

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

This note was prepared by AMEC and URS on behalf of the Planning Advisory Service. It aims to help local authorities prepare their plans in advance of an examination, taking into account the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework. A separate checklist looks at legal compliance.

In summary – the key requirements of plan preparation are:

- Has the plan been positively prepared i.e. based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed requirements?
- Is the plan justified?
- Is it based on robust and credible evidence?
- Is it the most appropriate strategy when considered against the alternatives?
- Is the document effective?
- Is it deliverable?
- Is it flexible?
- Will it be able to be monitored?
- Is it consistent with national policy?

The Tests of Soundness at Examination

The starting point for the examination is the assumption that the Council has submitted what it considers to be a sound plan. Those seeking changes should demonstrate why the plan is unsound by reference to one or more of the soundness criteria.

The tests of soundness are set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (para 182): “The Local Plan will be examined by an independent inspector whose role is to assess whether the plan has been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate, legal and procedural requirements, and whether it is sound. A local planning authority should submit a plan for examination which it considers is ‘sound’ “, namely that it is:

1. Positively Prepared: based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements

This means that the Development Plan Document (DPD) should be based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development. The NPPF, together with the Marine Policy Statement (MPS) set out principles through which the Government expects sustainable development can be achieved.

2. Justified: the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence

This means that the DPD should be based on a robust and credible evidence base involving:

- Research/fact finding: the choices made in the plan are backed up by facts.

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

- Evidence of participation of the local community and others having a stake in the area; and

The DPD should also provide the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives. These alternatives should be realistic and subject to sustainability appraisal. The DPD should show how the policies and proposals help to ensure that the social, environmental, economic and resource use objectives of sustainability will be achieved.

3. Effective: deliverable over its period based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities

This means the DPD should be deliverable, requiring evidence of:

- Sound infrastructure delivery planning;
- Having no regulatory or national planning barriers to delivery;
- Delivery partners who are signed up to it; and
- Coherence with the strategies of neighbouring authorities, including neighbouring marine planning authorities.
- The DPD should be flexible and able to be monitored.

The DPD should indicate who is to be responsible for making sure that the policies and proposals happen and when they will happen. The plan should be flexible to deal with changing circumstances, which may involve minor changes to respond to the outcome of the monitoring process or more significant changes to respond to problems such as lack of funding for major infrastructure proposals. Although it is important that policies are flexible, the DPD should make clear that major changes may require a formal review including public consultation. Any measures which the Council has included to make sure that targets are met should be clearly linked to an Annual Monitoring Report.

4. Consistent with national policy: enabling the delivery of sustainable development

The demonstration of this is a 'lead' policy on sustainable development which specifies how decisions are to be made against the sustainability criterion (see the Planning Portal for a model policy www.planningportal.gov.uk). If you are not using this model policy, the Council will need to provide clear and convincing reasons to justify its approach.

The following table sets out the requirements associated with these four tests of soundness. Suggestions for evidence which could be used to support these requirements are set out, although these have to be viewed in the context of the plan being prepared. Please don't assume that you have got to provide all of these, they are just suggestions of what could be relevant.

In addition, the Legal Compliance checklist (a separate document, see www.pas.gov.uk) should be completed to ensure that this aspect is covered.

The Duty to Co-operate will also be assessed as part of the examination process.

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<i>Positively Prepared: the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development.</i>		

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p><i>Vision and Objectives</i></p> <p>Has the LPA clearly identified what the issues are that the DPD is seeking to address? Have priorities been set so that it is clear what the DPD is seeking to achieve?</p> <p>Does the DPD contain clear vision(s) and objectives which are specific to the place? Is there a direct relationship between the identified issues, the vision(s) and the objectives?</p> <p>Is it clear how the policies will meet the objectives? Are there any obvious gaps in the policies, having regard to the objectives of the DPD?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sections of the DPD and other documents which set out (where applicable) the vision, strategic objectives, key outcomes expected, spatial portrait and issues to be addressed. • Relevant sections of the DPD which explain how policies derive from the objectives and are designed to meet them. • The strategic objectives of the DPD, and the commentary in the DPD of how they derive from the spatial portrait and vision, and how the objectives are consistent with one another. • Sections of the DPD which address delivery, the means of delivery and the timescales for key developments through evidenced infrastructure delivery planning. • Confirmation from the relevant agencies that they support the objectives and the identified means of delivery. 	<p>The vision and objectives, and the Local Plan strategic priorities are set out in Section 2. The key issues and strategic priorities from duty to cooperate engagement are also set out in Section 2, and in the Duty to Cooperate Statement of Compliance.</p> <p>The spatial portrait is set out in the separate Mansfield Today document which is a comprehensive review of the state of the district. The issues raised in this document have helped inform the key issues within the Local Plan. Please also see the Vision and Objectives Background Paper 2018. The key outcome of the plan is for the vision to be met. Targets against each policy are set out in the monitoring framework in Appendix 13.</p> <p>Appendix 3 presents a table linking the objectives with the policies and strategic priorities and shows that there are no policy gaps. Paragraph 2.6 of the DPD explains how the objectives have been the guiding principles for the policies. The Vision and Objectives Background Paper shows how the objectives are consistent with one another.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.6 (in Section 2) explains how the 14 objectives in the plan take forward the planning vision, and how they address the strategic priorities, deliver the vision and deal with the key issues. Paragraph 2.7 refers to how there may be policies that work towards a number of objectives.</p> <p>Section 9 covers infrastructure and Section 13 implementation. Each policy in the plan has a supporting information table that refers to delivery as well as evidence, NPPF connections and relevant objectives.</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p>Have reasonable alternatives to the quantum of development and overall spatial strategy been considered? Are the policies internally consistent?</p> <p>Are there realistic timescales related to the objectives?</p> <p>Does the DPD explain how its key policy objectives will be achieved?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information in the local development scheme, or provided separately, about the scope and content (actual and intended) of each DPD showing how they combine to provide a coherent policy structure. 	<p>Each of the relevant agencies has signed a Statement of Common Ground (SOCG) in support of the Local Plan and the identified means of delivery, as set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). All SOCGs are available on our website.</p> <p>The latest Local Development Scheme (May 2018) confirms that a Local Plan and a separate Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations DPD are being produced for Mansfield district. The LDS usefully refers to several Supplementary Planning Documents that are intended to be produced.</p> <p>Reasonable alternatives to what became the preferred approach were considered at the Regulation 18 stage of plan preparation and also through the ongoing sustainability appraisal process.</p> <p>The policies are internally consistent and it is intended that the objectives are to be achieved by the end of the plan period.</p> <p>A table showing the relationship of the objectives with the policies is provided in Appendix 3.</p>
<p><i>The presumption in favour of sustainable development (NPPF paras 6-17)</i></p> <p>Plans and decisions need to take local circumstances into account, so that they respond to the different opportunities for achieving sustainable development in</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An evidence base which establishes the development needs of the plan area (see Justified below) and includes a flexible approach to delivery (see 'Section 3 Effective', below) An audit trail showing how and why the 	<p>The housing needs work is based on the standardised housing methodology, replacing the previous approach which was based on the Outer Nottingham Strategic Housing Market Area Assessment (2015). The standardised methodology produces a lower housing requirement for the plan area (279 dwellings per annum) and alleviates concerns over the</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p>different areas.</p> <p>Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, unless:</p> <p>—any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or</p> <p>—specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.</p>	<p>quantum of development, preferred overall strategy and plan area distribution of development were arrived at.</p>	<p>district’s ability to deliver the SHMA target of 376 dpa.</p> <p>The local housing need produced by the standardised methodology is a starting point; local planning authorities are able to increase their housing target to account for economic growth aspirations or strategic infrastructure (e.g. HS2) in their area.</p> <p>The plan includes a target of 325 dpa which uses the local housing need (LHN) figure of 279 dpa as a starting point. This will deliver an uplift against past delivery rates, and is also considered to align closely with the economic growth aspirations of the LEP (328 dpa). It is considered to be both aspirational and realistic in accordance with paragraph 154 of the NPPF.</p> <p>A Housing Technical Paper has been prepared which provides the justification for the council’s approach.</p> <p>Employment land requirements are derived from a forecasting study from 2015 – a county-wide piece of research that is fed into the Employment Technical Paper which appears well presented and justified.</p> <p>Retail and leisure development requirements are derived from the Mansfield Retail and Leisure Study 2017. This is a comprehensive and up to date piece of research that identifies additional floorspace requirements for the plan period. The study identifies a considerable quantity of additional comparison retail floorspace requirement for Mansfield town centre. After an extensive search of potential sites within and on the edge of the town centre no suitable sites have been found to meet the long term need. A Retail and Leisure Technical Paper has been produced explaining what efforts have been made to satisfy the requirement figures.</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of responding to opportunities for achieving sustainable development in different areas 	<p>The above information is also included in the explanatory text to Policy S2 (in Section 3).</p> <p>The two main areas of the district – the Mansfield urban area and Warsop Parish have been appropriately considered as separate opportunities for sustainable development through the preparation of the evidence base.</p>
<p>Policies in Local Plans should follow the approach of the presumption in favour of sustainable development so that it is clear that development which is sustainable can be approved without delay. All plans should be based upon and reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development, with clear policies that will guide how the presumption should be applied locally.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A policy or policies which reflect the principles of the presumption in favour of sustainable development (see model policy at www.planningportal.gov.uk) 	<p>Policy S1 presents the presumption in favour of sustainable development in line with the model policy.</p>
<p><i>Objectively assessed needs</i> The economic, social and environmental needs of the authority area addressed and clearly presented in a fashion which makes effective use of land and specifically promotes mixed use development, and take account of cross-boundary and strategic issues. Note: Meeting these needs should be subject to the caveats specified in Paragraph 14 of the NPPF (see above).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Background evidence papers demonstrating requirements based on population forecasts, employment projections and community needs. Technical papers demonstrating how the aspirations and objectives of the DPD are related to the evidence, and how these are to be met, including from consultation and associated with the Duty to Co-operate. 	<p>The housing, employment and retail technical papers have been referred to above. In terms of community needs an open space assessment has been carried out, as has a Playing Pitch Strategy and Green Infrastructure evidence gathering. Comprehensive work has also been carried out in terms of infrastructure planning covering all the community and public utility services.</p> <p>The Duty to Cooperate Statement of Compliance 2018 usefully sets out the comprehensive work that has been carried out with relevant bodies in relation to strategic matters.</p> <p>Firm confirmation is given of close working between the three district councils in the Outer Nottingham area through the publication of the Memorandum of Understanding and the Statement of Common Ground.</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
NPPF Principles: Delivering sustainable development		
1. Building a strong, competitive economy (paras 18-22)		
Set out a clear economic vision and strategy for the area which positively and proactively encourages sustainable economic growth (21),	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Articulation of a clear economic vision and strategy for the plan area linked to the Economic Strategy, LEP Strategy and marine policy documents where appropriate. 	<p>The Plan is well grounded on the Ashfield and Mansfield Economic Strategy (A Plan for Growth) and refers to how this strategy is in accordance with the higher level Derby, Derbyshire, Nottingham and Nottinghamshire (D2N2) Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) Growth Strategy.</p> <p>Policy S2 sets out the minimum amount of employment land that the Local Plan will make provision for in the district (41 ha), and policies E2, SUE1 and SUE2 allocate specific sites to contribute towards this. Key and general employment areas are protected by Policy E3.</p>
Recognise and seek to address potential barriers to investment, including poor environment or any lack of infrastructure, services or housing (21)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A criteria-based policy which meets identified needs and is positive and flexible in planning for specialist sectors, regeneration, infrastructure provision, environmental enhancement. • An up-to-date assessment of the deliverability of allocated employment sites, to meet local needs, (taking into account that LPAs should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of an allocated site being used for that purpose) para (22) 	<p>A key barrier to economic growth is the lack of a skilled workforce and associated employment. The policy relating to training aims to address this issue (Policy E5).</p> <p>Policy S5 appropriately refers to regeneration initiatives and the visitor economy policy (Policy RT12) picks-up another opportunity for investment. Policy E4 encourages economic growth outside of allocated employment sites, subject to criteria.</p> <p>The Employment Land Review 2017 succinctly brings together extensive work that has been carried out assessing land in current employment use and potential new sites. Policy application to retain land for employment uses is appropriately focussed on Key / General Employment Areas and allocated sites.</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
2. Ensuring the vitality of town centres (paras 23-37)		
Policies should be positive, promote competitive town centre environments, and set out policies for the management and growth of centres over the plan period (23)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Plan and its policies may include such matters as: definition of networks and hierarchies; defining town centres; encouragement of residential development on appropriate sites; allocation of appropriate edge of centre sites where suitable and viable town centre sites are not available; consideration of retail and leisure proposals which cannot be accommodated in or adjacent to town centres. 	The retail chapter clearly identifies a logical hierarchy of centres (identified on the policies map) with appropriate policies (Policy RT1). The advantages of having residential development in centres is recognised (Policy RT2 and Policy RT4) and the sequential approach to considering retail and leisure schemes is set out (Policy RT1). Sites are allocated for retail development to meet the short to medium term requirement (Policy RT6).
Allocate a range of suitable sites to meet the scale and type of retail, leisure, commercial, office, tourism, cultural, community services and residential development needed in town centres (23)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An assessment of the need to expand (the) town centre(s), considering the needs of town centre uses. Primary and secondary shopping frontages identified and allocated. 	<p>The prospect of expanding Mansfield town centre through the allocation of a number of edge of centre site has been considered by the Retail Viability Study (2016). This is referred to in the Retail and Leisure Technical Paper.</p> <p>Primary and secondary shopping frontages have been identified on the policies map and allocated with appropriate policies applied (Policy RT3).</p>
3. Supporting a prosperous rural economy (para 28)		
Support sustainable economic growth in rural areas. Planning strategies should promote a strong rural economy by taking a positive approach to new development. (28)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where relevant include a policy or policies which support the sustainable growth of rural businesses; promote the development and diversification of agricultural businesses; support sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments, and support local services and facilities. 	Policy S5 appropriately refers.
4. Promoting sustainable transport (paras 29-41)		

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p>Facilitate sustainable development whilst contributing to wider sustainability and health objectives. (29)</p> <p>Balance the transport system in favour of sustainable transport modes and give people a real choice about how they travel whilst recognising that different policies will be required in different communities and opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary from urban to rural areas. (29)</p> <p>Encourage solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and congestion (29) including supporting a pattern of development which, where reasonable to do so, facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport. (30)</p> <p>Local authorities should work with neighbouring authorities and transport providers to develop strategies for the provision of viable infrastructure necessary to support sustainable development. (31)</p> <p>Opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure. (32)</p> <p>Ensure that developments which generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised (34)</p> <p>Plans should protect and exploit opportunities for the use of sustainable transport modes for</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint working with adjoining authorities, transport providers and Government Agencies on infrastructure provision in order to support sustainable economic growth with particular regard to the facilities referred to in paragraph 31. • Policies encouraging development which facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport and a range of transport choices where appropriate, particularly the criteria in paragraph 35. • A spatial strategy and policy which seeks to reduce the need to travel through balancing housing and employment provision. • Policy for major developments which promotes a mix of uses and access to key facilities by sustainable transport modes. • If local (car parking) standards have been prepared, are they justified and necessary? (39) • Identification and protection of sites and routes where infrastructure could be developed to widen transport choice linked 	<p>Infrastructure planning and Duty to Co-operate work cover this aspect.</p> <p>Policy P3 covers sustainable transport at the neighbourhood level. Policy IN8 requires that development proposals involving significant levels of movements are situated in locations that are, or can be, well served by the full range of transport modes including public transport. Policy RT5 prioritises sustainable transport modes in relation to Mansfield town centre.</p> <p>The urban concentration approach of Policy S2 is underpinned by reducing the need to travel and the choice of strategic development sites has been greatly influenced by the scope to access these by sustainable transport modes. This is set out in the Site Selection Technical Paper. Mixed use opportunities are appropriately being pursued at the strategic development sites.</p> <p>Policy IN10 sets out that minimum standards and design standards must be met in accordance with guidance (currently provided by Nottinghamshire County Council). Also referred to in Policy P3. This is justified within the explanatory text, and considered necessary in order to achieve high design standards.</p> <p>Policy IN8 fully addresses the need to safeguard proposed transport sites and routes with public transport scheme requirements clearly identified for protection.</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p>the movement of goods or people. (35)</p> <p>Policies should aim for a balance of land uses so that people can be encouraged to minimize journey lengths for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities. (37)</p> <p>For larger scale residential developments in particular, planning policies should promote a mix of uses in order to provide opportunities to undertake day-to-day activities including work on site. Where practical, particularly within large-scale developments, key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties. (38)</p> <p>The setting of car parking standards including provision for town centres. (39-40)</p> <p>Local planning authorities should identify and protect, where there is robust evidence, sites and routes which could be critical in developing infrastructure to widen transport choice. (41)</p>	<p>to the Local Transport Plan.</p>	
<p>5. Supporting high quality communications infrastructure (paras 42-46)</p>		
<p>Support the expansion of the electronic communications networks, including telecommunications' masts and high speed broadband. (43)</p> <p>Local planning authorities should not impose a ban on new telecommunications development in certain areas, impose blanket Article 4 directions over a wide area or a wide range of telecommunications development or insist on minimum distances between new</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy supporting the expansion of electronic communications networks, including telecommunications and high speed broadband, noting the caveats in para 44. 	<p>Policy IN11 appropriately deals with these matters.</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
telecommunications development and existing development. (44)		
6. Delivering a wide choice of high quality housing (paras 47-55)		
Identify and maintain a rolling supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years' worth of housing against their housing requirements; this should include an additional buffer of 5% or 20% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to ensure choice and competition in the market for land. 20% buffer applies where there has been persistent under delivery of housing(47)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) five years or more supply of specific deliverable sites; plus the buffer as appropriate • Where this element of housing supply includes windfall sites, inclusion of 'compelling evidence' to justify their inclusion (48) • A SHLAA 	<p>Policy S2 sets out the housing target and distribution between 2013 and 2033, and policies H1 and H2 identify the allocated and committed sites that meet the target.</p> <p>Against the LHN/standardised methodology derived requirement figure (325 dwellings per annum), the housing trajectory shows a five years supply (plus 5% buffer) being deliverable in the early part of the plan period.</p> <p>The Housing Technical Paper (page 10) and Site Selection Technical Paper (page 4) refer to compelling evidence for the use of a modest windfall sites contribution.</p> <p>A Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) has been produced and is suitably up to date and comprehensive.</p>
Identify a supply of developable sites or broad locations for years 6-10 and, where possible, years 11-15 (47).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of a supply of developable sites or broad locations for: a) years 6-10; b) years 11-15 	<p>The Local Plan does not distinguish in policy terms the timing of housing site delivery but sufficient land has been identified as site allocations for the whole plan period.</p>
Illustrate the expected rate of housing delivery through a trajectory; and set out a housing implementation strategy describing how a five year supply will be maintained. (47)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A housing trajectory • Monitoring of completions and permissions (47) • Updated and managed SHLAA. (47) 	<p>A housing trajectory has been produced.</p> <p>The monitoring of completions and permissions is done annually and will be updated for submission and examination.</p> <p>The HELAA is up to date and will continue to be reviewed annually.</p>
Set out the authority's approach to housing density to reflect local circumstances (47).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy on the density of development. 	<p>A flexible policy on density, taking account of local character,</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		is included in the plan (Policy H3).
<p>Plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic and market trends, and needs of different groups (50) and caters for housing demand and the scale of housing supply to meet this demand. (para 159)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy on planning for a mix of housing (including self-build, and housing for older people • SHMA • Identification of the size, type, tenure and range of housing) required in particular locations, reflecting local demand. (50) • Evidence for housing provision based on up to date, objectively assessed needs. (50) • Policy on affordable housing and consideration for the need for on-site provision or if off-site provision or financial contributions are sought, where these can these be justified and to what extent do they contribute to the objective of creating mixed and balanced communities. (50) 	<p>Policies that cover housing mix (H3), tenure (H3), self-build accommodation (H5) and specialist housing (H6) are each included in the plan.</p> <p>The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA 2015) considered the need for affordable housing, elderly and specialist housing need and the mix of homes required. Additional evidence has been provided by the 'Housing Needs of Particular Groups' study.</p> <p>As referred to above.</p> <p>The approach taken and evidence used is clearly explained in the Housing Technical Paper.</p> <p>There is a policy on affordable housing which on site provision and off-site financial contributions all related to the need to create mixed and balanced communities.</p>
<p>In rural areas be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs, particularly for affordable housing, including through rural exception sites where appropriate (54). In rural areas housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of allowing some market housing to facilitate the provision of significant additional affordable housing to meet local needs. • Consideration of the case for resisting inappropriate development of residential gardens. (This is discretionary)(para 53) 	<p>Rural exception sites are not needed in the plan area.</p> <p>There is not a need for a policy for development in residential gardens as inappropriate proposals can be controlled through the application of policies P2 and P7.</p> <p>Policy S5 covers this as far as is necessary for the plan area</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Examples of special circumstances to allow new isolated homes listed at para 55. 	otherwise it is appropriate to rely upon national policy.
7. Requiring good design (paras 56-68)		
Develop robust and comprehensive policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area (58).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inclusion of policy or policies which seek to increase the quality of development through the principles set out at para 58 and approaches in paras 59-61, linked to the vision for the area and specific local issues 	Section 4 (policies and supporting text) of the Local Plan fully embeds a design-led approach to development delivery taking account of the vision and local issues. Policy IN2 also sets out expectations for good quality design and connections.
8. Promoting healthy communities (paras 69-77)		
Policies should aim to design places which: promote community interaction, including through mixed-use development; are safe and accessible environments; and are accessible developments (69).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inclusion of a policy or policies on inclusive communities. Promotion of opportunities for meetings between members of the community who might not otherwise come into contact with each other, including through mixed-use developments which bring together those who work, live and play in the vicinity; safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion; and accessible developments, containing clear and legible pedestrian routes, and high quality public space, which encourage the active and continual use of public areas. (69) 	<p>The Local Plan picks-up the particularly pressing local need to address healthy communities in various ways – through design policies (Section 4), green and blue infrastructure initiatives (Policy IN2) and through facility infrastructure planning (Section 9) (for example the Mansfield Green Space Standard in association with Policy IN3 sets out a quality standard for the design of new open space which emphasises need to ensure they are inclusive and accessible for all and support social interaction).</p> <p>Policies P2 and P3 deal with safe and connected developments.</p> <p>The allocated strategic urban extensions (Section 8) are mixed use developments.</p>
Policies should plan positively for the provision and use of shared space, community facilities and other local services (70).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inclusion of a policy or policies addressing community facilities and local service. Positive planning for the provision and 	Policy IN7 recognises the importance of protecting local community facilities and the opportunities to use such

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
	<p>integration of community facilities and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments; safeguard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services; ensure that established shops, facilities and services are able to develop and modernize; and ensure that housing is developed in suitable locations which offer a range of community facilities and good access to key services and infrastructure.</p>	<p>buildings flexibly and in new ways to maintain their viability.</p> <p>The supporting text recognises how important these facilities are for sustainable communities.</p> <p>The settlement hierarchy is set out in Policy S2 and the supporting text reflects the importance of locating new development in areas which offer a range of facilities and good access to services and infrastructure.</p>
<p>Identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities; and set locally derived standards to provide these (73).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area. (73) • A policy protecting existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land from development, with specific exceptions. (74) • Protection and enhancement of rights of way and access. (75) 	<p>Thorough assessments have been done of open space and sport provision requirements with suitable policy approaches to protect and provide facilities. This is evidenced within the Community Open Space Assessment and the Playing Pitch Assessment, Playing Pitch Action Plan and Addendum applying Sport England's national development calculator.</p> <p>See Policy IN3.</p> <p>Policy IN2 ensures development proposals protect and enhance the functions and key assets of the green infrastructure network, which incorporates strategic trails, cycle trails, public rights of way and other local walking linkages. The main emphasis is to provide and maintain good recreational (walking and cycling) links between residential areas and green infrastructure networks, including providing access to the wider countryside</p> <p>Policy IN8 addresses the enhancement, including protecting and improving access to and along, multi-user trail networks.</p>
<p>Enable local communities, through local and neighbourhood plans, to identify special</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy enabling the protection of Local Green Spaces. (Local Green Spaces should 	<p>Policy IN6 addresses Local Green Spaces in accordance with</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
protection green areas of particular importance to them – ‘Local Green Space’ (76-78).	only be designated when a plan is prepared or reviewed, and be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period. The designation should only be used when it accords with the criteria in para 77). Policy for managing development within a local green space should be consistent with policy for Green Belts. (78)	NPPF provisions.
9. Protecting Green Belt land (paras 79-92)		
<p>Local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. (81)</p> <p>Local planning authorities with Green Belts in their area should establish Green Belt boundaries in their Local Plans which set the framework for Green Belt and settlement policy. (83)</p> <p>When drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development. (84)</p> <p>Boundaries should be set using ‘physical features likely to be permanent’ amongst other things (85)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where Green Belt policies are included, these should reflect the need to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt. (81) ○ Accord with criteria on boundary setting, and the need for clarity on the status of safeguarded land, in particular. (85) ○ Specify that inappropriate development should not be approved except in very special circumstances. (87) ○ Specify the exceptions to inappropriate development (89-90) ○ Identify where very special circumstances might apply to renewable energy development. (91) 	Not applicable.
10. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change (paras 93-108)		

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
Adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change taking full account of flood risk, coastal change and water supply and demand considerations. (94)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning of new development in locations and ways which reduce greenhouse gas emissions. • Support for energy efficiency improvements to existing building. • Local requirements for a building's sustainability which are consistent with the Government's zero carbon buildings policy. (95)) 	Policy P5 and Section 12 refer.
Help increase the use and supply of renewable and low carbon energy through a strategy, policies maximising renewable and low carbon energy, and identification of key energy sources. (97)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A strategy and policies to promote and maximise energy from renewable and low carbon sources, • Identification of suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy sources, and supporting infrastructure, where this would help secure the development of such sources (see also NPPF footnote 17) • Identification of where development can draw its energy supply from decentralised, renewable or low carbon supply systems and for co-locating potential heat customers and suppliers. (97) 	<p>Policy CC1 refers.</p> <p>The land suitable for wind energy generation is shown on the Policies Map and referred to in Policy CC1.</p>
Minimise vulnerability to climate change and manage the risk of flooding (99)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Account taken of the impacts of climate change. (99) • Allocate, and where necessary re-locate, development away from flood risk areas through a sequential test, based on a SFRA. (100) • Policies to manage risk, from a range of impacts, through suitable adaptation measures 	<p>Sites within Flood Zones 3a and 3b were generally not taken forward for assessment in the HELAA, and allocations have been prioritised on land within Flood Zone 1.</p> <p>Two sites (S4a and H1p) fall partially within Flood Zone 3, but the more sensitive parts (i.e. vulnerable types) of the development can be adequately located outside of FZ3. S4a is a key regeneration opportunity and H1p now has planning permission.</p> <p>We have worked closely with the EA to ensure our policy and</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		evidence base work approach is appropriate, applying the Sequential Test. This includes working jointly on the SFRA, SFRA Addendum and Mansfield Central Area Flood Risk Study. The latter incorporates a holistic approach to flood risk in and around the town centre (this includes site S4a). Policies P5, CC2, CC3 and CC4 refer.
Take account of marine planning (105)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure early and close co-operation on relevant economic, social and environmental policies with the Marine Management Organisation • Review the aims and objectives of the Marine Policy Statement, including local potential for marine-related economic development • Integrate as appropriate marine policy objectives into emerging policy • Support of integrated coastal management (ICM) in coastal areas in line with the requirements of the MPS 	Not applicable
Manage risk from coastal change (106)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of where the coast is likely to experience physical changes and identify Coastal Change Management Areas, and clarity on what development will be allowed in such areas. • Provision for development and infrastructure that needs to be re-located from such areas, based on SMPs and Marine Plans, where appropriate. 	Not applicable
11. Conserving and enhancing the natural environment (paras 109-125)		

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
Protect valued landscapes (109)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A strategy and policy or policies to create, protect, enhance and manage networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure. • Policy which seeks to minimise the loss of higher quality agricultural land and give great weight to protecting the landscape and scenic beauty of National Parks, the Broads and AONBs. 	<p>Policies NE2 and IN2 refer.</p> <p>Policy S5 refers to agricultural land. There are no nationally protected landscapes in the Plan area but Policy NE1 appropriately refers to landscape character. Landscape character was also considered when allocating sites. This is set out in the Site Selection Technical Paper (page 11).</p>
Prevent unacceptable risks from pollution and land instability (109)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy which seeks development which is appropriate for its location having regard to the effects of pollution on health, the natural environment or general amenity. 	<p>Policies NE3 and P7 refer.</p>
<p>Planning policies should minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity (117)</p> <p>Planning policies should plan for biodiversity at a landscape-scale across local authority boundaries (117)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification and mapping of local ecological networks and geological conservation interests. • Policies to promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the recovery of priority species 	<p>Policies NE2 and IN2 refer.</p> <p>The Mansfield District Council Green Infrastructure Study (2018) includes maps of ecological networks, of which are incorporated as part of the district's strategic green infrastructure networks.</p>
12. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment (paras 126-141)		
Include a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk (126)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A strategy for the historic environment based on a clear understanding of the cultural assets in the plan area, including assets most at risk. • A map/register of historic assets • A policy or policies which promote new development that will make a positive contribution to character and distinctiveness. (126) 	<p>Section 11 refers.</p> <p>The listings can be found online at http://www.mansfield.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=7087&p=0.</p> <p>Policies HE1 and HE2 refer.</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
13. Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals (paras 142-149)		
<p>It is important that there is a sufficient supply of material to provide the infrastructure, buildings, energy and goods that the country needs. However, since minerals are a finite natural resource, and can only be worked where they are found, it is important to make best use of them to secure their long-term conservation (142)</p> <p>Minerals planning authorities should plan for a steady and adequate supply of industrial materials (146)</p>	<p>Account taken of the matters raised in relation to paragraph 143 and 145, including matters in relation to land in national / international designations; landbanks; the defining of Minerals Safeguarding Areas; wider matters relating to safeguarding; approaches if non-mineral development is necessary within Minerals Safeguarding Areas; the setting of environmental criteria; development of noise limits; reclamation of land; plan for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates. This could include evidence of co-operation with neighbouring and more distant authorities.</p>	<p>Policy NE4 refers to minerals safeguarding; other aspects of minerals planning are county council matters.</p>
<p>Justified: <i>The plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence.</i></p> <p>To be 'justified' a DPD needs to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Founded on a robust and credible evidence base involving: research / fact finding demonstrating how the choices made in the plan are backed up by facts; and evidence of participation of the local community and others having a stake in the area. • The most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives. 		
<p><i>Participation</i></p> <p>Has the consultation process allowed for effective engagement of all interested parties?</p>	<p>The consultation statement. This should set out what consultation was undertaken, when, with whom and how it has influenced the plan. The statement should show that efforts have been made to consult hard to reach groups, key stakeholders etc. Reference SCI</p>	<p>A consultation statement has been prepared to set out how consultation has been carried out and how it has informed the plan.</p>
<p><i>Research / fact finding</i></p> <p>Is the plan justified by a sound and credible evidence base? What are the sources of evidence? How up to date, and how convincing is it?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The studies, reports and technical papers that provide the evidence for the policies set out in the DPD, the date of preparation and who they were 	<p>A comprehensive evidence base has been produced to support the plan. This can be found online at: http://www.mansfield.gov.uk/evidenceforthelocalplan</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p>What assumptions were made in preparing the DPD? Were they reasonable and justified?</p>	<p>produced by.</p> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sections of the DPD (at various stages of development) and SA Report which illustrate how evidence supports the strategy, policies and proposals, including key assumptions. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A very brief statement of how the main findings of consultation support the policies, with reference to: reports to the council on the issues raised during participation, covering both the front-loading and formulation phases; and any other information on community views and preferences. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For each policy (or group of policies dealing with the same issue), a very brief statement of the evidence documents relied upon and how they support the policy (where this is not already clear in the reasoned justification in the DPD). 	<p>Figure P1 on page 6 of the Local Plan shows the preparation process and how consultation and evidence have informed the plan. The technical reports explain how and why policy has changed through the plan's preparation. The consultation statement shows how the representations made have informed the plan.</p> <p>Section 6 of the SA Report explains how each policy has evolved between the Issues and Options, Consultation Draft, Preferred Option and Publication Draft stages. This includes details on the spatial strategy and the scale and distribution of growth, where the rationale and key assumptions for each option considered are set out.</p> <p>The plan includes a 'supporting information' table underneath each policy. This includes the evidence that has informed the policy.</p>
<p><i>Alternatives</i></p> <p>Can it be shown that the LPA's chosen approach is the most appropriate given the reasonable alternatives? Have the reasonable alternatives been considered and is there a clear audit trail showing how and why the preferred approach was arrived at? Where a balance had to be struck in taking decisions between competing alternatives, is it clear how and why the decisions were taken?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reports and consultation documents produced in the early stages setting out how alternatives were developed and evaluated, and the reasons for selecting the preferred strategy, and reasons for rejecting the alternatives. This should include options covering not just the spatial strategy, but also the quantum of development, strategic 	<p>The technical reports* produced at the Consultation Draft (CD), Preferred Options (PO) and Publication Draft (PD) stages of plan making explain why the council's approach is the most appropriate, and Section 6 of the SA Report sets out the assessment of options / alternatives for all policies and sites. There are two interim SA Reports which show how this has been an iterative process.</p> <p>Section 1 of the Local Plan states how the SA has been used</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p>Does the sustainability appraisal show how the different options perform and is it clear that sustainability considerations informed the content of the DPD from the start?</p>	<p>policies and development management policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An audit trail of how the evidence base, consultation and SA have influenced the plan. • Sections of the SA Report showing the assessment of options and alternatives. • Reports on how decisions on the inclusion of policy were made. • Sections of the consultation document demonstrating how options were developed and appraised. • Any other documentation showing how alternatives were developed and evaluated, including a report on how sustainability appraisal has influenced the choice of strategy and the content of policies. 	<p>as a tool to influence the content of the plan and to appraise policy and site options.</p> <p>Political decisions were made at key stages. The reports are available below:</p> <p>Consultation Draft (Item 15/88)</p> <p>Preferred Options (Item 17/70)</p> <p>Publication Draft (Item 18/68)</p> <p>Section 1 of the Local Plan provides a brief commentary on how alternatives have been considered throughout the plan preparation process, consultation and the SA. The SA, which demonstrates how options were developed and appraised, was also available for consultation purposes.</p> <p>*Technical reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing Technical Paper 2018 (PD) • Site Selection Technical Paper 2018 (PD) • Employment Technical Paper 2018 (PD) • Retail and Leisure Technical Paper 2018 (PD) • Gypsy and Traveller Technical Paper 2018 (PD) • Vision and Objectives Technical Paper 2018 (PD) • Education Technical Paper 2018 • Housing Technical Paper 2017 (PO) • Employment Technical Paper 2017 (PO) • Housing Technical Paper 2015 (CD) • Employment Technical Paper 2015 (CD)

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retail and Leisure Technical Paper 2015 (CD) • Alternative Options Technical Paper 2016 (CD)
<p>Effective: <i>the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities.</i></p> <p>To be 'effective' a DPD needs to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be deliverable • Demonstrate sound infrastructure delivery planning • Have no regulatory or national planning barriers to its delivery • Have delivery partners who are signed up to it • Be coherent with the strategies of neighbouring authorities • Demonstrate how the Duty to Co-operate has been fulfilled • Be flexible • Be able to be monitored 		
<p><i>Deliverable and Coherent</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is it clear how the policies will meet the Plan's vision and objectives? Are there any obvious gaps in the policies, having regard to the objectives of the DPD? • Are the policies internally consistent? • Are there realistic timescales related to the objectives? • Does the DPD explain how its key policy objectives will be achieved? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sections of the DPD which address delivery, the means of delivery and the timescales for key developments and initiatives. • Confirmation from the relevant agencies that they support the objectives and the identified means of delivery, such as evidence that the plans and programmes of other bodies have been taken into account (e.g. Water Resources Management Plans and Marine Plans). • Information in the local development scheme, or provided separately, about 	<p>The supporting information table for each policy refers to how they will be delivered. The monitoring framework in Appendix 13 will ensure remedial action is taken if delivery is not on target. The housing trajectory in Appendix 5 shows the predicted timescales for housing developments to be delivered.</p> <p>Sections 1 and 2 of the Local Plan refer to the Duty to Cooperate, with the strategic matters set out in paragraph 2.3. Full details are set out in the Duty to Cooperate Statement. A Developers Forum and Growth Delivery Group have been set up to assist in the delivery of sites.</p> <p>There are no obvious policy gaps and the policies are internally consistent. The Gypsy and Traveller Site</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
	<p>the scope and content (actual and intended) of each DPD showing how they combine to provide a coherent policy structure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section in the DPD that shows the linkages between the objectives and the corresponding policies, and consistency between policies (such as through a matrix). 	<p>Allocations DPD will allocate sites needed to meet the district's requirements for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation. This is shown in the LDS and in the Reg 18 consultation (Scoping) report for the above DPD.</p> <p>The supporting information table for each policy refers to which objective/s the policy meets. A matrix in Appendix 3 of the plan provides objective and policy linkages, and includes related strategic priorities. The objectives are all set to be achieved by the end of the Plan period.</p>
<p><i>Infrastructure Delivery</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have the infrastructure implications of the policies clearly been identified? Are the delivery mechanisms and timescales for implementation of the policies clearly identified? Is it clear who is going to deliver the required infrastructure and does the timing of the provision complement the timescale of the policies? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A section or sections of the DPD where infrastructure needs are identified and the proposed solutions put forward. A schedule setting out responsibilities for delivery, mechanisms and timescales, and related to a CIL schedule where appropriate. Confirmation from infrastructure providers that they support the solutions proposed and the identified means and timescales for their delivery, or a plan for resolving issues. Demonstrable plan-wide viability, particularly in relation to the delivery of affordable housing and the role of a CIL schedule. 	<p>Section 9 comprehensively covers infrastructure delivery. Additional, site specific, infrastructure needs are reflected in the site allocation policies where necessary. For example housing allocation H1b requires, inter alia, improvements to existing pathways for walking and cycling and contributions towards the mitigation of impacts at two specific road junctions.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) identifies implementation responsibilities and records standard practice / agreements reached with providers. The infrastructure providers have been consulted as part of the preparation of the IDP.</p> <p>An Education Technical Paper has been prepared which sets out how and when schools will be delivered to support growth.</p> <p>Each of the relevant agencies has signed a Statement of Common Ground (SOCG) in support of the Local Plan and the identified means of delivery, as set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). All SOCGs are available on our website.</p> <p>A broad brush Local Plan Viability Assessment has been completed. It has found that the plan as a whole is marginally viable although further work has been</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		commissioned to explore this in greater detail.
<p><i>Co-ordinated Planning</i></p> <p>Does the DPD reflect the concept of spatial planning? Does it go beyond traditional land use planning by bringing together and integrating policies for the development and use of land with other policies and programmes from a variety of agencies / organisations that influence the nature of places and how they function?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sections of the DPD that reflect the plans or strategies of the local authority and other bodies • Policies which seek to pull together different policy objectives • Expressions of support/representations from bodies responsible for other strategies affecting the area 	<p>Section 2 of the Local Plan (and the Duty to Cooperate Statement) sets out how the council has worked with our neighbours and strategic partners on a range of issues of strategic matters.</p> <p>The introductory paragraphs of the employment section refer to relevant strategies that the policies address. The retail chapter includes the town centre vision which has been written in consultation with town centre partners.</p> <p>Examples where different policy objectives are pulled together are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policy H6 (Specialist housing). This seeks to ensure that the more specialist housing needs of the elderly and people with disabilities are met. As a result this can improve the health and wellbeing of residents, and may help to reduce the length of hospital stays as residents would be returning to suitable accommodation. These outcomes are positive for the NHS. The policy is likely to also help to free up larger properties for families; ▪ Policy RT11 (Hot food takeaways). This seeks to restrict the availability of unhealthy food in close proximity of schools in an attempt to improve health and wellbeing and reduce obesity levels. As above this is expected to have a positive outcome for the NHS in the long term; ▪ Policy IN2 (Green infrastructure). This pulls together a range of policy objectives such as high quality design, improved health and wellbeing, climate change, sustainable transport, and protecting and enhancing important natural resources). <p>Each of the relevant agencies has signed a Statement of Common Ground (SOCG) in support of the Local Plan and the</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		identified means of delivery, as set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). All SOCGs are available on our website.
<p><i>Flexibility</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the DPD flexible enough to respond to a variety of, or unexpected changes in, circumstances? • Does the DPD include the remedial actions that will be taken if the policies need adjustment? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sections of the DPD setting out the assumptions of the plan and identifying the circumstances when policies might need to be reviewed. • Sections of the annual monitoring report and sustainability appraisal report describing how the council will monitor: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the effectiveness of policies and what evidence is being collected to undertake this b. changes affecting the baseline information and any information on trends on which the DPD is based • Risk analysis of the strategy and policies to demonstrate robustness and how the plan could cope with changing circumstances • Sections within the DPD dealing with possible change areas and how they would be dealt with, including mechanisms for the rate of development to be increased or slowed and how that would impact on other aspects of the strategy and on infrastructure provision • Sections of the DPD identifying the key 	<p>Policy IM1 refers to delivery related circumstances when plan review work would be triggered. Appendix 13 sets out the monitoring framework to be used for annual monitoring of the plan, with possible remedial actions and trigger points specified.</p> <p>Section 8 of the SA Report sets out recommended measures to monitor the significant effects of the plan. Where possible to avoid duplication, the measures replicate those that will be used to monitor the Local Plan. At this stage, it is only necessary to identify 'potential' monitoring measures for consideration. However, a monitoring framework must be finalised upon Adoption of the Plan; with measures set out in an SA Statement.</p> <p>A risk analysis of the Local Plan strategy and policies has been undertaken and is at Appendix A of this assessment.</p> <p>In order to ensure the delivery of sufficient houses to meet the housing target, an additional allowance has been allocated. This flexibility allows for slower than anticipated delivery, planning permissions which may lapse, and changing economic circumstances which may affect the take-up of housing. It also provides a good choice of sites.</p> <p>The housing trajectory (Appendix 5) refers to the estimated pace of housing delivery. Delivery will not be phased.</p> <p>Policy IM1 refers.</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
	<p>indicators of success of the strategy, and the remedial actions which will be taken if adjustment is required.</p>	
<p><i>Co-operation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the Duty to Co-operate has been undertaken appropriately for the plan being examined? • Is it clear who is intended to implement each part of the DPD? Where the actions required are outside the direct control of the LPA, is there evidence that there is the necessary commitment from the relevant organisation to the implementation of the policies? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A succinct Duty to Co-operate Statement which flows from the strategic issues that have been addressed jointly. A ‘tick box’ approach or a collection of correspondence is not sufficient, and it needs to be shown (where appropriate) if joint plan-making arrangements have been considered, what decisions were reached and why. • The Duty to Co-operate Statement could highlight: the sharing of ideas, evidence and pooling of resources; the practical policy outcomes of co-operation; how decisions were reached and why; and evidence of having effectively co-operated to plan for issues which need other organisations to deliver on, common objectives for elements of strategy and policy; a memorandum of understanding; aligned or joint core strategies and liaison with other consultees as appropriate. 	<p>Duty to Cooperate work is well embedded in the plan making process and is taken to a suitably formalised position with nearby local authorities. The Duty to Cooperate Statement, and Statements of Common Ground demonstrate this.</p> <p>Examples of how the Duty to Cooperate has informed the plan include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • collaboration with Bolsover District Council who requested that we include a mirror policy to theirs on the Pleasley Mills area (which straddles the boundary between the two districts) in order that both authorities have a joined up approach towards any future development / regeneration proposals; • the procurement of evidence bases and working on joint methodologies with neighbouring authorities – such as the SHMA, ELFS and GTANA.
<p><i>Monitoring</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the DPD contain targets, and milestones which relate to the delivery of the policies, (including housing trajectories where the DPD contains housing allocations)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sections of the DPD setting out indicators, targets and milestones • Sections of the current annual monitoring report which report on indicators, targets, milestones and 	<p>Section 13 covers this and is supplemented by a monitoring framework in Appendix 13 as set out above.</p> <p>Pages 5 and 6 of the 2017 AMR give the targets for the production of the Local Plan. Page 7 refers to the housing target, pages 11 and 12 refer to the employment target.</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is it clear how targets are to be measured (by when, how and by whom) and are these linked to the production of the annual monitoring report? • Is it clear how the significant effects identified in the sustainability appraisal report will be taken forward in the ongoing monitoring of the implementation of the plan, through the annual monitoring report? 	<p>trajectories</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference to any other reports or technical documents which contain information on the delivery of policies • Sections of the current annual monitoring report and the sustainability appraisal report setting out the framework for monitoring, including monitoring the effects of the DPD against the sustainability appraisal 	<p>Other indicators are from page 13 onwards. This report will be re-formatted to use the monitoring framework set out in Appendix 13 of the Local Plan.</p> <p>The council also produces housing, employment and retail monitoring reports. The SA Report proposes indicators to monitor the effects of the Local Plan against the SA which will be incorporated into the AMR. A baseline AMR will be prepared for submission.</p>
<p><i>Consistent with national policy: the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.</i></p> <p>The DPD should not contradict or ignore national policy. Where there is a departure, there must be clear and convincing reasoning to justify the approach taken.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the DPD contain any policies or proposals which are not consistent with national policy and, if so, is there local justification? • Does the DPD contain policies that do not add anything to existing national guidance? If so, why have these been included? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sections of the DPD which explain where and how national policy has been elaborated upon and the reasons. • Studies forming evidence for the DPD or, where appropriate, other information which provides the rationale for departing from national policy. • Evidence provided from the sustainability appraisal (including reference to the sustainability report) and/or from the results of community involvement. • Where appropriate, evidence of consistency with national marine policy as articulated in the UK Marine Policy Statement • Reports or copies of correspondence as 	<p>The Local Plan housing requirement has been calculated using the standardised housing methodology despite the Local Plan being submitted whilst transitional arrangements are in place. More information and justification is within the Housing Technical Paper (Sections 5 and 6). This has been appraised through the SA process, with information in Section 6.3 (pages 36 – 38) of the SA Report. All other Local Plan policies are consistent with national policy, as set out in NPPF 2012.</p> <p>Policy S1 (Presumption in favour of sustainable development) repeats paragraph 14 of the NPPF. However it was considered important to include the policy to embed the presumption in favour of sustainable development as part of the plan. It also sets out clearly that the council will work proactively with applicants and stakeholders to seek solutions that would allow an application to be approved.</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
	to how representations have been considered and dealt with.	

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Planning policy for traveller sites

Planning Policy for Traveller Sites was published in 23 March 2012 and came into effect on 27 March 2012. Circular 01/06: Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites and Circular 04/07: Planning for Travelling Showpeople have been cancelled. Planning Policy for Traveller Sites should be read in conjunction with the National Planning Policy Framework, including the implementation policies of that document.

The government's aim in relation to planning for traveller sites is:

'To ensure fair and equal treatment for travellers, in a way that facilitates the traditional and nomadic life of travellers whilst respecting the interests of the settled community'.

Government's aims in respect of traveller sites are:

- That local planning authorities (LPAs) make their own assessment of need for the purposes of planning
- That LPAs work collaboratively, develop fair and effective strategies to meet need through the identification of land for sites
- Plan for sites over a reasonable timescale
- Plan-making should protect green belt land from inappropriate development
- Promote more private traveller site provision whilst recognising that there will always be those travellers who cannot provide their own sites
- Aim to reduce the number of unauthorised developments and encampments and make enforcement more effective.

In addition local planning authorities should:

- Include fair, realistic and inclusive policies
- Increase the number of traveller sites in appropriate locations with planning permission, to address under provision and maintain an appropriate level of supply
- Reduce tensions between settled and traveller communities in plan-making and decision-taking
- Enable provision of suitable accommodation from which travellers can access education, health, welfare and employment infrastructure
- Have due regard to protection of local amenity and local environment

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Policy Expectations	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
Policy A: Using evidence to plan positively and manage development (para 6)		
Early and effective community engagement with both settled and traveller communities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early and effective engagement undertaken, including discussing travellers' accommodation needs with travellers themselves, their representative bodies and local support groups. 	This was done as part of the Mansfield District Council Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment (GTANA) 2017.
Co-operate with travellers, their representative bodies and local support groups, other local authorities and relevant interest groups to prepare and maintain an up-to-date understanding of likely permanent and transit accommodation needs of their areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstration of a clear understanding of the needs of the traveller community over the lifespan of your development plan. • Collaborative working with neighbouring local planning authorities. • A robust evidence base to establish accommodation needs to inform the preparation of your local plan and make planning decisions. 	<p>The GTANA refers, as does the Duty to Co-operate work.</p> <p>Meetings were held with the Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group (who are not exclusive to Derbyshire) to develop a clear understanding of need, and we worked collaboratively with neighbouring lpas when preparing the methodology for the GTANA.</p>
Policy B: Planning for traveller sites (paras 7-11)		
Set pitch targets for gypsies and travellers and plot targets for travelling showpeople which address the likely permanent and transit site accommodation needs of travellers in your area, working collaboratively with neighbouring LPAs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification, and annual update, of a supply of specific, deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5 years worth of sites against locally set target. Identification of a supply of specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth for years 6-10, and, where possible, for years 11-15. • An assessment of the need for traveller sites, and where an unmet 	<p>The GTANA identifies a small target of three pitches and one transit pitch over the plan period.</p> <p>No land has been identified. The Gypsy and Traveller Technical</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Policy Expectations	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p>Set criteria to guide land supply allocations where there is identified need.</p> <p>Ensure that traveller sites are sustainable economically, socially and environmentally.</p>	<p>need has been demonstrated a supply of specific, deliverable sites been identified.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy which takes into account criteria a-h of para 11 	<p>Paper sets out the process taken to try and identify land for these pitches, and the decision to produce a separate allocations DPD.</p> <p>The Local Plan includes a policy (H8) should a windfall site come forward in advance of the DPD.</p>
<p>Policy C: Sites in rural areas and the countryside (para 12)</p>		
<p>When assessing the suitability of sites in rural or semi-rural settings LPAs should ensure that the scale of such sites do not dominate the nearest settled community.</p>		<p>Policy H8 (3) (c) refers.</p>
<p>Policy D: Rural exception sites (para 13)</p>		
<p>If there is a lack of affordable land to meet local traveller needs, LPAs in rural areas, where viable and practical, should consider allocating and releasing sites solely for affordable travellers' sites.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If a rural exception site policy is used, and if so clarity that such sites shall be used for affordable traveller sites in perpetuity. 	<p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>Policy E: Traveller sites in Green Belt (paras 14-15)</p>		
<p>Traveller sites (both permanent and temporary) in the Green Belt are inappropriate</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt boundary revisions made in response to a specific identified need for a traveller site, undertaken through the plan 	<p>Not applicable.</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Policy Expectations	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p>development.</p> <p>Exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (which might be to accommodate a site inset within the Green Belt) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site ... should be done only through the plan-making process.</p>	<p>making process.</p>	
<p>Policy F: Mixed planning use traveller sites (paras 16-18)</p>		
<p>Local planning authorities should consider, wherever possible, including traveller sites suitable for mixed residential and business uses, having regard to the safety and amenity of the occupants and neighbouring residents.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of the need for sites for mixed residential and business use (having regard to safety and amenity of the occupants and neighbouring residents), or separate sites in close proximity to one another. • N.B. Mixed use should not be permitted on rural exception sites 	<p>Policy H8 (3) (b) requires that sites have reasonable access to a range of services. A mixed use site is not specifically mentioned, but would not be unacceptable in principle.</p>
<p>Policy G: Major development projects (para 19)</p>		
<p>Local planning authorities should work with the planning applicant and the affected traveller community to identify a site or sites suitable for relocation of the community if a major development proposal requires the permanent or temporary relocation of a traveller site.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where a major development proposal requires the permanent or temporary relocation of a traveller site, the identification of a site or sites suitable for re-location of the community. 	<p>The GTANA addendum identifies a further need for two Travelling Show People pitches which had become apparent since the original needs assessment in 2017. One of the communities in need of a pitch is currently located on housing allocation site H1t (Ley Lane).</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Policy Expectations	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		They are partial land owners of the site and work is ongoing to find a new site. This will be included within the Gypsy and Travellers Site Allocations DPD.

Integration of marine and terrestrial planning NOT APPLICABLE – this section has been deleted.

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Appendix A – Risk Assessment of Policies

The guidance on the Self-Assessment Checklist indicates that there is a need for an assessment of risk. This should be an analysis of the strategy and policies to demonstrate robustness and how the plan could cope with changing circumstances. To this end an assessment of risk has been undertaken to establish the overall level of risk to the implementation of the policy and what mitigation could be put in place to eliminate or reduce the level of risk.

The assessments seeks to identify potential hazards to the implementation of the policy and then establish both the impact of that hazard and the likelihood of that hazard occurring. Together the assessment of impact and likelihood informs the overall level of risk. Mitigation is then identified; this could include amendments to the policy or supporting text in the local plan or additional work with partners such as the D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership or Homes England. In some cases the risk needs to be balanced against other benefits such as the need to protect the viability or vitality of the town centre or achieve good quality design.

Policy	Hazards	Impact High Medium Low	Likelihood Very Likely Likely Unlikely	Overall Risk High Moderate Low	Mitigation How could risk be reduced to a lower level or eliminated?
Policy S1 – Presumption in favour of sustainable development	Evidence underpinning policies becomes out of date	Medium – will depend on what evidence is out of date but may require review of the local plan especially if related to housing numbers.	Likely – aware that some of the evidence base is in the process of being replaced. Household projections are released every two years	Moderate	Keep evidence up to date

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Policy S2 – Spatial strategy	Housing completions do not meet required level	High – would require review of the plan and mean sufficient homes not being built.	Likely – long term average completions are 308dpa while target is 325dpa	Moderate	<p>Establish forums/groups to explore constraints to delivery and ways of overcoming them with developers; this could include bidding for funding from D2N2 and or Homes England.</p> <p>Allocation of sufficient land to provide a buffer.</p> <p>Include monitoring process to ensure that up to date information on delivery is available.</p>
	Retail and employment supply does not meet requirements	High – would require review of the plan and mean sufficient jobs and services not provided	Likely – retail faces tough trading conditions. Employment land is challenging to deliver	Moderate	<p>Establish forums/groups to explore constraints to delivery and ways of overcoming them with developers; this could include bidding for funding from D2N2 and or Homes England.</p> <p>Allocation of sufficient land to provide a buffer.</p> <p>Include monitoring process to ensure that up to date information on delivery is available.</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

	Housing completions do not accord with distribution strategy identified.	Medium – would require review of plan to ensure that infrastructure kept pace with the location of growth	Unlikely (subject to there being a five year housing land supply) – Once adopted the local plan should avoid this scenario. Proposed allocations in Warsop Parish are largely based on extant planning permissions	Low	Ensure adoption of Local Plan. Ensure decision makers understand the Spatial Strategy.
S3 – Urban regeneration	Push for the redevelopment of previously developed land leads to poor quality development	Medium – want to avoid poor quality developments but needs to be balanced against benefit of redevelopment of previously developed land	Likely – aware of viability issues with redevelopment of previously developed land	Moderate	Establish clear but flexible policies regarding the quality of development Ensure that proposals are robustly tested against these policies and that proposals of lower quality are only granted where benefits outweigh the harm.

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

S4 – Delivering key regeneration sites	Push for the redevelopment of identified sites leads to poor quality development	Medium – want to avoid poor quality developments but needs to be balanced against benefit of redevelopment of previously developed land	Likely – aware of viability issues with redevelopment of previously developed land and desire to see redevelopment	Moderate	<p>Establish clear but flexible policies regarding the quality of development</p> <p>Ensure that proposals are robustly tested against these policies and that proposals of lower quality are only granted where benefits outweigh the harm.</p> <p>Consider need for AAP or SPD.</p>
	Identified sites are not delivered	Medium – sustainably located previously developed sites remain unused/under used	Likely – redevelopment will require significant work by a number of partners. Sites have been unused/under used for a number of years	Moderate	<p>Establish working groups to explore constraints to delivery and ways of overcoming them with developers. This include bidding for funding from D2N2 and Homes England.</p> <p>Ensure that all tools at disposal are used.</p> <p>Consider need for AAP or SPD.</p>
S5 – Development in the Countryside	Policy applied too flexibly leading to over development in the country side	Medium – overdevelopment in the countryside to be avoided but will occur over a number of years	Unlikely - Policy and context is clear on the nature and type of development that is acceptable	Low	<p>Ensure that policy understood by decision makers</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

	Policy applied too restrictively leading to necessary development in the countryside being refused	Medium – appropriate to allow some development in the countryside to achieve a number of sustainability benefits	Unlikely - Policy and context is clear on the nature and type of development that is acceptable	Low	Ensure that policy understood by decision makers
P1 – Achieving high quality development	Requirements increase cost of development affecting viability	Medium – development needs to be viable to come forward	Likely – Potential higher costs associated with requirements although not always the case	Moderate	Ensure that potential for increased costs taken into account in viability assessments Additional cost to be balanced against benefit of improving design.
P2 – Safe, healthy and attractive development	Requirements increase cost of development affecting viability	Medium – development needs to be viable to come forward	Likely – Potential higher costs associated with requirements although not always the case	Moderate	Ensure that potential for increased costs taken into account in viability assessments Additional cost to be balanced against benefit of improving design.
P3 – Connected developments	Requirements increase cost of development affecting viability	Medium – development needs to be viable to come forward	Likely – Potential higher costs associated with requirements although not always the case	Moderate	Ensure that potential for increased costs taken into account in viability assessments Additional cost to be balanced against benefit of improving design.

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

P4 – Comprehensive Development	Requirement for masterplans on large sites difficult to deliver if all landowners do not work together	High – failure to prepare masterplan leads to difficulties with access and infrastructure provision	Unlikely – majority of sites proposed through local plan are in single ownership or landowners have agreed to work together.	Moderate	Ensure that benefit of working together is clear to all landowners
P5 – Climate change and new development	Requirements increase cost of development affecting viability	Medium – development needs to be viable to come forward	Likely – Potential higher costs associated with requirements although not always the case	Medium	Ensure that potential for increased costs taken into account in viability assessments Additional cost to be balanced against benefit of addressing climate change.
P6 – Home extensions and alterations	Different decision makers come to different views regarding a proposals impact on character / appearance and residential amenity.	Low – proposals for home extensions usually have a very local impact	Unlikely – concepts well understood and opportunities for officers to discuss proposals to ensure consistent approach	Low	Ensure that decision makers have training on these concepts
P7 – Amenity	Different decision makers come to different views regarding a proposals impact on amenity.	Medium – proposals may have a wider impact	Unlikely – concepts well understood and opportunities for officers to discuss proposals to ensure consistent approach	Medium	Ensure that decision makers have training on these concepts
P8 – Shop front design and signage	Policy is too restrictive leading to issues for businesses	Low – flexibility is built into the policy wording	Likely – some business likely to have specific requirements	Low	Ensure that policy is applied flexibly. Include guidance in design SPD to ensure policy applied correctly.

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

H1 – Housing allocations	Identified sites are not developed, are developed more slowly or a developed for fewer homes	High – failure to deliver housing target will lead to need to review plan	Likely – sites have been assessed for deliverability although remains uncertainty	High	Allocation of sufficient land to provide a buffer. Establish process to explore constraints to delivery and ways of overcoming them with developers
H2 – Committed Housing Sites	Identified sites are not developed, are developed more slowly or a developed for fewer homes	High – failure to deliver housing target will lead to need to review plan	Likely – sites have been assessed for deliverability although remains uncertainty	High	Allocation of sufficient land to provide a buffer. Establish process to explore constraints to delivery and ways of overcoming them with developers
H3 – Housing density and mix	Flexibility of policy means insufficient guidance given over what is an appropriate density	Medium – leads to lack of certainty for decision makers and developers	Likely – density generally with acceptable range but not always	Moderate	Provide supporting text to identify reasonable range.
	Flexibility of policy means insufficient guidance given over what is an appropriate mix	Medium – leads to lack of certainty for decision makers and developers	Likely – density generally with acceptable range but not always	Moderate	Provide supporting text to identify reasonable range.

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

H4 – Affordable housing	Level of requirement makes schemes unviable	High – affordable housing is generally the largest single contribution made by developers; development needs to be viable to come forward	Likely – viability in Mansfield district more marginal than other areas meaning site more likely to need to reduce contributions.	High	<p>Ensure that level of affordable housing required is based on evidence of viability</p> <p>Additional cost to be balanced against benefit of providing affordable housing.</p> <p>Provide guidance in Obligations SPD regarding prioritisation of obligations.</p>
	Level required does not deliver the scale of affordable housing needed in the district within the plan period.	High – leaves some people on housing waiting list	Likely – viability in Mansfield district more marginal than other areas meaning site more likely to need to reduce contributions.	High	Explore ways of improving viability and securing additional funds for delivery of affordable housing.
H5 – Custom and self-build homes	Requirement for provision as part of large sites affects viability	High – has knock on effect for housing supply	Likely – new requirement so viability and delivery issues is unknown at present	Moderate	<p>Ensure that requirement is viability tested.</p> <p>Apply policy flexibly.</p>
	Provision on site has practical issues (e.g. access to site, health & safety)	Medium – adds complexity to development of sites	Likely – new requirement so viability and delivery issues are unknown at present	Moderate	Provide guidance on practical matters
H6 – Specialist housing	Policy does not lead to increase in provision of needed accommodation	High – there is an ageing population and sufficient accommodation is needed	Unlikely – market is likely to increase delivery.	Moderate	Explore ways of supporting delivery of specialist accommodation

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

H7 – Houses in multiple occupation and bedsit accommodation	Restrictions lead to reduced supply of this type of accommodation	Medium – supply of accommodation doesn't meet local need	Likely – may lead to schemes being refused	Moderate	Ensure that schemes are only refused where truly unacceptable
	Lack of guidance as to when permission should be refused	Medium – leads to lack of certainty for decision makers and developers	Likely – potential for differences of opinion new policy so will take time to settle in	Moderate	Monitor application of policy and ensure that learning points are shared with decision makers
H8 – Accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	Lack of certainty that site will be provided	High – lack of site means need not being met	Unlikely – a DPD is being prepared to identify a site	Moderate	Ensure that work on the DPD progresses.
	Site requirements make it impossible to find a site	High - lack of site means need not being met	Unlikely – site identification work is ongoing	Moderate	Considered that site requirements are appropriate.
E1 – Enabling economic development	Support for economic investment is taken to outweigh all other considerations	High – could lead to unsustainable development	Unlikely – local plans need to be read as a whole	Moderate	Ensure that all decision makers are aware of need to consider local plan as a whole.
E2 – Sites allocated as new employment areas	Sites identified are not developed	Medium – would lead to a shortfall in employment provision	Likely – deliverability has been explored but employment schemes are more uncertain than residential schemes	Moderate	Establish forums/groups to explore constraints to delivery and ways of overcoming them with developers; this could include bidding for funding from D2N2 and or Homes England.
E3 – Retaining land for employment uses: Key and general employment	Proposals for non-employment uses reduces available employment land	Medium – would lead to shortfall in employment provision	Likely – policy makes clear evidence requirements	Moderate	Ensure that policy is understood and applied by decision makers

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

areas	Sites on key and general employment sites remain vacant	Medium – would lead to shortfall in employment provision and well located sites unused	Likely – delivery of employment development is uncertain	Moderate	Establish forums/groups to explore constraints to delivery and ways of overcoming them with developers; this could include bidding for funding from D2N2 and or Homes England.
E4 – Other industrial and business development	Support for economic investment is taken to outweigh all other considerations	High – could lead to unsustainable development	Unlikely – local plans need to be read as a whole	Moderate	Ensure that all decision makers are aware of need to consider local plan as a whole.
E5 – Improving skills and economic inclusion	Insufficient developers agree to enter into local labour agreements	Low – provided alongside other traditional training routes	Likely – new policy so potential take up is unclear	Low	None required
RT1 – Main town centre uses	Retail sector continues to decline impacting on vitality and viability of centres	High – could lead to higher vacancy rates and reduced footfall	Very likely – recent reports on retail continue to indicate likelihood of continued decline of centres	High	Work with partners to explore ways to improve centres and broaden the mix of uses.
	Requirement for impact assessment places additional burden on business	Low – additional cost considered to be low when considering threshold	Likely – number of schemes likely to be affected	Low	Additional cost needs to be balanced against need to minimise harm to centres.
RT2 – Mansfield town centre strategy	Unable to secure funding for identified improvements	High – failure to secure sufficient improvements will affect vitality and viability	Likely – funding is uncertain	Moderate	Commence town centre masterplan which can be used as the basis for funding bids and attract investment.

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

RT3 – Mansfield town centre primary shopping area	Restrictions on non-A1 uses limits ability of new businesses to open	Medium – restrictions could lead to new businesses locating elsewhere and units remaining vacant	Likely – number of new businesses affected uncertain	Moderate	Impact on new business needs to be balanced against need to protect shopping character of town centre.
RT4 – Mansfield town centre improvements	Major development proposals do not provide the identified improvements	Medium – other potential funding sources could be explored	Unlikely – likely that major development will be able to contribute to at least one or two of the improvements	Low	None required
RT5 – Accessing Mansfield town centre	Major development proposals do not provide improvements to accessibility	Medium – other ways of improving access could be explored	Unlikely – likely that major development will be able to make some improvements to accessibility, requirements also contained in policies in transport section	Low	None required
RT6 – Retail and leisure allocations	Identified sites are not developed	High – failure to deliver sufficient retail land will lead to need to review plan and increase chances of out of centre development	Likely – sites have been assessed for deliverability although uncertainty remains	High	Establish forums/groups to explore constraints to delivery and ways of overcoming them with developers; this could include bidding for funding from D2N2 and or Homes England.
RT7 – Retail and leisure commitments	Identified sites are not developed	High – failure to deliver sufficient retail land will lead to need to review plan and increase chances of out of centre development	Likely – sites have been assessed for deliverability although uncertainty remains	High	Establish forums/groups to explore constraints to delivery and ways of overcoming them with developers; this could include bidding for funding from D2N2 and or Homes England.

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

RT8 – District and local centres	Restrictions on non-A1 uses limits ability of new businesses to open	Medium – restrictions could lead to new businesses locating elsewhere and units remaining vacant	Likely – number of new businesses affected uncertain	Moderate	Impact on new business needs to be balanced against need to protect shopping character of centres.
RT9 – Neighbourhood parades	Changes of use leads to a move away from convenience retail use	Low – size of units and nature of areas likely to limit changes of character	Unlikely – small number of units likely to be affected	Low	None required
RT10 – Retail parks	Permissive approach to development on identified retail parks harms vitality and viability of town centres	Medium – town centre already vulnerable to harm but policy only permits limited extension of existing parks, and only for bulky goods which are unlikely to be sold from town centre stores	Likely – additional harm possible but minimised as only limited extensions at existing parks, and only for bulky goods which are unlikely to be sold from town centre stores	Moderate	None required
RT11 – Hot food takeaways	Restricts affects ability of new businesses to open	Medium – restricts competition	Likely – unknown number of proposals could be affected	Moderate	Restriction needs to be balanced against benefit of contributing to tackling obesity
RT12 – Visitor economy	Support for economic investment is taken to outweigh all other considerations	Medium – could lead to unsustainable development	Unlikely – local plans need to be read as a whole but policy identifies clear criteria on these issues	Moderate	None required

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

SUE 1 – Pleasley Hill Farm	Homes are not delivered on site	Low – site is not required to provided sufficient new homes during the plan period	Likely – difficulties with delivery identified although site promoters consider they can be overcome	Moderate	<p>Undertake further work on viability to establish if site is deliverable.</p> <p>Establish forums/groups to explore constraints to delivery and ways of overcoming them with developers; this could include bidding for funding from D2N2 and or Homes England.</p>
	Employment on site is not delivered	High – required to meet employment land requirements	Low – indications are that operators are interested in scheme	Moderate	<p>Establish forums/groups to explore constraints to delivery and ways of overcoming them with developers; this could include bidding for funding from D2N2 and or Homes England.</p>
SUE 1 – Land off Jubilee Way	Homes are not delivered on site	Low – site is not required to provided sufficient new homes during the plan period	Likely – difficulties with delivery identified although site promoters consider they can be overcome	Moderate	<p>Undertake further work on viability to establish if site is deliverable.</p> <p>Establish forums/groups to explore constraints to delivery and ways of overcoming them with developers; this could include bidding for funding from D2N2 and or Homes England.</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

	Employment on site is not delivered	High – required to meet employment land requirements	Likely – indications are that operators are interested in scheme but uncertain	Moderate	Establish forums/groups to explore constraints to delivery and ways of overcoming them with developers; this could include bidding for funding from D2N2 and or Homes England.
SUE 3 – Land at Berry Hill – Committed strategic urban extension	Homes are not delivered on site or delivered more slowly	High – site required as part of housing supply	Unlikely – site is currently under construction	Moderate	Establish forums/groups to explore constraints to delivery and ways of overcoming them with developers; this could include bidding for funding from D2N2 and or Homes England.
	Employment on site is not delivered	High – required to meet employment land requirements	Likely – employment elements in future phases with delivery uncertain	Moderate	Establish forums/groups to explore constraints to delivery and ways of overcoming them with developers; this could include bidding for funding from D2N2 and or Homes England.

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

IN1 – Infrastructure delivery	Unable to secure all contributions required due to viability meaning cannot deliver the infrastructure required	Medium – likely be able to secure some contributions but would lead shortfall to provide necessary infrastructure.	Likely – policy requirements set to ensure that sites are viable but always potential for schemes to be unviable.	Moderate	<p>Ensure that viability assessment is robust.</p> <p>Work with infrastructure providers to ensure that essential infrastructure is identified and prioritised.</p> <p>Work with partners to explore other sources of funding, including CIL, to secure infrastructure.</p> <p>Prepare Obligation SPD to provide guidance.</p>
IN2 – Green Infrastructure	Requirements increase cost of development affecting viability	Medium – development needs to be viable to come forward	Likely – Potential higher costs associated with requirements although not always the case	Moderate	<p>Ensure that potential for increased costs taken into account in viability assessments.</p> <p>Additional cost to be balanced against benefit of providing GI.</p>
	Policy not implemented fully due to lack of awareness of approach	Medium – can be addressed through revisions to schemes but adds cost and delays.	Medium – some developers, especially small/medium developers, may be unaware of GI.	Moderate	Prepare Green Infrastructure SPD to provide more guidance on approach.
IN3 – Protection of community open space and outdoor sports provision	Part 1 leads to reduction in amount of open space available	High – open space has numerous benefits for the public and environment.	Unlikely – policy requires that assessments demonstrate that open space is no longer needed or is being replaced.	Moderate	None required

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

IN4 – New community open space and outdoor sports provision	Requirements increase cost of development affecting viability	Medium – development needs to be viable to come forward	Likely – Potential higher costs associated with requirements although not always the case	Moderate	Ensure that potential for increased costs taken into account in viability assessments Additional cost to be balanced against benefit of providing open space and sports provision.
IN5 – Allotments	Part 1 leads to reduction in availability of allotments	Medium – allotments have numerous benefits but aren't open to the public	Unlikely – policy requires that assessments show that allotment is no longer needed or is being replaced.	Moderate	Built into policy.
IN6 – Designated local green space	Leads to sustainably located sites not being developed	Low – sufficient other sustainable sites which can be allocated	Unlikely – sites proposed are valuable to the local community and have associated designations	Low	None required
IN7 – Local shops, community and cultural facilities	Requirement for marketing leads to delay and alternative schemes not coming forward.	Medium – could result in vacant buildings/sites if marketing not done	Unlikely – six months not considered unreasonable and likely owners to have undertaken prior to considering alternative schemes	Moderate	None. Risk needs to be balanced against benefit of ensuring that community facilities are not lost unnecessarily.
	Proposals for convenience retail lead to impact on viability of centres	Low – proposals is for small scale retail which is unlikely to lead to significant impact even if located close to a centre	Likely – no. of proposals unknown.	Low	None required
IN8 – Protecting and improving the sustainable transport network	Identified schemes do not come forward	High – a number of schemes are vital to ensure that proposed growth can be accommodated	Likely – funding for schemes is uncertain	High	Work with partners to explore other potential sources of funding

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

IN9 – Impact of development on the transport network	Schemes which would otherwise be supported are unable to comply with this policy	Medium – could lead to unacceptable developments being approved	Likely – number of schemes have come forward in the past where access appears constrained	Moderate	Policy reflects advice from the Highway Authority and is considered to be an absolute requirement.
IN10 – Car and cycle parking	Requirement for sufficient car parking reduces no. of homes possible affecting viability	Medium – some sites maybe more affected than others	Unlikely - car parking requirements well established	Low	Ensure that policy is understood and applied flexibly by decision makers
IN11 – Telecommunications and broadband	Requirements increase cost of development affecting viability	Medium – development needs to be viable to come forward	Likely – Potential higher costs associated with requirements although not always the case	Moderate	Ensure that potential for increased costs taken into account in viability assessments Additional cost to be balanced against benefit of providing good connectivity.
NE1 – Protection and enhancement of landscape character	Schemes which would otherwise be supported are unable to comply with this policy	Medium – could lead to developments being approved which would have an adverse impact on landscape	Unlikely – other policies (e.g. S5) will limit developments in the open countryside	Low	Policy would need to be balanced against other material considerations.
NE2 – Biodiversity and geodiversity	Schemes which would otherwise be supported are unable to comply with this policy	Medium – could lead to developments being approved which would have an impact on biodiversity/geodiversity	Likely – number of sites across the district and additional sites can be added	Moderate	Need to balance restrictions against need to protect biodiversity/geodiversity. Ensure that policy is understood and applied appropriately by decision makers

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

	Requirements increase cost of development affecting viability	Medium – development needs to be viable to come forward	Likely – Potential higher costs associated with requirements although not always the case	Moderate	Ensure that potential for increased costs taken into account in viability assessments Additional cost to be balanced against benefit of providing net gains in biodiversity.
NE3 – Pollution and land instability	High level of remediation required affects viability	Medium – development needs to be viable to come forward	Likely – remediation can be costly but usually reflected in land values	Moderate	Ensure that potential for increased costs taken into account in viability assessments. However, requirement for sites to be appropriately remediated is an absolute requirement.
	Restriction on development where unacceptable pollution restricts the development of sites	Medium – considered to be sufficient sites to deliver requirements but could affect brownfield sites	Unlikely – likely very few sites affected and potential for alternative scheme designs/layouts	Low	Reflects guidance in new NPPF.
NE4 – Mineral safeguarding areas	Lack of clarity on areas as Nottinghamshire County Council currently preparing Mineral Plan	Medium – could result in schemes having to prepare unanticipated work	Unlikely – areas previously mapped	Low	Reflects guidance from Nottinghamshire County Council and NPPF on minerals.

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

HE1 – Historic environment	Information requirements and additional work required to protect/enhance heritage add cost to development	Medium – development needs to be viable to come forward	Unlikely – potential for a number of developments to be affected given number/location of heritage assets in district	Moderate	Policy reflects guidance in NPPF and law.
HE2 – Pleasley Vale Regeneration Area	Proposals for housing only	Low – preference for employment, commercial and tourism development but not restricted	Unlikely – type of schemes uncertain	Low	Reflects joint work with Bolsover DC
CC1 – Renewable and low carbon energy generation	Restrictions identified in policy limit the number of schemes that come forward.	Low – no specific target related to provision of renewable and low carbon schemes	Unlikely – policy covers matters which would have been assessed previously.	Low	No mitigation required. Areas identified as suitable areas for large turbines based on evidence.
CC2 – Flood risk	Restrictions identified in policy limit where schemes can come forward	Low – flood risk taken into account so able to meet development needs without being at risk of flooding	Unlikely – areas of district not extensive so few sites affected	Low	Reflects guidance in NPPF
CC3 – Sustainable drainage systems	Requirements increase cost of development affecting viability	Medium – development needs to be viable to come forward	Likely – Potential higher costs associated with requirements although not always the case	Moderate	Ensure that potential for increased costs taken into account in viability assessments Additional cost to be balanced against need to manage surface water runoff in accordance with NPPF and STW advice.

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

CC4 – River and waterbody corridors	Requirements increase cost of development affecting viability	Medium – development needs to be viable to come forward	Likely – Potential higher costs associated with requirements although not always the case	Moderate	<p>Ensure that potential for increased costs taken into account in viability assessments</p> <p>Additional cost to be balanced against benefit of protecting and improving river and waterbodies.</p>
IM1 – Monitoring and review of the local plan	Indicators lead to very early review of the local plan	Medium – review may increase uncertainty	Unlikely – considered to have provided sufficient deliverable sites to avoid the need for an early review	Low	Appropriate to identify circumstances when early review is necessary.