



Mansfield
District Council

Mansfield District Council

Mansfield District Local Plan Review – Regulation 19 Companion Document

September 2026

Contents

Introduction:.....	3
Regulation 19 Local Plan Review document:	3
About this document	3
Section 1: Introduction	4
Section 2: Vision, issues and objectives	5
Section 3: The spatial strategy.....	6
Section 4: Place making.....	12
Section 5: Housing	20
Section 6: Employment.....	30
The introductory text to this section was amended at Regulation 18 stage, as follows:....	30
What has changed?.....	30
Section 7: Retail	36
Section 8: Strategic urban extensions.....	46
Section 9: Infrastructure and facilities	49
Section 10: Natural environment.....	61
Section 11: Historic environment	65
Section 12: Climate change	68
Section 13: Implementation and monitoring	72
Appendices.....	73

Introduction:

This is a companion guide to the Regulation 19 Publication Draft Mansfield District Local Plan Review 2023-2043 and should be read alongside it. It follows the structure of the above document and explains the changes that have been made at Regulation 18 and Regulation 19 stages and the reasons why they were required.

It will refer to numerous evidence base studies and topic papers which have been prepared to inform the content of the plan. These can be viewed online at www.mansfield.gov.uk/localplanreview.

Regulation 19 Local Plan Review document:

About this document

This section explains the plan making process and the stages that we have gone through to get to the Publication Draft plan, as well as explaining the next steps for examination and adoption.

At Reg 18 May 2025 we added a box that explained the approach to making changes to the document and ensuring this was clear to stakeholders and the community of the Mansfield district and how they could make comments. For this section the box stated the following:

What has changed?

Boxes have been added to the end of each section or policy area which summarise and explain the changes that have been made in this consultation version of the Local Plan Review.

For example in this section we have changed the name of the document and the consultations that have informed it. We have also referenced the 2024 NPPF and the relevant planning regulations. This is to reflect that this is a review of the current Local Plan (2013-2033), and that the NPPF has been revised since that was adopted.

These boxes will also include Information about any additional evidence that needs to be collected to support the next stages of the Local Plan Review.

There will be consultation questions at these points that focus on the changes and also allow an opportunity for additional comments on each section to be made.

At Regulation 19 we've made further minor changes to the text in this section to update the latest position of the Local Plan Review.

To show how the plan has progressed, the remainder of this companion document repeats the same boxes from the Regulation 18 document and will

go on to highlight the additional changes to the Local Plan Review that have been made at this stage. It will include an explanation of why these were required.

Section 1: Introduction

This introduces the plan and the stages that it has been through to get to Regulation 19 and the further stages to reach adoption.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

This section has been updated to include references to the new NPPF and other legislation that has come in since the current Local Plan was adopted. We have also provided updates in relation to the various studies and assessments that will be required during the process of preparing the Local Plan Review. We have inserted reference to the East Midlands County Combined Authority which was established in 2024. Finally it makes it clear that this consultation is seeking views on *all* options for development in the district to meet our requirements.

We have also updated the map of the district referred to above to reflect the development that has taken place since the current plan was adopted.

We have also removed reference to the 1998 Local Plan and deleted appendix 1 which contained the saved policies from the 1998 Local Plan.

At Regulation 19 we have made minor changes to the tense of the wording to reflect that this is the document that will be submitted to the government for independent examination. We have also made it clear that all policies, other than IN5 – Designated local green space, are strategic policies. We did this to ensure users can clearly identify the status and purpose of the policies.

Section 2: Vision, issues and objectives

This section sets out the vision for the local plan and addresses the key issues and opportunities that have emerged from the evidence base, sustainability appraisal and consultation responses.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

The text in this section has been updated to take account of the fact that the Local Plan is being reviewed.

Much of the previous work to identify a vision, strategic priorities and objectives is still relevant and whilst it has been revisited, there has not been a need for significant changes to be made.

The Regulation 18 consultation in August 2023 included the questions "Do you agree with the growth and spatial strategy issues identified? Are there any other growth and spatial strategy issues that should be considered?" In summary there was broad agreement that the development should be focused on Mansfield.

However, some considered that growth in the rural areas was important for infrastructure and sustainability reasons. The needs of neighbouring local planning authorities (LPAs) was considered an important consideration.

Employment needs (and alignment with housing targets) were frequently promoted. Infrastructure requirements were a key theme as was viability. In response to this strategic priority 3 has been amended to reflect the need for links between employment provision and the district's target for the number of new homes to be provided over the plan period.

We have also updated the information on Duty to Cooperate to explain that we are building on work previously undertaken.

We asked if stakeholders agreed that the existing vision, issues, strategic priorities and objectives remain appropriate and should be taken forward in the Local Plan Review? If not, is there anything else that the Local Plan Review needs to include within the vision, issues, strategic priorities or objectives?

At Regulation 19 the responses were reviewed and the council has not considered it necessary to fundamentally rewrite the Vision or objectives. Much of the existing framework remains appropriate and continues to provide a sound strategic basis for the plan. However, Strategic Priority 3 has been amended to make clearer the relationship between employment provision and the district's housing growth target. This responds directly to comments seeking closer alignment between employment and housing growth.

Section 3: The spatial strategy

Policy S1: Presumption in favour of sustainable development

This policy sets out the approach to development proposals where the Local Plan Review is silent and does not provide relevant policies or where the evidence supporting the relevant policy is out of date or superseded by more up to date information.

The policy also acts to guide the approach of the local planning authority to working with applicants and relevant stakeholders to seek solutions that would allow an application to be approved.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have updated Policy S1 to account for changes to the NPPF that places the emphasis on the delivery of housing when applying the presumption in favour of sustainable development. We have also updated the relevant NPPF paragraph numbers and changed the name of the strategic health body to ensure that this is up to date.

At Regulation 19 there were no further changes required.

Policy S2: The spatial strategy

This policy sets the overall framework for the rest of the Local Plan Review, setting out the proposed scale and strategic distribution of new development by reference to the hierarchy of settlements within the district.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have changed the Local Plan period and the increased housing numbers that will be required over the plan period. We have also updated the text to reflect the changes to the NPPF and the situation with respect to the three strategic sustainable urban extensions (SUEs). We have made it clear that this consultation also seeks comments on all other potential sites for residential and employment purposes. This will help inform decisions on the final allocations for inclusion within the Local Plan Review. In recognition that the council will need to allocate additional sites, reference to these being located "as far as possible" around the MARR has been removed. We have also confirmed that evidence will be commissioned to inform the employment and retail needs of the district.

We consulted on the spatial development growth options in August 2023. Representations supported a variety of strategic solutions to locating growth. Some representations supported 'urban concentration' as the ongoing preferred strategic approach, others preferred increased focus on other areas (including Market Warsop).

Some responses were shaped by sites being promoted. There was some concern that the SUEs would not deliver as anticipated and that the use of previously developed land should be explored. Concerns were raised regarding some of the options in relation to the cumulative impact of development. For example, at Market Warsop if the percentage of development directed to the settlement be increased it could cause additional pressure on infrastructure and services.

It is not intended to change the spatial strategy of the plan as Mansfield urban area is considered to be to most sustainable settlement within the district. However, the split of development requirements may need to be altered to reflect the availability of suitable and developable land. This will be confirmed in the next version of the Local Plan Review and informed by evidence, such as the sustainability appraisal of various options, and consultation responses. The options to be tested have been shaped by the previous consultation undertaken in 2023 and will include all suitable brownfield sites, sites with planning permission and current Local Plan allocations as "constants" i.e. those that will automatically feature as part of any distribution of growth across the district. As shown in the table below, the constants equate to 8,361 dwellings of the total provision to be made in the Local Plan Review. The table shows we need to allocate new greenfield sites to provide for a minimum of 2,034 dwellings. Options for the "variable" element of the requirement will focus on whether we concentrate on larger sites in specific areas or a more dispersed approach across a number of smaller sites.

Table 3.2 Breakdown of existing committed and new housing provision

Constants	Total number of dwellings
Completions	687
Commitments (see policies H2 and SUE3)	2,447
Adopted Local Plan allocations (without planning permission) (see policies H1 and SUE1-2)	3,588
Brownfield site allocations	919 ¹
Windfall Allowance	720
Sub total	8,361
Variables	Total number of dwellings
New site allocations	at least 2,034
Total (this includes a 5% buffer)	10,395

The majority of consultation responses preferred the retention of a ‘countryside’ designation. However, there was a recognition that the boundaries of countryside may need to be reassessed to accommodate development.

There was more limited support for ‘no strategic greenfield designation’ and ‘Green Wedges / Areas of Separation’. Some of the representations received identified specific sites and areas which will be considered at the next stage of plan development along with potential site allocations.

In relation to the housing target, a majority of consultation responses supported use of the standard methodology as the basis for housing requirements and emphasised that the Local Plan should try and increase growth in housing above the standard method. Many representations referred to MDC’s consistent delivery above the standard method and annual requirements in the current local plan. Additional growth would boost the supply of housing (and affordable housing) and align with economic growth and deliver infrastructure. Several sites were promoted. This consultation was undertaken when the standard method housing target was 279 per year, this has now been superseded by the new minimum target of 495 dwellings per year. Despite the consultation responses to increase the standard method figure, as the new target is significantly higher, the council do not propose to set a higher minimum target.

¹ (this figure is subject to further assessment and will be confirmed in the Reg 19 document)

In relation to employment growth, consultation responses generally favoured the provision of growth over the identified need for flexibility. Also mentioned was the need to carefully consider the link between employment and housing, as an increase in jobs can generate a requirement for additional housing. Some consultees stated that this should be as high as possible to ensure economic and housing delivery to regenerate the district, however it was also raised that this approach could increase unemployment and cause environmental harm if additional housing is provided but the jobs do not emerge. An oversupply of employment uses could also have consequences on the market. Due to the significantly higher housing target, it is unlikely that we would increase this further, although this will be confirmed by new and updated evidence.

During the last consultation, there was broad consensus that retailing is changing and that the evidence needs to be updated to reflect this. This would include evidence on the amount required.

What still needs to be done?

Obtain evidence and confirm the employment and retail requirements over the plan period. Clarify the distribution of development between the various settlements once further assessment of sites and testing of options has been undertaken.

We asked if stakeholders agree with the proposed spatial strategy. If not, what needs to be changed? We also asked which distribution option and combination of sites for the variable element of the development requirement they would prefer.

At Regulation 19 we have updated the development requirements of the district over the plan period. This included adding the employment need of 41.06 hectares (from our employment needs study) and removing reference to a quantitative retail and leisure requirement (as our retail study has found that there is no specific need for new floorspace). We have inserted text to make it clear that qualitative improvements should be directed to Mansfield town centre to increase its vitality and viability.

We also made changes to the supporting text which took out references to the position as at May 2025 when we consulted on the Regulation 18 version of the Local Plan Review. This included removing table 3.2 which was intended to set out the distribution of retail floorspace targets amongst the town centres.

We have added in a reference to locations around public transport hubs being suitable for development. This aligns with the changes to the NPPF in 2026. We also updated the table of evidence, and the key diagram.

Policy S3: Development in the countryside

This policy sets out the uses which are considered to be potentially appropriate in the countryside. However, it will be necessary that proposed development does not unduly impact upon the character and appearance of the countryside

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have updated the exceptional design of individual dwellings criteria to reflect changes to the NPPF. Alongside this we have updated the criteria in the supporting text. We have updated the NPPF paragraph numbers to reflect the changes made.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we added a new criterion (1p) to reflect a change made to the presumption in favour of sustainable development within the new NPPF. This allows development of sites which are physically well-related to a railway station or a settlement within which the station is located.

We also made a minor change to the numbering within part two of the policy to make it consistent with the rest of the plan.

We have added a paragraph into the supporting text to direct attention to policy NE2 which would apply to brownfield sites that are important for wildlife and are of high environmental value. This was in response to a comment from Natural England who raised concerns over the need to protect high value open mosaic habitat.

We also added reference to the submission of a design review to demonstrate how an isolated dwelling would meet the exceptional quality requirement. We also amended the paragraph regarding ‘appropriate accessibility’ to make the wording clearer.

Policy S4: Urban regeneration

This policy supports proposals which help regenerate the area. It gives emphasis to proposals which provide new homes and jobs and make good use of previously developed land.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

There has been no change to this policy as it is still considered to be relevant and up to date. The supporting text has been updated to remove reference to the former Mansfield Brewery site as this has now been developed. It has also been updated to incorporate reference to the Riverside and Portland Gateway sites that were previously identified in policy S5. Policy S5 has been deleted as it committed the council to actively seek regeneration of these sites. However, since the current plan was adopted, council budgets have reduced year on year and there has been a need to prioritise spending on other projects elsewhere. The gateway sites have been included within the text to emphasise the councils continued support for their regeneration. They are not included as allocations due to ongoing concerns regarding deliverability at this time.

Other text has been reworded in order to improve clarity.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we have added reference to green *and blue* infrastructure into criterion 1i) in response to a comment from the Environment Agency.

We also added supporting text to clarify that Policy CC4 will be an important consideration for schemes that may affect river corridors. This was in response to a comment from the Environment Agency who considered that policy S4 didn't go far enough to protect these areas. We also added reference to the Mansfield Design Code into the table at the end of this section.

Section 4: Place making

Policy P1: Achieving high quality design

This policy sets the strategic approach for the work that the council will undertake to deliver well-designed buildings and spaces and reflects the government's expectations of local planning authorities in setting out a local design vision and aspirations.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have changed the policy and supporting text to include reference to Building for a Healthy Life which has superseded Building for Life 12. We have also included reference to Streets for Life in the supporting text. The Mansfield Place Making Principles have been updated to include reference to the requirement for street trees which now forms part of the NPPF. References to NPPF paragraph numbers have been updated to reflect the latest version of the document. We have replaced reference to the Design SPD with the Mansfield Town Centre Design Code as this was produced instead.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we made a number of changes to the policy following a further review and consideration of consultation responses. The main change was introducing a need for minor developments to also consider design and respond to the Mansfield Place Making Principles / Building for a Healthy Life (the policy previously only applied to major developments). Also added was an inclusion of heritage and historic assets as opportunities / constraints to be considered.

We also added that the outcomes of any engagement with local communities and key stakeholders should be summarised and it made clear how they have informed the proposals.

What needs to be included within design and access statements has been made clearer in the supporting text and also a recommendation that applicants carry out pre application engagement with the council to avoid delays and redesigns later on in the process.

Policy P2: Safe, healthy and attractive development

This policy seeks to identify the key factors that will be taken into account when considering whether or not a development successfully creates a sense of place and fits into the surrounding context.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have changed the link to the Secured by Design guidance and updated the reference to the Spatial Planning and Health Framework 2025 - 2030. We have deleted reference to production of a Design SPD as resources were directed towards the Mansfield Town Centre Design Code. There are no current plans to produce a Design SPD. We have added reference to hot food takeaways in part 2 c) of the policy. This is for clarity. We have reflected the stronger emphasis that the NPPF places on health, updated the NPPF references and the Sport England Active Design guidance. We have updated the Health Impact Assessment template in appendix 3.

As part of the previous consultation, we asked if we should have a consolidated healthy policy or continue with the current approach. Opinion was split but there was consensus that health was a key issue to be considered through the plan. The need for 'evidence' to underpin the plan was emphasised.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we made a number of changes recommended following expert urban design advice. These changes clarify the various technical details that will need to be assessed and demonstrated at the planning application stage. We also moved certain criteria into a new part two of the policy to make it clearer that they apply to major developments.

We updated the reference to the Nottinghamshire Spatial Planning and Health Framework 2025-2030 (SPHF) which has been published since the Regulation 18 consultation was undertaken, and provided a link. Linked to this, we also changed the threshold within the policy for non-residential developments which are required to carry out a health impact assessment, from 5,000 sqm to 1,000 sqm.

Policy P3: Connected developments

This policy seeks to ensure that new development, especially new residential developments, connect well with the surrounding areas, and are easily navigated by users.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have deleted reference to the production of a Design SPD for the reasons outlined in policy P2. We have updated the reference to Building for Life to Building for a Healthy Life (BHL) and amended the NPPF paragraphs.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we made a number of changes to the policy recommended following expert urban design advice. The changes relate to the incorporation and design of public / green and blue spaces within a development scheme.

We also removed the previous criteria c) and d) on the basis that these repeated parts of policies IN8 and IN9 and the plan should be read as a whole.

We also added the consideration of walking and cycling is addressed at an early stage to address comments made on Policy IN8 to ensure the policy meets paragraph 109 of NPPF.

Policy P4: Comprehensive development

This policy ensures that development proposals do not jeopardise the comprehensive delivery of allocated sites or sites with existing planning permission or their associated infrastructure. It also requires masterplans to be submitted with planning applications for large sites of five hectares / 150 dwellings or more.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have amended appendix 7 (formerly appendix 8) to remove the current indicative masterplans, these will be updated at the next stage of plan making process. We have updated the references to the NPPF to reflect the revised document.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 amended the policy to include reference to the fact that it would also apply to development proposals in adjacent districts that straddle the Mansfield boundary. This means that the council would object to proposals that do not meet the requirements of this policy.

We added supporting text to clarify that use of strategic planting, water features and environmental buffers can help to ensure layouts are flexible and can protect long-term development opportunities, benefiting future generations.

We also added supporting text confirming that schemes will be subject to internal design reviews and the authority may request a design review by an independent consultant or panel if necessary.

It was also confirmed that design and access statements are expected to demonstrate in clear, legible graphic format how the scheme has addressed Policy P4.

Policy P5: Climate change and new development

This policy sets out the council's commitment to improve the sustainability and environmental performance of all new development. The policy emphasises how the design and layout can provide mitigation and adaptation to the impacts of climate change and supports development that incorporates renewable and zero to low carbon design and technologies and improves energy efficiency.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have added reference to blue infrastructure and biodiversity in 1c) of the policy to ensure that it meets the requirements of the NPPF. We have also added reference to water consumption targets within table 4.5. We have updated the data and references in relation to emissions and the NPPF. We have referred to the MDC Climate Change Strategy 2022 and added reference to the UK Climate Change Projections Headline Findings document from 2022. We have deleted reference to the production of an SPD whilst retaining the option to produce further detailed guidance in the future. This is because SPDs are being abolished in favour of Supplementary Plans under the new plan making system. We have deleted the SFRA reference on the basis that an update will be provided as part of the evidence base.

Consultation response on climate change options generally favoured options A and C which related to updating current Local Plan policies and considering use of an SPD. It was considered that Local Plan policies should not be over prescriptive and should not repeat other national / statutory requirements. Some respondents felt there is a need for Supplementary Planning Documents to provide more detail on this subject. However, it should not introduce new policy.

What still needs to be done?

Further evidence is required to inform any other policy revisions including updating the Mansfield Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and the production of a Climate Change Study. A Local Area Energy Plan (LAEP) is also being produced for the district. We need to consider whether there is a need / justification to include development standards that would assist in addressing issues around climate change such as the Future Home Standard.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we made a number of changes to strengthen the policy, as recommended by the Mansfield Climate Change Study 2026. This included:

- **adding to criterion 1a) which encourages developers to demonstrate how they have followed the energy hierarchy;**

- adding a criterion which encourages developers to demonstrate climate adaptation by taking account of predicted changes to climate conditions in the future;
- adding confirmation that proposals that deliver significant improvements to energy / carbon performance or climate adaptation of an existing building will be looked upon favourably;
- changes to the supporting text to explain and justify the amendments to the policy and to provide guidance on how the policy can be implemented; and
- reference to Historic England Advice Note 18 regarding adapting historic buildings to take account of climate change was added, as suggested during the consultation period.
- In table 4.5, we inserted some information about flood resilience. This relates to measures that can reduce dampness and support recovery following flood events and that can help maintain indoor environmental quality. We also inserted a new section on resilience with reference to indoor air quality. This refers to measures that support good indoor air quality that can help reduce and improve the resilience to future climatic conditions. This was inserted following recommendations within the Air Quality Study 2026.

Policy P6: Home extensions and alterations

This policy sets out the criteria that need to be met in order for a householder application to be considered favourably.

At Regulation 18 we only made the following changes as set out below:

What has changed?

The only changes that have been required are to the NPPF references as no concerns have been raised.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we made minor changes to the layout of the supporting text and added in that applicants are advised to check submission requirements prior to undertaking works.

Policy P7: Amenity

This policy ensures that development proposals are designed to avoid and minimise impacts on the amenity of existing and future users of the development and those close to it.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have added reference to running businesses from home to reflect changes in work patterns seen across the district. We have also updated NPPF and other guidance references.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we made some minor grammatical corrections.

Policy P8: Shop front design and signage

This policy supports new, and alterations to existing, shop fronts where a number of criteria are met. Part two of the policy relates to proposals which affect heritage assets, and states that changes will not be permitted if they fail to preserve or enhance the area's character, appearance and setting.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have added a new paragraph relating to how applicants should demonstrate compliance with criteria 1c). This was in response to feedback from colleagues in Development Management. We also clarified that this policy relates to other publicly accessible commercial premises. This recognises the fact that many commercial and retail uses are now within the same Use Class. We replaced the text around the production of future design guidance with reference to the Mansfield Town Centre Design Code and updated information about Mansfield Forward BID and potential grants that are available. Within the supporting text, we have added reference to other planning controls that may also be required such as listed building consent and conservation area consent. This was in response to a comment from Historic England. We have added a link to shop front guidance that can be found on the council's website. We have updated references relating to the NPPF and added the Equalities Act and Historic England guidance on accessible buildings.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we added a criterion to the policy to prevent the creation of recessed areas within shopfronts, as per the Secured by Design guidance. We also added supporting text to clarify that design and access statements need to demonstrate how proposals meet this policy.

Section 5: Housing

This section includes all policies relating to the development of residential uses and sets out the sites allocations as well as policies that address the district's housing needs.

At Regulation 18 changes were made to the introduction to this section as follows:

What has changed?

We have amended the housing numbers to reflect the new target and updated the plan period. We have deleted reference to the production of a separate Gypsy and Traveller DPD. This is to bring it line with the Local Plan Review process as agreed by the council in March 2023.

Policy H1: Housing allocations

This policy sets out the housing site allocations as well as the criteria each site needs to meet to address the specific needs identified in the evidence base.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have struck through the text on all former allocations that have been completed before the new plan period (2023). These sites include H1i, H1m, H1r, H1t and H1w. We have also struck through H1s on the basis that despite having a resolution to grant planning permission, we consider this site to be undeliverable. Sites which have planning permission have also been struck through (and moved to Policy H2 where development has not yet commenced). These are H1a, H1c, H1d, H1e, H1h, H1l, H1o, H1u, and H1v. We have struck through the text rather than deleting numbers. This is to maintain consistency with referencing. We have updated the NPPF paragraph numbers and appendix numbers where these have changed. In addition, we have updated the housing target and how it is calculated to reflect the changes on a national level. We have included reference to a 5% buffer on top of the housing target which will provide flexibility over the plan period and we have updated table 5.1 to reflect the position at April 2025. This will be updated further in the Publication Draft when the final allocations are known. Finally we have updated the windfall allowance and made reference to the Housing, Site Selection and Education Technical Papers.

What still needs to be done?

We also need to update the evidence base in respect of housing need of different members of the community, transport and viability. For the next stage of the plan, the housing trajectory in appendix 4 will be updated and include new allocations.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area and also provided the opportunity for them to comment on any of the potential housing allocations, and make any other site suggestions.

At Regulation 19 we added all housing allocations into the plan following Regulation 18 consultation and the HELAA / site selection assessment processes. The assessment drew on a wide range of evidence that the council has collected, including heritage impact assessments, a habitats study, and landscape sensitivity assessments for example. All documents will be made available on the council's website.

Policy H2: Committed housing sites

This policy identifies all sites that already have planning permission.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have struck through the H2 completions prior to the plan commencement period (1 April 2023) as well as any sites which have lapsed. We have also added new commitments. We have changed the dates and number of commitments in the supporting text and updated the NPPF paragraph numbers.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we updated Policy H2 to reflect the information set out in the Housing monitoring report for the period 2025/26, including sites with planning permission and updating commitments to reflect lapsed permissions.

Policy H3: Housing density and mix

This policy sets out the approach to ensuring an appropriate density is achieved on development proposals and that the mix of dwelling types meets the needs of Mansfield's community.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have updated the NPPF references as well as the position in relation to evidence of housing need. We have added reference to the need for housing mix information at outline stage rather than reserved matters.

What still needs to be done?

Update the Housing Needs of Particular Groups Study (commissioned) and use this to inform revisions to the policy.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we made the following changes as recommended by the updated evidence base and review of consultation responses:

- **populated Table 5.4 with the housing mix figures recommended by the now-completed Housing Needs of Particular Groups Study (2026);**
- **amended criterion 1b) so that development proposals are expected to provide a mix of dwelling sizes and types having regard to Table 5.4, rather than being required to strictly conform to it. This reflects the Regulation 18 representation from Avant Homes seeking greater flexibility, while retaining a clear expectation that housing mix will be assessed against the Study's evidence;**
- **updated the supporting text at paragraph 5.23 from the future to the present tense, to confirm that the Housing Needs of Particular Groups Study is now complete;**
- **expanded paragraph 5.24 to highlight the benefit of bungalow provision for older people and people with disabilities, reflecting the Study's evidence of Mansfield's above-average disability rate;**
- **amended the information requirements at paragraph 5.26 so that housing mix information must be submitted at outline and full application stage; and**
- **added some explanatory text regarding Building Regulations M4(2) and M4(3) (around the accessibility) and how the council will apply the requirements from the evidence base flexibly having regard to site constraints, viability and the most up-to-date evidence. This was a recommendation from the Health Impact Assessment of the plan.**

Policy H4: Affordable housing

This policy seeks to maximise affordable housing delivery whilst adopting a flexible approach which recognises that viability varies across the district and that on-site provision may not always be appropriate.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have replaced the previous definition of affordable housing with a reference to that contained in annex 2 of the NPPF. This is to avoid duplication and ensure the plan stays up to date and remains flexible should the definition change in the future. We have talked about the affordable housing need that will be identified in the Housing Needs of Particular Groups Study Update (which has been commissioned) and removed current figures. We have also updated the amount of affordable housing delivered so far as part of the new plan period. We have referred to the review of the affordable housing zones to take account of the recommendations contained in the new Whole Plan Viability Assessment and have removed the plan of the existing zones until this work has been completed. We have updated the NPPF paragraph numbers. We have updated the position on HRA schemes to reflect the current position. We have updated the reference to the Affordable Housing SPD to reflect that it has been produced.

A majority of responders to the issues and Opportunities consultation supported options A (continue with same approach based on current percentages) or B (review existing requirements and amends the existing affordable housing zones. The need for the approach to affordable housing to be based on evidence, including viability was highlighted. It was highlighted that there is a need for the policy to be flexible.

What still needs to be done?

We need to update the affordable housing requirement and affordable housing zones taking account of the findings and recommendations of the Housing Needs of Particular Groups Study Update and Whole Plan Viability Assessment. This will include updating the percentage requirements for affordable housing on greenfield and brownfield sites.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we amended the affordable housing requirement to reflect the findings of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment.

We also added the tenure split that will be sought on all applications that provide affordable housing. This is to reflect the findings of the Housing Needs of Particular Groups Study. It is recognised that this mix may not always prove to be viable, so flexibility has been included within the policy wording. This is therefore a starting point for negotiation.

Another change is the addition of two further circumstances for when payment of commuted sums will be acceptable in lieu of on-site provision. This reflects the approach set out in the Affordable Housing SPD which was adopted in 2023.

Other information from the SPD, such as the calculation for commuted sums, has been moved into Appendix 5, and reference to this has been made.

We have also made it clear that the policy does not apply to the C2 residential use class, which has a separate policy (H6 – Specialist housing).

We have also removed reference to a need figure for affordable housing, as the Housing Needs of Particular Groups Study does not give a total or annual figure, instead referring to there being a significant need within the district, and that the council should aim to maximise opportunities to deliver it where possible.

We have removed reference to the updating of the Affordable Housing SPD on the basis that this is no longer possible under the new planning system.

Policy H5: Custom and self-build homes

This policy sets out the criteria that proposals for custom or self-build homes need to meet.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have corrected the reference within part 1a) to ensure that this relates to Policy S3 (development in the countryside). We have amended the definition of self and custom build so that it is in line with the PPG and NPPF. We have also added text to clarify that, whilst exempt from the mandatory biodiversity net gain requirement, proposals are required to meet the requirements of policy NE2 (biodiversity and geodiversity). Finally, we updated the NPPF paragraphs and deleted text in relation to the site thresholds and the preparation of an SPD. These related to a previous draft of the plan and should have been deleted following the Local Plan examination. We also deleted reference to the viability study for the same reason.

The majority of respondents to the Issues and Opportunities consultation were in favour of retaining the current approach to this policy area. We also looked at an option that would include a requirement for self and custom build plots to be provided on allocated housing sites over a certain size e.g. 100 dwellings and on other sites that may come forward during the plan period. There was limited support for this approach which reflects previous discussions on this policy area.

What still needs to be done?

The Housing Needs of Particular Groups Study Update will give advice on the approach to this policy area and further amendments may be made if necessary.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we have added a criterion that requires the plot to be, or be able to be, connected to existing walking, cycling and public transport infrastructure, where available or appropriate. This was in response to a comment at Regulation 18 from Nottinghamshire County Council.

We also added reference to the fact that the Housing Needs of Particular Groups Study highlights that the council has a shortfall in the availability of plots when having regard to the Custom and Self-build Register. We stated how the policy allows this need to be met as applications are received.

Policy H6: Specialist housing

This policy supports the development of specialist housing where they meet the criteria that is set out.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have removed the first paragraph of the supporting text as this is covered by policy H3. The possible inclusion of accessibility standards will be assessed as part of the Housing Needs of Particular Groups Study Update. We have updated the supporting text to include children's homes and added reference to safety. This is to ensure that such provision is located appropriately, taking account of children and those who are vulnerable. We have also updated the NPPF references and removed the reference to the number of spaces required for the aging population. This will be updated to reflect wider care needs that will be identified as part of the evidence base.

Responses to the Issues and Opportunities consultation were mixed. There was some support for maintaining the current approach. Whilst there was also some support for widening the scope of the policy to encompass all those with specific housing requirements, concerns were raised about the policy being over prescriptive and repeating building regulations. Viability is also an issue that needs consideration.

What still needs to be done?

We need to identify the amount of bed spaces that are required to accommodate the various specialist housing requirements. There is also a need to consider whether specific design standards regarding accessibility should be included in this policy or elsewhere within the plan.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we have added in a policy criterion that ensures sufficient car parking, cycle parking and parking for mobility scooters, based on the demonstrable requirements of residents and staff are considered. This was in response to a comment from Nottinghamshire County Council during the Regulation 18 consultation.

We have also added in the need for approximately 500 units with support (sheltered/retirement housing), 800 units with care (extra-care), and 700 nursing and residential care bedspaces, as identified by the Housing Needs of Particular Groups Study (2026).

We also added a paragraph regarding accessibility requirements and the recommendation within the Housing Needs of Particular Groups Study (2026) that, where possible, all new dwellings should meet Building Regulations M4(2) (accessible and adaptable dwellings) and that around 5% of market

housing and around 10% of affordable housing should meet M4(3) wheelchair user standards.

Policy H7: Houses in multiple occupation and bedsit accommodation

This policy sets out the criteria that proposals for houses in multiple occupation (HMOs) and bedsit accommodation need to meet in order to be considered favourably.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have expanded the supporting text to highlight the need for proposals to incorporate sufficient space for bin storage and cycle parking. We have set out how mixed and balanced communities will be assessed in terms of criteria 1b). This is based on feedback from development management colleagues and good practice from other local planning authorities. We have confirmed that we will not always have information about the number of HMOs in an area but that we will assess applications based on the information available at the time. We will also liaise with colleagues in the council's housing department. We have updated the NPPF reference.

What still needs to be done?

The Housing Needs of Particular Groups Study Update will look at HMOs and provide guidance to inform further policy changes if needed.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we renamed the policy to make it clear that it includes self-contained flats. We have also added in a policy criterion that ensures parking issues are considered, rather than just the supporting text that was added to the Regulation 18 document. This was in response to a comment from Nottinghamshire County Council during the Regulation 18 consultation. We also strengthened criterion 1b) to prevent properties being sandwiched between HMOs / bedsit accommodation. This was in response to further discussion with housing colleagues. Explanation of this was added to the supporting text.

We also made it clear that the 10% threshold for HMOs within 100m of the application site applies to residential areas. This is to allow areas that are more suitable for such accommodation, such as town centres, to be able to provide a higher level, where appropriate.

We also added supporting text to refer to the need for HMOs / bedsits within the district.

Policy H8: Accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

This policy sets out the need for this type of accommodation over the plan period and the criteria that needs to be met for any development proposals that come forward. It also safeguards all new and existing sites unless they are no longer needed.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have updated the plan period and removed previous need figures. The latter will be confirmed once the evidence base has been updated. We removed part 2 of the policy as the Local Plan Review will seek to allocate sites if required. On 7 March 2023, the council made a decision to bring the allocation of sites into the Local Plan Review and no longer proceed with a separate DPD. We have made it clear that existing showpeople's yards will be safeguarded and these are named within the policy. We have also updated reference to government guidance that was previously published in 2015. We have corrected a typographical error regarding the period for planning for new provision and have updated the NPPF references.

We included options in the Issues and Opportunities consultation in 2023. There were limited comments received and no clear preference between having a criteria-based policy or making allocations within the plan.

What still needs to be done?

Update the evidence base and confirm whether there is a requirement for new provision. If, so these site(s) will be identified in the policy and shown on the policies map. As part of this consultation, the council are seeking views on the sites that are being considered. We will also consider previous views that were submitted as part of consultation on the now discontinued DPD.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area and gave them opportunity to comment on the sites that are being considered. These are HELAA refs 60 (Ley Lane), 286 (Longster Lane) and 398 (Bainbridge Road).

At Regulation 19 we have updated the 5-year periods and the number of pitches required in Parts 1 a) – c) of the policy; We also made some minor changes to the wording of Parts 2 a) – e) of the policy. Finally we added reference to 'yards' within Part 3 of the policy

Within the supporting text we have updated the information about the requirements for pitches that have been identified in the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment (2026). We have also added a paragraph that refers to a recommendation in the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment (GTAA), 2026 regarding the local authority implementing a

corporate policy to provide negotiated stopping arrangements to address unauthorised encampments.

Finally, we have added reference to the 2024 NPPF and the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment (2026) within table 5.10.

Section 6: Employment

The introductory text to this section was amended at Regulation 18 stage, as follows:

What has changed?

We updated the NPPF references and those relating to the latest D2N2 strategy. We also added reference to the creation EMCCA and its emerging Growth Plan. Due to the reclassification of commercial uses within the Use Classes Order, we have changed B1 uses to E(g). We have removed the figures in table 6.1 and these will be replaced once the employment requirement for the plan period is known. We have changed the dates to reflect the new plan period. We have referred to the HELAA 2025 process.

During the Issues and Opportunities consultation that took place in 2023, Option C, which proposed to provide employment growth over the identified need for flexibility, was the most popular choice. Also mentioned was the need to carefully consider the link between employment and housing, as an increase in jobs can generate a requirement for additional housing. Some consultees stated that this should be as high as possible to ensure economic and housing delivery to regenerate the district, however it was also raised that this approach could increase unemployment and cause environmental harm if additional housing is provided but the jobs do not emerge. An oversupply of employment uses could also have consequences on the market.

What still needs to be done?

We need to confirm our new employment targets which will be identified through the Local Employment Needs Study. This will be set out in an updated table 6.1. We will also include more detail from the EMCCA Growth Plan as this emerges.

At Regulation 19 we updated the reference to the EMCCA Growth Plan and provided a weblink as this has now been published. We also updated table 6.1 and figures within the introductory text with the new employment target and supply position. Within the bullet points that explain how the Local Plan Review will help the creation of new jobs we added a reference to the council supporting the development of modern economy sectors and supporting infrastructure improvements that would allow for the intensification of employment sites where this is appropriate. This was a recommendation from the employment needs study.

Policy E1: Enabling economic development

This policy supports economic development and sets out the most appropriate locations for different scales of proposals.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have amended the text to update information about commuter flow patterns based on the 2021 census. We have incorporated reference to meeting the needs of a modern economy to take account of the updated NPPF. We have updated the NPPF paragraph numbers and included references to new and emerging strategies that impact on employment.

What still needs to be done?

We need to update the Local Plan employment evidence base and potentially amend the description of our employment profile.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we have added a new criterion 1b) to the policy to express particular support for development of modern economy businesses. This is expanded at the bottom of the policy box to demonstrate the sectors that are most likely to be realistic within the district and have wider benefits upon the economy.

We also updated the supporting text to state how the council will work with partners such as EMCCA to reduce barriers to the modern economy where possible, and to highlight that employment site allocations and sites in the employment land supply offer a good range of opportunities for such uses to come forward.

We added some context around the need for strategic distribution within the wider area, and how it has been recognised that Mansfield district will have a limited role in providing sites for such uses due to various constraints.

We also made an amendment to reflect the fact that the EMCCA Growth Plan (2025-2035) has now been published and provided a weblink.

Policy E2: Sites allocated as new employment areas

This policy sets out new employment site allocations and any specific criteria that need to be met (informed by the local plan evidence base).

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have added the current development status of sites E2a and E2c to reflect the latest position. Due to changes to the Use Classes Order, we have also replaced references to Use Class B1 with E(g). We have added reference to the employment land contained within the Berry Hill SUE (SUE3) increasing the total employment land from the SUEs by 18.8 hectares to 21.8 hectares. We also removed reference to 41 hectares as we need to clarify the new employment land target and have updated table 6.3 as far as possible. We have updated the plan period and NPPF paragraph numbers. We have updated the document list.

Representations submitted as part of the previous consultation, broadly supported the employment issues identified. There was some questioning of the amount of employment land required. Some felt that evidence justified a reduction in employment land, others considered that economic growth aspirations should result in increased allocations.

What still needs to be done?

Update the employment land target and confirm if we need to identify any new allocations including suitable locations to meet the requirements for a modern economy such as laboratories, gigafactories, data centres, digital infrastructure, freight and logistics.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we updated the employment target and relevant supporting text following the completion of the Employment Needs Study. The resultant figure (41.06 hectares) meant that no further employment allocations were needed. However, this should be seen as a minimum figure and not prevent further sites that meet Local Plan policies from being developed.

Policy E3: Retaining land for employment uses

This policy directs employment development to key or general employment areas and protects land within these areas from loss to alternative uses unless criteria within the policy can be met.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have updated the use class references B1 to E(g) as a result of the change to the Use Classes Order in 2020. We have inserted text from the Planning Practice Guidance that updates the previous text from the 2012 NPPF about long term protection of sites. We have also made reference to the Nottingham Core HMA and Nottingham Outer HMA Employment Land Needs Study 2021 which endorsed the ongoing retention of our largest employment sites and we refer to the fact that an update to this study will be undertaken that will also assess the smaller, non-strategic sites. We have updated the NPPF references and added reference to the PPG to the table above.

What still needs to be done?

We need to carry out a local update to the 2021 employment study and assess the smaller, non-strategic employment sites to see if they should continue to be retained for employment use.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we added the Penniment Farm employment site (E3w) onto the list due to it now having planning permission.

We removed reference to the update to the 2021 study carrying out a review of the key and general employment areas. This was on the basis that we decided that this was not proportionate as they had been reviewed so recently.

We also added a sentence to clarify that the council will be supportive of proposals to intensify employment uses in these areas where appropriate.

We also updated the reference to the most recent employment needs update (2025).

Policy E4: Other industrial and business development

This policy sets out the criteria that proposals for employment development outside of existing key / general employment areas and allocated employment sites needs to meet.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have amended the use class and NPPF references to reflect changes made since the plan was adopted.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we added a reference to the supporting text to reflect the need for premises to be capable of meeting the requirements of the modern economy. This corresponds with the approach set out in policy E1.

Policy E5: Improving skills and economic inclusion

This policy aims to improve the educational attainment and skills of the district's workforce by seeking local labour agreements on particular developments.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have inserted reference to the Make it in Mansfield Strategy (2024) to replace Ashfield and Mansfield: A Plan for Growth. We have also updated the NPPF reference.

As part of the previous consultation, the main area of concern related to the policy not being too onerous on businesses. Some suggested that the threshold for seeking local labour agreements should be raised. Other representations identified the need for evidence to identify specific skills required.

What still needs to be done?

We will review the thresholds within the policy as part of our local update to the 2021 Employment Study. This is in response comments from the council's Development Management Team.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we decided to keep the thresholds within the policy as they are on the basis that the policy has been working, and no alternative thresholds have been put forward for consideration. An update was not included in the employment needs study as this did not form part of the original evidence base.

Section 7: Retail

Policy RT1: Main town centre uses

This policy protects the district's town centres from out of centre development of main town centre uses. It sets a town centre first approach for main town centre uses and requires edge and out of centre proposals to demonstrate that the development could not be accommodated on a suitable and available site within or on the edge of a nearby centre. It also sets an impact test threshold.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have made it clear in the policy that there is a definition of main town centre uses in the NPPF to which this policy applies. We have removed references to policies RT3 and RT8 within criteria 1b) to reflect changes to the Use Classes Order which has made the use of thresholds for the amount of retail in a centre ineffective. We have given the Berry Hill Local Centre a reference (RT1j) and shown it on the Policies Map now that it has full planning permission. We have updated the information about Pleasley Hill Farm to reflect that this Local Centre now has outline planning permission. We have expanded the definition of day-to-day convenience to make this clearer for applicants. We have updated the NPPF paragraph numbers and inserted reference to the Mansfield Town Centre Masterplan.

As part of the previous consultation, there was broad consensus that retailing is changing and that evidence needs to be updated to reflect this. Some responses supported flexibility in retail policy and some suggestions were made about specific sites (such as Portland Retail Park) being included in the town centre.

What still needs to be done?

We need to review the 500sqm impact assessment threshold as referred to in part 5 of the policy. This will be based on the findings of the Class E study that will be commissioned to inform retail policies.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we deleted reference to the new local centre at Pleasley Hill Farm at Part 3 of the policy. This is because it is already referred to in the table at part 2. We added a note at the bottom of the policy to confirm that this new local centre has outline planning permission and will be shown on the Policies Map once the precise boundary has been confirmed at reserved matters stage. We also amended the impact assessment threshold from 500 sqm to 350 sqm gross, in both the policy (part 4) and referred to this in the supporting text. This was as a result of recommendations within the updated evidence base.

Policy RT2: Mansfield town centre vision and strategy

This policy states how the council will work in partnership with developers and other town centre stakeholders to achieve the town centre vision.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

Vision: What has changed?

We have replaced the previous vision for Mansfield town centre to reflect that which is contained within the Mansfield Town Centre Masterplan (2023). This is to ensure that the vision remains up to date and there is consistency between the two documents. We have also included the eight key principles from the Mansfield Town Centre Masterplan.

Policy: What has changed?

We have added reference to pedestrian priority and flow of traffic to criteria 1e) of the policy. We updated criteria 1f) to reflect the production of the Mansfield Town Centre Masterplan. In addition to this we have updated the supporting text to set out the key principles of the masterplan. We have reference to the potential for a new Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for Mansfield town centre. This is to reflect the aims and aspirations of the council. We have updated the NPPF and PPG references.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we made no additional changes to this policy. Within paragraph 7.19 of the supporting text, we crossed referenced to the eight key principles set out in paragraph 7.14. We then deleted the eight bullet points that were set out below in paragraph 7.19. This was to avoid repetition.

Policy RT3: Mansfield town centre primary shopping area

This policy supports proposals that allow for a diverse and attractive primary shopping area (PSA) in Mansfield town centre, particularly when these are retail uses.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

Due to changes in both the use classes order and the NPPF, this policy has had to be updated and amended, including the removal of reference to old use classes and primary and secondary shopping frontages. The impact of the introduction of class E uses has meant units can now change uses within Class E without planning permission being needed, unless they are restricted by condition. We have deleted table 7.4 to recognise the removal of reference to primary and secondary shopping frontages. The parts of the policy which sought to control the level of A1 units are no longer enforceable. We have also updated the NPPF reference.

As part of the previous consultation, representations indicated that the changing role of town centres, and changes to the Use Classes Order need to be considered in any review. One representation indicated that policies should not contradict the Design Code.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we made no additional changes to this policy or the supporting text.

Policy RT4: Mansfield town centre improvements

This policy aims for all development within the town centre to contribute to the improvement of the area. There are a number of improvements listed and it should be demonstrated through the application process how the proposal contributes to the aims - where relevant and proportionate to the scale and nature of the development.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

Part 1a) of the policy has been updated to reflect any sites that are allocated by Policy RT6 and we removed Beales and the Rosemary Centre from criteria 1j) on the basis that plans for these sites are at various stages of development. We amended criteria 2 to include reference for developments to be in line with the Mansfield Town Centre Masterplan and Mansfield Town Centre Design Code. We updated the supporting text to reflect the updated position on White Hart Street and the fact that the Planning Obligations SPD has been produced and adopted. We have updated references to the NPPF, PPG and evidence base documents.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we added green infrastructure into criterion 1i) at the request of Natural England. We also updated the supporting text to provide an update on some development proposals within the town centre such as at White Hart Street and the Rosemary Centre. We also removed reference to the Planning Obligations SPD as information is now set out in Appendix 8 of the plan.

Policy RT5: Accessing Mansfield town centre

This policy aims to achieve better access to the town centre by pedestrians, cyclists, public transport users, taxis and private cars. The policy helps to deliver a more accessible town centre, encouraging people to visit the town and help to reduce pedestrian / vehicular conflict.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have removed reference to the town centre mobility scheme from table 7.7 as this is no longer in operation. We updated reference to the access strategy as this has now been produced. We have updated the NPPF paragraph numbers.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we made no additional changes to this policy or the supporting text.

Policy RT6: Retail and leisure allocations

This policy identifies which sites have been allocated for retail and / or leisure development.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have deleted reference to RT6a) and RT6c) as these sites have been developed / partially developed. We have amended RT6b) to reflect changes to the use classes order.

What still needs to be done?

We need to identify any further new allocations that may be required based on the findings of the Class E Study and the HELAA.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we amended this policy to reflect that there is just one allocation, updating the site allocation policy reference to RT6a.

In relation to new RT6a, we updated previous text that required ‘around’ 11,500 sqm of main town centre and complimentary uses, to ‘up to’ 11,500 sqm. This is in response to comments from the site promoter and the recommendations within the updated evidence base around the fact that there is now no quantitative need for retail / leisure development but that this site represents a major regeneration opportunity. The wording change allows for more flexibility

over what is delivered on site, while retaining the need for the council's aspirations to be met.

We also amended the last bullet point in the policy so that all nearby designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings are conserved and enhanced, not just the listed buildings as the policy was previously worded.

A paragraph was added to the supporting text to clarify benefits that the redevelopment of this site would bring.

Policy RT7: Retail and leisure commitments

This policy identifies sites which already have the benefit of planning permission for retail / leisure uses.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have updated the list of commitments to reflect new planning permissions that have been granted with a net gain in floorspace of over 100 square metres. We have deleted those sites where planning permission has lapsed or where the development has been completed. We have removed previous data regarding retail need as this will be updated on completion of the Class E Study. Table 7.11 which sets out the supply of sites has been updated as far as possible at this stage. We have updated the NPPF references.

What still needs to be done?

We need to update the tables based on the outcomes of the Class E Study and further monitoring data.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we updated the policy with all current retail and leisure commitments based on most recent monitoring data.

Policy RT8: District and local centres

This policy supports development proposals in district and local centres which help to sustain and enhance the range of retail and community provision, particularly where these are for retail uses. It also ensures that development in these areas contributes to the quality of the physical environment by meeting one or more of the criteria.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have updated the policy and supporting text to take account of changes in both the use classes order and the NPPF. The impact of the introduction of class E uses has meant units can now change uses within Class E without planning permission being needed, unless they are restricted by condition. The parts of the policy which sought to control the level of A1 units are no longer enforceable. We have also updated the NPPF reference. Within the supporting text we have included further detail about the Berry Hill Local Centre. We also made reference to the Class E Study updating the amount of retail floorspace that will be required in each centre.

What still needs to be done?

We need to clarify the amount of retail floorspace that will be required in each centre based on the findings of the Class E Study.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 no further changes were made to the policy, and the reference in the supporting text to the need for additional retail floorspace was removed on the basis that the updated evidence base does not identify such a need.

Policy RT9: Neighbourhood parades

This policy provides protection to neighbourhood parades and allows appropriate development to promote their vitality and viability as key elements of sustainable communities. It also supports the development of new neighbourhood parades and extensions to existing ones where they meet the immediate local needs of new residential development but do not undermine existing town centres.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have amended part one of the policy to reflect the role that neighbourhood parades play in meeting day-to-day needs of the community. We have removed reference to the former A1 use class, and simplified the text in paragraph 7.66 (now 7.71). We have amended table 7.13 to include the new parade at Thorpe Road, (Bellamy Estate) and reference to community facilities. We have added the policy reference that relates to the Jubilee Way Neighbourhood Parade. We have updated the NPPF paragraph numbers.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we updated the text and table to reflect that a neighbourhood centre will now be coming forward as part of the Berry Hill SUE (SUE3) in addition to the Local Centre there.

Policy RT10: Hot food takeaways

This policy allows for hot food takeaways provided they are not in an exclusion zone around a school or college or within 400m of another location where children and young people congregate, and they do not cause significant harm to residential amenity.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have amended part one of the policy to extend the restriction to fast food outlets. This will now also apply to proposals within 400 metres of primary schools and other locations people and young people congregate. This is on the basis of changes to the NPPF and other good practice contained within guidance published by the Town and Country Planning Association. It also reflects concerns expressed by local councillors. We have also updated the supporting text and table above to reflect more up to date guidance documents and data. We have taken out reference to the use of conditions to restrict permitted development rights that would allow a change of use from the supporting text. This is because hot food takeaways are now a Sui Generis use and changes of use cannot take place without planning permission. We have updated the NPPF paragraph number.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we have amended the policy to incorporate provisions within the 2026 NPPF. This includes the allowance of hot food takeaways within 400m of a school or place where young people congregate if it is within a designated town centre. It also includes a criterion around the consideration of clusters of uses, which was also suggested during the Regulation 18 consultation. We have also added anti-social behaviour to part two of the policy which lists the impacts upon amenity that will be considered through the planning application process.

We also amended the supporting text to include an explanation of the most recent changes to national planning policy and the addition regarding the clustering of hot food takeaways. Proposals which would create a cluster of such uses may cause a cumulative negative impact upon amenity.

The data within the supporting text, and the table of supporting information has also been updated.

Policy RT11: Visitor economy

This policy supports a number of visitor related uses, including accommodation, that meet the policy criteria. It also relates to the appropriate location of such developments, and requires any town centre uses to also be in accordance with Policy RT1.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have updated the support text to include reference to new data and strategies that have been or are in the process of being produced. We have removed reference to the Visit Mansfield website and figure 7.3 as this has been superseded. We have also removed reference to the Sport England online tool because the information is considered to be out of date. We have updated the council's aspirations for its cultural services, and the NPPF references.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 there were no further changes required, having considered the comments made during the Regulation 18 consultation.

Section 8: Strategic urban extensions

The introduction of this section explains how large, mixed-use strategic urban extensions can help to meet the housing needs of the district, but due to their size they are often more complex to deliver. The text was amended at Regulation 18 as follows:

What has changed?

We have updated this section to reflect the progress that has been made in terms of bring these sites forward for delivery. This includes removing text which referred to these sites meeting longer term aspirations and not contributing towards the councils overall housing target. The sites will now count towards the Local Plan Review development targets.

What still needs to be done?

We need to consider if any further strategic urban extensions need to be allocated to meet the development requirements within the Local Plan Review. This will be based on evidence from the HELAA, other studies and the outcomes of this public consultation (see policy S2).

Policy SUE1: Pleasley Hill Farm

Pleasley Hill Farm is located to the north-west of the Mansfield urban area, close to the settlement of Pleasley (part of which lies in Bolsover district). The site lies alongside the Mansfield Ashfield Regeneration Route (MARR) which was opened in 2004 with the aim of contributing to the regeneration of the area following the closure of coal mines and de-industrialisation. Whilst the majority of the site has outline planning permission, there is a small section where there has been no progress to date.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have updated this policy to remove reference to uses classes as these have now changed. The masterplan for the site is currently being negotiated and part 5 of the policy has been changed to reflect this. The supporting text has been changed to reflect the progress that has been made with delivering this site. It notes that whilst a majority of the site has outline planning permission, there is a small area where there has been no progress.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we updated the policy to reflect the fact that the majority of the site has outline planning permission.

We amended part 4 of the policy to cross reference to the infrastructure needs that are set out in the IDP (which updates the position from when the last local plan was adopted).

We also updated references in the supporting text to reflect new evidence that has been gathered.

Policy SUE2: Land off Jubilee Way

Land off Jubilee Way is located to the east of Mansfield and was previously part of Mansfield Colliery (also known as Crown Farm). Since the colliery closed the wider area has been used for informal recreation and currently includes Mansfield Rugby Club and two golf courses.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

Due to changes in the planning system, we have removed reference to a masterplan for the site being within a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

What still needs to be done?

Confirmation of the infrastructure requirements for the site is needed. This will be based on the evidence base and discussions with the various stakeholders.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we added a new part 6 to the policy to cross reference to the infrastructure needs that are set out in the IDP (which updates the position from when the last local plan was adopted). This was in part to replace part 6g) which set out specific transport requirements that have now been updated.

Policy SUE3: Land at Berry Hill

The principle of development on this site to the south of the district has already been established and phase 1 has been completed. Although the original outline permission has lapsed for part of the wider site, the council would wish to support a renewed permission and Policy SUE3 allows for this. It will make an important contribution to meeting the district's development requirements for the plan period and the council will continue to work closely with the developers to support the delivery of this allocation.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have updated the policy to remove references to specific use classes. This is to reflect changes to the use classes order. We have also removed a previous duplication of commercial uses. We have updated part 1b) to reflect that planning permission has been granted for this element of the development. We have deleted the previous part 2 of the policy as the new local centre has now been granted planning permission in accordance with policy RT1. The new part 2 of the policy has been updated in recognition that the previous outline planning permission that included a masterplan has now lapsed. We have updated the supporting text to reflect the current circumstances with the site's delivery. We have updated the NPPF paragraph numbers in the table below.

What still needs to be done?

Confirmation of the infrastructure requirements for the site is needed. This will be based on the evidence base and discussions with the various stakeholders. Due to changes to market conditions and to reflect the approach to the employment within the NPPF, we also need to confirm the amount and mix of employment floorspace that may be required on this site. This will be based on information within the updated employment evidence base.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we added a new part 3 to the policy to cross reference to the infrastructure needs that are set out in the IDP (which updates the position from when the last local plan was adopted).

We also added a table to make it clear that certain elements of the development already have planning permission and in some cases are already completed.

Section 9: Infrastructure and facilities

This policy area addresses the delivery of and funding for infrastructure as it relates to new development. The policies within the section cover specific requirements in relation to green infrastructure, open space, outdoor sport provision, allotments, sustainable and highways transport networks, car and cycle parking, community and cultural facilities, and telecommunications.

At Regulation 18 we only made a change to the NPPF paragraph numbers in the introductory text:

What has changed?

We have updated the NPPF paragraph numbers in the supporting text.

At Regulation 19 we made no further changes.

Policy IN1: Infrastructure delivery

This policy seeks to ensure that growth is supported by necessary infrastructure and helps to preserve and enhance our natural and built environment. This is to ensure that the area receives the necessary improvements to its infrastructure so that the provision of new homes and jobs does not put too much pressure on existing services and facilities.

At Regulation 18 we made the following changes:

What has changed?

We have updated the NPPF paragraph numbers and referred to evidence base studies that will be produced as part of the Local Plan Review. We have also referred to council's SPDs and Nottinghamshire County Council's Developer Contributions Strategy.

As part of the previous consultation, key issues identified were:

- The need for joint working between authorities regarding infrastructure provision.
- The importance of evidence to support need for infrastructure and the consideration of viability.
- The importance of green infrastructure.
- Waste management infrastructure is important and needs to be considered.
- Need to ensure that the provision of EV charging points does not have an impact on wider capacity.

Due to the ongoing uncertainty of CIL along with the lack of transparency and linkages between CIL monies collected from a development and where / what infrastructure monies are spent on, the preferred option was to continue with the current policy approach. It was noted that contributions sought for infrastructure need

to be based on evidence and related to the development concerned. As part of this, need to consider the cumulative impacts of development on infrastructure. There is also a need to ensure that developers deliver the infrastructure that they say they will.

What still needs to be done?

We need to update the evidence base regarding the various types of infrastructure that will be required to meet the needs of development and to update appendix 8.

At Regulation 19 We didn't make any changes to the policy but did amend the supporting text. We removed reference to the Planning Obligations SPD on the basis that it will have reduced weight under the new planning system. This has resulted in the approach to development requirements being added into the plan at Appendix 7. We have referred to this, as well as Appendix 5 where the calculation for commuted sums towards off-site affordable housing is located.

We took out reference to the former Appendix 8 (Summary of key infrastructure requirements) on the basis that this was duplication of what is in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).

We updated the date of the Mansfield Transport Study and Infrastructure Delivery Plan (to 2026) and included a reference to East Midlands County Combined Authority as the body now responsible for some aspects of transport infrastructure.

Policy IN2: Green infrastructure

This policy supports new development where it takes a holistic approach to planning for green infrastructure.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have amended parts 1f) and 2 of the policy to include reference to biodiversity net gain. We added a reference to blue / green infrastructure to make it clear that this term can also apply. We have included reference to the Biodiversity Net Gain and Green Infrastructure SPDs that have been adopted by the council. We have updated the NPPF paragraphs in the table above.

As part of the previous consultation, the majority of responses supported the principle of protecting GI. Opinions varied as to whether GI should continue to be protected via an SPD or enshrined within Local Plan policies. There was broad consensus that GI evidence should be updated and should inform Local Plan updates. It is considered that it would not be proportionate to update the GI evidence for the Local Plan Review as it is still seen as being fit for purpose.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we have added to policy criterion 1e) to ensure that when developments improve the quality of green infrastructure this supports the delivery of the Local Nature Recovery Strategy.

We also added supporting text to confirm that the county council's Local Nature Recovery Strategy provides a co-ordinated plan for nature including blue and green infrastructure.

Policy IN3: Community open space and outdoor sports provision

This was previously two separate policies (IN3 and IN4) covering the protection of, and new, community open space and outdoor sports provision. The aim of the policy area is to protect and enhance community open space and outdoor sports provision in order to help support healthy communities and enhance place shaping in the district.

At Regulation 18 (for IN3) we made the following changes:

What has changed?

We have updated the appendix numbers.

As part of the previous consultation, there was no overall preferred option, whilst some consultees suggest a hybrid of a number of the options. A need was highlighted for up-to-date evidence to support approach, including a Playing Pitch Strategy. There were some concerns about the use of rigid standards and the need for flexibility. Any planning obligations sought need to be appropriate and justified.

What still needs to be done?

The Open Space Study and Playing Pitch Strategy are being produced. These will inform any changes that may be required to appendix 9 and the policies map, such as showing any new green spaces that will be protected under this policy.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 18 (for IN4) we made the following changes:

What has changed?

We have made reference to the update to the Community open space assessment and the fact that the Planning Obligations SPD has now been produced and adopted.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we merged the two policies together to streamline the plan and to be consistent with the approach to other policies, such as IN6 (formerly IN7) which deals with the protection of, and development of, community facilities.

Part 4 of the policy was expanded to include a requirement for all new on-site provision of community open space within an 8.9km radius of the Birklands & Bilhaugh Special Area of Conservation (SAC) to be designed to reflect the need to provide Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspaces (SANGs) in

perpetuity to relieve pressure on the SAC. This was recommended in the Habitats Regulations Assessment of the Local Plan Review.

We have made a minor change to the wording of the policy to change ‘safeguard’ to ‘protect’. This better reflects commonly used terminology and to be consistent with the approach used across the country. This was raised during public consultation.

When reviewing the NPPF, consistency was improved by replacing terminology ‘sports provision standards’ with ‘requirements’. This helps to avoid confusion as the methodology for studies such as playing pitch strategies do not utilise quantity standards.

We have added references to the Mansfield Green Infrastructure SPD and Natural England’s Green Infrastructure Framework and referred to the Sport England Playing Pitch Calculator. This was in response to consultation comments from Sport England and Natural England.

We also added confirmation to the supporting text that the 10% open space contribution will count towards biodiversity net gain. However, we clarified that discussions will be required with the council’s parks department and ecologist to ensure the appropriate provision is made. This was in response to a consultation response.

We also updated the list of evidence bases with new studies that have been completed and made minor changes to the policy wording in order to reflect the changes to the 2026 NPPF. Finally, we have provided further clarity on the quality requirements detailed in Part C of the Mansfield Green Space Standard. Appendix 10 now includes key considerations for the design/quality for different types of open spaces. This was informed by the Open Space Study 2026.

Upon review of the findings of the Playing Pitch Strategy 2026 we have added to the list of sites at Appendix 9.

Policy IN4: Allotments

This policy sets out the council's approach to the protection of existing allotments and the creation of new provision.

At Regulation 18 we made minor changes to this section of the plan as set out below:

What has changed?

We have added some context to the supporting text in respect of allotment occupation and have updated the NPPF paragraph numbers and evidence base references.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we have made amendments to part 1 of the policy to bring it in line with the 2026 NPPF. This includes a consideration of the quantity, quality and accessibility of any replacement allotments that are provided, as well as a new criterion regarding the potential loss of allotments being acceptable where it would result in alternative recreational use. We also updated the supporting text to include more up to date information on plot uptake from the Mansfield Parks and Open Space Strategy 2023-2028.

Finally, we updated the Supporting Information table to include reference to the 2026 NPPF and the Mansfield Open Space Study.

Policy IN5: Designated local green space

This policy recognises the unique benefits of the designated sites and ensures their long-term protection beyond the plan period. It also addresses the need to consider any potential impacts from nearby proposed development.

At Regulation 18 we made the change set out below:

What has changed?

We have updated the NPPF paragraph numbers.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we reviewed the policy against the new NPPF and all consultation responses received. No further changes were made, other than updating the Supporting Information table.

Policy IN6: Local shops, community and cultural facilities

This policy seeks to maintain and improve the provision of local community and cultural services and facilities by supporting proposals which protect or enhance existing community facilities (including multi use and shared schemes), or lead to the provision of new facilities.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

Within part 1b) of the policy we have added the need for marketing to be at a reasonable price. Within the supporting text we have added reference to applicants being required to check the Community Asset Register. We have updated the NPPF paragraphs.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we have split our approach to indoor sports facilities from the other community facilities covered by the policy (and added a new part two). This is to ensure that the policy is in conformity with the NPPF (paragraph 104). We repeated criteria from Policy IN3 which relates to outdoor sports facilities, and whilst we considered including indoor sports facilities within that policy, the decision was made to keep them within Policy IN6. This was due to the way indoor sports facilities are categorised within the NPPF as community facilities. We have made it clear that the determination of relevant development proposals will need to have regard to the Built Facilities Strategy, 2026. We reviewed the rest of the policy and the remaining parts are NPPF compliant.

Policy IN7: Protecting and improving the sustainable transport network

This policy seeks to support and promote sustainable transport across the district by:

- encouraging modal shift towards more sustainable transport modes including walking, cycling and public transport;
- setting out priorities for improvements; and
- safeguarding existing key infrastructure and potential routes.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

Within the supporting text we have added reference to Active Travel England being a statutory consultee where a scheme meets the threshold and the need for applicants to give consideration to the guidance published by Active Travel England when developing schemes. We have added reference to the county council's Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP) and the D2N2 Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP). We have updated the NPPF references.

As part of the previous consultation, representations encouraged the location of growth close to areas with transport choice. There was a recognition that the Local Plan Review does not have control of transport 'behaviours' or the longer term delivery of bus services. There was some support for linking GI and sustainable transport. In addition, a majority of responses recognised the importance of sustainable travel and locations for growth. A combination of the options were supported in terms of securing effective transportation solutions to growth. Multiple representations called for transport evidence to be updated and for any transport infrastructure to be based on evidence of viability.

What still needs to be done?

We need to work with county council to update table 9.8 which will inform the content of part 2 of the policy, the policies map and figure 9.3. A new Transport Study, Climate Change Study and Air Quality Study are being produced that will inform the content of this policy.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we made a number of changes that were suggested to us during the Regulation 18 consultation. These included:

- the addition wording to part 1 of the policy to give more emphasis to reducing the need to travel by private car, promote trip internalisation, and reduce journey lengths;
- reference to the LCWIP strategic cycle network in criterion 1a);
- the addition of 'contribute towards' in criterion 1b) of the policy to recognise that it is not always appropriate for individual developments to fund or provide for improvement schemes in full,

- the addition of 'and services' to criterion 1b) at the request of Nottinghamshire County Council,
- updated the description of the Robin Hood Line extension in criterion 1c) and added more details to the supporting text to make it clear that this refers to the reopening for passenger services between Shirebrook and Ollerton,
- removed former references to specific routes that had appeared in the Local Transport Plan 3, and replaced text with a reference to the emerging EMCCA Mayor's Transport Plan, and also made changes to the supporting text to reflect this;
- updated part 2 of the policy to take account of comments from EMCCA and the Highway Authority;
- additional information regarding the transport hierarchy approach, including the provision of a source on the basis that this was raised during public consultation,
- additional text regarding meeting the government's aims for sustainable transport. This had been a suggestion to refer to the Planning and Infrastructure Bill and the Bus Services Bill however as these may be superseded we did not include them by name,
- inserted the Walk Wheel Cycle Trust's National Cycle Network Route 648 and EMCCA's strategic cycle network into the list of schemes that make up Mansfield's sustainable transport network, and removed Sustrans Route 6;
- the inclusion of guidance suggested by the county council (Local Transport Note 1/20 and the DfT's inclusive mobility guidance),
- the addition of the Active Travel Rural Design Guide (2026) as suggested by colleagues at EMCCA;
- the addition of bus shelters into the supporting text regarding improvements to bus services and wording to explain that the list of potential improvements is indicative and may change over time depending on the need for new/improved provision,
- removed the diagram of safeguarded schemes and removed reference to them being on the policies map, on the basis of uncertainty over which schemes will appear in the EMCCA Mayor's Transport Plan when it is finalised;
- updated the table of schemes, and
- updating relevant references and website addresses in the supporting information table and in the text.

Policy IN8: Impact of development on the transport network

This policy requires proposals for new development to be acceptable in terms of safety and their impact on the local highway network.

At Regulation 18 we made a change as set out below:

What has changed?

We have updated the NPPF paragraph numbers.

What still needs to be done?

We need to update the transport evidence base and a new Transport Study is being produced.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we amended some aspects of the policy in accordance with advice from our Transport Study consultants. These changes were to strengthen the policy. Part one now clearly states the various technical details that will need to be assessed at planning application stage, part two gives more detail on what is required in a transport assessment / statement, and part three relates to the safeguarding of the Public Rights of Way network.

We also updated the references to the Transport Study and also inserted supporting text to make it clear that Derbyshire County Council should, as Highway Authority, be consulted on relevant planning applications.

Policy IN9: Car and cycle parking

This policy seeks that car parking in any new development is sensitively designed in order to not be obtrusive or damaging to the character of the area and should be an integral part of the design process.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

Within part 1b) of the policy, we have removed the words 'where practical' as EV charging points are now a requirement of the Building Regulations. We have updated the supporting text to include reference to the county council's Highway Design Guide which will be used to consider the suitability of the level of parking provided as part of a development. As such, we have removed reference to the district council, producing a car parking SPD as this is no longer required. We have updated the NPPF paragraph references.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we made further changes to the policy to remove the criterion that related to EV charging points. As was pointed out during the Reg 18 consultation there was no need for this to remain within the policy as it is already covered in the Building Regulations. Reference to the specific regulations has been added to the supporting text to ensure that the provision is made, where appropriate.

Policy IN10: Telecommunications and broadband

This policy supports the provision of telecommunication and broadband growth whilst ensuring adverse impacts to the character of the built form or physical environment are minimised.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have updated the policy so that it applies to all, not just major, development. Parts 1 and 2 have been amalgamated and updated in line with other recently adopted Local Plans. The supporting text has also been updated and now refers to new government targets and guidance as well as the Nottinghamshire Digital Connectivity Framework. We have updated the NPPF references.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

No comments were received during the Regulation 18 consultation, so no further changes were made at Regulation 19 stage.

Section 10: Natural environment

Policy NE1: Protection and enhancement of landscape character

This policy recognises the importance landscape plays in conserving our natural, cultural and built heritage and seeks that development proposals are sensitively integrated into the existing landscape, demonstrate an understanding of the intrinsic qualities of the landscape setting and, where possible, seek to make the most of the opportunities to protect and enhance landscape characteristics and features.

At Regulation 18 we didn't make any changes to this policy or supporting text but we did ask stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we made a number of changes. These include:

- **criterion 1d) – Added 'having regard to the mitigation opportunities set out in the Mansfield Landscape Sensitivity Study (LSS)'**
- **Adding a new a paragraph to the supporting text that provides information about the Mansfield Landscape Sensitivity Study.**
- **The supporting text has been amended to confirm that the Landscape Character Assessment and Landscape Sensitivity Study are essential documents for applicants in seeking to assess and minimise the potential impacts of proposals on the landscape. In addition, the previous paragraph 10.10 has been moved to under paragraph 10.8. This is because the aspects covered relate to each other.**
- **Updating table 10.1 to include reference to the Landscape Sensitivity Study (2026).**

Policy NE2: Biodiversity and geodiversity

This policy addresses the need to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity in the district.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

In relation to biodiversity net gain, we removed the words 'seek to' from part 1c) of the policy and added the need for a minimum of 10% net gain. This is to reflect that BNG of at least 10% is now mandatory and is in accordance with the council's Biodiversity Net Gain SPD. This document was adopted in 2023 and we have added a link to it. We amended the supporting text in relation to the hierarchy of designated sites to ensure that it reflects changes to the NPPF. We have added an explanation about biodiversity net gain is calculated and that further information measures that can be used to deliver net gain can be found in the Biodiversity Net Gain SPD. We also referred to the council's Local Validation List. We have included reference to the Birklands & Bilhaugh SAC/Sherwood Forest NNR and Clumber Park SSSI zones of influence that affect the district and set out the requirements for development. We have added reference to the Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) and updated the NPPF paragraph numbers and supporting information references in table 10.3.

The main issue raised as part of the previous consultation related to provision above 10% BNG. The majority of developer responses considered that 10% (and no more) should be sought. Some environmental groups encouraged greater provision. There was some concern that the 'BNG hierarchy' could be too prescriptive. If we also felt that there should be alignment with the emerging Local Nature Recovery Strategy. Some of the issues raised have subsequently been addressed through both national and local guidance that has been published including the council's Biodiversity Net Gain SPD.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we made the following changes:

- **deleted part 1c) of the policy as mandatory 10% BNG applies to all non-exempt development. We also added additional text to explain this and provided a link to government guidance;**
- **added a new part 4 to the policy that makes it clear that a Recreational Impact Assessment is required for certain developments that are within 10km of the Clumber Park SSSI;**
- **added a requirement in part 8 (formerly 7) for developments that impact upon any designated habitat site to provide an additional 10% BNG uplift on said site;**
- **removed reference to the Biodiversity Net Gain SPD from supporting text on the basis that legislation has been updated and this document no longer reflects the current position;**

- clarified the position regarding mandatory BNG following changes to legislation;
- added new supporting text to refer to changes made to Policy IN3 that require new on-site community open space to be designed as Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspaces (SANGs) when within 8.9km of the Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC in order to relieve recreational pressure on the SAC. This was a recommendation from the Habitat Regulations Assessment of the Local Plan Review (2026);
- made a change to the supporting text to clarify the need for a Recreational Impact Assessment for developments that may have an effect on the Clumber Park SSSI; and
- made a number of minor changes including adding additional references to the Local Nature Recovery Strategy.

Policy NE3: Pollution and land instability

This policy considers impacts on air, soil and water quality, contaminated or potentially contaminated land, land stability, and light and noise pollution.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have updated the supporting text to reflect that The Coal Authority has been renamed to the The Mining Remediation Authority. Following a review of the supporting documents to be produced, we have removed reference to the preparation of an Air Quality SPD. We have updated the NPPF paragraphs and list of supporting evidence, some of which will be updated.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 the policy and supporting text have been reviewed and references have been updated, including the relevant River Basin Management Plan, and minor textual and typographical matters have been corrected where necessary. Supporting information and NPPF references have also been reviewed.

Policy NE4: Mineral safeguarding areas

This policy sets out the approach that the district council will take when determining proposals for non-minerals development within minerals safeguarding areas. (Nottinghamshire County Council is the minerals planning authority and has identified minerals safeguarding areas and supporting policies as part of the adopted Minerals Local Plan 2021².

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have updated the supporting text to refer to the adopted Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan 2021 and updated the NPPF paragraph references.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 there were no further changes made.

² <https://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/planning-and-environment/minerals-local-plan/adopted-minerals-local-plan>

Section 11: Historic environment

This policy area is focused on protecting and enhancing our historic environment for existing and future generations.

The introductory text to this section was amended at Regulation 18 as follows:

What has changed?

The reference to 'historic parks and gardens' has been corrected to 'registered parks and gardens' and paragraph 1.3 has been expanded to detail that harm should be avoided or mitigated. These changes have been made in response to feedback from Historic England. We have also inserted reference to the Mansfield Town Centre Masterplan and Mansfield Town Centre Design Code. We have also added support for measures that help increase energy efficiency and resilience to flooding and provided a link to guidance from Historic England.

At Regulation 19 we amended the wording of paragraph 11.2 to provide more detailed information about heritage assets. This was based on a suggestion from AHP who reviewed the policy.

Policy HE1: Historic environment

This policy sets out the criteria that development proposals affecting heritage assets will need to meet in order to be considered favourably during the determination of a planning application.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have inserted the word 'irreplaceable' into part 1 of the policy to make it clear that designated heritage assets are irreplaceable resources that should be conserved and enhanced. We have also added a statement to this part of the policy to set out the hierarchical approach to the consideration of harm and mitigation in development proposals. Both changes were suggested by Historic England during Duty to Cooperate discussions.

We have referred to the 'significance' of the heritage assets in part 3 of the policy, again on the advice of Historic England. We have also added in a reference to enhancing the heritage assets (as well as conserving them) to reflect wording in part 2.

The supporting text has been updated to include reference to recording any loss of significance and adding it to the Historic Environment Record, as a minimum, when harm is unavoidable. We have also added in a reference to trial trenching in relation to archaeology and the need for any assessment to be carried out by an appropriately qualified professional and deleted a repetitive sentence. We have also

updated the NPPF references and deleted the 2018 Heritage Impact Assessment from the evidence list. This will be updated.

The supporting text has been updated to include reference development proposals needing to be in compliance with the relevant aspects of the Mansfield Town Centre Design Code.

During the Issues and Opportunities consultation the majority of responses supported policies that sought to protect designated and non-designated heritage assets (above and below ground). There was some concern that policies should follow national guidance and not be overly-prescriptive.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we made a number of changes that were suggested to us during the Regulation 18 consultation. These included:

- the addition of 'and their significance' at the end of criterion 1a);
- deletion of 'in order of preference' from criterion 1b);
- added an additional sentence to the end of criteria 2 'Proposals will also be required to demonstrate they are consistent with the special character as described in the statement or appraisal for that area'. This was following a suggestion from Heritage England;
- at the end of criterion 4, added 'and for satisfactory provision to be made for evaluation, excavation, recording and interpretation of the remains before and during the commencement of the development.' This was following a suggestion during the Regulation 18 consultation;
- added 'the character and appearance of the' after 'preserves or enhances' in paragraph 11.21;
- deleted 'and demonstrate that there is no alternative means of delivering the same outcome' in paragraph 11.24; and
- added 'and development management' after 'policy' in paragraph 11.26.

We also added wording to the policy to make it clear that substantial public benefits would include measures to improve accessibility for disabled people. This was a recommendation from the Equalities Impact Assessment of the Local Plan Review.

Policy HE2: Pleasley Vale regeneration area

This policy mirrors Policy SS8 of the Bolsover District Local Plan, March 2020 and is intended to ensure a coordinated approach to dealing with planning applications for the regeneration of this area which straddles the district administrative boundary. The area covered by the policy was formally recognised as part of the Pleasley Park and Vale Conservation Area that was designated in Bolsover district in 1987 and in Mansfield district in 1992.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have updated the title of the policy to be more consistent with the policy in the adopted Bolsover Local Plan. We have updated the supporting text and supporting information regarding the NPPF paragraphs and status of the Bolsover Local Plan.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 no further changes were made to the policy or supporting text.

Section 12: Climate change

Policy CC1: Renewable and low carbon energy generation

This policy sets out a positive approach to encourage renewable and low carbon energy development while ensuring that adverse impacts are addressed satisfactorily. It provides support to encourage greater investment by the renewable energy industry and from community-led energy projects within the district.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have updated the supporting text to include the UK target for clean energy by 2030 and added the district council's targets with reference to its Climate Change Strategy 2022. We updated references to the evidence base and noted that this needs updating in terms of identifying local energy opportunities. We have updated the NPPF paragraph references.

As part of the previous consultation, there was support for options A and C which concerned updating current policy and producing a specific SPD to provide more detail on this subject however it was noted that the latter should not introduce new policy. There was no support for option B (on site generation targets) unless combined with other options.

Some responders felt that Local Plan policies should not be over prescriptive and should not repeat other national / statutory requirements. Various consultees make reference to specific documents that should be used to inform policy, and which could be used when justifying specific standards.

Reference was made to various types of renewable energy sources that could be explored. As part of this, some concern was expressed about biomass based renewable energy. The wider approach to sustainable power generation will be addressed as part of the updated evidence base.

What still needs to be done?

We need to update the evidence base which will identify local energy opportunities and update the policy if required.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we have made number of changes to the policy that have been recommended through the Climate Change Study 2026 (Policy CC1 review). This includes new parts regarding ground mounted solar panels, and community energy schemes. We also added in three more considerations that can help justify development proposals. These changes bring the policy into greater alignment with national planning policy, set out a more balanced approach to assessing renewable energy proposals and plan positively for the growth of renewable energy.

We added reference to an assessment of the impact upon best and most versatile agricultural land being required, in response to a comment from Natural England.

We have removed previous reference to the 2015 written ministerial statement that restricted the development of wind turbines within the supporting text as this is no longer in force.

We have added reference to Historic England Advice Note 15 within the supporting text, as well as the Clean Power 2030 Action Plan.

Policy CC2: Flood risk

This policy requires that new development avoids risk by prioritising the location of development outside of areas with the greatest flood risk, as informed by the sequential test, and where required, the exceptions test.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have updated the supporting text to update reference to Nottinghamshire County Council's Local Flood Risk Management Strategy 2021 - 2027. We have also updated the NPPF and evidence base references.

What still needs to be done?

We need to update the flood risk evidence base to help inform the determination of development proposals.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we made the following changes as recommended by the updated evidence base and review of consultation responses:

- **added a new criterion 1a) to emphasise the development in areas at risk of flooding needs to be appropriate and in accordance with the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance**
- **added a new criterion 1f) to require a 10 metre buffer at the top of rivers / watercourses;**
- **added some text to the new criterion 1h) in relation to incorporation of natural flood management (NFM) and the re-naturalisation of watercourses being supported wherever possible;**
- **added a new part 2 to the policy which relates to development that is proposed in an area at risk of residual flooding; and**
- **updates to the supporting text that reflect the new evidence base.**

Policy CC3: Sustainable drainage systems

This policy expects development proposals to actively pursue the use of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) and for them to be designed to address water quality, benefit biodiversity and complement amenity, place shaping and water efficiency.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

Within the supporting text we have inserted reference Severn Trent Water's Green Recovery Project and the council's SuDs SPD. We have updated the NPPF and evidence references.

As part of the previous consultation, a policy supporting the provision of SuDS was broadly supported. There was support for continued use of the adopted SPD and some suggestions regarding the potential policy areas that could be included, including those related to environmental improvements. Concerns were related to policies being viable and not overly prescriptive. It was felt that updated regulations and guidance needs to be monitored if the SuDS SPD is to be continued as a material consideration. Having been adopted in 2023, it is considered that the SuDS SPD is still fit for purpose. This includes a range of measures that can be used to help improve the environment of the district.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we made the following changes as recommended by the updated evidence base and review of consultation responses:

- **added reference to the need for the design of schemes to be in accordance with the government's national standards for SuDS and the surface water drainage hierarchy within part 1 of the policy;**
- **added reference to the approach to discharging surface water to criterion 1a);**
- **added new requirements in a new criterion 1b) in relation to surface water run-off rates and volumes where infiltration SuDS are not achievable;**
- **added a new criterion 1c) regarding the design and location of new infiltration SuDS;**
- **added a new criterion 1f) ensuring the design and location of SuDS avoids impacts upon archaeology; and**
- **added the collection, storage and re-use of water to the top of the hierarchy of drainage options that is set out in the supporting text.**

Policy CC4: River and waterbody corridors

This policy seeks to ensure that the overall condition of rivers and other water bodies in the district is improved. In doing so, the biodiversity, landscape and recreational value of watercourses and their corridors should be conserved and enhanced through well-designed development.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have updated the NPPF and evidence references. We also confirmed that the SFRA needs updating.

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we made the following changes as recommended by the updated evidence base and review of consultation responses:

- **added reference to the need for hydraulic modelling into criterion 1a);**
- **at criterion 1c) we amended the minimum development buffer from 8 metre to 10 metres on both sides of a watercourse – this included a requirement for previously developed land in such a buffer to be reinstated where possible;**
- **added requirements for the enhancement of blue / green infrastructure and the species to be used for the formation of blue / green wildlife corridors into criterion 1d);**
- **added a new criterion 1e) which requires developments to contribute to the recovery, expansion and protection of riparian and aquatic species, and avoid adverse impacts on locally, regionally or nationally important populations;**
- **made changes to the supporting text to clarify how various actions can support the protection and enhancement of the river's overall health and improved status under the Water Framework Directive (and therefore meet policy CC4); and**
- **added a note that developers should have regard to archaeology and consult Historic England guidance if necessary.**

Section 13: Implementation and monitoring

Policy IM1: Monitoring and Review of the Local Plan

This policy sets out how the council will monitor the effectiveness of the Local Plan and the circumstances that would trigger a review/partial review of the plan.

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

We have updated the NPPF and evidence base references.
--

We asked stakeholders if they agreed with our approach to this policy area.

At Regulation 19 we added the following circumstances to the policy where a review of the plan may be necessary:

- **changes in government planning policy; and**
- **changes to strategic priorities arising from local government reorganisation and / or an emerging Spatial Development Strategy.**

We also added into the supporting text that unforeseen changes to infrastructure capacity or new infrastructure proposals would be kept under review (in addition to the emergence of new evidence), and referred to how the council could (subject to resources) explore how the Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) could be better presented, on an online dashboard for example.

Appendices

Appendix 1- Glossary of terms

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

Where appropriate we have updated and amended the definitions to reflect the NPPF.

At Regulation 19 we made other changes to ensure the glossary is up to date, such as the deletion of the reference to the former duty to cooperate as this has been removed through the introduction of new planning regulations, as a result of the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023.

Appendix 2- Objective and policy links

We didn't make any changes to this appendix at Regulation 18.

At Regulation 19 we have updated policy references where these have changed.

Appendix 3- Health impact assessment checklist

We didn't make any changes to this appendix at Regulation 18.

At Regulation 19 we updated the checklist to reflect the changes made to the Rapid Health Impact Assessment template in the Nottinghamshire Spatial Planning and Health Framework 2025-2030 (SPHF). We also included a link to examples of completed templates.

Appendix 4- Housing trajectory

We didn't make any changes to this appendix at Regulation 18 other than delete the data from the adopted Local Plan and insert the new annual requirement.

At Regulation 19 we updated the trajectory to include details of completions and commitments since the start of the plan period (2023) and the site allocations.

Appendix 5- Affordable housing zones

We didn't make any changes to this appendix at Regulation 18.

At Regulation 19 we updated the plan showing the affordable housing zones. This was to take account of the findings of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment which identified the high and low values within the district and gave recommendations about the percentage of affordable housing that should be sought on brownfield and greenfield sites. Changes were also made to reflect the ward boundary changes that have taken place since the current Local Plan was adopted. In addition, wording has been added to set out the council's approach to commuted sums for affordable housing including when such sums may be sought and the formula that will be used to calculate them. This is based upon the current affordable housing SPD. It has also been included to reflect the reduced weight that SPDs will have under the new planning system.

Appendix 6- Masterplanning requirements

At Regulation 18 we made a number of changes as set out below:

What has changed?

Within the masterplanning requirements, we have referred to street trees due to the emphasis given to them in the revised NPPF. We have removed the current indicative masterplans. This is to recognise that some will need to be updated and some sites have now been developed. We have updated the text under the indicative masterplans heading to make it clear that additional masterplanning work will be undertaken.

At Regulation 19 we deleted the former Appendix 6 (Plans of employment sites within key employment areas) on the basis that this information will be kept up to date annually in the council's employment monitoring reports, and renumbered the rest of the appendices as appropriate.

In the 'new' Appendix 6 (Masterplanning requirements) we inserted new indicative masterplans for sites on the edge of the settlement boundary.

Appendix 7- Planning obligations

We didn't make any changes to this appendix at Regulation 18.

At Regulation 19 we removed the former appendix (Key infrastructure requirements) on the basis that this information will be contained within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and doesn't need to be repeated. We then inserted a new appendix in its place which contains our approach to planning obligations. This is based upon the current Planning Obligations SPD and has been updated to reflect information from our new evidence base including the Mansfield Open Space Study (2026), Planning Pitch Strategy (2026), Built Facilities Strategy (2026) and Whole Plan Viability Study (2026). It has also

been included to reflect the reduced weight that SPDs will have under the new planning system.

It should be noted that the approach for the calculation of commuted sums for affordable housing has been included in Appendix 5 which covers wider matters related to affordable housing.

Appendix 8- Protected sports pitches (referred to in Policy IN3)

We didn't make any changes to this appendix at Regulation 18.

At Regulation 19 we updated the list to reflect the findings of the Mansfield Playing Pitch Strategy 2026.

Appendix 9 - The Mansfield green space standard

We didn't make any changes to this appendix at Regulation 18.

At Regulation 19 we added a table that gives guidance on how quality standards can be demonstrated. This is based on recommendations within the Open Space Study 2026.

Appendix 10 - Local green space designations

We didn't make any changes to this appendix at Regulation 18.

At Regulation 19 we have updated the site policy references to reflect the change from IN6 to IN5.

Appendix 11 - Monitoring Framework

We didn't make any changes to this appendix at Regulation 18.

At Regulation 19 we have:

- updated policy references where these have changed or where policies have merged;
- made corrections and clarifications;
- removed references to the development of further supplementary planning documents;
- added new review indicators and triggers related to:
 - new evidence becoming available including unforeseen infrastructure capacity constraints or new infrastructure proposals;

- **changes in government planning policy being published meaning adopted policy / policies become outdated; and**
- **changes to strategic policies arising from the emerging Spatial Development Strategy or Local Government Reorganisation meaning there is a requirement for a new Local Plan based on new administrative boundaries.**