

**Appendix 1 – Assessment of whether 2016 Stratford-on-Avon District Core Strategy continue to conform with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework Dec 2024 (as amended) and other relevant policies and guidance.**

Policy	Analysis as to whether policy should be considered up to or out of date
CS.1	<p>Policy CS.1 is entitled sustainable development and is an overarching policy setting out broad principles that apply and the approach that will be taken when considering development proposals.</p> <p>Ultimately, these principles reflect longstanding international agreements on sustainable development. Para 7 of the NPPF refers to resolution 42/187 of the UN General Assembly (which was agreed in 1987) and “Transforming our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development” (agreed in 2015). Both of which remain cornerstones of the UK approach to sustainable development and have been unaltered since the adoption of the Core Strategy in 2016.</p> <p>CS.1 goes on to refer to a positive approach to decision taking reflecting the presumption in favour of sustainable development in the NPPF to which it cross refers. The policy cross refers to the NPPF twice and these cross references need to be correctly read as meaning to the current NPPF (Dec 2024 version at the time of this analysis) in force rather than the version that existed at the time of adoption.</p> <p>The final two paras of the policy reflect closely the content of NPPF 11c) and d). Not surprisingly the final para of CS.1 doesn’t refer to the possibility of its policies being out-of-date. But in reviewing currency of the plan in accordance with legislative requirements and indicating which policies are considered to remain up-to-date it is considered this potential inconsistency has been managed.</p> <p>Therefore, policy CS.1 should be considered to be <b>up-to-date</b>.</p>
CS.2	<p>Policy CS.2 is a strategic policy setting out the approach to be taken towards climate change and sustainable construction. It is divided into two parts which are considered below. The policy is also supplemented by part V of the Development Requirements Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>Part A deals with mitigating and adapting to climate change and sets out at a strategic level, measures to mitigate the impact of climate change before addressing a range of adaption measures for development proposals.</p> <p>The range of mitigation measures identified appear to all be in accordance with the approach taken with the NPPF and other aspects of government policy. In some respects, government policy has moved on and it could be argued that the policy omits supportive reference to</p>

	<p>other measures such as non decentralised renewable energy schemes, but what content is there is clearly consistent with national policy.</p> <p>Adaption measures are largely dealt with by cross reference to other policies CS.4, CS.6 and CS.7 and the currency of these policies will be considered further in due course. The approach to heating and cooling remains consistent with paras 163 and 166b) of the NPPF.</p> <p>Overall, CS.2A is considered to remain <b>up-to-date</b>.</p> <p>CS.2B addresses sustainability standards in buildings. It promotes an energy hierarchy to achieve carbon emission reductions (reducing demand through energy efficiency measures, supplying energy efficiently and prioritising decentralised energy and providing energy from renewable or low carbon energy sources). This is broadly consistent with the energy hierarchy set out in the National Design Guide (2021) and is considered to be up to date.</p> <p>Part B of the Policy also references the need for non-residential development to be compliant with BREEAM ‘Good’ Standard until such time as this is superseded. The Building Research Establishment is still supporting BREEAM for the built environment, including new construction projects, which at the time of undertaking this review was on its seventh iteration, with updates reflecting changes to the Building Regulations. The policy also requires proposals for an extension or major refurbishment of an existing building to demonstrate that the energy performance of the building will be improved where it is viable to do so. The Development Requirements SPD (2020) includes reference to the use of BREEAM.</p> <p>The Planning and Energy Act 2008 allows local planning authorities to set energy efficiency standards in their development plan policies that exceed the energy efficiency requirements of the building regulations. Such policies must not be inconsistent with relevant national policies for England. Section 43 of the Deregulation Act 2015 would amend this provision, but is not yet in force.</p> <p>The most recent Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) in relation to Local Energy Efficiency Standards was an update issued in December 2023. On 25<sup>th</sup> July 2025, the Court of Appeal issued a ruling on the WMS that concluded that LPAs can set energy efficiency standards above national regulations, where justified by local circumstances and backed by evidence. The 2023 WMS does not itself prohibit higher local standards.</p> <p>CS2.B is considered to remain <b>up-to-date</b>.</p>
CS.3	<p>Policy CS.3 is a strategic policy setting out the approach to be taken towards sustainable energy in support of the objective to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. It is divided into 4 parts and addresses: a) renewable and low carbon energy generation, especially decentralised energy systems; b) solar energy; c) biomass energy; and d) wind energy,</p>

	<p>climate change and sustainable construction. It is divided into two parts which are considered below. The policy is also supplemented by part Q of the Development Requirements Supplementary Planning Document which addresses district heat networks.</p> <p>The policy content appears to remain consistent with paras 165-169 of the NPPF insofar as the policy takes a positive approach towards the provision of such development and doesn't seek to require applicants to demonstrate a need for renewable or low carbon energy.</p> <p>It offers particular encouragement for small scale community led initiatives which accords closely with NPPF 168b).</p> <p>CS.3 is considered to remain <b>up-to-date</b>.</p>
CS.4	<p>CS.4 deals with the water environment and flood risk and is divided into 4 parts: a) flood risk; b) surface water runoff and SUDS; c) enhancing and protecting the water environment; and d) water quality.</p> <p>Part a) remains consistent with the relevant parts of the NPPF, notably paras 170-175. Part b) accords with para 181-182 although it is perhaps surprising that the policy doesn't refer to the role of lead local flood authorities in relation to SUDS.</p> <p>Part c) is more detailed in nature than the NPPF although no conflict can be identified with the relevant sections of the NPPF or the additional guidance on water efficiency standards in planning practice guidance (see paragraph: 013 Reference ID: 56-013-20150327 and paragraph: 014 Reference ID: 56-014-201503270). The policy includes the need for residential development to incorporate water efficiency measures in the Building Regulations and for non-residential development to use BREEAM Good as a minimum. The policy is supported by Part V of the Development Requirements SPD.</p> <p>Part d) cross refers to the relevant river basin management plans which have been updated since the publication of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>CS.4 is considered to remain <b>up-to-date</b>.</p>
CS.5	<p>CS.5 addresses landscape and is written in 3 parts: a) landscape character and enhancement; b) visual impacts; and c) trees, woodlands and hedges. Policy CS.12 provides more detail on development in SLAs and is considered further below.</p> <p>In general, it should be noted that landscape character of the District has been created over long periods and changes more slowly than other matters that are addressed in the plan.</p> <p>Part a) of the policy makes high level statements about the approach to landscape character and enhancement that remain consistent with the principles set out in section 15 of the NPPF. Similarly, policy content on assessing visual impacts also remains consistent with the NPPF and the</p>

	<p>PPG makes clear that to assess “the likely effects of a proposed development on the landscape, a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) can be used” (para: 037 Reference ID: 8-037-20190721)</p> <p>Part c) is consistent with NPPF para 136 with regard to the importance of trees to urban environments, para 193 with regard to woodland and trees and legislation for hedgerow protection.</p> <p>CS.5 is considered to remain <b>up-to-date</b>.</p>
CS.6	<p>CS.6 deals with the natural environment and is in two parts: a) biodiversity; and b) geodiversity.</p> <p>Part a) accords closely to the requirements of NPPF 192-195. Some aspects of the supporting text appear dated as it doesn’t refer to either the Sub-regional Green Infrastructure Strategy that was produced in late 2024 by Warwickshire County Council or the more recent and as yet unpublished Local Nature Recovery Strategy. However, the absence of reference to these local documents is not considered to render the policy out of date especially as these documents appear complementary to CS.6</p> <p>Para 192 of the NPPF also clearly refers to geodiversity and no conflict is apparent between this and part b) of the policy.</p> <p>It is considered that CS.6 remains <b>up-to-date</b>.</p>
CS.7	<p>CS.7 deals with Green infrastructure and is set over two parts, the existing green infrastructure network and the provision of new green infrastructure.</p> <p>The first part of the policy is based on green infrastructure contributions to a number of planning considerations including low carbon economy, tourism, health, historic and archeological settings, sense of place and landscape character, biodiversity and flooding in accordance with the relevant parts of the NPPF. The purpose of the policy is based on the enhancement and preservation of green infrastructure assets, opportunities for links and addressing specific needs through development</p> <p>Green infrastructure remains of importance within the NPPF and Policy CS.7 is largely in accordance with para’s 20 d), 96 c), 164 a) 188,199 and would overall contribute to the achievement of the environmental objective of achieving sustainable development.</p> <p>The same sentiment applied in Policy CS.6 in regard to any updated national guidance surrounding green infrastructure is echoed, that this would be deemed to complement the policy rather than outdate the policy itself.</p> <p>It is considered that CS.7 remains <b>up-to-date</b></p>

CS.8	<p>Policy CS.8 is the policy involving historic environment and heritage assets.</p> <p>Policy CS.8 is largely in accordance with the purposes of chapter 16 of the NPPF which is to conserve and enhance the historic environment.</p> <p>In regard to proposals affecting the significance of a heritage asset, the NPPF and CS.8 directly refer to the levels of harm including substantial, less than substantial and harm specific to non designated heritage assets.</p> <p>There has been updated wording within the NPPF within Chapter 16 on these matters. In review, the updated wording within the NPPF could reasonably fit within the parameters of the text within Policy CS.8 and therefore CS.8 would not be deemed to be overly restrictive or lenient in a way which outdates the policy when considered against the intentions of the NPPF.</p> <p>It is noted that provisions may need to be made in the upcoming SWLP to reflect updated wording.</p> <p>Overall, Policy CS.8 is still considered <b>up to date</b>.</p>
CS.9	<p>CS.9 forms the core strategy design policy and is split into 4 parts of local distinctiveness, ensuring high quality design, design innovation and advertisements.</p> <p>CS.9 is also informed and read alongside a number of NDPs which inform their own local distinctiveness assessments and design considerations conforming with Para 132 of the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF does include importance on design codes and the national model design code (NMDC) at para 132-133 which are not included within the design policy CS.9. The NPPF does include the caveat that where there is an absence of locally produced design guides/codes then the national documents should be used to guide decision making. These national documents are material considerations and can be read alongside the existing policy which is considered to remain <b>up to date</b>.</p> <p>Due to this caveat, it is considered that the policy's silence on design codes within CS.9 does not result in the Policy being considered to be out of date.</p> <p>Para 141 of the NPPF relating to advertisement is still well reflected within CS.9 and considered <b>up to date</b>.</p> <p>The NPPF design focus on Trees and Tree lined streets would be caught elsewhere within the Core strategy under CS.2</p> <p>Therefore CS.9 is considered <b>up to date</b></p>
CS.10	CS.10 sets out the approach to development within the greenbelt.

	<p>The opening statement resists inappropriate development except for Very Special Circumstances (VSC). Any changes to the establishment of VSC within the NPPF are covered within the policy due to wording requiring compliance with the NPPF.</p> <p>These matters are therefore still considered <b>Up-to-date</b></p> <p>CS.10 is however missing reference to Paras 155-160 of the NPPF which introduces Grey Belt and the Golden Rules.</p> <p>The supporting text for the policy allows limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development. The updated NPPF has altered this to which would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt and therefore this part of the supporting text would be considered <b>out-of-date</b>.</p> <p>Overall, it is considered that the policy intentions are to safeguard Greenbelt land in accordance with the NPPF. However, it is considered the assessments surrounding Greenbelt have evolved significantly and therefore the policy considered partly <b>out-of-date</b> and schemes within the green belt requiring grey belt and golden rules assessment should be assessed in compliance with the NPPF.</p>
CS.11	<p>CS.11 is a specific policy related to the Cotswold's Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)</p> <p>The NPPF has made provisions to alter and rebrand AONBs to National Landscapes. Although, the term for the designation has changed the intentions of the designation remain broadly the same with safeguarding and conservation at the core as well as the opportunity for appropriate enhancements. CS.11 would align with both para 189 and para 190 which introduces exceptional circumstances for large scale development and refers back to the NPPF.</p> <p>Further guidance was also produced in regard to this Policy within the Development Requirements SPD.</p> <p>The policy refers to the Cotswold AONB Management Plan which was the version in force at the time of adoption of the Core Strategy and is specifically referenced in the supporting text. The management plan has been revised on a number of occasions subsequently. The current version is the Cotswolds National Landscape Management Plan 2025-2030.</p> <p>Despite the term change from AONB to National Landscape the policy is still in conformity with National Policy. Overall CS.11 is considered to</p>

	remain to be <b>up-to-date</b>
CS.12	<p>CS.12 is a further landscaping policy which refers to Special Landscape Areas.</p> <p>Although the term Special Landscape Areas does not feature within the NPPF para 188 does allow for plans to distinguish between international, national and Local designations. In review, CS.12 does identify the Special Landscape Areas as high landscape quality and is consistent with Chapter 15 of the NPPF and thus is considered to still be <b>up-to-date</b>.</p> <p>Further guidance was also produced in regard to this Policy within the Development Requirements SPD.</p>
CS.13	<p>CS.13 is the policy on areas of restraint.</p> <p>There is no explicit reference in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) to the use of such a local designation. The purpose of use of the area or restraint rather than a landscape designation remains apparent.</p> <p>The evidence base informing the designations now dates back to 2011, there is no reference to the use of such designations in the current NPPF and as it is a restrictive policy it may have implications for housing land supply. Therefore the policy is considered to be <b>out-of-date</b></p> <p>A landscape character assessment will also be conducted alongside the emerging SWLP. This offers the potential that this evidence will be material to future planning decisions.</p>
CS.14	<p>CS.14 relates to HGV controls within the Vale of Evesham.</p> <p>The Vale of Evesham spatially is cross-boundary and seeks to reduce the impact of HGV on Local communities, natural environment and landscape character which the NPPF does attribute weight to consider. Specific transport impacts are mentioned within para 89 (relating solely to rural areas) and chapter 9 which promotes sustainable transport.</p> <p>CS.14 is therefore considered <b>up-to-date</b></p>
CS.15	<p>This policy sets out the main spatial strategy for the plan and the hierarchy of places where development will be supported. As there is now a clear requirement to deliver housing at a far greater level that would result from following the spatial strategy it follows that insofar as housing proposals are concerned this policy should be considered to be <b>out-of-date</b>.</p> <p>As a consequence, housing development may now be appropriate at locations other than listed in the bullet points under part A, B, D and in part F. Where proposals for housing developments larger than consistent with the principles of CS.15, a detailed masterplan should not be required unless required by the NPPF or particular local</p>

	<p>circumstances.</p> <p>Elements of policy aimed at encouraging development on brownfield sites and local needs schemes seek to encourage rather than restrict supply and so can be considered <b>up-to-date</b>.</p>
CS.16	<p>Overall policy clearly provides for insufficient homes to be delivered to meet current needs it follows that insofar as housing proposals are concerned this policy should be considered to be <b>out-of-date</b>.</p> <p>As a consequence, housing delivery in excess of approximate targets in section A and B may be acceptable. Limitation on the scale of development in 4 categories of service village undoubtedly seeks to restrict supply.</p> <p>Aspects of the policy supporting delivery of allocated sites should not be considered out of date as should support expressed for neighbourhood planning.</p>
CS.17	<p>This is strategic and significant issue. It is important that insofar as is practicable housing addresses the pressing and significant shortfall in local needs. It should be noted that the in the Bordon Hill decision the inspector noted the plan-making process is the most appropriate route for dealing with this issue as it is a strategic and cross-boundary matter. Policy should be considered to be <b>up-to-date</b>.</p>
CS.18	<p>CS.18 is a positive policy which acts in support of the strategic objective to secure a mix of housing types and tenures. LHN figure encompasses both affordable and open market needs, indeed in circumstances where insufficient housing is being provided this can increase demand for affordable tenures. Nothing in the evidence base suggests the 35% target in CS.18 is not required. The Bordon Hill decision letter ascribed significant weight to acute need for affordable housing alongside market housing.</p> <p>Separate procedures apply to circumstances where viability may prevent the provision of housing where the policy is applied. The Policy should be considered to be <b>up-to-date</b> insofar as housing proposals are concerned.</p>
CS.19	<p>Housing type and mix. See above. Nothing in the evidence base or the Bordon Hill decision suggests that housing mix requirements are unreasonable. Policy remains in accordance with para 61 and 63 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Policy should be considered to be <b>up to date</b> insofar as housing proposals are concerned.</p>
CS.20	<p>Primary purpose of the policy is to safeguard existing housing stock as a vital resource. The Policy is considered to remain up to date. Circumstances of being unable to demonstrate sufficient supply of new</p>

	<p>housing land would suggest, if anything, the decision maker may consider applying increased weight to the issue in striking the planning balance. Policy should be considered to be <b>up to date</b>.</p>
CS.21	<p>Policy is essentially restrictive specifying multiple constraints that new sites must comply with. There is a pressing need for further Gypsy and Traveller site provision alongside the need for housing for the settled population. Insofar as proposals for residential accommodation are concerned this policy should be considered to be <b>out of date</b>. It should be noted however that many of the factors listed in the policy would still attract weight by virtue of the NPPF.</p>
CS.22	<p>CS.22 is the Economic Development policy.</p> <p>This Policy sets out a positive approach to promoting economic development across the District. It sets out broad support for business and commercial activity within sustainable locations. The policy also safeguards existing and consented employment sites from redevelopment to non employment uses unless continued employment use is demonstrably no longer viable.</p> <p>In paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 it sets out requirements across the District for employment land provision, expressed in hectares, for general needs, to meet out of district needs and to enable the expansion of key employers within the automotive sector. This includes making allocations of a minimum of 35 hectares of land over the plan period 2011-2035 to meet general (non strategic) needs, 19ha for the specific needs of Redditch and a total of 104.5ha for the expansion of automotive sector manufacturers.</p> <p>With regards to general delivery of employment sites this has occurred at a level in excess of that planned for in the CS although generally this has not happened on the sites that were allocated for the purpose. Of the 35ha that were identified, up to date evidence suggests that 13.7ha remains available which appears sufficient to meet needs for take up in the short to medium term.</p> <p>The specific allocation to meet the needs of Redditch has been delivered in full. The evidence base for the SWLP identifies further out of district need that should be met in the SWLP area but this relates to needs from Coventry and it suggests that sites in WDC may be preferable to meet this need.</p> <p>The specific allocations for the automotive sector haven't been brought forward but current evidence suggests that the quantum previously remains appropriate although alternative sites may be better placed to address these needs.</p> <p>In these regards the policy appears consistent with the content of the</p>

	<p>NPPF. Furthermore notwithstanding the fact that the evidence underpinning the amount of employment land provided for in CS.22 was taken from the GL Hearn Employment Land Study (August 2011) and the Coventry and Warwickshire Strategic Employment Land Study (Atkins) - October 2014, the remaining allocations in the CS continues to meet identified needs and so can be considered <b>up-to-date</b>.</p> <p>However with regard to strategic employment needs arising from within the District, there has been a very considerable change in circumstances. NPPF para 86 now requires planning policies to identify strategic sites for local investment and pay particular regard to facilitating development to meet the needs of a modern economy (citing data centres, freight and logistics among other uses). Para 87 goes on to require provision to be made for storage and distribution operations at a variety of scales. This approach reflects new national policy contained in the UK modern industrial strategy.</p> <p>As CS.22 does not specifically plan for such strategic employment sites it needs to be considered as being <b>out-of-date</b> in relation to these matters. It should also be noted that the published evidence base to inform the emerging SWLP suggests that is a considerable need for the provision of such sites</p> <p>The final paragraph also allows support for business investment where the economic and social benefits of an individual proposal outweigh any specific harm likely to be caused. These matters are in accordance with National Policy economic aim of achieving sustainable development and therefore can be considered to be <b>up-to-date</b></p> <p>The Policy defers to AS.10 for certain employment development in the countryside and these aspects of AS.10 are considered <b>up-to-date</b> for non residential development (see below).</p>
CS.23	<p>Policy CS.23 is for retail development and main centres.</p> <p>CS.23 in accordance with the NPPF encourages retail development that ensures vitality of town centers.</p> <p>CS.23 alongside policies CS.15 and Area strategies AS.1-AS9 outline the respective roles of Stratford-upon-Avon Town centre and Main Rural Centres in accordance with para 90 of the NPPF.</p> <p>CS.23 also sets the hierarchy for favourable locations for large scale retail development.</p> <p>CS.23 does refer to the Site Allocations Development Plan Document which will be superseded by the eventual SWLP.</p> <p>The policy then sets out the requirements of a retail impact assessment</p>

	<p>as allowed under para 94 which allows for a locally set floor space threshold, and in the event there is not a locally set floorspace threshold defaults to 2,500m<sup>2</sup> of gross floor space. CS.23 does not use the term sequential test but does outlines the requirements for a sequential test for any large scale retail in any other areas. These aspects are in broad accordance with the NPPF and therefore considered <b>up-to-date</b></p> <p>The text in relation to Class A1 has now been superseded by the introduction of Class E and the amended use classes order and therefore the second and third last paragraphs of the policy are considered to be <b>Out-of-date</b></p>
CS.24	<p>CS.24 is the Tourism and Leisure Development policy which sets out general support for the sustainable growth of existing attractions.</p> <p>CS.24 encourages new attractions within urban areas and main rural centers and outlines the criteria to justify large and major extensions. Tourism and leisure do fall into the definition of a main town centre use within the NPPF and therefore CS.24 is deemed consistent.</p> <p>CS.24 does also allow (subject to criteria) development within rural areas in turn making positive contributions to the rural economy in accordance with para 88 of the NPPF.</p> <p>The policy also encourages the reuse of previously developed land which is consistent with the NPPF in regard to making effective use of land.</p> <p>The policy also has a focus on appropriate preservation and enhancements of canals and waterways in which the NPPF includes rivers, canals lakes and reservoirs within the definition of open space. The NPPF offers broad encouragement to preservation and enhancement of open space within the social objective of achieving sustainable development , prosperous, rural economy and healthy communities.</p> <p>Therefore this policy is considered to be <b>up-to-date</b></p>
AS1-9	<p>In practice the nature of these area strategies set out aspirations for environmental, social and economic improvements that may be delivered to assist settlements to absorb the levels of growth set out in the housing strategy. They aren't worded as restrictive polices seeking to restrict housing delivery unless certain things are delivered. Where housing delivery may occur at greater levels than envisaged in the Core Strategy it is considered important that positive policies seeking to improve supporting infrastructure are retained. Individual judgements will need to be made on the circumstances of the case but policies are considered to be largely <b>up to date</b>.</p>
AS.10	<p>Policy specifies a range of circumstances where development may be</p>

	<p>acceptable around villages and in the open countryside. However, penultimate paragraph is restrictive in nature seeking to prevent all other types of development unless certain circumstances are met. Where there is a pressing housing need that doubtless will require the release of further sites in the countryside to deliver this aspect of the policy in respect of housing proposals should be considered <b>out of date</b>.</p> <p>Policy should be considered <b>up to date</b> in respect of non-residential development.</p>
AS.11	<p>Positive policy to encourage re use of brownfield sites. Policy should be considered <b>up to date</b>.</p>
CS.25	<p>Policy CS.25 is the Healthy Communities policy and is split into 2 parts. Part A, infrastructure, services and community facilities &amp; Part B Open space and recreation.</p> <p>Part A broadly sets out the expectance for developments to put suitable arrangements in place to mitigate impact and assist integration consistent with the NPPF para 35. This part of CS.25 also promotes the use of sustainable transport for new provisions which is also deemed consistent with the framework.</p> <p>Part A also safeguards the loss of existing facilities unless criteria is satisfied which is deemed consistent with para 98 c) of the NPPF which allows policies to guard against the loss of valued facilities.</p> <p>Overall, Part A of the Policy is deemed up to be <b>Up-to-date</b></p> <p>Part B of the policy refers to open space provisions and broadly intends to enable an increase or enhancement to open space and provision including new developments and this would be consistent with the NPPF.</p> <p>In regard to the quantum of open space defined within part B additional Open Space guidance is within the development requirements SPD Part O.</p> <p>Therefore this policy is considered to be <b>up-to-date</b>.</p>
CS.26	<p>Policy CS.26 is the Transport and Communications policy split into 6 parts A-F.</p> <p>Parts A and B refer to a overarching transport strategy and new developments. Parts A and B both promote sustainable forms of transport, pedestrian safety, EV charging and appropriate contributions to mitigate cumulative impacts and therefore are deemed to be consistent with the aims of chapter 9 of the NPPF and therefore considered to be <b>up-to-date</b></p> <p>Part C para 1 refers to parking standards and is consistent with para 112-113. Part D is relevant to strategic transport schemes and the safeguarded land designations still apply and therefore considered <b>up-</b></p>

	<p><b>to-date.</b></p> <p>Part E involves aviation and outlines a general support for further aviation development at existing airfields which is consistent with the NPPF para 111, f) and therefore considered <b>up-to-date.</b></p> <p>Part F relates to telecommunications and is in broad cohesion with the NPPF which promotes new development contribution to communications. The Policy is however, outdated by newer technologies and therefore considered <b>out-of-date.</b></p>
CS.27	<p>Policy CS.27 informs developer contributions alongside CIL, the development requirements SPD and the mechanisms of securing any contribution. The requirement of planning contributions to achieve sustainable development is well established within the NPPF and therefore this Policy deemed consistent.</p> <p>CIL has been adopted by the Council since 2018 and remains up to date with Development requirements SPD offering further guidance on planning contributions as well as a suite of policies within the core strategy engaged when relevant to the appropriate material consideration and consequent contribution.</p> <p>Overall, this policy is considered <b>up-to-date.</b></p>