

## Mansfield Local Plan Examination

Inspector - Mrs S Housden BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

Programme Officer – Ian Kemp

[ikemp@icloud.com](mailto:ikemp@icloud.com)

07723 009166

---

## HEARING SESSION AGENDA

**23 May 2019 9.30am**

**Note – the additional points in bold have been identified for further discussion at the hearing sessions in addition to the MIQs**

1. Inspector’s introduction
2. Participant introductions
3. Follow up items from 22.5.19
4. **Main Matter 7 – Whether or not the plan will contribute to the vitality and viability of Mansfield town centre, the District Centres and Local Centres**

(Note the Council has appended a 2019 Retail Update to its MM7 Hearing Statement)

- 1 Is the 500 sqm threshold for impact assessments in Policy RT1 based on robust evidence? Are the proposed new Local Centres at Berry Hill (Policy SUE3) and Pleasley Hill Farm (Policy SUE1) justified by the evidence?

**Is the use of a 500 sqm figure ‘net’ figure justified?**

**Is the number of local centres justified?**

**Should Mansfield town centre be covered by a separate policy?**

- 2 Are the requirements in Policy RT2 reasonable and justified and does the policy provide an appropriate framework for further policy guidance? Is this contained in the Local Development Scheme (K4a)?
- 3 How have the specific percentage and sales area thresholds in Policy RT3 been arrived at and are they based on robust evidence? Is the designation of secondary shopping frontages relevant having regard to changing retail trends?

- 4 Will Policy RT4 be effective in securing qualitative improvements to Mansfield town centre? Why is the requirement in paragraph 2 restricted to major development?
- 5 Is the scale of retail and leisure development proposed in site allocation RT6b at Ransom Wood Business Park justified and would this have any implications for the viability and vitality of Mansfield town centre or any of the District and Local Centres?
- 6 Is the allocation of sites with planning permission in Policy RT7 justified?
- 7 The following questions apply to Policies RT8, RT9 and RT10:
  - a. Is the policy clear and will it provide sufficient guidance for decision making?
  - b. Is it based on a robust evidence base?
  - c. How will the policy be implemented and would it be flexible to respond to specific circumstances including viability?
  - d. Is the policy positively prepared, justified by the evidence and consistent with national policy and will it be effective? Are any modifications necessary for soundness?

**How will 'predominant use' set out in Policy RT8 paragraph 1a be defined and measured?**

**How would larger scale proposals in neighbourhood parades be assessed and how has the figure of 250 sqm in paragraph 7.66 of the plan been arrived at?**

**Should Policy IN7 be included within the Retail chapter in so far as it relates to local shops?**

**Would the approach to further retail development at Portland and St Peter's Retail Parks as set out in Policy RT10 have any implications for the vitality and viability of Mansfield town centre? Would a condition restricting sales to bulky goods only be justified in the case of extensions to the existing retail units at St Peter's?**

- 8 Will the plan provide the quantitative as well as qualitative needs for retail and leisure development over the plan period and should any further sites be allocated to meet the long term requirement for comparison floorspace having regard to Table 7.11 of the plan?
- 9 Is the approach to hot food takeaways in Policy RT11 justified by the evidence and consistent with national policy and

guidance?

**How has the 400 m threshold been arrived at and from which point would it be calculated? Have the areas around the relevant schools been mapped?**

- 10 Overall, do Policies RT1 to RT11 represent a positively prepared strategy for the town centre, District and Local Centres? Are any main modifications necessary for soundness?

**2pm**

**5. Main Matter 8 – Whether or not the plan makes appropriate provision for new infrastructure to support the level of new development proposed**

- 1 Does the Infrastructure and Delivery Plan (IN1) contain the full range of infrastructure necessary to support the development proposed in the plan?
- 2 Does Policy IN1 make clear the contributions that will be sought towards new and improved infrastructure necessary to support the development in the plan? How will strategic and local infrastructure improvements be funded?
- 3 Is the designation of green infrastructure on the Policies Map justified by the evidence and does Policy IN2 provide sufficient flexibility to assess development proposals that may come forward?
- 4 Do Policies IN3 and IN4 provide a robust and appropriate approach to the protection and provision of community open space and outdoor sports facilities and is the geographic interpretation of Policy IN3 and areas of community open space on the Policies Map justified?
- 5 Is the safeguarding of non-statutory allotments under Policy IN5 justified?
- 6 Is the local Green Space designation justified by the evidence and is there any overlap with the Green Infrastructure notation on the Policies Map? Will Policy IN6 provide sufficient guidance for plan users, in particular what is meant by 'very special circumstances'?
- 7 Is Policy CC1 consistent with the Written Ministerial Statement on Wind Energy? On what basis have the 'areas with potential for commercial wind generation' shown on the Policies Map been identified? Are the areas with potential for commercial wind generation soundly based and are the boundaries of those areas on the Policies Map clear?

- 8 What evidence justifies the definition in Policy CC1 of a 'small scale turbine' being up to 43 metres in hub height? Is the geographic interpretation of 'areas with potential for small scale wind generation' on the Policies Map clear?
  - 9 Has a sequential, risk based approach been taken to the location of development to avoid where possible flood risk to people and property as required by the NPPF?
  - 10 Will Policy IN8 be effective in supporting modal shift to sustainable modes of transport and is it consistent with national policy? Are the safeguarded routes correctly shown on the Policies Map?
  - 11 What is the likely effect of the proposed scale and distribution of development on the strategic and local highway network and key junctions? Have the necessary highway improvements and/or mitigation measures been identified in the plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IN1) including timing/phasing where necessary?
  - 12 Overall, does the plan make appropriate provision for new infrastructure and are any main modifications necessary for soundness?
6. **Main Matter 9 – Whether or not the plan would be viable and deliverable within the plan period and whether the arrangements for monitoring are robust**
- 1 Would new employment, housing and other development be able to accommodate the plan's policy requirements having regard to viability and is this supported by the evidence in the Viability Study (V2)?
  - 2 Will the monitoring framework provide a robust basis for assessing plan outcomes and are the indicators, targets and triggers appropriate?
  - 3 Does the plan have sufficient flexibility to respond to changing circumstances? Should there be a policy or statement requiring an early review of the plan?
7. Follow up items and close of hearing session