

Mansfield District Local Plan
Hearing Position Statement

On behalf of Welbeck Estates Company Ltd

30th April 2019

Quality Control

Project No.	14.033			
Client	The Welbeck Estates Company Ltd			
Title	Hearing Statements: Mansfield Local Plan Examination in Public (EiP) 2019			
File reference	P&DG/14.033 HS			
Issue	Date	Prepared By	Reviewed By	Authorised By
1.	30 th April 2019	CJ	RH	RH

1.0 Introduction

1.1 This Hearing Position Statement sets out P&DG's representations to the Mansfield Local Plan Examination in Public (EiP), submitted on behalf of the Welbeck Estates Company Ltd.

1.2 Representations are provided in response to the following Matters and Questions:

- *Hearing Statement 1 – Main Matter 1 - Duty to Cooperate and other Legal Requirements*
- *Hearing Statement 2 – Main Matter 2 – Local Plan Vision, Issues and Objectives, Spatial Strategy, Settlement Hierarchy, and the distribution of employment and housing*
- *Hearing Statement 3 – 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*
- *Hearing Statement 4 – 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.*
- *Hearing Statement 5 – 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.*
- *Hearing Statement 6 – Main Matter 8 - Whether or not the plan makes appropriate provision for new infrastructure to support the level of new development proposed.*

1.3 This Statement should be read in conjunction with P&DG's previous representations made to the Mansfield District Local Plan at Publication Draft (Regulation 19).

4.0 Hearing Statement 3

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

Question 1: Would Policies P1 – P4 secure inclusive design and accessible environments as required by the NPPF?

- 4.1 The plan will, through the proposed allocations, secure significant enhancements to the design and character of the local area, and through additional provision of green infrastructure, enhancement of the District’s landscape character, natural and historic environments can be secured. With regards to the allocation at Jubilee Way (SUE2). We believe that Policies P1-P4 as drafted are sound and consistent with national planning policy, apart from the requirement for a Health Impact Assessment in Policy P2 which is overly prescriptive and should be encouraged, not mandated for major developments above 50 dwellings.

Question 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?

- 4.2 We support the inclusion of a masterplan on large sites providing it accurately portrays the development that is being put forward for allocation (as promoted). If amendments are required to the masterplan for other reasons discussed during the hearings then we are supportive of working with the Council to achieve the desired outcomes if they are justified.

Question 10: How would any net gain in biodiversity sought through Policy NE2 be secured, measured and monitored?

- 4.3 We believe that such gains can be demonstrated readily through the planning application process and secured by a series of appropriately worded management conditions that secure and measure all of the required biodiversity outcomes. In the case of the proposed allocation at Jubilee Way (SUE) the significance of all environmental effects will be scrutinised as part of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).

Question 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'?

- 4.4 There will be an expectation during the planning application process to fully afford sufficient protection for irreplaceable habitats and safeguard the potential SPA through the due Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) process. In the case of the site at Jubilee Way, the Sustainability Appraisal has robustly assessed the site and confidently determined its suitability for allocation with the plan. Notwithstanding this, a future planning application will involve the submission of an Environmental Impact Assessment where there will be a requirement to duly assess all of the associated environmental impacts associated with the scheme.
- 4.5 We support the current wording of Policy NE2 to adopt a risk based approach and for individual applications to have to assess the impact of development upon the potential Special Protection Area, including Habitat Regulations Assessment at the application stage.