

our ref K30
please ask for Carlos Hone
contact carlos.hone@ipswich.gov.uk
direct dial 01473 432917



IPSWICH
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Grafton House
15-17 Russell Road
Ipswich Suffolk
IP1 2DE

www.ipswich.gov.uk

23rd July 2021

Dear Ms Baker and Mr Hayden

RE: Examination of Ipswich Local Plan Review (ILPR) 2018-2036 and the revised National Planning Policy Framework.

I write further to your letter of 22nd July 2021 (Examination document reference K29).

The Council has considered the revised National Planning Policy Framework published on 20 July 2021, and have added our comments in a table at Appendix 1 (Examination document reference K30).

The Council considers that the new Framework does not have an implication for the soundness of the Ipswich Local Plan Review that would require further resolution through Main Modifications.

Yours sincerely

Carlos Hone MRTPI
Planning and Development Operations Manager

Appendix 1 - NPPF 2021 Update – Schedule of Changes and Implications for Ipswich Local Plan Review

<u>Original (2019) Paragraph</u>	<u>Original (2019) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Amended (2021) Paragraph</u>	<u>Amended (2021) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Implications for soundness of the emerging Ipswich Local Plan Review (ILPR)</u>	<u>Modification required</u>
Chapter 1. Introduction					
Footnote 1	“This document replaces the first National Planning Policy Framework published in March 2012, and includes minor clarifications to the revised version published in July 2018.”	Footnote 1	“This document replaces the first previous version of the National Planning Policy Framework published in March 2012 February 2019. , and includes minor clarifications to the revised version published in July 2018.”	No implication.	None.
Chapter 2. Achieving Sustainable Development					
Paragraph 7 (and new footnote 5)	“The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. At a very high level, the objective of sustainable development can be summarised as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs ⁴ .”	Paragraph 7	“The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. At a very high level, the objective of sustainable development can be summarised as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs ⁴ . <u>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.</u>	No implication. The change sets out the 17 Global Goals for Sustainable Development. The ILPR remains in accordance with Paragraph 7 as amended. Appendix 1 of this document outlines how the 17 Global Goals for Sustainable Development are considered through the Sustainability Appraisal objectives.	None.

<u>Original (2019) Paragraph</u>	<u>Original (2019) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Amended (2021) Paragraph</u>	<u>Amended (2021) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Implications for soundness of the emerging Ipswich Local Plan Review (ILPR)</u>	<u>Modification required</u>
			⁵ <u>Transforming our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.</u> ”		
Paragraph 8 – Criterion B	“b) a social objective – to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering a well-designed and safe built environment, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities’ health, social and cultural well-being; and”	Paragraph 8 – Criterion B	“b) a social objective – to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering well-designed, beautiful and safe places , with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities’ health, social and cultural well-being; and”	No implication. The insertion of “beautiful” and change from “built environment” to “places” does not effect the plans consistency with this paragraph. The ILPR remains in accordance with this criterion through policies such as DM12 of the Core Strategy and Policies DPD and the site constraints identified in the Site Allocations and Policies DPD.	None
Paragraph 8 – Criterion C	“c) an environmental objective – to contribute to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, helping to improve biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate	Paragraph 8 – Criterion C	“c) an environmental objective – to contribute to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, helping to improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon	No implication. The criterion has been clarified and strengthened by removing the terminology of “contribute to” and “helping to”. The ILPR still accords with this criterion.	None

<u>Original (2019) Paragraph</u>	<u>Original (2019) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Amended (2021) Paragraph</u>	<u>Amended (2021) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Implications for soundness of the emerging Ipswich Local Plan Review (ILPR)</u>	<u>Modification required</u>
	change, including moving to a low carbon economy.”		economy.”		
Paragraph 11 – Criterion A	“a) plans should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area, and be sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change;”	Paragraph 11 – Criterion A	<u>“a) all plans should promote a sustainable pattern of development that seeks to: meet the development needs of their area; align growth and infrastructure; improve the environment; mitigate climate change (including by making effective use of land in urban areas) and adapt to its effects;”</u>	No implication. The strategy of the ILPR promotes a sustainable pattern of development. It seeks to meet the development needs of the area through Policies ISPA1, CS7, CS13 and CS14 – CS20. The ILPR seeks to align growth and infrastructure, namely through Policies CS15 – CS20. It seeks to improve the environment by way of Policies CS4 and CS16. It seeks to mitigate climate change and adapt to its effects, principally through Policy CS1, including through effective use of land in urban areas as set out in Policy CS2 which encourages the effective use of brownfield land.	None.
Footnote 7	“ ⁷ This includes, for applications involving the provision of housing,	Footnote 8	“ ⁸ This includes, for applications involving the provision of housing, situations where	No implication. The transitional arrangements	N/A

<u>Original (2019) Paragraph</u>	<u>Original (2019) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Amended (2021) Paragraph</u>	<u>Amended (2021) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Implications for soundness of the emerging Ipswich Local Plan Review (ILPR)</u>	<u>Modification required</u>
	situations where the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites (with the appropriate buffer, as set out in paragraph 73); or where the Housing Delivery Test indicates that the delivery of housing was substantially below (less than 75% of) the housing requirement over the previous three years. Transitional arrangements for the Housing Delivery Test are set out in Annex 1.”		the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites (with the appropriate buffer, as set out in paragraph 73); or where the Housing Delivery Test indicates that the delivery of housing was substantially below (less than 75% of) the housing requirement over the previous three years. Transitional arrangements for the Housing Delivery Test are set out in Annex 1.”	are listed in footnote 9 instead.	
Paragraph 14 Criterion C	“c) the local planning authority has at least a three year supply of deliverable housing sites (against its five year housing supply requirement, including the appropriate buffer as set out in paragraph 73); and”	14. c)	“c) the local planning authority has at least a three year supply of deliverable housing sites (against its five year housing supply requirement, including the appropriate buffer as set out in paragraph 73 <u>74</u>); and”	No implication. The paragraph reference has been updated to reflect later changes.	N/A
3. Plan-making					
20	Strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and quality of development, and make sufficient provision ¹² for:	20.	Strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and quality of development design quality of places , and make sufficient provision ¹³ for:	No implication. The plan sets out a strategy for the pattern of development and it’s quality.	
Paragraph 22	“Strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum 15 year period from	22.	“Strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum 15 year period from adoption,	No implication. The only significant extension in the	None

<u>Original (2019) Paragraph</u>	<u>Original (2019) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Amended (2021) Paragraph</u>	<u>Amended (2021) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Implications for soundness of the emerging Ipswich Local Plan Review (ILPR)</u>	<u>Modification required</u>
	adoption, to anticipate and respond to long-term requirements and opportunities, such as those arising from major improvements in infrastructure.”		to anticipate and respond to long-term requirements and opportunities, such as those arising from major improvements in infrastructure. <u>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.</u> ¹⁶ <i><u>16 - Transitional arrangements are set out in Annex 1.</u></i>	ILPR is the Ipswich Garden Suburb. Policy CS10, which covers the Ipswich Garden Suburb, looks forward over the lifetime of the anticipated development as it sets out clear aims, visions and requirements for all the parcels of land. 3,295 of the approximately 3,500 dwellings proposed would be delivered within the plan period. Notwithstanding the above, Paragraph 221 states that technically the larger scale development part of this paragraph would not apply to the ILPR because it is beyond the Regulation 19 stage.	
Paragraph 35 – Criterion D	“d) Consistent with national policy – enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in this Framework.”	Paragraph 35 – Criterion D	d) Consistent with national policy – enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in this Framework <u>and other statements of national planning policy, where relevant.</u>	No implication. The ILPR is considered to be consistent with other statements of national planning policy where they are relevant. For example, Policy CS11 references the Planning	None.

<u>Original (2019) Paragraph</u>	<u>Original (2019) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Amended (2021) Paragraph</u>	<u>Amended (2021) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Implications for soundness of the emerging Ipswich Local Plan Review (ILPR)</u>	<u>Modification required</u>
				Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) (2015).	
4. Decision Making					
Paragraph 53	“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). Similarly, planning conditions should not be used to restrict national permitted development rights unless there is clear justification to do so.”	53 and new Paragraph 54 created from last sentence of 2019 version of para 53.	<p>“The use of Article 4 directions to remove national permitted development rights should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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) • in other cases, be limited to situations where an Article 4 direction is necessary to protect local amenity or the well-being of the area (this could include the use of Article 4 directions to require planning permission for the demolition of local facilities) • in all cases, be based on robust 	No implication. The ILPR does not commit to the use of article 4 directions in any policies to achieve the strategy of the ILPR. The potential removal of permitted development rights on developments in the defined Employment Areas would be through planning conditions only, as set out in Policy DM33. Policy DM13 also sets out that the withdrawal of permitted development rights to protect the character and appearance of a conservation area would only be done through planning conditions. The existing Article 4 directions in the Borough relate to the removal of certain permitted development	None.

<u>Original (2019) Paragraph</u>	<u>Original (2019) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Amended (2021) Paragraph</u>	<u>Amended (2021) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Implications for soundness of the emerging Ipswich Local Plan Review (ILPR)</u>	<u>Modification required</u>
			evidence, and apply to the smallest geographical area possible.”	rights in Conservation Areas ¹ . These are based on the smallest geographical area possible. The implementation of other Article 4 Directions as referenced at 9.18.8 in the ILPR would be undertaken in accordance with appropriate legislation and in accordance with the NPPF.	
5. Delivering a Sufficient Supply of Homes					
Paragraph 64.	“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, ...”	Paragraph 65.	“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, ...”	No implication. This is a clarification only and does not affect the approach in the emerging Local Plan.	No modification required.
Paragraph 69.	“Neighbourhood planning groups should also consider the opportunities for allocating small and medium-sized sites ...”	Paragraph 70.	“Neighbourhood planning groups should also consider give particular consideration to the opportunities for allocating small and medium-sized sites ...”	No implication. This policy relates to Neighbourhood Groups and not the Local Plan. There are no neighbourhood groups in Ipswich developing	No modification required.

¹ <https://www.ipswich.gov.uk/content/article-4-directions>

<u>Original (2019) Paragraph</u>	<u>Original (2019) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Amended (2021) Paragraph</u>	<u>Amended (2021) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Implications for soundness of the emerging Ipswich Local Plan Review (ILPR)</u>	<u>Modification required</u>
				Neighbourhood Plans.	
Paragraph 72.	“The supply of large numbers of new homes can often be best achieved through planning for larger scale development, such as new settlements or significant extensions to existing villages and towns, provided they are well located and designed, and supported by the necessary infrastructure and facilities. Working with the support of their communities, and with other authorities if appropriate, strategic policy-making authorities should identify suitable locations for such development where this can help to meet identified needs in a sustainable way. In doing so, they should:”	Paragraph 73.	“The supply of large numbers of new homes can often be best achieved through planning for larger scale development, such as new settlements or significant extensions to existing villages and towns, provided they are well located and designed, and supported by the necessary infrastructure and facilities <u>(including a genuine choice of transport modes)</u> . Working with the support of their communities, and with other authorities if appropriate, strategic policy-making authorities should identify suitable locations for such development where this can help to meet identified needs in a sustainable way. In doing so, they should:”	No implication. Access by a variety of transport modes is already addressed through a strategic policy of the Plan (CS5); by the infrastructure requirements set out in Table 8B; and by the detailed master plan guidance set out through the IGS SPD.	No modification required.
Paragraph 72. c)	“[LPAs should] c) 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	Paragraph 73. c)	“[LPAs should] c) set clear expectations for the quality of the development <u>places to be created</u> and how this can be maintained (such as by following Garden City principles); and ensure that <u>appropriate tools such as masterplans and design guides or codes are used to secure</u> a variety of <u>well-</u>	No implication. The master plan guidance set out through the IGS SPD already allows for design briefs and design codes. In relation to the allocation ISPA4.1, the allocation	No modification required.

<u>Original (2019) Paragraph</u>	<u>Original (2019) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Amended (2021) Paragraph</u>	<u>Amended (2021) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Implications for soundness of the emerging Ipswich Local Plan Review (ILPR)</u>	<u>Modification required</u>
	provided;”		designed and beautiful homes to meet the needs of different groups in the community will be provided; ”	already requires prior master planning in conjunction with East Suffolk Council, therefore no change is needed to the Local Plan to reflect the new NPPF requirements.	
Paragraph 79. d)	“the development would involve the subdivision of an existing residential dwelling; or”	Paragraph 80. d)	“the development would involve the subdivision of an existing residential dwelling building; or”	No implication. Clarification only	N/A
Paragraph 79. e)	“e) the design is of exceptional quality, in that it: - is truly outstanding or innovative, reflecting the highest standards in architecture, and would help to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas; and - would significantly enhance its immediate setting, and be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area.”	Paragraph 80. e)	“e) the design is of exceptional quality, in that it: - is truly outstanding or innovative, reflecting the highest standards in architecture, and would help to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas; and - would significantly enhance its immediate setting, and be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area.”	No implication. Refers to isolated homes in the countryside – these are mentioned in clause c. of Policy DM11 but the NPPF change does not have implications for the policy wording.	No modification required
6. Building a Strong, competitive economy and 7. Ensuring the vitality of town centres - no changes other than para/footnote numbering					
8. Promoting Healthy and Safe communities					
Paragraph 91. b)	“Planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places which: ...	Paragraph 92.b)	“Planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places which: ...	No implication. Policies DM12 and DM21 already require well-designed pedestrian and cycle routes.	None.

<u>Original (2019) Paragraph</u>	<u>Original (2019) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Amended (2021) Paragraph</u>	<u>Amended (2021) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Implications for soundness of the emerging Ipswich Local Plan Review (ILPR)</u>	<u>Modification required</u>
	b) are safe and accessible, so that crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion – for example through the use of clear and legible pedestrian routes, and high quality public space, which encourage the active and continual use of public areas; and”		b) are safe and accessible, so that crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion – for example through the use of attractive, <u>well-designed</u> , clear and legible pedestrian <u>and cycle</u> routes, and high quality public space, which encourage the active and continual use of public areas; and”		
N/A (New Paragraph)	N/A (New Paragraph)	Paragraph 96.	<u>“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.”</u>	No implication. The Council has worked with the CCG in finalising the Policy CS19 Provision of Health Services to ensure that the needs of the Heath Road Hospital Campus have been understood and catered for appropriately. The new NPPF requirement can be applied in the context of individual development applications.	No modification required.
Paragraph 96.	“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	Paragraph 98.	“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, <u>and can deliver wider benefits for nature</u>	No implication. Policies CS16 and DM5 already recognise the multiple functions that open spaces can perform.	No modification required.

<u>Original (2019) Paragraph</u>	<u>Original (2019) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Amended (2021) Paragraph</u>	<u>Amended (2021) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Implications for soundness of the emerging Ipswich Local Plan Review (ILPR)</u>	<u>Modification required</u>
	communities. Planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the need for open space, sport and recreation facilities (including quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses) and opportunities for new provision. Information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sport and recreational provision is needed, which plans should then seek to accommodate.”		and support efforts to address climate change. Planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the need for open space, sport and recreation facilities (including quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses) and opportunities for new provision. Information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sport and recreational provision is needed, which plans should then seek to accommodate.”		
9. Promoting sustainable transport					
Paragraph 104.	“Planning policies should: ... d) provide for high quality walking and cycling networks and supporting facilities such as cycle parking (drawing on Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans);”	Paragraph 106.	“Planning policies should: ... d) provide for high quality attractive and well-designed walking and cycling networks and with supporting facilities such as secure cycle parking (drawing on Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans)”	No implication. Policy DM21 requires sustainable transport modes to be prioritised and their routes well-designed into new developments and their surroundings. Policy DM22 requires secure cycle parking.	None.
Paragraph 108.	-	Paragraph 110. new criterion c)	“In assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be	No implication. Policy DM12 does not prevent the National Design Guide and	None.

<u>Original (2019) Paragraph</u>	<u>Original (2019) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Amended (2021) Paragraph</u>	<u>Amended (2021) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Implications for soundness of the emerging Ipswich Local Plan Review (ILPR)</u>	<u>Modification required</u>
		added and previous c) renumbered to d)	ensured that: ... <u>c) the design of streets, parking areas, other transport elements and the content of associated standards reflects current national guidance, including the National Design Guide and the National Model Design Code ⁴⁶; and</u>	National Model Design Guides standards from being followed in new developments.	
N/A (New Footnote)	N/A (New Footnote)	New footnote 46	<u>⁴⁶ Policies and decisions should not make use of or reflect the former Design Bulletin 32, which was withdrawn in 2007.</u>	No implication.	
10. Supporting high quality communications – no changes					
11. Making effective use of land					
Paragraph 120. a)	“Where the local planning authority considers there to be no reasonable prospect of an application coming forward for the use allocated in a plan: a) they should, as part of plan updates ...”	Paragraph 122. a)	“Where the local planning authority considers there to be no reasonable prospect of an application coming forward for the use allocated in a plan: a) they <u>it</u> should, as part of plan updates...”	No implication. Grammatical correction therefore no implications.	None.
Paragraph 123.	“Where there is an existing or anticipated shortage of land for meeting identified housing needs, it is especially important that planning policies and decisions avoid homes being built at low densities, and	Paragraph 125.	<u>“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.</u> Where there is an existing or anticipated shortage	No implication. Policy DM12 requires good design of the public realm and buildings (clauses h. and i.) An Urban Character SPD for Ipswich has already been prepared	None.

<u>Original (2019) Paragraph</u>	<u>Original (2019) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Amended (2021) Paragraph</u>	<u>Amended (2021) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Implications for soundness of the emerging Ipswich Local Plan Review (ILPR)</u>	<u>Modification required</u>
	ensure that developments make optimal use of the potential of each site.”		of land for meeting identified housing needs, it is especially important that planning policies and decisions avoid homes being built at low densities, and ensure that developments make optimal use of the potential of each site.”	and is cross referenced through the Local Plan, e.g. Policy DM12, para 9.12.11.	
12. Achieving well-design places					
Paragraph 124.	“The creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve.”	Paragraph 126.	“The creation of high quality, <u>beautiful and sustainable</u> buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve.”	No implication. Policy DM12 requires a high-standard of design which would accord with the insertion of “beautiful”. Buildings are required to be sustainable through Policies DM1 and DM2 of the ILPR.	None.
Paragraph 125.	“Neighbourhood plans can play an important role in identifying the special qualities of each area and explaining how this should be reflected in development.”	Paragraph 127.	“Neighbourhood plans <u>planning groups</u> can play an important role in identifying the special qualities of each area and explaining how this should be reflected in development, <u>both through their own plans and by engaging in the production of design policy, guidance and codes by local planning authorities and developers.</u> ”	No Implication. There are no neighbourhood planning groups in the Borough.	None.
Paragraph 126.	“To provide maximum clarity about design expectations at an early stage, plans or supplementary	128.	“To provide maximum clarity about design expectations at an early stage, plans or supplementary planning documents	No implication. The ILPR does not prevent the Council from preparing local	None.

<u>Original (2019) Paragraph</u>	<u>Original (2019) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Amended (2021) Paragraph</u>	<u>Amended (2021) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Implications for soundness of the emerging Ipswich Local Plan Review (ILPR)</u>	<u>Modification required</u>
	<p>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.”</p>		<p>should use visual tools such as design guides and codes. These provide a <u>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</u> framework for creating <u>beautiful and</u> distinctive places, with a consistent and high quality standard of design. However their <u>Their geographic coverage,</u> level of detail and degree of prescription should be tailored to the circumstances <u>and scale of change</u> in each place, and should allow a suitable degree of variety where this would be justified.”</p>	<p>design guides or codes.</p>	
-	-	<p>New Paragraph 129.</p>	<p><u>“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</u></p>	<p>No implication. See above.</p>	<p>None.</p>

<u>Original (2019) Paragraph</u>	<u>Original (2019) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Amended (2021) Paragraph</u>	<u>Amended (2021) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Implications for soundness of the emerging Ipswich Local Plan Review (ILPR)</u>	<u>Modification required</u>
			<p><u>they wish to develop. Whoever prepares them, all guides and codes should be based on effective community engagement and reflect local aspirations for the development of their area, taking into account the guidance contained in the National Design Guide and the National Model Design Code. These national documents should be used to guide decisions on applications in the absence of locally produced design guides or design codes.”</u></p>		
N/A (New paragraph)	N/A (New Paragraph)	New Paragraph 131.	<p><u>“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</u></p>	No implication. Policy DM12 of the ILPR requires developments to introduce greener streets and spaces which accords with this. Policy DM9 also requires new development to integrate tree planting and landscaping into new development, including car-parking areas.	None.

<u>Original (2019) Paragraph</u>	<u>Original (2019) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Amended (2021) Paragraph</u>	<u>Amended (2021) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Implications for soundness of the emerging Ipswich Local Plan Review (ILPR)</u>	<u>Modification required</u>
			<u>are planted in the right places, and solutions are found that are compatible with highways standards and the needs of different users.”</u>		
N/A (New footnote)	N/A (New footnote)	New footnote 50	<u>“Unless, in specific cases, there are clear, justifiable and compelling reasons why this would be inappropriate.”</u>	No implication. (see above)	None.
Paragraph 129.	“... and assessment frameworks such as Building for Life ⁴⁷ .”	133.	“... and assessment frameworks such as Building for a <u>Healthy</u> Life ⁵¹ .”	No implication. Policy DM12 does not prevent this requirement from being applied.	None.
Paragraph 130. Substantially deleted – final part becomes new para 135.	“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 in plan policies, design should not be used by the decision maker as a valid reason to object to development.	New paragraph 134.	<u>“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:</u> <u>a) development which reflects local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary</u>	No implication. Policy DM12 of the ILPR accords with this paragraph.	None.

<u>Original (2019) Paragraph</u>	<u>Original (2019) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Amended (2021) Paragraph</u>	<u>Amended (2021) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Implications for soundness of the emerging Ipswich Local Plan Review (ILPR)</u>	<u>Modification required</u>
	Local planning authorities should also seek to ensure that the quality of approved development is not materially diminished between permission and completion, as a result of changes being made to the permitted scheme (for example through changes to approved details such as the materials used)."		<u>planning documents such as design guides and codes; and/or b) outstanding or innovative designs which promote high levels of sustainability, or help raise the standard of design more generally in an area, so long as they fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings."</u>		
-	-	New footnote 52	<u>52 Contained in the National Design Guide and National Model Design Code.</u>	No implication. (see above)	None.
131. now incorporated as new Paragraph 134.b)	"In determining applications, great weight should be given to 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."	Paragraph 134. b)	See New Paragraph 134 b) above.	No implication. (see above)	None.
13. Protecting Green Belt land					
146. f)	"development brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order or Neighbourhood Development Order."	150. f)	"development, <u>including buildings,</u> brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order or Neighbourhood Development Order."	No implication. Ipswich contains no Green Belt.	No modification required
14. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change					
157.	"All plans should apply a sequential,	161.	"All plans should apply a sequential, risk-	No implication. The	None.

<u>Original (2019) Paragraph</u>	<u>Original (2019) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Amended (2021) Paragraph</u>	<u>Amended (2021) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Implications for soundness of the emerging Ipswich Local Plan Review (ILPR)</u>	<u>Modification required</u>
	risk-based approach to the location of development – taking into account the current and future impacts of climate change...”		based approach to the location of development – taking into account all sources of flood risk and the current and future impacts of climate change...”	Strategic Flood Risk Assessment which evidenced the ILPR followed this approach..	
157. c)	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...”	161. c)	“c) using opportunities provided by new development and improvements in green and other infrastructure to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding, (where appropriate through the use of making as much use as possible of natural flood management techniques as part of an integrated approach to flood risk management); and...”	No implication. Policies CS16 and DM5 already recognise all the functions Green Infrastructure can perform.	None.
158.	“The aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding.”	162.	“The aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. ”	No implication. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment which evidenced the ILPR followed this approach. Policy DM4 also follows this approach.	None.
159.	“If it is not possible for development to be located in zones with a lower risk of flooding (taking into account wider sustainable development objectives), the exception test may have to be applied. The need for the exception test will depend on the	163.	“If it is not possible for development to be located in zones areas with a lower risk of flooding (taking into account wider sustainable development objectives), the exception test may have to be applied. The need for the exception test will depend on the potential vulnerability of	No implication. The vulnerability classification is included in the draft Development and Flood Risk SPD as an appendix.	None.

<u>Original (2019) Paragraph</u>	<u>Original (2019) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Amended (2021) Paragraph</u>	<u>Amended (2021) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Implications for soundness of the emerging Ipswich Local Plan Review (ILPR)</u>	<u>Modification required</u>
	potential vulnerability of the site and of the development proposed, in line with the Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification set out in national planning guidance.”		the site and of the development proposed, in line with the Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification set out in national planning guidance- Annex 3. ”		
160.	“For the exception test to be passed, it should be demonstrated that:”	164.	“ For To pass the exception test to be passed it should be demonstrated that:”	No implication. Grammatical change only.	None
163. b)	“b) the development is appropriately flood resistant and resilient;”	167. b)	“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; ”	This detail will be covered through our SPD which is now flagged through DM4	
15.Conserving and enhancing the natural environment					
172	“Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues. The conservation and enhancement of wildlife and cultural heritage are also important considerations in these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads ⁵⁴ . The scale and extent of	176 & 177	“176) Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues. The conservation and enhancement of wildlife and cultural heritage are also important considerations in these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads ⁵⁴ . The scale and extent of development within these designated areas should be limited, while	No implication. The change is effectively adding in reference to development within the setting of these designated areas to be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the designated areas. This is to match what is already said in the relevant Planning Practice Guidance. The ILPR already includes a	None.

<u>Original (2019) Paragraph</u>	<u>Original (2019) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Amended (2021) Paragraph</u>	<u>Amended (2021) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Implications for soundness of the emerging Ipswich Local Plan Review (ILPR)</u>	<u>Modification required</u>
	<p>development within these designated areas should be limited. 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. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of:</p> <p>a) the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy;</p> <p>b) the cost of, and scope for, developing outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and</p> <p>c) any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated.”</p>		<p><u>development within their setting should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the designated areas.</u></p> <p><u>177) When considering applications for development within National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty,</u> 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. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of:</p> <p>a) the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy;</p> <p>b) the cost of, and scope for, developing outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and</p> <p>c) any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated.”</p>	<p>main modification to include reference to the setting of the AONB in Policy DM11 so no further modification is needed.</p>	
175 – Criterion	<i>[When determining planning</i>	180 – Criterion	<i>[When determining planning applications</i>	No implication. Policy DM8	None.

<u>Original (2019) Paragraph</u>	<u>Original (2019) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Amended (2021) Paragraph</u>	<u>Amended (2021) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Implications for soundness of the emerging Ipswich Local Plan Review (ILPR)</u>	<u>Modification required</u>
D	<p><i>applications the following principles should apply]:</i></p> <p>“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.”</p>	D	<p><i>the following principles should apply]:</i></p> <p>“d) development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported; while opportunities to incorporate improve biodiversity improvements in and around developments should be encouraged 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.”</p>	of the ILPR already requires biodiversity net gain to be incorporated into new developments. Policy DM10 of the ILPR already seeks to enhance public access to the identified green and blue corridors.	
16. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment					
N/A (New Paragraph)	N/A (New paragraph)	198	<p><u>“198. 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.”</u></p>	No implication. Policies DM13 and DM14 of the ILPR are considered robust and in accordance with the aims of this paragraph and these will apply in cases where there are Listed statues, plaques, memorials and Scheduled Monuments. In cases where there is an application to remove a non-listed historic statue, plaque, memorial or	None.

<u>Original (2019) Paragraph</u>	<u>Original (2019) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Amended (2021) Paragraph</u>	<u>Amended (2021) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Implications for soundness of the emerging Ipswich Local Plan Review (ILPR)</u>	<u>Modification required</u>
				monument, the ILPR does not prevent the decision-maker from applying the requirements of this new paragraph of the NPPF. Although the ILPR does not repeat the requirements of this paragraph, the ILPR does not contain any policies which conflict with it.	
17. Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals – These changes relate to Minerals Planning which is administered by Suffolk County Council. Therefore it is not considered necessary to list the changes here.					
Annex 1: Implementation					
212	“The policies in this Framework are material considerations which should be taken into account in dealing with applications from the day of its publication. 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.”	218	“The policies in this Framework are material considerations which should be taken into account in dealing with applications from the day of its publication. 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. ”	No implication.	None.
214	“The policies in the previous Framework published in March 2012	220	“The policies in the <u>original National Planning Policy</u> previous Framework	No implication.	None

<u>Original (2019) Paragraph</u>	<u>Original (2019) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Amended (2021) Paragraph</u>	<u>Amended (2021) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Implications for soundness of the emerging Ipswich Local Plan Review (ILPR)</u>	<u>Modification required</u>
	will apply for the purpose of examining plans, where those plans were submitted ⁶⁹ on or before 24 January 2019. Where such plans are withdrawn or otherwise do not proceed to become part of the development plan, the policies contained in this Framework will apply to any subsequent plan produced for the area concerned.”		<p>published in March 2012 will apply for the purpose of examining plans, where those plans were submitted⁶⁹ on or before 24 January 2019. Where such plans are withdrawn or otherwise do not proceed to become part of the development plan, the policies contained in this Framework will apply to any subsequent plan produced for the area concerned.</p> <p>⁶⁹—For spatial development strategies, ‘submission’ in this context means the point at which the Mayor sends to the Panel copies of all representations made in accordance with regulation 8(1) of the Town and Country Planning (London Spatial Development Strategy) Regulations 2000, or equivalent. For neighbourhood plans, ‘submission’ in this context means where a qualifying body submits a plan proposal to the local planning authority in accordance with regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.”</p>		
N/A (New Paragraph)	N/A (New Paragraph)	221	<u>“221. For the purposes of the policy on larger-scale development in paragraph 22, this applies only to plans that have</u>	No implication. The ILPR has already progressed beyond Regulation 19 and so the	None.

<u>Original (2019) Paragraph</u>	<u>Original (2019) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Amended (2021) Paragraph</u>	<u>Amended (2021) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Implications for soundness of the emerging Ipswich Local Plan Review (ILPR)</u>	<u>Modification required</u>
			<u>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).</u>	larger-scale development aspect of Paragraph 22 does not apply.	
215	“The Housing Delivery Test will apply from the day following the publication of the Housing Delivery Test results in November 2018. For the purpose of footnote 7 in this Framework, delivery of housing which was substantially below the housing requirement means where the Housing Delivery Test results published in: a) November 2018 indicate that delivery was below 25% of housing required over the previous three years; b) November 2019 indicate that delivery was below 45% of housing required over the previous three years; c) November 2020 and in subsequent years indicate that	222	“The Housing Delivery Test will apply from the day following publication of the Housing Delivery Test results, in November 2018 <u>at which point they supersede previously published results. Until new Housing Delivery Test results are published, the previously published result should be used.</u> For the purpose of footnote 7 8 in this Framework, delivery of housing which was substantially below the housing requirement means where the Housing Delivery Test results published in: a) November 2018 indicate that delivery was below 25% of housing required over the previous three years; b) a) November 2018 <u>for years 2016/17 to 2018/19 (Housing Delivery Test: 2019 Measurement, published 13 February 2020),</u> indicated that delivery was below 45% of housing required over the previous	No implication. The updates to the paragraph wording are to reflect the fact that certain dates have passed and so revised to be up to date.	None.

<u>Original (2019) Paragraph</u>	<u>Original (2019) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Amended (2021) Paragraph</u>	<u>Amended (2021) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Implications for soundness of the emerging Ipswich Local Plan Review (ILPR)</u>	<u>Modification required</u>
	delivery was below 75% of housing required over the previous three years.		three years; e) b) November 2020 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.”		
216	“216. For the purpose of paragraph 14: a) up to and including 11 December 2018, paragraph 14a also includes neighbourhood plans that became part of the development plan more than two years before the date on which the decision is made; and b) from November 2018 to November 2019, housing delivery should be at least 25% of that required over the previous three years, as measured by the Housing Delivery Test.”	N/A (paragraph deleted)	“ 216. For the purpose of paragraph 14: a) up to and including 11 December 2018, paragraph 14a also includes neighbourhood plans that became part of the development plan more than two years before the date on which the decision is made; and b) from November 2018 to November 2019, housing delivery should be at least 25% of that required over the previous three years, as measured by the Housing Delivery Test. ”	No implications. Paragraph 14 of the Original NPPF related to neighbourhood plans and the Borough does not have any neighbourhood plans.	None.
Annex 2: Glossary (changes relating to the minerals planning chapter of the NPPF have not been included)					
N/A (New Entry)	N/A (New Entry)	Article 4 Direction	“<u>Article 4 Direction: A direction made under Article 4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 which withdraws permitted development</u>	No implication. This is just referencing Article 4 Directions.	None.

<u>Original (2019) Paragraph</u>	<u>Original (2019) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Amended (2021) Paragraph</u>	<u>Amended (2021) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Implications for soundness of the emerging Ipswich Local Plan Review (ILPR)</u>	<u>Modification required</u>
			<u>rights granted by that Order.”</u>		
N/A (New Entry)	N/A (New Entry)	Design Guide	<u>“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.”</u>	No implication. This is just explaining what a design guide is.	None.
Green Infrastructure	“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.”	Green Infrastructure	<u>“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.”</u>	No implication. The ILPR defines green infrastructure as “Sub regional network of protected sites, nature reserves, green spaces and greenway linkages, including river corridors and flood plains, migration routes and features of the landscape, which are important as wildlife corridors.” Policy CS16 of the ILPR also explains the benefits of green infrastructure, including improved biodiversity, health and fitness, flood attenuation and better air quality. Policy DM12 (paragraph 9.12.9) highlights the economic	None.

<u>Original (2019) Paragraph</u>	<u>Original (2019) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Amended (2021) Paragraph</u>	<u>Amended (2021) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Implications for soundness of the emerging Ipswich Local Plan Review (ILPR)</u>	<u>Modification required</u>
				benefits of greening the streets of Ipswich.	
Housing Delivery Test	“Housing Delivery Test: Measures net additional dwellings provided in a local authority area against the homes required, using national statistics and local authority data. The Secretary of State will publish the Housing Delivery Test results for each local authority in England every November.”	Housing Delivery Test	“Housing Delivery Test: Measures net dwellings provided homes delivered in a local authority area against the homes required, using national statistics and local authority data. The Secretary of State will publish the Housing Delivery Test results for each local authority in England every November.”	No implication. The change is minor and a change in terminology.	None.
Sustainable transport modes	“Sustainable transport modes: Any efficient, safe and accessible means of transport with overall low impact on the environment, including walking and cycling, low and ultra low emission vehicles, car sharing and public transport.”	Sustainable transport modes	“Sustainable transport modes: Any efficient, safe and accessible means of transport with overall low impact on the environment, including walking and cycling, low and ultra low and zero emission vehicles, car sharing and public transport.”	No implication. The removal of “low” and insertion of “zero” reflects the latest technology. The ILPR supports the use of the latest technology through sustainable transport modes by way of Policy DM21 principally.	None.
Annex 3: Flood risk vulnerability classification					
N/A (new Annex)	N/A (new Annex)	Annex 3: Flood risk vulnerability classification	[The entire annex is not repeated here. The new annex sets out the flood risk vulnerability classification, specifically: - Essential infrastructure; - Highly vulnerable; - More vulnerable;	No implication. The flood risk vulnerability classification has been copied over from the relevant Planning Practice Guidance. The ILPR was	None.

<u>Original (2019) Paragraph</u>	<u>Original (2019) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Amended (2021) Paragraph</u>	<u>Amended (2021) NPPF wording</u>	<u>Implications for soundness of the emerging Ipswich Local Plan Review (ILPR)</u>	<u>Modification required</u>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Less vulnerable; and - Water compatible development. 	already consistent with this in terms of how it has informed site allocation (e.g. through the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment) and in the wording of Policy DM4. The vulnerability classification is included in the draft Development and Flood Risk SPD as an appendix.	

Appendix 1 – United Nations Global Goals for Sustainable Development and relationship to the Sustainability Appraisal Objectives.

UN Global Goal for Sustainable Development	Comparable Sustainability Appraisal Objective.
1. No Poverty	SA Objective 1 - To reduce poverty and social exclusion SA Objective 4 - To improve the quality of where people live and work SA Objective 16 - To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and growth throughout the plan area
2. Zero Hunger	SA Objective 3 - To improve the health of the population overall and reduce health inequalities
3. Good Health and Well Being	SA Objective 3 - To improve the health of the population overall and reduce health inequalities SA Objective 7 - To maintain and where possible improve air quality
4. Quality Education	SA Objective 5 - To improve levels of education and skills in the population overall
5. Gender Equality	SA Objective 3 - To improve the health of the population overall and reduce health inequalities SA Objective 4 - To improve the quality of where people live and work SA Objective 16 - To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and growth throughout the plan area
6. Clean Water and Sanitation	SA Objective 6 - To conserve and enhance water quality and resources
7. Affordable and Clean Energy	SA Objective 7 - To maintain and where possible improve air quality

	SA Objective 10 - To reduce emissions of greenhouse gases from energy consumption
8. Decent Work and Economic Growth	SA Objective 4 - To improve the quality of where people live and work SA Objective 16 - To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and growth throughout the plan area SA Objective 17 - To maintain and enhance the vitality and viability of town and retail centres
9. Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure	SA Objective 4 - To improve the quality of where people live and work SA Objective 16 - To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and growth throughout the plan area SA Objective 19 - To ensure that the digital infrastructure available meets the needs of current and future generations
10. Reduced Inequalities	SA Objective 3 - To improve the health of the population overall and reduce health inequalities SA Objective 4 - To improve the quality of where people live and work SA Objective 16 - To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and growth throughout the plan area SA Objective 18 - To encourage efficient patterns of movement, promote sustainable travel of transport and ensure good access to services SA Objective 19 - To ensure that the digital infrastructure available meets the needs of current and future generations
11. Sustainable Cities and Communities	SA Objective 2 - To meet the housing requirements of the whole community SA Objective 14 - To conserve and where appropriate enhance areas and assets of historical and archaeological importance SA Objective 16 - To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and growth throughout the plan area SA Objective 17 - To maintain and enhance the vitality and viability of town and retail centres SA Objective 18 - To encourage efficient patterns of movement, promote sustainable travel of transport and ensure good access to services SA Objective 19 - To ensure that the digital infrastructure available meets the needs of current and future generations
12. Responsible Consumption and Production.	SA Objective 8 - To conserve and enhance soil and mineral resources SA Objective 9 - To promote the sustainable management of waste
13. Climate Action.	SA Objective 10 - To reduce emissions of greenhouse gases from energy consumption SA Objective 11 - To reduce vulnerability to climatic events and flooding SA Objective 13 - To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity
14. Life Below Water	SA Objective 12 - To safeguard the integrity of the coast and estuaries

15. Life on Land	SA Objective 8 - To conserve and enhance soil and mineral resources SA Objective 13 - To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity SA Objective 15 - To conserve and enhance the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscape
16. Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions	SA Objective 1 - To reduce poverty and social exclusion SA Objective 3 - To improve the health of the population overall and reduce health inequalities
17. Partnerships	N/A – This goal is summarised as “Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalise the global partnership for sustainable development”. It is not considered applicable to the function of the ILPR.