

Mansfield Local Plan Examination

Inspector - Mrs S Housden BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

Programme Officer – Ian Kemp

ikemp@icloud.com

07723 009166

HEARING SESSION AGENDA

15 May 2019 9.30am

1.	Inspector's introduction
2.	Participant introductions
3.	Follow up items from 14.5.19
4.	Main Matter 3 – Whether or not the plan will secure high quality sustainable design and safeguard and enhance the District's landscape character, natural and historic environment
	1 Would Policies P1 – P4 secure inclusive design and accessible environments as required by the NPPF?
	2 Is the requirement for a health impact assessment in Policy P2 justified and what would be required?
	3 Is Policy P3 criteria (d) consistent with the overall aim of the policy to promote sustainable modes of transport?
	4 Is the requirement in Policy P4 for a masterplan on large sites (5 hectares or more or 150 dwellings) and public involvement in the design of major development proposals justified and how will this be secured and delivered? Should the considerations set out in paragraph 4.36 be incorporated into Policy P4?
	5 Does Policy P6 set out a positive approach to reflect the requirement for high quality and sustainable design set out in Policies P1 – P4?
	6 Does Policy P7 provide clear and robust guidance on how the impact of new development on amenity will be assessed and how will 'appropriate standard' and 'unacceptable level' be defined?
	7 Is Policy P8 consistent with the statutory test in relation to Conservation Areas?

	8	Will Policy NE1 be effective in protecting and enhancing the landscape character of the District as set out in the Mansfield Landscape Character Assessment (ENV1 & ENV2)? Is the geographic interpretation of Policy NE1 clear on the Policies Map, in particular the Landscape character policy zones?
	9	How have landscape character and other natural and historic environment designations been taken into account in identifying site allocations?
	10	How would any net gain in biodiversity sought through Policy NE2 be secured, measured and monitored?
	11	Should Policy NE2 paragraph 2 include reference to the Sherwood Forest potential Special Protection Area? Does Policy NE2 afford sufficient protection for 'irreplaceable habitats'?
	12	Is the wording of Policy HE1 paragraph 2 consistent with the statutory test that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area?
	13	Overall, is the plan's strategy to secure high quality design and safeguard landscape character and the natural and historic environment positively prepared and are any main modifications necessary for soundness?
	2pm	
5.	Main Matter 4 – Whether or not the approach to assessing housing and employment needs and the housing and employment land requirements are robustly based on consistent with national policy	
	1	What evidence justifies the use of the standard method to assess local housing need when the plan has been submitted for examination during the transitional period?
	2	How has the plan's housing requirement of 6500 dwellings (325 dwellings per year) set out in Policy S2 been arrived at having regard to the 'starting point' of 279 dwellings per year set by the standard methodology?
	3	Is the housing requirement of 325 dwellings per year justified when the OAN set out in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (H4) and Demographic Update Paper (H5) is a different figure?
	4	As the plan's housing requirement is based on the standard methodology, are there any implications arising from the

	revised Planning Practice Guidance ¹ which indicates the use of the 2014 based household projections as a baseline for the assessment of need?
5	Is the housing requirement of 325 dwellings per year aligned with the plan's economic strategy and jobs growth? How much of the figure can be attributed to needs arising from demographic change and how much to jobs growth? Does the evidence justify that approach?
6	Does the housing requirement take appropriate account of the need to deliver the identified need for affordable housing?
7	Does the use of the standard methodology have any implications for other local authority areas within the Outer Nottingham Housing Market Area?
8	Does the District represent an appropriate functional economic area for the purposes of assessing the need for employment land?
9	What are the implications of the District's links with the wider functional economic area of the Derby, Derbyshire and Nottingham and Nottinghamshire (D2N2) Local Enterprise Partnership area for jobs growth? Which sectors are expected to deliver an 'uplift' in jobs growth compared with baseline projections, why and is this based on robust evidence?
10	Does the D2N2 Economic and Policy review (E6) have any implications for the growth of the local economy?
11	What interventions by public sector bodies and partners would be necessary to deliver the plan's economic strategy and how likely are they to be achieved?
12	Is the assumption of jobs growth under Scenario 2 (D2N2 LEP Policy On Job Growth) set out in the Employment Land Forecasting Study (E1) justified and robust? Why was this scenario selected and how does it compare to historical rates of jobs growth?
13	Would the jobs created be likely to meet the requirements of the District's working age population? Are there any identified skills shortages?
14	How has the OAN for employment been translated into a requirement for floorspace and land? Are the assumptions in relation to the following factors clear, are they realistic and justified by the evidence:

¹ Paragraph 004

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vacancy rate – 10% (industrial and office uses) • Gross developable area to net floorspace – 40% • Loss of employment land to other uses – 0.68 hectares per year B1c/B2 and B8, 428 square metres B1a/b (offices) • Assumptions for job densities in the following sectors: B1a/b (offices, research & development, light industry) – 12.5 square metres B2 (general industry) – 42 square metres B8 (storage and distribution) – 69.5 square metres • Flexibility/contingency – 2x gross average annual completions
15	Is the overall supply of 55.8 hectares of employment land identified in Table 6.3 of the plan against the requirement of 42 hectares in Policy S2 justified and would this have any implications for the employment strategies of adjoining authorities?
16	Does the plan identify sufficient employment land, of the right type and in the right locations to support the economic strategy in the 'Ashfield and Mansfield 'A Plan for Growth' (E4)?
17	Overall, will the plan's economic strategy meet the objectively assessed quantitative and qualitative need for employment land over the plan period and are any main modifications necessary for soundness?
6.	Follow up items and close of hearing session