

Mansfield Local Plan Examination

Inspector - Mrs S Housden BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

Programme Officer – Ian Kemp

idkemp@icloud.com

07723 009166

MAIN MATTERS, ISSUES AND QUESTIONS (MIQs)

These MIQs should be read in conjunction with the Inspector's Examination Information Note.

References in brackets () are to the document references in the Local Plan Examination Library which can be found on the Examination web site <http://www.mansfield.gov.uk/LocalPlanSubmission>.

Additional Examination Documents

The Council has provided a list of responses to the main issues raised and representations made at the Regulation 19 consultation stage (November and December 2018) in document S7b together with a Schedule of Proposed Main and Minor Modifications (S2) and associated Policies Map changes (S4a and S4b). You should refer to these when responding to the MIQs and there will be further consideration of the proposed changes at the relevant hearing sessions. The following documents have also been published since the plan was published for consultation at the Regulation 19 stage and are available on the Examination web site:

Updated Whole Plan Viability Assessment (V2) and addendum (V2a) relating to custom and self-build dwellings

Housing Technical Paper Addendum (H2)

Sustainability Appraisal Addendum (S8)

Duty to Cooperate Statement of Compliance (DTC4)

Education Technical Paper (IN2)

Vision and Objectives Background Paper (SE6)

Local Development Scheme March 2019 (K4A)

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

On 19 February 2019, the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government published a revised version of the NPPF. Paragraph 214 of the revised document states that the previous NPPF (2012) will apply for the purposes of examining plans where the plan was submitted for examination on or before the 24 January 2019. As the Mansfield Local Plan (the plan) was submitted on 19 December 2018 it will be examined against the 2012 NPPF.

Rejected/Omission Sites

It is not part of my role to examine the soundness of rejected or alternative sites put forward by representors. Consequently, discussion at the hearing sessions and in response to these MIQs should focus on whether the proposed housing and employment site allocations and strategic urban extensions in the submitted plan are sound.

Abbreviations

DtC – Duty to Co-operate, IDP – Infrastructure Delivery Plan, NPPF – National Planning Policy Framework, OAN – Objective assessment of need, SA - Sustainability Appraisal, SHMA – Strategic Housing Market Assessment.

Main Matter 1 – Duty to Cooperate (DtC) and Other Legal Requirements

Issue – Has the Council has complied with the DtC in the preparation of the plan?

- 1 What are the relevant strategic matters in relation to the DtC?
(Defined as matters having a significant impact on at least two planning areas or on a county matter in a two tier area¹).
- 2 Has the Council maximised the effectiveness of the plan by engaging constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis with the prescribed bodies on relevant strategic matters during the preparation of the plan and what form has this taken?
- 3 What outcomes have resulted from the co-operation with the prescribed bodies on any relevant strategic matters and how have these informed the plan's policies?
- 4 Are there any cross boundary issues in relation to any of the proposed site allocations and any general policies and if so, how have they been dealt with through the DtC?

Other Legal Requirements

- 5 Do the content and timescale for preparation of the plan accord with the latest version of the Local Development Scheme (K4a)? Are other proposed Supplementary Planning Documents referred to in the plan included within the Local Development Scheme?
- 6 Has public consultation complied with the public consultation requirements in the Town and Country Planning (Local Plan) (England) Regulations 2012 and the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement (K3)?
- 7 Is it clear how the Sustainability Appraisal (S8a -d) and its Addendum (S9) influenced the plan's strategy and policies and how mitigation measures have been dealt with?

¹ S33A(4) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

- 8 Does the Sustainability Appraisal test the plan against reasonable alternatives in terms of the scale of employment and housing development and its broad distribution as set out in the spatial strategy in Policy S2? What alternatives were considered and is it clear why they were discounted?
- 9 Is the Habitats Regulations Screening Report (S10) legally compliant having regard to the judgement in *People over Wind, Peter Sweetman v Coillte Teoranta*²? Does the report incorporate any mitigation measures that are intended to avoid or reduce harmful effects on the Birklands and Bilhaugh Special Area of Conservation and Sherwood Forest potential Special Protection Area? Are the report's conclusions robust and is Appropriate Assessment necessary?
- 10 Does the plan include policies designed to mitigate and adapt to climate change, including supporting the transition to a low carbon future?
- 11 Has the preparation of the plan complied with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 Part 2 and the Town and Country Planning (Local Plan) (England) Regulations 2012 in all other respects?

Main Matter 2 – Local Plan Vision, Issues and Objectives, spatial strategy, settlement hierarchy and the distribution of employment and housing land

Issue – Will the plan contribute to the achievement of sustainable development in the plan area (Policy S1)?

- 1 Are the plan's objectives appropriate and justified by the evidence and will they help to deliver the vision and strategic priorities to 2033? Are the objectives soundly based and is it clear how the plan and its policies will deliver the objectives?
- 2 Is the plan period 2013 - 2033 justified?
- 3 Is Policy S1 consistent with the NPPF and will it be effective in delivering sustainable development and informing proposals for new development?
- 4 Having regard to paragraph 184 of the NPPF, is it clear which policies should be regarded as 'strategic policies' for the purpose of Neighbourhood Plans (NP)? Do the strategic policies provide an appropriate framework for NPs and what is the up-to-date position with NP preparation in the District?

Issue - Is the spatial strategy, settlement hierarchy and distribution of housing, employment and retail development appropriate and justified by a robust and credible evidence base (Policy S2)?

² C-323/17

- 5 Were alternative options for the level and distribution of development considered during the plan's preparation and is it clear why alternatives were discounted?
- 6 Does Policy S2 Part 1a provide sufficient guidance for plan users? What is meant by 'most' new development and 'district wide service development'? Should Policy S2 include reference to locations served by sustainable modes of transport including public transport? Is it clear what is meant by 'underutilised' land?
- 7 Is the spatial distribution of housing development in Policy S2 justified? What evidence justifies the 'split' in the distribution of housing between the Mansfield Urban Area (90%) and Warsop parish (including the villages) (10%) and is the approach justified?
- 8 Is the 'ceiling' on the level of retail and leisure development within Policy S2 Part 2c justified and is the policy positively prepared?
- 9 What evidence has informed the different settlement categories in the settlement hierarchy in Policy S2 and is the approach justified? In addition:
 - Should the Mansfield Urban area include reference to Forest Town?
 - Is the requirement in Policy S2 for new development to reflect the more rural character of Rainworth justified?
 - Is reference to Market Warsop justified?
- 10 What approach has been taken to identifying the settlement boundaries and are they appropriately identified on the Policies Maps?
- 11 Does the spatial strategy in Policy S2 make clear the approach that will apply to development in the countryside?
- 12 Which policies will contribute towards objective 9 which seeks to reduce the need to travel?
- 13 Overall, will the spatial strategy set out in Policy S2 contribute to the plan's vision and objectives for the District and if so, how?

Issue – Are the plan's policies for urban regeneration and key regeneration sites soundly based (Policies S3 and S4)?

- 14 Should Policy S3 include reference to a wider range of surplus and/or derelict land which does not fall within the definition of previously developed land?
- 15 Does Policy S4 provide sufficient guidance for development proposals and how will it be delivered? How does Site S4a relate to the retail and town centre policies in Chapter 7 of the plan?

Issue – Is the approach to development in the countryside soundly based (Policy S5)?

- 16 Is the geographic interpretation of Policy S5 clear on the Policies Maps and should a notation be included to identify 'the countryside'?
- 17 How would small scale residential development in the countryside relate to the spatial strategy in Policy S2? Would it be consistent with the aim in paragraph 55 of the NPPF to enhance or maintain the viability of rural communities? How would 'innovative/exceptional design' be assessed?
- 18 How would development proposals that do not fall within the categories identified in Policy S5 criteria (a) – (o) be assessed?
- 19 Is the requirement in Policy S5 for development in the countryside to be made accessible by sustainable modes of transport realistic and consistent with the NPPF?
- 20 Overall, will the strategic priorities and objectives deliver the plan's vision and is the spatial strategy and distribution of development soundly based? Are any main modifications necessary for soundness?

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

Issue – Place Making and High Quality Design

- 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?

Issue - Are other environment policies soundly based and justified by the evidence? (Policies NE1 – NE4, HE1 – HE2)

- 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 How have landscape character and other natural and historic environment designations been taken into account in identifying site allocations?
- 14 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?

Main Matter 4 – Whether or not the approach to assessing housing and employment needs and the housing and employment land requirements are robustly based and consistent with national policy

Issue – Is the objective assessment of housing need (OAN) and the housing requirement in Policy S2 soundly based?

- 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

Guidance³ 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?

Issue – Is the assessment of need for employment and the employment land requirement in Policy S2 soundly based?

- 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:
 - 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:

³ Paragraph 004

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?

Main Matter 5 – Whether or not the proposed strategic urban extensions and employment allocations are soundly based and deliverable in the plan period and whether other policies for employment and the economy are soundly based

Issue – Is the site selection process based on a robust assessment against relevant criteria?

- 1 Is the site selection process for the employment allocations soundly based, including sustainability appraisal and the testing of reasonable alternatives?
- 2 Is the site selection methodology based on an appropriate set of criteria and where are these explained? Are the reasons for selecting allocated sites and rejecting other clear and justified?
- 3 What approach has been taken where specific site constraints or developer intentions are known?

Issue – Are the strategic site and employment allocations soundly based?

Pleasley Hill Farm (Policy SUE1)

- 4 Are the overall scale and mix of uses for the site justified and is any further flexibility to accommodate additional uses justified? Should the housing yield be a minimum figure?
- 5 Have cross boundary impacts been identified and appropriately addressed?
- 6 Would the development have any adverse effect on landscape character and/or the form and character and setting of Pleasley village?

- 7 Is the requirement for a masterplan reasonable and would it provide an appropriate framework for the development of site proposals and sufficient flexibility to respond to changing circumstances?
- 8 Is the site allocation soundly based having regard to paragraph 8.4 of the plan and the viability study which indicate that the site is not viable? What interventions would be necessary to ensure that the site is deliverable?
- 9 Are any further safeguards or mitigation measures necessary to achieve an acceptable form of development? Are any main modifications necessary for soundness?

Land off Jubilee Way (Policy SUE2)

- 10 Are the overall scale and mix of uses for the site justified and are the site boundaries appropriate?
- 11 Is the site allocation soundly based having regard to paragraph 8.4 of the plan and the viability study which indicate that the site is not viable? What interventions would be necessary to ensure that the site is deliverable?
- 12 Is the requirement for a new primary school justified?
- 13 Is the requirement for a masterplan reasonable and would it provide an appropriate framework for the development of site proposals?
- 14 Are any further safeguards or mitigation measures necessary to achieve an acceptable form of development and are any main modifications necessary for soundness?

Land at Berry Hill (Policy SUE3)

- 15 Are the overall scale and mix of uses for the site justified including the amount of employment land and retail/leisure floorspace?
- 16 Are any further safeguards or mitigation measures necessary to achieve an acceptable form of development and are any main modifications necessary for soundness?

Site E2a Ratcher Hill Quarry

- 17 What is the position in relation to the restoration for part of the site set out in a section 106 agreement relating to a previous planning permission for minerals development? Having regard to this, is the site allocation justified and are Figure 6.1 and the Policies Map consistent?
- 18 Would the mitigation set out in E2a (f) be effective?
- 19 Are any further safeguards or mitigation measures necessary to achieve an acceptable form of development and are any main modifications necessary for soundness?

Site E2b Oakfield Lane, Market Warsop

- 20 Is the site required to meet an identified need for employment development in Market Warsop?
- 21 Is the reference to specific highway improvements within the site policy justified?
- 22 Is the requirement for a range of units to meet the needs of different employers reasonable?
- 23 Are any further safeguards or mitigation measures necessary to achieve an acceptable form of development and are any main modifications necessary for soundness?

Site E2c Penniment Farm

- 24 Is the requirement for a masterplan reasonable and would it provide an appropriate framework for the development of site proposals and sufficient flexibility to respond to changing circumstances?
- 25 Are any further safeguards or mitigation measures necessary to achieve an acceptable form of development and are any main modifications necessary for soundness?

Issue – Will other employment and economy policies support jobs and contribute to the economy in the plan area?

- 26 How have the existing key/general employment areas set out in Policy E3 been reviewed and what is the justification for seeking to protect those areas for the uses specified? How would proposals for other types of uses be assessed?
- 27 Are the requirements in Policy E4 for other employment development justified and deliverable and will the policy provide sufficient guidance for plan users?
- 28 Is the requirement for local labour agreements in Policy E5 reasonable and how would this be secured and delivered?
- 29 Overall, are the strategic site. employment allocations and other employment policies soundly based and are any main modifications necessary for soundness?

Main Matter 6 - Whether or not the proposed housing allocations are soundly based and deliverable, whether other housing policies are soundly based and whether a 5 year supply of land can be provided on adoption and throughout the plan period

Issue – Is the housing site selection process based on a robust assessment against relevant criteria?

- 1 Is the site selection process for the housing allocations soundly based, including sustainability appraisal and the testing of reasonable alternatives? Is the site selection methodology based on an appropriate set of criteria?
- 2 Are the reasons for selecting allocated sites and rejecting other clearly set out and justified?
- 3 Are the following assumptions for residential development set out in the Housing Land Availability Assessment and Policy Assessment (HE1) appropriate and based on robust evidence:
 - Gross to net developable areas for residential development (Table 5.5)
 - Density of 35 dwellings per net developable hectare.
- 4 What approach has been taken to site capacity where specific site constraints or developer intentions are known?
- 5 The following three questions apply to each of the sites proposed for housing as set out in the table below:
 - a. Is the amount of development proposed for each site justified having regard to any constraints and the provision of necessary infrastructure?
 - b. Are the development requirements for each site clear and is the development proposed for each site deliverable in the timescales envisaged in the delivery trajectory?
 - c. Are any further safeguards or mitigation measures necessary to achieve an acceptable form of development including in relation to:
 - ecology, biodiversity, green infrastructure and agricultural land;
 - landscape quality and character;
 - heritage assets;
 - strategic and local infrastructure including transport;
 - air and water quality, noise pollution, land stability and flood risk.
 - d. Overall, would the site allocation be soundly based and are any main modifications necessary for soundness?

Housing Allocations

Site reference	Location
H1a	Clipstone Road East
H1b	Land off Skegby Lane
H1c	Fields Farm, Abbott Road
H1d	Three Thorn Hollow Farm
H1e	Land at Redruth Drive
H1f	Former Rosebrook Primary School

H1g	Abbott Road
H1h	Centenary Road
H1i	Former Mansfield Brewery (Part A)
H1j	Cauldwell Road
H1k	Bellamy Road
H1l	High Oakham Farm (east)
H1m	Land off Balmoral Drive
H1n	Sherwood Close
H1o	Ladybrook Lane/Tuckers Lane
H1p	Hermitage Mill
H1q	South of Debdale Lane
H1r	Land off Holly Road
H1s	Land at Cox's Lane
H1t	Land off Ley Lane
H1u	Land off Rosemary Street
H1v	Stonebridge Lane/Sookholme Lane, Market Warsop
H1w	Sherwood Street/Oakfield Lane, Market Warsop
H1x	Former Warsop Vale School, Warsop Vale

Issue – Will the plan provide an appropriate choice and mix of housing to meet the needs of different groups in the community? (Policies H3, H4, H5 & H6)

- 6 Have Policies H3 and H6 been positively prepared to meet the housing needs of different groups having regard to the findings of the SHMA (H4) and Housing Needs of Particular Groups (H3), including the need for accessible and adaptable homes? What are the implications for overall plan viability?
- 7 Are the thresholds and targets for affordable housing in Policy H4 justified and based on a robust assessment of economic viability? Are the different percentages for greenfield and brownfield land justified by the viability assessment?
- 8 Is the provision in Policy H5 for at least 5% of the dwelling plots on sites of more than 100 dwellings to be provided for self build or custom build homes appropriate and what evidence justifies the threshold of 100 dwellings? What evidence is available to demonstrate the level of interest in these types of dwellings?
- 9 Is Policy H7 clear and justified and will it provide sufficient guidance for plan users?
- 10 Does Policy H8 set out appropriate and clear criteria for the assessment of planning applications for gypsy, traveller and travelling showpeople's sites that may come forward during the plan period? Are any main modifications necessary for soundness?

Note: A separate Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document is being prepared by the Council to address needs identified in the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GT1).

Issue - Will the plan provide a 5 year supply of specific deliverable housing sites on adoption and is there a reasonable prospect that this will be maintained throughout the plan period?

Note - The Council has updated the five year land supply position and updated the plan's housing trajectory in the Housing Technical Paper Addendum (H2).

- 11 Taking into account completions since 2013, what is the residual amount of housing that needs to be delivered to meet the housing requirement of 6500 dwellings over the plan period?
- 12 Is the development proposed on the sites listed in Policy H1 deliverable in the timescales envisaged in the updated housing trajectory in document H2? Are the assumptions for start dates and rates of delivery on each site appropriate and justified?
- 13 Does the updated trajectory in the Housing Technical Paper Addendum (H2) provide an accurate indication of housing supply in the plan period from:
 - Completions 2013 – 2019 (as at 31.3.18);
 - Sites with planning permission for 10 or more dwellings (large sites);
 - Sites with planning permission for 9 or less dwellings (small sites);

(In responding to this question, the Council should provide up to date figures from the most recent monitoring information)

- 14 Are the assumptions for the 'non delivery' of sites set out in section 3 of document H6 justified and based on robust evidence?
- 15 Are the assumptions about the rate of windfall development (380 dwellings from 2023 – 2033) justified and are there any policy changes which could change the rate of delivery in the future compared with historical rates?
- 16 Does the proposed supply of 8597 dwellings set out in Table 5.1 of the plan against a requirement of 6500 dwellings incorporate a sufficient 'buffer' to allow for non-delivery as well as providing choice and flexibility in the supply of housing land?
- 17 Does past delivery and/or the recent Housing Delivery Test results have any implications for the appropriate buffer to be added to the five year housing land supply?
- 18 What is the 5 year requirement for the relevant period on adoption of the plan?
- 19 Is the approach to calculating the 5 year requirement set out in document H2 appropriate and consistent with national policy, in particular the deduction of 'oversupply' from the subsequent 5 year period?
- 20 Based on a requirement of 325 dwellings per year, would the plan help to ensure a 5 year supply of deliverable sites on adoption and over the plan

period? Is there clear evidence to support the delivery of sites in the relevant 5 year period?

(In responding to this question, the council should provide a worked table of the 5 year requirement based on 325 dwellings per year and the deliverable 5 year supply position against the 5 year requirement)

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

- 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?
- 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 RT6a 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?
- 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?
- 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?

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?

Issue - Will the plan be effective in supporting sustainable travel and what effect will providing for new jobs homes have on the capacity and operation of the strategic and local road network?

- 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?

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?

Main Matter 10 – Miscellaneous Matters

- 1 Are any changes to the Policies Maps necessary?