



# **Newark & Sherwood Amended Core Strategy**

## **Soundness Self-Assessment**

**September 2017**

### **Newark & Sherwood – Amended Core Strategy Soundness Self-assessment Checklist**

The 2014 checklist provided by the Planning Advisory Service has been used as a template for the soundness self-assessment for the Newark & Sherwood Amended Core Strategy. 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.
- 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](http://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. The Legal Compliance checklist (a separate document, see [www.pas.gov.uk](http://www.pas.gov.uk)) should be completed to ensure that this aspect is covered.

The Duty to Cooperate will also be assessed as part of the examination process.

| Soundness Test and Key Requirements   | Evidence Provided  |
|---|--|
| <b><i>Positively Prepared:</i></b> 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.  |  |
| <p><i>Vision and Objectives</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 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?</li> <li>2. 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?</li> <li>3. 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?</li> <li>4. Have reasonable alternatives to the quantum of development and overall spatial strategy been considered?</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Chapter 2 of the amended Core Strategy sets out an overview of the District’s characteristics and features, with sub-area profiles following on from this. A range of ‘key issues and challenges’ are detailed in the final section of the Chapter, providing a clear set of priorities which the Plan seeks to address.</li> <li>2. Drawing on the above a clear locally specific vision for the District is outlined, with specific Area Objectives flowing from this reflecting the distinct spatial characteristic of different locations and assisting in the delivery of the overall vision. There is a clear and unambiguous relationship between the identified issues (outlined in Chapter 1), vision and objectives.</li> <li>3. The policy platform follows a logical path from the objectives and address those issues necessary for successful implementation of the vision, with desired outcomes being clearly and concisely outlined. Comprehensive coverage of policies set against the objectives has been provided for. With ‘Spatial Policies’ having been developed to deliver the vision and objectives, ‘Core Policies’ address District-wide issues and ‘Area Policies’ responding to the needs of distinct locations. Each objective can be clearly traced to an accompanying policy or policies.</li> <li>4. Reasonable alternatives to the quantum of development and overall spatial strategy have been considered through the Plan-making process, Sustainability Appraisal (incorporated into the</li> </ol> |

| Soundness Test and Key Requirements  | Evidence Provided   |
|--|---|
| <p>5. Are the policies internally consistent?</p> <p>6. Are there realistic timescales related to the objectives?</p> <p>7. Does the DPD explain how its key policy objectives will be achieved?</p> | <p>Integrated Impact Assessment) and where appropriate the bringing together of the supporting evidence base – all of which have been made available for public consultation. The Preferred Approach ‘Strategy’ stage, preceding publication of the Draft Plan, set out reasonable alternative options to the Authorities preferred approach on those areas of the Plan subject to review (including the quantum of development and the spatial strategy intended to deliver this). The process of plan-making was iterative with Sustainability Appraisal (incorporated into the Integrated Impact Assessment) helping appraise options and guide decisions.</p> <p>5. The Plan’s policies are considered internally consistent, with the process of Sustainability Appraisal (incorporated into the Integrated Impact Assessment) having assessed individual and cumulative impacts, minimising the potential for conflicts between policies.</p> <p>6. The timescales associated with delivery of the Plan are considered realistic. The Plan Period stretches from 2013 – 2033, with a supporting evidence base having been brought together to understand development needs (including housing, employment and retail) over this time period and to establish and plan the delivery of the infrastructure required to support this. Through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan development and infrastructure requirements have been able to be aligned with one another. The Plan is supported by a robust monitoring framework (set out at Appendix F); with development trajectories forecasting (on the basis of the most up-to-date information available) when and where growth will occur, in the case of employment and retail this will be updated through the review of the Allocations &amp; Development Management DPD. Regular monitoring of the Plan’s performance and the updating of the evidence base will indicate whether timescales need to be reviewed.</p> <p>In respect of planning to meet gypsy and traveller needs the pitch requirements derived from the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) cover the period 2013-2028 (5 years shorter than the plan period). To address this a new GTAA will be produced to cover the remaining portion of the plan period, and an appropriate period beyond this. Notwithstanding the duration of the current GTAA Core Policy 4 commits the Authority to addressing future pitch requirements of the most up-to-date GTAA through all necessary means, and ensuring that gypsy and traveller needs over the plan period will be met.</p> <p>7. The strategic objectives of the plan provide an overview over how they will be delivered and the</p> |

| Soundness Test and Key Requirements   | Evidence Provided   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>Plan follows a logical path through from the vision and objectives, clearly establishing how delivery will occur.</p>  |
| <p><i>The presumption in favour of sustainable development</i></p> <p>8. Plans and decisions need to take local circumstances into account, so that they respond to the different opportunities for achieving sustainable development in different areas.</p> <p>9. Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> <li>• Specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.</li> </ul> <p>10. 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</p> | <p>8. Guided by a robust evidence base, sustainability appraisal (incorporated into the Integrated Impact Assessment), habitats regulations assessment and public consultation process the Plan has established localised objectives, a spatial strategy and specific policies which respond to the needs and characteristics of different localities across the District. Importantly a sustainable pattern of future development is promoted, supporting the achievement of sustainable development in different areas. This process will be completed through the review of non-strategic site specific allocations and policies and individual Development Management policies in the review of the Allocations &amp; Development Management DPD.</p> <p>9. The Plan carries development requirements and pursues a strategy which will result in the District’s full objectively assessed development needs being met. Through the existing Allocations &amp; Development Management DPD a balance of housing and employment sites is carried which comfortably exceed objectively assessed needs, whilst these will be subject to later review any de-allocation will only occur in those circumstances where the site is no longer deliverable, and on the basis of work undertaken so far these are expected to be limited in number. The mixed use strategic allocation at Thoresby Colliery adds further flexibility to the approach to meeting housing and employment needs over the plan period. Significantly the allocation of a strategic site beyond the Newark Urban Area also rebalances the distribution of development from dependence on that location. In terms of gypsy and traveller accommodation and retail development the amended Core Strategy contains commitment and policy approaches which will result in development requirements being met, but which contain sufficient flexibility to deal with any changes in circumstance.</p> <p>Where it becomes clear through the monitoring process that delivery is not taking place at the rates required, then the Council will actively seek to bring forward opportunity sites by working with landowners and developers to release sites earlier in the plan period. Accordingly it is considered that there is sufficient flexibility to allow for some sites not delivering as anticipated whether in terms of the rate of delivery or due to unanticipated considerations preventing development occurring.</p> |

| Soundness Test and Key Requirements   | Evidence Provided   |
|---|---|
| <p>how the presumption should be applied locally.</p>   | <p>10. The amendment of the Core Strategy has been undertaken in accordance with national planning policy, and so reflects its definition and presumption in favour of sustainable development. The desire to promote sustainable development is the basis around which the Plan has been constructed. Through the development of localised objectives and led by the Sustainability Appraisal (incorporated into the Integrated Impact Assessment) process clear policies defining what sustainable development means in different parts of the District and how the presumption should be applied locally have been established. Policy DM12 ‘Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development’ within the Allocations &amp; Development Management DPD formalises the presumption and how it will operate within local planning policy.</p>  |
| <p><i>Objectively Assessed Needs</i></p> <p>11. 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.</p> | <p>11. The amended Core Strategy is supported by an extensive and robust evidence base, which has identified the economic, social and environmental needs of the District, and informed the overall strategy and development of policy. Importantly the process of Sustainability Appraisal (incorporated into the Integrated Impact Assessment) and Habitats Regulations Assessment has ensured that these economic, social and environmental needs have been balanced. Through the spatial distribution of development, allocation of Strategic Sites and general policy platform the approach followed has been one which makes effective use of land and, where appropriate supports mixed use development. The Authority has fulfilled its duty to cooperate with cross-boundary and strategic issues having been considered through this process. Particularly close cooperation has occurred in establishing objectively assessed housing and employment needs through the preparation of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and Employment Land Forecasting Study. How the Authority has met the requirements of the ‘Duty’ is further detailed in the Statement of Compliance with the Duty to Cooperate.</p> |
| <p><i>Building a strong, competitive economy</i></p> <p>12. Set out a clear economic vision and strategy for the area which positively and proactively encourages sustainable economic growth.</p> <p>13. Recognise and seek to address potential barriers</p>  | <p>12. A clear economic vision with linked objectives is set out in Chapter 3. This logically flows through into a spatial strategy and distribution of development which promotes sustainable economic growth and recognises the varied needs of differing locations. Beyond this Spatial Policy 5 ‘Delivering the Strategy’, Spatial Policy 6 ‘Infrastructure for Growth’, Spatial Policy 7 ‘Sustainable Transport’, Core Policy 6 ‘Shaping our Employment Profile’, Core Policy 7 ‘Tourism Development’,</p>   |

| Soundness Test and Key Requirements   | Evidence Provided  |
|---|--|
| <p>to investment, including poor environment or any lack of infrastructure services or housing.</p> | <p>Core Policy 8 ‘Retail &amp; Town Centres’, Area Policies responding to localised issues and the strategic site allocations made at Land East of Newark, Land South of Newark, Land around Fernwood and Land at Thoresby Colliery will collectively deliver the vision and objectives to support, shape and deliver sustainable economic growth in the District.</p> <p>13. Through the Settlement Hierarchy and Spatial Distribution of Growth differing roles and strategies have been attributed to the settlements central to the delivery of the spatial strategy. This responds to the needs, characteristics and function of that particular location and seeks to support the role of Newark Urban Area as a Sub-regional Centre, communities which require regenerative intervention (Ollerton &amp; Boughton, Rainworth, Clipstone, Edwinstowe, Bilsthorpe and Blidworth) and those locations where the continuation of a sustainable community is sought (Southwell, Collingham, Farnsfield, Lowdham and Sutton-on-Trent). The range of Spatial and Area Policies and site allocations have been developed to facilitate these objectives.</p> <p>Through the bringing together of a robust evidence base, Sustainability Appraisal (incorporated into the Integrated Impact Assessment), Habitats Regulations Assessment and public consultation process the constraints in these locations are well established and understood – the Infrastructure Delivery Plan has been particularly significant in this respect. Policies have sought to respond to and allow for the addressing of potential barriers to investment. For instance where particular environmental concerns exist (e.g. the ability of Newark Town Centre given its historic nature to accommodate additional retail and office development, or concerns over the quality of Ollerton’s town centre environment) then specific interventions have been detailed in the Area Policies to positively address these potential barriers and secure the conditions necessary to attract investment.</p> <p>The plan recognises the delivery of infrastructure as being key to unlocking investment, with the Infrastructure Delivery Plan establishing requirements, their costs and methods of delivery as well as allowing for development and infrastructure requirements to be aligned.</p> <p>Through Spatial Policy 5 ‘Delivering the Strategy’ the Council provides support and encouragement for the delivery of allocated sites so that development requirements can be met, significantly this includes housing and employment needs. The policy further details that help will be provided to overcome constraints and unlock sites for development where appropriate. Flexibility is provided</p> |

| Soundness Test and Key Requirements   | Evidence Provided  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>by an approach which would support the delivery of non-allocated ‘opportunity sites’ should monitoring suggest that this has become necessary.</p> <p>Spatial Policy 6 ‘Infrastructure for Growth’ details how strategic and local infrastructure will be secured to support growth in the District.</p>  |
| <p><i>Ensuring the vitality of town centres</i></p> <p>14. Policies should be positive, promote competitive town centre environments, and set out policies for the management and growth of centres over the plan period.</p> <p>15. 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.</p> | <p>14. Core Policy 8 provides a positive policy for managing the District’s hierarchy of centres. The policy seeks to achieve a network of healthy, vibrant and resilient centres, composed of a balanced range of retail and other Main Town Centre uses. The policy sets out an approach to ensure that the needs for retail and other main Town Centre use development are met in full, and establishes how the sequential and impact tests will be implemented (including the introduction of localised impact test thresholds). This approach is complemented by centre specific interventions for Newark Town Centre and Ollerton and Southwell District Centre’s responding to the findings of the Town Centre &amp; Retail Study (2016) in the Area Policies.</p> <p>15. Through the Town Centre &amp; Retail Study (2016) forecast convenience and comparison retail requirements and the needs for other main town centre uses, over the plan period have been established. The Employment Land Forecasting Study (2015) provides recommendations over employment land floorspace requirements and guidance concerning individual sectors and/or employment uses. Through a combination of Core Policy 8 and the various Area Policies an appropriate approach which will ensure that the forecast requirements for retail and other main town centre uses can be met in full has been provided. In terms of comparison retail this includes the exploration of Town Centre redevelopment opportunities within both Newark Town Centre and Ollerton District Centre – with the approach to allocation beyond this to be addressed through the Allocations &amp; Development Management DPD. In convenience retail terms given the lack of sequentially preferable alternatives support is provided for an appropriate scale of new provision to meet the requirements of population growth within either the Land South of Newark or Land around Fernwood strategic site allocation. Requirements for other main town centre uses, aside from office floorspace, were not considered to be of a sufficient scale to warrant specific allocations to deliver. In terms of meeting the commercial office needs identified in the ELFS the historic nature of Newark Town Centre represents a particular constraint, and in reality means that office requirements would be unable to be met exclusively in this location. Core Policy 8 does</p> |

| Soundness Test and Key Requirements  | Evidence Provided  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>provide support for the introduction of larger format units which would meet modern requirements, where the level of impact on the historic environment is considered acceptable. The exploration of the identified redevelopment opportunities within the Town Centre could also offer the potential for this to be realised. Nevertheless given the constraints it has been necessary to consider locations beyond defined Centre’s and so significant amounts of employment land have been allocated on the strategic sites around Newark and at Thoresby Colliery, complementing the Town Centre approach and ensuring that requirements can be met. Beyond this any residual requirement for commercial office space will be addressed through the review of site allocations in the Allocations &amp; Development Management DPD.</p>   |
| <p><i>Supporting a prosperous rural economy</i></p> <p>16. Support sustainable economic growth in rural areas. Planning strategies should promote a strong rural economy by taking a positive approach to new development.</p>   | <p>16. Through Spatial Policy 3 ‘Rural Areas’ the rural economy is supported through the encouragement of tourism, rural diversification and appropriate agricultural and forestry development. This is complimented by additional content in Core Policy 6 ‘Shaping our Employment Profile’ and Core Policy 7 ‘Tourism Development’.</p>  |
| <p><i>Promoting sustainable transport</i></p> <p>17. Facilitate sustainable development whilst contributing to wider sustainability and health objectives.</p> <p>18. 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.</p> <p>19. Encourage solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and congestion including supporting a pattern of development</p> | <p>17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23</p> <p>The spatial distribution of development and allocation of strategic sites focuses development in either locations which are already sustainable, or those which can be made sustainable (access to sustainable modes of transport is key to this and also forms a criterion in Spatial Policy 9 ‘Selecting Appropriate Sites for Allocation’ which has guided the site allocation process). Informed by a robust Sustainability Appraisal (incorporated into the Integrated Impact Assessment) process a sustainable pattern of development has been provided for, supporting the conditions whereby sustainable transport choices can be extended, enhanced or introduced where they are currently absent. Enhanced rural accessibility to services, facilities and employment is promoted through Core Policy 11 ‘Rural Accessibility’. Spatial Policy 7 ‘Sustainable Transport’ promotes an improved and integrated transport network with an emphasis on non-car modes as a means of access to services and facilities, balancing the transport system in favour of sustainable modes. The approach set out within the Amended Core Strategy has been subject to Health Impact Assessment (incorporated into the Integrated Impact Assessment), assessing the effects of the policy content (individually and cumulatively) on the health of the Districts population as a whole and on groups within this. The approach is consistent with the objectives of reducing health inequalities, improving access to</p> |

| Soundness Test and Key Requirements  | Evidence Provided  |
|--|--|
| <p>which, where reasonable to do so, facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport.</p>  | <p>health services, increasing the opportunities for recreational physical activity and facilitating healthy lifestyles.</p>   |
| <p>20. Local authorities should work with neighbouring authorities and transport providers to develop strategies for the provision of viable infrastructure necessary to support sustainable development.</p>  | <p>20, 26 Through the District-wide Transport Study (2010) and Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2016) the nature, extent and cost of infrastructure to support sustainable development is understood. Building on this Spatial Policy 7 ‘Sustainable Transport’ commits the Authority to working with Highways England, Nottinghamshire County Council and other relevant agencies to ensure delivery of the highway and public transport infrastructure required to support growth. In addition the routes of highways schemes identified in the Nottinghamshire Local Transport Plan, the Southern Link Road and Newark Flyover have been safeguarded through the policy. In line with Spatial Policy 6 ‘Infrastructure for Growth’ the Community Infrastructure Levy will ensure the delivery of strategic transport infrastructure, whilst planning obligations will be used to ensure that new development provide for transport improvements and other appropriate mitigation measures which relate to development of a site.</p> |
| <p>21. 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.</p>   |  |
| <p>22. 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.</p>  | <p>24. Core Policy 8 ‘Town Centres and Retail’ seeks to support a network of healthy, vibrant and resilient centres, composed of a balanced range of retail and other Main Town Centre Uses. With the defined centres being well located in relation to their catchments and in possession of good levels of connectivity minimising the need for significant journeys and maximising the availability of sustainable transport choices. Through the Land South of Newark, Land around Fernwood and Land at Thoresby strategic site allocations appropriate mix of uses has been provided for (all three sites contain substantial amounts of employment development, facilities to ensure that day-to-day needs can be met and primary education provision.</p>   |
| <p>23. Plans should protect and exploit opportunities for the use of sustainable transport modes for the movement of goods or people.</p>  |  |
| <p>24. 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. 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</p> | <p>25. In line with the 2015 Written Statement: Planning Update the Authority has concluded that there is no clear and compelling justification to support the introduction of local parking standards.</p>  |

| Soundness Test and Key Requirements  | Evidence Provided  |
|--|--|
| <p>schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties.</p> <p>25. The setting of car parking standards including provision for town centres.</p> <p>26. 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.</p>   |  |
| <p><i>Supporting High Quality Communications Infrastructure</i></p> <p>27. Support the expansion of the electronic communications networks, including telecommunications’ masts and high speed broadband.</p> <p>28. 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 telecommunications development and existing development.</p> | <p>27. Core Policy 9 ‘Sustainable Design’ recognises the importance of high speed broadband provision and outlines that a Supplementary Planning Document will be produced to provide good practice guidance to developers. Supporting the roll out of broadband to communities is a strategic objective of the Authority.</p> <p>28. No such measures are proposed.</p> |
| <p><i>Delivering a wide choice of high quality housing</i></p> <p>29. Identify and maintain a rolling supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years’</p>   | <p>29. Whilst the Amended Core Strategy allocates the Strategic Sites, the more detailed Allocations &amp; Development Management DPD will identify the additional sites necessary to maintain a rolling</p>   |

| Soundness Test and Key Requirements   | Evidence Provided  |
|---|--|
| <p>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.</p> | <p>supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years’ worth of housing against requirements. Notwithstanding this the most recent site specific stage of the Plan Review (the <a href="#">Preferred Approach – Sites &amp; Settlements consultation</a>) outlined the results from the review of existing allocations. This shows a supply (5556 dwellings) which greatly exceeds the proposed residual requirement (3707 dwellings). As detailed in the <a href="#">Statement of Five Year Housing Land Supply (1<sup>st</sup> April 2017)</a> the Authority can demonstrate a 6.2 year land supply, having applied an additional 20% buffer.</p>   |
| <p>30. Identify a supply of developable sites or broad locations for years 6-10 and, where possible, years 11-15.</p>   | <p>30. The combination of the Amended Core Strategy and Allocations &amp; Development Management DPD will identify a supply of developable sites or broad locations for years 6-10 and, where possible 11-15. ‘The Illustrative Local Development Framework Housing Trajectory as at 01/04/2017’ provided in Appendix C of the Amended Core Strategy sets out forecast delivery rates.</p>   |
| <p>31. 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.</p>   | <p>31. An illustrative housing trajectory is provided in Appendix C of the Amended Core Strategy. Spatial Policy 5 ‘Delivering the Strategy’ sets out the approach which will be followed to ensure that the housing needs of the District are met. Outlining that sufficient flexibility is possessed in respect of strategic site allocations in the amended Core Strategy, and existing sites within the Allocations &amp; Development Management DPD to allow for some sites not delivering as anticipated. The Council will support and encourage the delivery of allocated sites and to overcome constraints and unlock sites where necessary. Through the monitoring process where the five year land supply falls below 5 years for a period of two consecutive years, the Authority will seek to assist the owners on identified but non-allocated ‘opportunity sites’ to unlock delivery. Measures could include securing alternative sites for the existing use, granting Permission in Principle on brownfield sites, seeking Government funding to assist in the release of the site, consider purchasing the site on behalf of the Council’s Development Company or Compulsory Purchase.</p> |
| <p>32. Set out the authority’s approach to housing density to reflect local circumstances.</p>  | <p>32. Core Policy 3 ‘Housing Mix, Type and Density’ details the density levels which would be pursued in different locations around the District, flexibility through allowing for individual site circumstances to be taken account of is provided.</p>  |
| <p>33. Plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic and market trends, and needs of different groups and caters for housing demand and the scale of housing supply to meet this demand.</p>  | <p>33. Core Policy 3 ‘Housing Mix, Type and Density’ informed by the Housing Market and Needs Assessment, provides guidance over the housing mix sought within new development, with an emphasis being placed on smaller dwelling types and housing suitable for the elderly and disabled.</p>   |
| <p>34. 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.</p> <p>In rural areas housing should be located where it</p>                          | <p>33. Core Policy 3 ‘Housing Mix, Type and Density’ informed by the Housing Market and Needs Assessment, provides guidance over the housing mix sought within new development, with an emphasis being placed on smaller dwelling types and housing suitable for the elderly and disabled.</p>   |

| Soundness Test and Key Requirements   | Evidence Provided   |
|---|---|
| <p>will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.</p>  | <p>The study takes account of current and future demographic and market trends, the needs of different groups and demand. Core Policy 1 sets out the approach to the securing of affordable housing as a proportion (30%) of new housing development on qualifying sites. Some allowance for circumstances where off-site provision or contributions may be appropriate is outlined in the policy. The approach has been guided by the Housing Market and Needs Assessment and subject to viability testing, with 30% representing the highest level of such housing which could be secured and remain viable.</p> <p>34. Spatial Policy 3 ‘Rural Areas’ sets out to meet local housing need by focusing housing in sustainable, accessible villages. In these locations support is provided for new housing where it helps to support community facilities and local services and for proposals of 3 or more dwellings where they reflect the mix and type requirements of Core Policy 3, or those of relevant Neighbourhood Plan policies. Rural affordable housing exception sites are facilitated through Core Policy 2, in some circumstances a cross-subsidy scheme whereby some market housing to support provision of affordable housing would be allowed through the policy. Taken as a whole the approach will help to enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.</p> |
| <p><i>Requiring good design</i></p> <p>35. Develop robust and comprehensive policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area.</p>  | <p>35. Core Policy 9 ‘Sustainable Design’ details an approach to deliver high standards of sustainable design that protects and enhances the natural environment, and contributes to and sustains the rich local distinctiveness of the District. Core Policy 13 ‘Landscape Character’ and Core Policy 14 ‘Historic Environment’ compliment this in ensuring that the matters of landscape character and heritage are appropriately addressed through the design of new development.</p>  |
| <p><i>Promoting healthy communities</i></p> <p>36. Policies should aim to design places which: promote community interaction, including through mixed-use development; are safe and accessible environments and are accessible developments.</p> <p>37. Policies should plan positively for the provision</p> | <p>36. Promotion of high quality and inclusive design is promoted through Core Policy 9 ‘Sustainable Design’ with developments which are accessible to all being sought. Through the seeking of an appropriate mix of house types, reflecting localised needs and demand (Core Policy 3), and securing affordable housing provision (Core Policy 1 and 2) the creation of balanced and inclusive communities will be provided for. Mixed use development is supported through Core Policy 9 where compatible. This approach is reflected in the allocation of strategic mix use allocations at Land South of Newark, Land around Fernwood and Land at Thoresby. Policy DM5 ‘Design’ in the</p>  |

| Soundness Test and Key Requirements   | Evidence Provided  |
|---|--|
| <p>and use of shared space, community facilities and other local services.</p> <p>38. 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.</p> <p>39. Enable local communities the local and neighbourhood plans, to identify special protection green areas of particular importance to them – ‘Local Green Space’</p> | <p>Allocations &amp; Development Management DPD compliments and adds further detail to the above.</p> <p>37. Spatial Policy 8 encourages provision of new and enhanced community and leisure facilities and seeks to avoid their loss without robust justification – ensuring that those facilities which contribute towards the creation of a healthy community are where possible enhanced and retained. Core Policy 11 ‘Rural Accessibility’ looks to increase rural sustainability through the retention, enhancement and provision of new facilities and services supporting the desire for healthy communities in these locations.</p> <p>38. The Playing Pitch Strategy and Green Space Improvement Plans provide a picture over open space, sports and recreational facilities across the District. Spatial Policy 6 ‘Infrastructure for Growth’ and Policy DM3 ‘Developer Contributions and Planning Obligations’ (within the Allocations &amp; Development Management DPD) set out the approach to securing the infrastructure necessary to support growth – such as open space and sports and recreational facilities. Particular thresholds against which contributions may be sought are outlined in the Developer Contributions and Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document. Whilst there are no specific local standards set out in policy the information from the two studies will inform the review of the area based open space requirement summaries in the Allocations &amp; Development Management DPD – which act as a focus for negotiations around developer contribution priorities. Aside from developer contributions and planning obligations the evidence base can be drawn upon the Council to shape its strategy and actions with regards to provision and enhancement of open space, sports and recreational facilities – as seen with its recent delivery of the Newark Sports Hub.</p> <p>39. Identification of ‘Local Green Space’ is beyond the scope of the review of the Core Strategy. This form of designation would be more appropriately considered through the Allocations &amp; Development Management DPD. Support is provided for communities to progress Neighbourhood Plans, and so providing the potential designation was evidenced and the Neighbourhood Plan progressed satisfactorily then the amended Core Strategy would not impede the making of such designations through that process.</p> |
| <p><i>Protecting Green Belt Land</i></p> <p>40.</p>   | <p>40. The Core Strategy through Core Policy 12 ‘Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure’ promotes the</p>   |

| Soundness Test and Key Requirements  | Evidence Provided  |
|--|--|
| <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.</p> <p>41. 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.</p> <p>42.</p> <p>43. When drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development.</p> <p>Boundaries should be set using ‘physical features likely to be permanent’ amongst other things</p> | <p>implementation of access to the countryside including through the implementation of its Green Infrastructure Strategy and promotes biodiversity within the District this includes land within the Nottingham-Derby Green Belt in the south west of the District. Similarly Core Policy 13 sets out a comprehensive framework for the protection and enhancement of the District’s different Landscape Character areas. Spatial Policy 4B Green Belt Development defers to national Green Belt policy on all other matters than which are included within it.</p> <p>41. Spatial Policy 4A Extent of the Green Belt and the Newark &amp; Sherwood Policies Map set out the extent of the Green Belt. Spatial Policy 4B Green Belt Development sets out the policies on the Green Belt and settlement policies.</p> <p>42. Green Belt boundaries have not been reviewed as part of this Plan Review process.</p> <p>43. Green Belt boundaries have not been reviewed as part of this Plan Review process.</p> |
| <p><b><i>Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change</i></b></p> <p>44. Adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change taking full account of flood risk, coastal change and water supply and demand considerations.</p> <p>45. Help increase the use and supply of renewable and low carbon energy through a strategy, policies maximising renewable and low carbon</p>  | <p>44 – 46 Core Policy 9 ‘Sustainable Design seeks high standards of sustainable design which pro-actively manages surface water and utilises, where possible, Sustainable Drainage Systems. The minimisation of the production of waste and the maximisation of its re-use and recycling is also sought. The importance of development being resilient in the long-term is emphasised, taking account of the potential impacts of climate change. Through the policy the commitment to a ‘Sustainable Design’ Supplementary Planning Document is provided to assist developers with bringing forward development which meets the standards sought.</p>  |

| Soundness Test and Key Requirements  | Evidence Provided   |
|--|---|
| <p>energy, and identification of key energy sources.</p> <p>46. Minimise vulnerability to climate change and manage the risk of flooding</p> <p>47. Take account of marine planning</p> <p>48. Manage risk from coastal change</p>   | <p>Core Policy 10 ‘Climate Change’ underlines the seriousness with which the Authority is committed to tackling the cause and impacts of climate change to deliver reductions in the District’s carbon footprint. The promotion of energy generation from renewable and low-carbon sources, including community-led schemes, is provided for. As is content which seeks to ensure that development proposals maximise the use of opportunities for decentralised energy and achieve efficient consumption of energy, water and other resources.</p> <p>CP10 incorporates a sequential approach to flood risk, steering development to those areas at lowest risk and where appropriate applying the Exceptions Test. The securing of ‘strategic flood mitigation measures’ (where appropriate) also forms part of the policy approach. The content on surface water in CP9 is supplemented with additional detail.</p> <p>47 The Marine Management Organisation has been consulted throughout the process and the body liaised with as part of fulfilling the Duty to Cooperate. The update to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment took account of the section of the River Trent within the District subject to tidal influence – however no marine planning issues were raised as a result of proposals within the amended Core Strategy.</p> <p>48 N/A</p> |
| <p><b><i>Conserving and enhancing the natural environment</i></b></p> <p>49. Protect valued landscapes</p> <p>50. Prevent unacceptable risks from pollution and land instability.</p> <p>51. Planning policies should minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity.<br/>Planning policies should plan for biodiversity at a landscape-scale across local authority boundaries</p> | <p>49. Core Policy 12 ‘Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure’ promotes the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure. Core Policy 13 ‘Landscape Character’ sets out a comprehensive framework for the protection and enhancement of the District’s different landscape character areas. This is based on the Landscape Character Assessment which identified the landscape character areas and parcels and their condition and their sensitivity.</p> <p>50. The Allocations &amp; Development Management DPD contains policies with specific clauses on this in Policy DM5 Design and Policy DM10 ‘Pollution and Hazardous Materials.’</p> <p>51. The policies of the plan seek to ensure that the biodiversity and geodiversity of the District is</p>  |

| Soundness Test and Key Requirements  | Evidence Provided  |
|--|--|
|  | protected and were possible enhanced. Core Policy 12 ‘Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure’ promotes the implementation of its Green Infrastructure Strategy and promotes biodiversity across the District. Similarly Core Policy 13 sets out a comprehensive framework for the protection and enhancement of the District’s different Landscape Character areas. |
| <p><b>Conserving and enhancing the historic environment</b></p> <p>52. Include a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk.</p>   | <p>52. Core Policy 14 ‘Historic Environment’ sets out a comprehensive strategy for the management of the District’s historic environment, including those assets which are most at risk.</p>   |
| <p><b>Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals</b></p> <p>53. 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.</p> <p>Minerals planning authorities should plan for a steady and adequate supply of industrial materials.</p>   | <p>53. The District Council has ensured that it has fully taken into account minerals matters in the production of the Amended Core Strategy.</p>  |
| <p><b>Justified:</b> <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"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• The most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives.</li> </ul> |  |
| <p><b>Participation</b></p> <p>Has the consultation process allowed for effective engagement of all interested parties?</p>  | <p>Public consultation has been carried out in line with the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), available on the Council’s website:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Statement of Community Involvement (March 2015)</a></li> </ul>   |

| Soundness Test and Key Requirements  | Evidence Provided  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>Following the approach set out within the Statement has ensured that individuals, groups and communities with an interest in the District have been able to participate in the preparation of the Amended Core Strategy. The consultation processes have been robust and allowed for meaningful and effective engagement to take place. A range of engagement approaches have been employed, including direct contact with statutory and non-statutory stakeholders, representatives of hard to reach groups, the holding of well publicised open consultation events and attendance of the meetings of groups with an interest in the emerging plan. In order to ensure an open process and maximise the ease with which stakeholders could respond a range of methods were made available, from structured comments forms, web hosted interactive versions of consultation documents, the acceptance of email responses and the ability for correspondence to be received via traditional mail.</p> <p>The requirements of the Duty to Cooperate, established through Section 110 of the Localism Act 2011, have been fully complied with. Neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies have been closely worked with to ensure that strategic issues have been appropriately addressed, the development needs of the District met and the strategic priorities of the wider area delivered. Our <a href="#">Statement of Compliance with the Duty to Cooperate</a> provides full details.</p> <p>The Council has summarised the consultation that took place during preparation of the Amended Core Strategy in two separate Consultation Statements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The <a href="#">Statement of Consultation</a> (under Regulation 18), detailing the consultation carried out up to the publication of the Amended Core Strategy in July 2017; and</li> <li>• The <a href="#">Statement of Representation</a> (under Regulation 22), detailing the seeking of representations on the Publication Amended Core Strategy and the content of those representations received.</li> </ul> |
| <p><i>Research / fact finding</i></p> <p>Is the plan justified by a sound and credible evidence base? How up to date and how convincing is it?</p> <p>What assumptions were made in preparing the DPD?</p> | <p>The Council considers that the Amended Core Strategy is justified by sound and robust evidence. The submission DPD is supported by a comprehensive District-specific evidence base, all of which is available to view through the <a href="#">Examination Library</a>.</p> <p>The development of policy within the Amended Core Strategy and assumptions underpinning this are documented within the <a href="#">Integrated Impact Assessment</a>, Statements of Consultation and Representation,</p>   |

| Soundness Test and Key Requirements   | Evidence Provided   |
|---|---|
| <p>Were they reasonable and justified?</p>  | <p>evidence base documents and the various stages in the preparation of the Amended Core Strategy which proceeded its submission -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Gypsy &amp; Traveller DPD - Issues Paper</a> (16<sup>th</sup> September – 28<sup>th</sup> October 2013)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Gypsy &amp; Traveller DPD – Preferred Strategy</a> (23<sup>rd</sup> February – 6<sup>th</sup> April 2015)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Issues Paper</a> (5<sup>th</sup> October – 16<sup>th</sup> November 2015)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Preferred Approach Strategy</a> (29<sup>th</sup> July - 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2016)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Preferred Approach Sites and Settlements</a> (12<sup>th</sup> January – 24<sup>th</sup> January 2017)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Preferred Approach Town Centre and Retail</a> (12<sup>th</sup> January – 24<sup>th</sup> January 2017)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Publication Amended Core Strategy</a> (July 2017)</li> </ul> <p>The Amended Core Strategy has been subject to a process of Integrated Impact Assessment meeting Sustainability Appraisal (SA), Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) and Health Impact Assessment (HIA) requirements. Reasonable alternatives have been considered through the SA process, at each plan-making stage.</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?</p> <p>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> <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>Where review of the adopted Core Strategy indicated that amendments are necessary (as a result of changes to national policy, updated evidence base and emergence of new information etc.) then reasonable alternatives were prepared and considered through the Sustainability Appraisal process and the bringing together of a robust and proportionate evidence base. SA was embedded from the outset and throughout the plan-making process with all necessary requirements being complied with. Relevant Sustainability Appraisals include those within:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Post-consultation Integrated Impact Assessment Scoping Report</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Post-consultation Integrated Impact Assessment – Preferred Approach Strategy</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Post-consultation Integrated Impact Assessment – Preferred Approach Sites and Settlements and Town Centre &amp; Retail</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Post-consultation Integrated Impact Assessment – Publication Amended Core Strategy</a></li> </ul> <p>The Issues Paper set out the scope and rationale for the review of the adopted Core Strategy, drawing on the <a href="#">Planning Advisory Service review</a> of Core Strategy policies undertaken in February 2015. Following the separation of the review of the Core Strategy and Allocations &amp; Development Management DPDs into separate processes an <a href="#">uncoupling briefing note</a> was produced explaining the reasoning.</p> |

| Soundness Test and Key Requirements   | Evidence Provided   |
|---|---|
| <p><b>Effective:</b> the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities.</p>  |   |
| <p>To be ‘effective’ a DPD needs to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Be deliverable</li> <li>• Demonstrate sound infrastructure planning</li> <li>• Have no regulatory or national planning barriers to its delivery</li> <li>• Have delivery partners who are signed up to it</li> <li>• Be coherent with the strategies of neighbouring authorities</li> <li>• Demonstrate how the Duty to Cooperate has been fulfilled</li> <li>• Be flexible</li> <li>• Be able to be monitored</li> </ul> |   |
| <p><i>Deliverable and Coherent</i></p> <p>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?</p> <p>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>  | <p>The policy platform follows a logical path from the objectives and addresses those issues necessary for successful implementation of the vision, with desired outcomes being clearly and concisely outlined. Comprehensive coverage of policies set against the objectives has been provided for. With ‘Spatial Policies’ having been developed to deliver the vision and objectives, ‘Core Policies’ address to District-wide issues and ‘Area Policies’ responding to the needs of distinct locations. Each objective can be clearly traced to an accompanying policy or policies, providing an explanation of how key policy objectives will be realised.</p> <p>Policies within the Plan are considered to be internally consistent, and through the SA their individual and cumulative impacts have been considered, with their interrelation to one another forming a crucial aspect of this.</p> <p>The Plan is supported by a robust monitoring framework (including development trajectories) which, where appropriate, set out realistic timescales to policy outcomes. Importantly the timescale assumptions which underpin the five year housing land supply and development trajectories are founded on the collection of primary information, and a comprehensive evidence base which has identified constraints and the methods, delivery mechanisms and timescales necessary for their addressing.</p> |
| <p><i>Infrastructure Delivery</i></p>   | <p>The Amended Core Strategy is supported by an updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2016) which has taken account of baseline conditions, established the infrastructure impacts of planned growth (both in</p>   |

| Soundness Test and Key Requirements   | Evidence Provided  |
|---|--|
| <p>Have the infrastructure implications of the policies clearly been identified?</p> <p>Are the delivery mechanisms and timescales for implementation of the policies clearly identified?</p> <p>Is it clear who is going to deliver the required infrastructure and does the timing of the provision complement the timescale of the policies?</p> | <p>respect of its overall level and its spatial distribution), identified the infrastructure required to support this growth, its costs, delivery responsibilities, delivery priorities and potential funding opportunities. This includes a detailed delivery programme for the three strategic sites (Land South of Newark, Land East of Newark and Land around Fernwood) the allocations for which are maintained through the Amended Core Strategy.</p> <p>Thorough engagement with infrastructure providers and neighbouring authorities has been fundamental to the preparation of the IDP, and allowed for the plans, strategies and programmes of external bodies to be aligned with that of the Local Planning Authority and to ensure that delivery responsibilities have been clearly established. The Authorities approach will however be one of continued engagement outside of the Development Plan process, ensuring that the programme of improvements dovetails with projected growth.</p> <p>This comprehensive understanding of infrastructure requirements, costs, timings, delivery mechanisms and involvement of infrastructure providers has guided the delivery forecasts within the development trajectories, seeking to ensure that the timely delivery of the infrastructure required to support growth can occur and so development needs met.</p> <p>Spatial Policy 6 ‘Infrastructure for Growth’ outlines the approach that the Authority will follow to secure necessary infrastructure. This provides a clear demarcation between ‘strategic infrastructure’ (improvements to the highway network and contributions to secondary education required due to cumulative growth) which will be funded by the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), and ‘local infrastructure’ (that required to make specific sites suitable in planning terms) secured through planning obligations has been provided.</p> <p>Spatial Policy 5 ‘Delivering the Strategy’ emphasises the commitment of the Authority to the support and encouragement for delivery of allocated sites, and where appropriate providing help to overcome constraints and unlock sites for development.</p> <p>The Community Infrastructure Levy has recently been reviewed and a revised Charging Schedule subject to Examination in August 2017. The Inspectors report was received in October 2017 and concluded that the schedule provides an appropriate basis for the collection of the levy in the District. It is anticipated that this will be adopted and come into force on the 1<sup>st</sup> January 2018. The Regulation 123 List (defining</p> |

| Soundness Test and Key Requirements   | Evidence Provided   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>those projects which the CIL will be used to fund) was also revised through the review. This process took account of the implications of the updated IDP and Amended Core Strategy, and will ensure that an appropriate charging mechanism is in place to meet ‘strategic infrastructure’ needs.</p> <p>The implications of the Amended Core Strategy and revised Community Infrastructure on the economic viability of planned growth have been tested through the <a href="#">Whole Plan Viability Study</a>, with the ability of future development to make infrastructure contributions through the CIL and planning obligations forming part of the assessment. The conclusion reached is that the development strategy proposed through the Amended Core Strategy is deliverable with additional sufficient additional viability margin for CIL.</p>   |
| <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> | <p>The Amended Core Strategy takes account and brings together the objectives of a wide range of strategies such as those relating to education and school place planning, transport and health etc. into a cohesive spatial strategy. Importantly the Amended Core Strategy goes far beyond traditional land use planning by setting out a clear vision as to what the District will be like in 2033, supported by objectives outlining what will need to be achieved to deliver the vision. The Plan’s policies follow logically from the vision and objectives and provide an appropriate policy platform for their delivery.</p> <p>The Authority has carried out extensive consultation, including with Duty to Co-operate bodies as well as partner agencies and key stakeholders. Representations from bodies responsible for other strategies have been received and where appropriate taken into account in the preparation of the Plan.</p> |
| <p><i>Flexibility</i></p> <p>Is the DPD flexible enough to respond to a variety of, or unexpected changes in, circumstances?</p> <p>Does the DPD include the remedial actions that will be taken if the policies need adjustment?</p>   | <p>The Authority considers that the Amended Core Strategy is sufficiently flexible to respond to unexpected changes in circumstance</p> <p>Spatial Policy 5 ‘Delivering the Strategy’ formalises the approach which the Authority will take to deliver its strategy, and outlines mechanisms and measures which would be taken should delivery stall. Beyond this individual policies have been formulated in a way which include safeguards over viability and that allow for site specific circumstances to be taken account of, allowing for the flexible implementation of policy where appropriate. A robust monitoring framework has been developed, through which policy effectiveness will be appraised; this along with the regular refreshing of the evidence base will indicate whether detailed review is necessary.</p>  |

| Soundness Test and Key Requirements  | Evidence Provided   |
|--|---|
| <p><i>Co-operation</i></p> <p>Is there sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the Duty to Cooperate has been undertaken appropriately for the plan being examined?</p> <p>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?</p>   | <p>The Authority has comprehensively fulfilled its requirements under the Duty to Cooperate, having undertaken extensive engagement and cooperation with neighbouring Authorities and statutory bodies to ensure that strategic issues have been appropriately addressed, the District’s development needs met and strategic priorities of the wider area delivered. The process and outcomes are outlined in the <a href="#">Duty to Cooperate Statement</a>.</p> <p>Where successful implementation stretches beyond the sole control of the Authority then this has been acknowledged. The monitoring framework provides a comprehensive assessment identifying the responsible agencies for each element of the Amended Core Strategy. Comprehensive engagement and cooperation has taken place with external agencies with a role in implementing the Amended Core Strategy, and the content of the Plan reflects the outcome of this process. The <a href="#">Statement of Representation</a>, <a href="#">Statement of Consultation</a> and <a href="#">Duty to Cooperate Statement</a> provide further detail.</p>  |
| <p><i>Monitoring</i></p> <p>Does the DPD contain targets, and milestones which relate to the delivery of the policies, (including housing trajectories where the DPD contains housing allocations)?</p> <p>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?</p> <p>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> | <p>A comprehensive and robust monitoring framework has been brought together, set out in Appendix F of the Amended DPD. This framework includes appropriate targets and milestones against which to monitor the effectiveness of the Plan. A housing trajectory based on reasoned assumptions and evidence has been provided in Appendix C, which sets out forecast delivery for the three strategic sites allocated through the document. The framework clearly outlines how performance will be monitored, by whom and how this is linked to production of the Annual Monitoring Report.</p> <p>The approach set out within the Amended Core Strategy has been guided by the Sustainability Appraisal process (incorporated into the Integrated Impact Assessment), and where necessary the identification of significant effects have been responded to through the introduction of specific policy content seeking to provide for avoidance/mitigation. The monitoring framework has been developed to robustly appraise the effectiveness of the Plan, and so the significant effects identified through the SA would be monitored through this wider process.</p> <p>The existing monitoring framework has been reviewed both in terms of its effectiveness and in response to amendments proposed through the review of the Core Strategy. The Framework is intended to have a degree of flexibility inbuilt, allowing change to be adapted to, and it will be regularly reviewed.</p> |
| <p><b>Consistent with national policy:</b> the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework. 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>   |   |

| Soundness Test and Key Requirements   | Evidence Provided   |
|---|---|
| <p>Does the DPD contain any policies or proposals which are not consistent with national policy and, if so, is there local justification?</p> <p>Does the DPD contain policies that do not add anything to existing national guidance? If so, why have these been included?</p> | <p>It is not considered that the Amended Core Strategy contains any policies or proposals that are not consistent with national policy. Indeed the purpose of many of the amendments is to bring the existing Core Strategy into line with current national planning policy. This process was guided by the <a href="#">Planning Advisory Service review</a> of Core Strategy policies undertaken in February 2015. The policy platform builds on and adds further detail to aid the implementation of national planning policy at the local level.</p> |

## **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; and
- 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; and
- Have due regard to protection of local amenity and local environment.

| Policy Expectations  | Evidence Provided   |
|--|---|
| <p><b>Policy A: Using evidence to plan positively and manage development (para 6)</b></p>    |   |
| <p>Early and effective community engagement with both settled and traveller communities.</p> | <p>The Authority has undertaken early and effective consultation with both the settled and traveller communities. This process is outlined below.</p> <p>In early 2013 work was undertaken to establish a methodology for assessing current and future gypsy and traveller accommodation needs with neighbouring Nottinghamshire Authorities. This methodology was tested through a technical consultation which canvassed the views and opinions of key stakeholders, local community representatives, known interested parties and agents in July 2013.</p> <p>Following adoption of the Allocations &amp; Development Management DPD the intention had been to produce a separate Gypsy and Traveller DPD. Consequently two stages of consultation were undertaken. The first being the <a href="#">Issues Paper</a> (September 2013) through which further input on the method for assessing accommodation needs of the community was sought, as well as views on pitch definitions and the broad locations for meeting future needs. In addition a ‘call for sites’ and request for details of additional representatives of the gypsy and traveller community (beyond those already known to the District Council) was made. The consultation was carried out in line with the previous Statement of Community Involvement, and included engagement with the settled population and direct consultation with the Gypsy and Traveller community, carried out by the East Notts Travellers Association and Nottinghamshire’s Gypsy and Traveller Liaison Officer.</p> <p>The Issues Paper was complimented by a <a href="#">stakeholder workshop event</a> in November 2013 where the input from service providers, representatives from the travelling communities, neighbouring local authorities/organisations and other relevant stakeholders was sought over a range of matters relevant to meeting the existing and future needs of the gypsy and traveller community. Gypsy and travellers on authorised and unauthorised sites and those living in housing were also, separately, given the opportunity to participate in a <a href="#">survey</a> aimed at establishing their future needs. The survey work was carried out by the East Notts Travellers Association (ENTA) and Nottinghamshire’s Gypsy and Traveller Liaison Officer. Residents of all sites known to the Council and any others known to the interviewers were invited to contribute. Whilst ENTA reported difficulties in generating a positive</p> |

response to the survey in the Newark area the County’s Gypsy & Traveller Liaison Officer collected a high level of response in the West of the District, carrying out one to one interviews with owners and occupiers of sites.

Taking account of the input previously received the second formal stage of consultation on the Gypsy and Traveller DPD was the [Preferred Strategy](#) consultation (February 2015). Through this document the pitch requirements calculated from the [Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment](#) (February 2015), the preferred locational approach to meeting needs, pitch sizes and definitions and approach to future development on Tolney Lane, Newark were set out. Consultation was undertaken in line with the previous Statement of Community Involvement, with specific effort being made to engage with the gypsy and traveller community, their representatives and the settled population.

Following consultation on the Preferred Strategy the issue of planning to meet Gypsy and Traveller needs was brought into the wider Plan Review process, with work on the separate Gypsy and Traveller DPD ceasing.

The matter of gypsy and traveller needs was picked up in the [Issues Paper](#) (October 2015), supported by an updated [Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment](#) (October 2015), to take account of the changes to definitions for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople within national policy. Input was sought from the community, their representatives and settled community over the Councils approach to assessment of need, the approach and locations to providing for it, amended text for Core Policy 5 and future development on Tolney Lane, Newark. Importantly the consultation document detailed how the Authority proposed to take account of the change in definition and the implications of this on future requirements – giving the both the settled and travelling communities and their representatives the opportunity to provide feed into this.

Subsequently the [Preferred Approach Strategy](#) was published for public consultation in July 2016, with a refreshed [Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment](#) (June 2016) sitting alongside the document. Following reflection on the Issues Paper consultation responses, establishing a numerical distinction between the Gypsy and Traveller population who travel and those who have ceased to do so permanently was acknowledged as difficult. To more accurately reflect the split census data was drawn upon to identify approximate proportions of the population living in ‘bricks and mortar’. Knowing from housing records that bricks and mortar tenants consider themselves adequately housed they were considered them to have permanently ceased travelling and so the GTAA was

updated to reflect this in the calculations of future pitch need. Amended wording, providing the preferred approach, for Core Policy 4 and Core Policy 5 was also included. Again through carrying out consultation in line with the Statement of Community Involvement there was the opportunity for the two communities and their representatives to comment.

In order to meet gypsy and traveller needs the plan period the [Preferred Approach Sites & Settlements](#) consultation (January 2017) proposed the re-allocation of NUA/Ho/2 ‘Land south of Quibells Lane’ for gypsy and traveller accommodation, sufficient to meet pitch requirements over the plan period. Full and comprehensive consultation was carried out in line with the Statement of Community Involvement and replicating that undertaken in earlier stages.

The results of detailed investigations, showed NUA/Ho/2 to be at lesser flood risk than previously considered, and consequently following discussions with the landowner was concluded to no longer be deliverable for the proposed gypsy and traveller use. Accordingly the decision was taken to ‘decouple’ the review of the Core Strategy and Allocations & Development Management DPDs from one another. With the Core Strategy to be progressed first. The [Uncoupling Briefing Note](#) outlines this decision in greater detail.

Subsequently the [Publication Amended Core Strategy](#) was published for Representation in July 2017, and as a result of the decoupling contained pitch requirements based on the June 2016 GTAA. In addition the approach that the Authority will follow in seeking to secure site(s) to deliver the pitches required through the review of the Allocations & Development Management DPD was outlined (including the locational approach to meeting needs). Amended text to Core Policy 5 detailing how potential allocations and site proposed to meet unexpected demand will be considered was also provided. The Authority followed a robust approach to seeking representations, meeting regulatory requirements and ensuring the travelling and settled communities and their representatives were able to submit representations as appropriate.

The process and outcomes covered above are outlined in the

- [Summary of Responses on Gypsy and Traveller Assessment Methodology Consultation](#);
- [Consultation Report on the Issues Paper](#);
- [Statement of Consultation](#) and
- [Statement of Representation](#).

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>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.</p>  | <p>The District Council has used its best endeavours to co-operate with travellers, representative bodies, stakeholder groups and other local authorities, as outlined above. Importantly the process followed has utilised a range of differing techniques and not relied solely upon formal consultation and the seeking of representations. Requirements under the Duty to Cooperate have been fully complied with, as set out within the <a href="#">Duty to Cooperate Statement</a>.</p> <p>This process has led to the production of a robust and transparent <a href="#">Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment</a> (June 2016) which has drawn on a range of appropriate data sources, including the direct input of the gypsy and traveller community where this was possible to secure. As set out earlier the GTAA has been subject to continual refinement throughout the plan-making process taking account of consultation responses, availability of new data and changes in national planning policy. It is considered that this document provides an up-to-date understanding of likely permanent and transit accommodation within the District. The District Council acknowledges that the Assessment will need to be kept under regular review, as per other areas of objectively assessed need.</p> |
| <p><b>Policy B: Planning for traveller sites (paras 7- 11)</b></p>   |   |
| <p>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. Set criteria to guide land supply allocations where there is identified need. Ensure that traveller sites are sustainable economically, socially and environmentally.</p> | <p>The Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (June 2016) provides a robust assessment over the accommodation needs of gypsies and travellers within Newark &amp; Sherwood District. The methodology followed has been established through collaborative work with neighbouring LPA's, with the process followed outlined above. Importantly this process has drawn on robust data, including primary sources where available, and has responded to the definitional change within national policy.</p> <p>Core Policy 4 'Gypsies and Travellers New Pitch Provision' outlines the approach which will be followed to secure pitch provision sufficient to meet the 40 pitches required over the plan period. Whilst site allocations will not be made through the Amended Core Strategy, the approach does include allocation through the review of the Allocations &amp; Development Management DPD. The broad spatial distribution of development which will be followed in making provision is also detailed along with how future proposals on Tolney Lane, Newark will be considered.</p> <p>Following the spatial approach outlined by Core Policy 4, Core Policy 5 'Criteria for Considering Sites for Gypsies &amp; Travellers and Travelling Showpeople' provides a criterion based approach to guide the</p> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | allocation of sites and the response to proposals for ‘unexpected demand’. The approach is one based around the promotion of sustainable development, and is consistent with the Planning Policy for Travellers.  |
| <b>Policy C: Sites in rural areas and the countryside (para 12)</b>   |   |
| 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.  | Core Policy 4 seeks to make new pitch provision in line with the District Councils spatial strategy, and with an emphasis on Newark Urban Area. This would direct development towards the most sustainable locations in the District, i.e. commonly the larger settlements. Consequently this should act as a natural restraint on the scale of development which would be seen in rural locations beyond this. However in terms of unexpected demand Core Policy 5 includes a range of criteria which would be relevant to establishing whether the scale of a proposal would ‘dominate’ the nearest settled community (landscape, character/ visual amenity, highways and amenity). |
| 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.   | No specific evidence has been identified through the various sources and stages of engagement that affordability is a particular issue. The matter is more one of general land availability. Whilst there is evidence over the desire for a Council owned site this relates to concerns over site management rather than affordability.   |
| <b>Policy E: Traveller sites in Green Belt (paras 14-15)</b>  |   |
| Traveller sites (both permanent and temporary) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.<br><br>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. | Through Spatial Policy 4A ‘Extent of the Green Belt’ no further amendments will be made to the extent of the Green Belt established through the small scale review in 2012.S  |
| <b>Policy F: Mixed planning use traveller sites (paras 16-18)</b>   |   |
| Local planning authorities should consider, wherever possible, including traveller sites suitable for mixed   | Core Policy 5 recognises the contribution that love/work mixed use sites can make towards achieving sustainable development, subject to appropriate safeguards.   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| residential and business uses, having regard to the safety and amenity of the occupants and neighbouring residents.  |  |
| <b>Policy G: Major development projects (para 19)</b>  |  |
| 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. | Whilst the District Council is unaware of any planned development which would necessitate such consideration criterion 7 of Core Policy 5 nonetheless replicates this wording. |

### Integration of marine and terrestrial planning

As the UK marine area and marine plan area boundaries extend up to the level of mean high water spring tides while terrestrial planning boundaries generally extend to mean low water spring tides (including estuaries), the marine plan area will physically overlap with that of some terrestrial plan. Local authorities with any tidal frontage, even if far inland and not conventionally regarded as coastal, must therefore take full account of the MMO, the MPS and marine plans under S.58 of the Marine and Coastal Access Act and the Duty to Co-operate in Section 110 of the Localism Act 2011. A full list of the local planning authorities whose areas overlap with the UK marine area appears in Appendix One.

Furthermore, the Duty to Co-Operate requires all local planning authorities, even if landlocked, to take account, where relevant, of the MMO’s plans and activities when preparing their Local Plans. Finally, the NPPF requires LPAs to take the MPS into account under the tests of soundness (specifically, to test if an emerging DPD is consistent with national policy, which includes the MPS). The Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 (the Act) provided for the introduction of a marine planning system for England’s inshore and offshore marine area, establishing the Secretary of State as the Marine Planning Authority for these areas. The Act also provided for the establishment of the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) and for the Secretary of State to delegate various planning functions. The planning functions including preparation and review were delegated to the MMO in 2010. The Act also provided for the adoption of the UK Marine Policy Statement (MPS). The MPS was adopted on 18 March 2011 and provides the policy framework for marine planning and for all decisions likely to affect the marine area.

There are eleven plan areas in English waters, for each of which a Marine Plan will be prepared by the MMO and adopted by the Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs.

In practical terms, all activities undertaken in the marine area require land based infrastructure, without which our ability to benefit economically and socially from activities in the marine area would be extremely limited.

The UK Government's vision for the marine environment, as articulated in the MPS, is:

'clean, healthy, safe, productive and biologically diverse oceans and seas'.

In the absence of a marine plan prepared by the MMO and adopted by the Secretary of State the MPS is the relevant marine policy document.

Where a marine plan has been adopted both the MPS and the Marine Plan are relevant marine policy documents for the marine plan area.

As articulated in the Marine and Coastal Act and the MPS, the Government aims for the MPS and marine planning systems to sit alongside and interact with existing planning regimes across the UK. Specifically, s.58 of the Marine and Coastal Access Act requires all public bodies to:

- take authorisation or enforcement decisions that affect or might affect the UK marine area in accordance with the MPS and relevant Marine Plans, unless relevant considerations indicate otherwise
- state their reasons where authorisation or enforcement decisions are not taken in accordance with the MPS and relevant Marine Plans
- have regard to the MPS and relevant Marine Plans when taking decisions that affect or might affect the UK marine area which are not authorisation or enforcement decisions

In addition, the MPS seeks integration of marine planning and the terrestrial planning system through:

- Consistency between marine and terrestrial policy documents and guidance
- Liaison between respective responsible authorities for terrestrial and marine planning, including in plan development, implementation and review stages
- Sharing the evidence base and data where relevant and appropriate so as to achieve consistency in the data used in plan making and decisions

These aims are further supported by footnote 36 in the NPPF.

| Policy Expectations  | Evidence Provided   |
|--|---|
| <b>Key requirements under the Duty to Co-Operate</b>   |   |
| Consistency between marine and terrestrial policy documents and guidance   | The Amended Core Strategy is considered to be compliant with the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009, the Marine Policy Statement and Marine Licensing.  |
| Liaison between respective authorities responsible for terrestrial and marine planning, including in plan development, implementation and review stages                            | The District Council has liaised with the Marine Management Organisation during the preparation of the plan and this is detailed in the <a href="#">Duty to Cooperate Statement</a> .   |
| Sharing the evidence base and data where relevant and appropriate so as to achieve consistency in the data used in plan making and decisions                                       | Given the marginal overlap of the District with the UK Marine Area (the River Trent is tidal downstream of Cromwell Weir) and the nature of the proposals within the Amended Core Strategy it was not considered proportionate to make specific efforts to share its evidence base and data beyond that which was made publically available. The Authority has thoroughly cooperated with the Marine Planning Organisation and engaged with the body through formal consultation and the seeking of representations, at no stage has any request for a greater level of sharing been received.  |
| <b>Marine Policy Statement- Chapter 2: General Principles for Decision-Making</b>  |   |
| <b>Sections 2.1 -2.2: The UK vision for the marine environment</b>   |   |
| <p>The UK vision for the marine environment (‘clean, healthy, safe, productive and biologically diverse oceans and seas’)</p> <p>Achieving the vision through marine planning.</p> | <p>A marginal portion of the District falls within the UK Marine Area. Nonetheless the Amended Core Strategy contains general policies which seek to direct development to areas at least flood risk (Core Policy 10) and to manage surface water so as to avoid unacceptable impact (which could include the transfer of pollution and contaminates into the marine environment, Core Policy 10 and 10a).</p> <p>The update to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment took account of the re-modelling of the tidally influenced section of the River Trent undertaken by the Environment Agency. The results of the modelling did not show any significant increased intrusion of the floodprints into Flood Zone 1, and the primary risk was still fluvial in nature. Whilst the re-assessment of existing allocations will be carried out through the review of the Allocations &amp; Development Management DPD consideration</p> |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>was given as to whether the levels of growth anticipated through as part of the amended Spatial Strategy were deliverable. With respect to tidal flood risk the two ‘settlements central to the Spatial Strategy’ potentially affected by the modelling are Collingham and Sutton-on-Trent.</p> <p>Collingham falls largely outside of the tidal flood outlines, as is the case with the single allocation (Co/MU/1) – which now benefits from a resolution to grant outline planning permission subject to the agreement of the Section 106). In terms of Sutton-on-Trent a much greater portion of the village falls within the EA modelled tidal flood outlines. Prompted by the EA tidal modelling results further flood risk (sequential and exceptions) was requested and undertaken as part of the determination of the detailed planning application on the only allocation in the settlement (ST/MU/1, now also benefiting from resolution to grant permission). The District Council were satisfied sequentially, whilst the EA have approved the Flood Risk Assessment and so appear satisfied from the Exceptions Test perspective. The EA have not raised any objection to the proposed continued allocation of the site through the Preferred Approach – Sites &amp; Settlements consultation (the most recent site specific consultation stage of the Plan Review). Consequently the site is presently viewed as still being deliverable. Accordingly the District Council is content that the levels of growth in areas potentially affected by marine planning issues remain deliverable and appropriate.</p> <p>The Development Plan contains specific policy content on the control of pollution and hazardous materials beyond the Core Strategy, Policy DM11 in the Allocations &amp; Development Management DPD.</p> |
| <p><b>Section 2.4: Considering benefits and adverse effects in marine planning</b></p>                       |   |
| <p>Consider benefits and adverse effects of plan policies</p>  | <p>The potential benefits and adverse effects of the policy options has been assessed and detailed through the Sustainability Appraisal process (documented within the various stages of the Integrated Impact Assessment). The monitoring Framework sets out indicators for the monitoring of the effects of the plan, which will be reported in the AMR.</p>  |
| <p><b>Section 2.5: Economic, social and environmental considerations</b></p>                                 |   |
| <p>Contribute to the objectives of relevant EU Directives (Marine Strategy Framework Directive and Water</p> | <p>Economic, social and environmental considerations have been considered and assessed and detailed through the Sustainability Appraisal process (documented within the various stages of the Integrated</p>  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>Framework Directive)</p>   | <p>Impact Assessment). The monitoring framework sets out indicators for the monitoring of the effects of the plan, which will be reported in the AMR.<br/>The implications of the Water Framework Directive have been taken account of as part of the <a href="#">Water Cycle Study</a> update</p>   |
| <p><b>Marine Policy Statement- Chapter 3: Policy Objectives for Key Activities</b></p>  |  |
| <p>Incorporate identified areas and features of importance for nature conservation</p> <p>Activities or developments that may result in adverse impacts on biodiversity should be designed or located to avoid such impacts</p> | <p>Through Core Policy 12 ‘Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure’ the conservation and enhancement of the biodiversity and geological diversity of the District is sought. With the expectation that proposals will take into account the need for continued protection of assets, particularly sites of international, national and local significance.</p> |
| <p><b>3.4 Ports and shipping</b></p>  |  |
| <p>Take into account and seek to minimise any negative impacts on shipping activity, freedom of navigation and navigational safety.</p> <p>Protect the efficiency and resilience of continuing port operations.</p>             | <p>No specific policy content on this aspect. Spatial Policy 7 ‘Sustainable Transport’ does however promote the use of the River Trent for commercial activities (potentially including shipping of freight).</p>  |
| <p><b>3.8 Fisheries</b></p>   |  |
| <p>Consider potential economic, social and environmental impacts of other developments on fishing activity</p>  | <p>No specific policy content.</p>   |
| <p><b>3.9 Aquaculture</b></p>   |  |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Consider the benefits of encouraging the development of efficient, competitive and sustainable aquaculture industries.                            | No specific policy content.   |
| <b>3.10 Surface water management and waste water treatment and disposal</b>   |   |
| Maximise opportunities for coexistence of waste water infrastructure with other activities in the marine environment                              | No specific policy content. Though Core Policy 10 and 10a provide the basis for appropriate surface water management, so as to avoid unacceptable impact. |
| <b>3.11 Tourism and recreation</b>  |   |
| Consider the potential for tourism and recreation in the marine environment and the benefits this will bring to the economy and local communities | Spatial Policy 7 ‘Sustainable Transport’ promotes the use of the River Trent for tourism purposes.  |