the need for paragraph 133(b) (of the consultation draft) to be consistent with the change proposed at paragraph 79(e) (of the consultation draft) in terms of the use of the term "innovative"
- paragraph 133(b) (of the consultation draft) should also consider character, and not just fitting in with form and layout
- successful buildings can differ from their surroundings, so the emphasis on 'fitting in' may be too restrictive, and harm innovation
- clarity was sought on the status of the 'Manual for Streets' and the new footnote 51 as proposed in the consultation draft

On the inclusion of the term "beautiful" in this chapter, many welcomed the greater encouragement for high quality design in the proposed changes. However, respondents also questioned the use of the term "beautiful" in the Framework as they felt it is too subjective, and that it would help to provide a definition.

Government response

The proposed new paragraph on street trees takes forward the government's manifesto commitment which expects all new streets to be lined with trees, as part of our drive for environmentally friendly homes. The government recognises much of the feedback in the consultation responses, and believes that the proposed policy wording addresses many of these important points by asking for the long term maintenance of newly-planted trees, and working with local 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.

The consultation proposals also ask for the provision of trees, not only on streets, but across a development. This is in addition to the existing policy in paragraph 130(b) (of the final Framework) that proposals should include appropriate and effective landscaping. New footnote 50 is intended to provide an element of flexibility in the policy, for circumstances that present particular challenges where trees would not be appropriate. A number of responses referred to the proposed policy on retention of existing trees. While many welcomed this requirement, there was also a call for stronger protection for existing trees.

The government is currently considering new legislation that will lead to more trees being planted whilst ensuring strong protections for existing trees, and will consider a review of this policy as part of the wider consideration of the National Planning Policy Framework, in the context of forthcoming planning reforms. In response to feedback, we have added that parks may be appropriate places to locate new trees.

The consultation responses on design codes called for greater clarity on the role of developers and neighbourhood planning groups in the preparation of design codes, as well as the geographic coverage of design codes. We have added that 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. We have further clarified that the geographic coverage of design codes and design guides should be tailored to the circumstances and scale of change in each place, and that they can be prepared at either area-wide, neighbourhood or site-specific scale.

In response to the feedback which requested greater clarity on the role of developers in preparing design codes, we have added that landowners and developers can either contribute to codes being prepared as part of a local plan or supplementary planning document, or prepare design codes in support of a planning application for sites they wish to develop.

Our proposed changes asked that design codes should allow a suitable degree of variety, which we believe addresses the points raised in the responses that codes should not be too rigid in their requirements, for example in preventing innovation. This is further reinforced by the policy at 134(b) (of the final Framework) that allows for outstanding designs to come forward in areas where design codes may or may not be in place. On the issue of viability, the Framework currently asks for effective engagement between applicants, communities, local planning authorities and other interested groups throughout the process, which allows for commercial considerations to be taken into account in preparing design codes and guides.

Clarity was also sought in terms of the relationship between new design guides and codes and current local planning policy. The proposed new policy asks for design guides and codes to be prepared either as part of the local plan, or as a supplementary planning document, so they would need to follow the established statutory process in either case.

While the National Model Design Code is intended to guide the preparation of design codes locally, the government believes that the advice is capable of being material to the determination of planning applications. As with all government guidance, the weight to be given to this advice is a matter for the decision maker to determine in each case.

On the proposed policy in relation to refusal of planning permission for development that is not well-designed, consultation responses asked why there was an apparent inconsistency between the removal of the term 'innovative' from paragraph 80(e), and its retention in paragraph 134(b) (of the final Framework). Paragraph 80(e) specifically relates to an exception to the policy to avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside, whereas the reference in 134(b) is a broader policy to allow for innovative design in other locations, especially where it can push the boundaries in tackling climate change given the link to high levels of sustainability.

On the footnote reference to Manual for Streets, this guidance is currently in the process of being updated, so will be considered for inclusion in the Framework again at a later date. Manual for Streets is currently referenced in the National Design Guide and the National Model Design Code.

On the use of the term "beautiful", this has been included in the Framework in response to the recommendations of the Building Better, Building Beautiful Commission. This should be read as a high-level statement of ambition rather than a policy test. The government would encourage local

planning authorities, communities and developers to work together to decide what beautiful homes, buildings and places should look like in their area. This should be reflected in local plans, neighbourhood plans, design guides and codes, taking into account government guidance on design.

The government recognises there are a number of concerns surrounding local authority resources. We are exploring a resources and skills strategy, and options to introduce a new planning fee structure to support changes proposed.

Q9: Do you agree with the changes proposed in Chapter 13 “Protecting the Green Belt”?

Question 9 response

A total of 385 respondents answered yes/no to this question. Of those, 269 (70%) of respondents agreed with the changes proposed in Chapter 13, while 116 (30%) said they did not.

334 respondents provided substantive comments. Points raised include:

- there was broad support for the proposed change as it could aid decision-making and allows communities to deliver facilities while still limiting the impact on Green Belt
- some respondents raised concern that the new wording proposed in paragraph 149(f) (of the consultation draft) would allow communities to work with developers to build on Green Belt against the wishes of the local authority. These respondents suggested that we need to define more carefully those empowered to raise Community Right to Build or Neighbourhood Development Orders
- some respondents commented that the government should prioritise re-use of brownfield land

Government response

The government welcomes the support for the proposed changes in Chapter 13. The government noted that some respondents raised the need to define more carefully those empowered to raise Community Right to Build or Neighbourhood Development Orders. The government believes strongly in community participation in planning, and respectfully disagrees.

Some respondents commented that the government should prioritise re-use of brownfield land. The government agrees with the importance of using brownfield land and current policy already encourages making as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites.

The government considers that the amended wording, as drafted, is necessary to clarify that Community Right to Build Orders and Neighbourhood Development Orders may include buildings. This change is for clarification only. The government therefore concludes that, on balance, the proposed changes to Chapter 13 should be implemented as proposed in the consultation.

Q10: Do you agree with the changes proposed in Chapter 14 “Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change”?

Question 10 response

A total of 517 respondents answered yes/no to this question. Of those, 407 (79%) of respondents agreed with the changes proposed in Chapter 14, while 110 (21%) said they did not.

459 respondents provided substantive comments. Points raised include:

- respondents welcomed the clarification that the Sequential Approach and Sequential Test should consider all sources of flood risk when allocating or permitting development and the inclusion of Annex 3: Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification. A minority of respondents sought additional guidance on the practical relationship between the Sequential Test (and Exception Test) and non-fluvial flood risk considerations
- respondents across all groups expressed support for a requirement to integrate Sustainable Drainage Systems into all scales of development and across all areas – not just those at high risk of flooding
- 20% of respondents who commented recognised the importance of climate change and indicated a need for stronger terminology to reflect this, such as specific references to the Net Zero target and emphasis on renewable energy

Government response

The government welcomes the positive response to the proposals to clarify the approach towards accounting for all sources of flood risk when allocating or permitting development. Similarly, the government welcomes the support for strengthening of national policy for the use of natural flood management techniques. The government has therefore taken forward these proposals in the final Framework.

The government is committed to meeting its climate change objectives and recognises the concerns expressed across groups that this chapter should explicitly reference the Net Zero emissions target. It is our intention to do a fuller review of the Framework to ensure it contributes to climate change mitigation/adaptation as fully as possible, as set out in the White Paper “Planning for the Future”.

The government has considered comments regarding Sustainable Drainage Systems and has amended the National Model Design Code so it is consistent with the policy set out in Chapter 14 of the Framework in this regard.

The government recognises that further amendments are needed to clarify the relationship between the Sequential Approach/Test (and Exception Test) and non-fluvial flood risks. The government concludes that guidance should be used to make these clarifications, and this will be updated in conjunction with the publication of the Flood Review. In the meantime, in response to the comments received that the use of the term “zones” does not cover all types of flooding, new paragraph 163 has been amended to replace “zones” with “areas” in the final version of the Framework.

Q11: Do you agree with the changes proposed in Chapter 15 “Conserving and enhancing the natural environment”?

Question 11 response

A total of 539 respondents answered yes/no to this question. Of those, 408 (76%) said they did agree with the changes proposed in Chapter 15, 131 (24%) said they did not.

499 respondents provided substantive comments. Points raised include:

- the majority of respondents welcomed the changes
- some commented that there is a need for a minimum requirement for measurable net gain for biodiversity expected through development

- a number of respondents suggested that the additional wording in paragraphs 175 and 176 (of the consultation Framework) should also apply at the plan-making stage
- many respondents asked for stronger requirements to protect existing trees and woodland, and plant new ones
- some respondents commented that protection for pre-existing habitat corridors is needed
- others commented that some weight should be given to protecting landscapes identified locally as valued
- a number of respondents requested greater emphasis on the development and maintenance of wildlife corridors, and that reference be added to Artificial Nesting Sites such as swift bricks
- some respondents requested changes to paragraphs 175, 176 and 177 (of the consultation Framework) to include National Parks, Heritage coastlines, and World Heritage Site settings
- some commented that insufficient reference has been made to the contribution that green and blue infrastructure (including Sustainable Drainage Systems) can make to delivering biodiversity
- a number of respondents raised concern about the widening of application of “great weight” to be given to the “settings” of protected landscapes as these could potentially include large areas of mineral resource and existing extraction sites

Government response

The government welcomes the support for the proposed changes to Chapter 15. In response to the comments received, the revised Framework (new paragraph 176) now makes clear that the scale and extent of development within all the designated areas listed should be limited, while development within their setting should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the designated areas.

Given their sensitivity and varying circumstances, it is appropriate for the development plan to consider the scale and extent of development in designated areas within this policy context, but for stringent tests to apply to applications, as provided for in paragraph 177 (of the final Framework). Whilst the responses around locally identified landscapes are noted, the Framework already sets expectations for protecting and enhancing valued landscapes and recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside at paragraph 174 (of the final Framework) which is considered to be satisfactory.

Having considered responses, it is considered premature to set a minimum requirement for biodiversity net gain at this time, as the matter is being brought forward through the Environment Bill. However, on reflection, the wording in paragraph 180(d) (of the final Framework) has been amended to clarify the policy, by seeking to improve biodiversity around developments but not explicitly within other developments as this could be unreasonable. The policy emphasis remains for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity or increasing public access to nature, providing this is appropriate in the context of the site.

Due to the high-level nature of the Framework, it is not considered appropriate to explicitly emphasise specific measures such as wildlife corridors, or blue/green infrastructure or swift bricks. Whilst the strength of representations around enhanced protections for trees is noted, it is not considered necessary to further the provisions in this chapter; as the government is introducing policy to protect existing mature trees and to create tree lined streets as part of new paragraph 131.

Q12: Do you agree with the changes proposed in Chapter 16 “Conserving and enhancing the historic environment”?

Question 12 response

A total of 434 respondents answered yes/no to this question. Of those, 289 (66%) said they did agree with the changes proposed in Chapter 16, 145 (34%) said they did not.

399 respondents provided substantive comments. Points raised include:

- the number of responses to the question and level of agreement indicate that there is considerable support for the proposed changes. Even from those that generally support the change, three main areas of concerns were prevalent:
 1. Wording and clarity: some respondents raised concern that the proposed wording of the new paragraph was ambiguous and could result in unforeseen issues, particularly terms such as "historic", "statue", "alter" and "plaque", where definitions were requested, and the phrases "have regard to" and "where appropriate". Some requested amended wording or an updated PPG to provide clarification
 2. Some respondents commented that the proposed changes would be unlikely to serve their intended purpose. It was suggested that removal of these statues may not be within the legal definition of development, and therefore unenforceable. It should therefore be ensured that the legal definition would encompass the removal of statues
 3. A number of respondents commented that the role of communities should be emphasised within the changes. Some who agreed with the changes still felt that communities should be able to choose to relocate and explain in specific circumstances
- respondents who opposed the changes commented that the changes served no purpose as heritage assets of value were already protected, or that this issue should be wholly separate from the planning system

Government response

The government recognises the importance of the historic environment and has no intention to reduce the important protections that exist for it within in the Framework. The purpose of the change to Chapter 16 was to reflect a change made to national planning policy by a Written Ministerial Statement on protecting our nation's heritage dated 18 January 2021.

The government concludes that, on balance, the proposed changes to Chapter 16 should be implemented as proposed in the consultation, with minor amendments to drafting to make clear that monuments are included, to avoid cutting across the definition of heritage assets, and to clarify that retention should be "in situ".

We have set out the statues etc. which are covered by this policy in Part 11 of Schedule 2 to General Permitted Development Order 2015 and directions. We will be updating the Planning Practice Guidance to help local planning authorities further. We recognise the important role of community engagement in the planning system. This is already emphasised in the Framework and it is not considered necessary to reiterate it here.

Q13: Do you agree with the changes proposed in Chapter 17 "Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals"?

Question 13 response

A total of 332 respondents answered yes/no to this question. Of those, 278 (84%) said they did agree with the changes proposed in Chapter 17, 54 (16%) said they did not.

277 respondents provided substantive comments. Points raised include:

- there was strong support for the changes proposed in Chapter 17
- a majority of respondents supported the inclusion of Mineral Consultation Areas in paragraph 209(c) of the consultation Framework. This reflects the mechanisms through which Mineral Planning Authorities can safeguard important mineral resource. This clarification in policy supports what is already defined in the Planning Practice Guidance
- respondents voiced their support for the above insertion but asked that this be further clarified in Paragraph 209(c) that Mineral Consultation areas are only relevant in two tier areas
- the changes to paragraph 210(f) of the consultation Framework were largely supported. However, some respondents were concerned with the removal of the reference to 'small-scale' sites. Other respondents were pleased with this deletion as this phrasing is considered too restrictive
- some respondents raised wider environmental/sustainability concerns regarding mineral development and extraction

Government response

The government welcomes the considerable support for the proposed changes to Chapter 17. We recognise that Chapter 17 should be amended to clarify that Mineral Consultation Areas only apply in two tier areas. As the revised Framework is making only limited changes, the new wording of Paragraph 211(f) allows for more flexibility.

The government considers that the wider environmental/sustainability issues raised regarding mineral development are more appropriately addressed as part of the wider planning reform agenda.

Annex 1: Implementation

Annex 1 comments

Although the consultation did not ask a specific question on the proposed changes to Annex 1: Implementation, a small number of respondents commented that a transitional period was needed to implement the new Framework. Others commented that the wording in paragraph 217 of the consultation draft should be reinstated.

Some respondents also commented on the proposed changes to the text on the Housing Delivery Test.

Government response

As set out under Chapter 3: Plan making, in response to consultation responses around the evidence base needed to support a 30-year vision, a new paragraph has been added to Annex 1 to clarify that plans that have already reached Regulation 19 (Pre-Submission) stage (or for Spatial Development Strategies, consultation under section 335(2) of the Greater London Authority Act 1999) at the point the new Framework is published will not have to reflect this change in their evidence base.

The government has considered whether it is necessary to include other transitional provisions. The Framework has retained the implementation provisions so that existing policies should not be considered out of date because they are adopted or made prior to the publication of the Framework as set out in paragraph 219 of the revised Framework. As the revised Framework is making only limited changes and given the wider reform agenda, the government concludes that it is not necessary to set out other transitional arrangements.

In response to the responses related to the Housing Delivery Test (HDT), the final version of the Framework has been amended to reflect financial years rather than calendar years. This is to make the timeframes consistent with those used in the HDT measurement and the HDT Rule Book.

Q14: Do you have any comments on the changes proposed in Annex 2 “Glossary”?

Question 14 response

A total of 337 respondents provided substantive comments on the Glossary. Comments mainly focused on proposed changes to definitions of:

- green infrastructure: there was overall support for the proposed changes to this definition
- housing delivery test: a number of respondents requested that reference to “net additional dwellings” be reinstated or that the word, “net” is added to “homes delivered” for clarity
- minerals: some support for the proposed changes to the definitions related to minerals, others suggested minor amendments or requested that we clarify that the lists included within these definitions are not definitive
- sustainable transport modes: a couple of respondents highlighted that reference to “low and ultra low emission vehicles” should be replaced with “zero emission vehicles” to be consistent with the government’s commitment to end the sale of vehicles with petrol/diesel by 2030
- a significant number of respondents requested a definition of beauty/beautiful

Government response

The final version of the Framework now includes a definition of an Article 4 direction to complement our revision of Article 4 direction policy in paragraph 53.

On the use of the term ‘beautiful’, this has been included in the Framework in response to the recommendations of the Building Better, Building Beautiful Commission. This should be read as a high-level statement of ambition rather than a policy test. The government would encourage local planning authorities, communities and developers to work together to decide what beautiful homes, buildings and places should look like in their area. This should be reflected in local plans, neighbourhood plans, design guides and codes, taking into account government guidance on design. The government therefore does not propose to set out a national definition.

A definition of “design guide” has also been added. This has been defined as: “A document providing guidance on how development can be carried out in accordance with good design practice, often produced by a local authority”.

Many comments on the proposal to amend the definition of “housing delivery test” focused on the absence of the word ‘net’ from the definition. For clarity and consistency with other documents and guidance (including the Housing Delivery Test Rule Book and Housing Flows Reconciliation guidance) and in response to comments made by consultation respondents, the final version now refers to “net homes delivered”.

On balance, the government has concluded that it is not necessary to amend the definitions related to minerals. The final version therefore implements the changes proposed in the consultation.

The definition of “sustainable transport modes” has been amended to include “ultralow and zero emission vehicles” to ensure consistency with the government’s commitment to end the sale of petrol/diesel fuelled vehicles by 2030. The text has been amended in collaboration with the Department for Transport’s Office for Zero Emission Vehicles.

Q15: We would be grateful for your views on the National Model Design Code, in terms of a) the content of the guidance b) the application and use of the guidance c) the approach to community engagement

Question 15 response

A total of 687 respondents commented on the National Model Design Code (NMDC). Generally, feedback from respondents was very positive, with general appreciation for the objectives and content of the documents. Many respondents provided constructive suggestions emphasising the need to strengthen, refine, add, or correct detailed wording.

- contents: several respondents welcomed the extracts on Context and Nature but questioned whether enough emphasis had been placed upon: net zero, health and wellbeing, food, biodiversity, blue and green infrastructure, historic environment, flood protection, security and sustainable drainage systems
- context: some responded to the contents of the NMDC commenting that it could be too ‘urban centric’ with suggestions that additional text and imagery could be included to recognise more rural local authorities
- flexibility: it was noted that the NMDC should provide greater flexibility and allow for adaptability and change over time with more emphasis upon collaboration with developers to assess the deliverability of schemes
- innovation: Design Codes should ensure that innovative, high quality schemes are not held back and compromised
- simple and concise: Design Codes should not include all design parameters listed and should be easy and flexible to apply. Respondents also raised the importance of Design Review and Community Panels to address this
- security: Home Office have met separately to address their emerging requirements for Protect Duty

Community engagement: There is overall support for the focus on community engagement and the importance of consultation at all stages of the Design Code process. Some respondents requested greater clarity on how codes are verified and by whom to ensure they reflect community views, alignment with Statement of Community Involvement and the role of Community Panels. There were also some general points of concern and queries which were noted:

- resources: a number of respondents raised concerns regarding resources, skills capacity and expertise within local authorities to produce and comment on Design Codes, conduct meaningful consultation and clarification on understanding the number of codes that would be necessary to cover its area

- permitted development rights: there were repeated concerns that the NMDC is at odds with the expansion of permitted development rights
- piloting: feedback and reports from the planned NMDC Testing Programme is supported and of interest to many respondents as it represents an opportunity to trial and understand the viability of the NMDC
- Office for Place: some respondents are keen to learn more about the role of Office for Place and its potential to assist in the production of design codes to alleviate resource concerns

Government response

The government welcomes the range of responses received with regards to the NMDC and upon review, amendments have been made to the final version of document as follows.

The titles of the documents have been amended to NMDC Part 1 – The Process and NMDC Part 2 – Guidance Notes.

Definitions for Design Codes and Design Guides reflect the National Planning Policy Framework and new guidance states that the NMDC can be used to develop both codes and guides.

A small number of new and concise wording has been introduced within the Purpose, Objectives and Application chapters. This commentary provides greater clarity on the application of design codes in the absence of local codes, allows for more flexibility and innovation, emphasises the benefits of collaboration between local authorities and developers and restructures the minimum contents of codes.

The government recognises the importance of sustainability, the natural environment, climate change, safety and security for all and health and wellbeing and is therefore strengthening the objectives and amending details where necessary to support these aspects.

Additional text, references, imagery and revisions to potentially contentious terminology have been incorporated providing greater emphasis upon recognising local heritage and settings more applicable to rural contexts. More images of the rural context have been included to balance the urban and rural examples.

Wording has been amended to avoid duplication and ensure alignment with the National Planning Policy Framework. Further weight has been placed upon the need to address food production, flood risks and incorporate sustainable drainage systems.

The community engagement extracts have been strengthened through recognising inclusivity and digital technologies to ensure that all members of the community are interacted with appropriately.

Q16: We would be grateful for your comments on any potential impacts under the Public Sector Equality Duty

Question 16 response

123 respondents provided comments on potential impacts of the proposed changes under the Public Sector Equality Duty. Across all sectors, the main comments were:

- a number of respondents commented that they did not think the proposed changes would have a detrimental impact on people who share a protected characteristic, or that the proposed changes (particularly those on design) would have a positive impact

- the focus on community engagement was generally supported, but many respondents commented that engagement must be inclusive and not exclude those from protected groups, particularly those who are less likely to have access to digital technology
- some respondents commented that the proposed changes to Article 4 directions may adversely impact protected groups through a loss of important local services
- some respondents commented that the proposed changes related to statues could disproportionately impact protected groups, and that the text should be amended to ensure that protected groups are fully represented in the built environment
- one respondent commented that safe and attractive cycling and walking conditions could lead to positive equalities impacts
- some respondents commented that changes in relation to flooding have the potential to result in equalities impacts as people who share protected characteristics may be less resilient to the prevention and impacts of flooding

Government response

The government has considered equalities impacts as part of the wider changes to national planning policy related to Article 4 Directions. The government recognises the concerns regarding poor standards of accommodation provided through Permitted Development Rights, but acknowledges the measures that have been undertaken to mitigate against these. The wording of paragraph 53 has been amended in response to the consultation.

The government agrees that safe walking and cycling conditions lead to positive equalities impacts. The government will consider how changes can be made to supporting guidance which includes guidance on accessible and sustainable transport.

The government has considered the comments regarding flooding and concludes that all protected groups should benefit indirectly from strengthened environmental policies, in particular:

- clarification that the policies apply to all sources of flood risk
- clarification that plans should manage any residual flood risk by 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)
- clarification of the criteria that need to be demonstrated in order to pass the exception test
- a definition of what is meant by a development being appropriately flood resistant and resilient

Older people and disabled people should particularly benefit from these policy changes as these are groups for whom climate change is expected to have a disproportionately adverse impact. The policy may also have an indirect positive impact on groups such as low income households, and residents of housing in areas at increasing risk of flooding and coastal erosion.

The government has carefully considered comments that the paragraph on statues may lead to disproportionate impacts on protected groups. The government has concluded that all protected groups should benefit indirectly from the new policy that historic statues should be retained and their historical and social context explained rather than being removed as it will enhance our collective understanding of our national history.

Whilst decisions are ultimately at the discretion of Local Planning Authorities, as Historic England has highlighted, retention provides the opportunity to provide thoughtful, long lasting and powerful reinterpretation that responds to their contested history and tells the full story, including about the

historical impact on protected groups. This information should foster, rather than shut down, understanding and dialogue within the community.

The National Model Design Code recognises that when preparing design codes, communities need to be involved at each stage of the process with engagement appropriate for access by all people. It is also clear that community engagement needs to recognise that some aspects of the development process are complex and some community groups are harder to reach. Therefore, the form and approach for community engagement needs to be decided locally and co-designed with community groups.

The National Model Design Code states that there are a range of in-person and digital engagement tools that can be used. Using a combination of different techniques should be considered to reach the maximum number and range of people.

The National Model Design Code has been strengthened through imagery to recognise the importance of both traditional and digital forms of engagement. With revised imagery also recognising members of the community that maybe harder to reach. The National Model Design Code recognises that a balance will need to be applied of face to face and digital techniques appropriate to their circumstances.

[Print this page](#)

Is this page useful?

- [Yes this page is useful](#)
- [No this page is not useful](#)

Thank you for your feedback

[Report a problem with this page](#)

[Close](#)

Help us improve GOV.UK

Don't include personal or financial information like your National Insurance number or credit card details.

What were you doing?

What went wrong?

[Send](#)

[Close](#)

Help us improve GOV.UK

To help us improve GOV.UK, we'd like to know more about your visit today. We'll send you a link to a feedback form. It will take only 2 minutes to fill in. Don't worry we won't send you spam or share your email address with anyone.

Email address

[Send me the survey](#)