

BASSETLAW LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

MATTERS, ISSUES AND QUESTIONS

Updated 31 October 2022

Inspectors Anne Jordan BA(Hons) MRTPI and Alison Partington BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

Programme Officer – Carmel Edwards

tel: 07969 631930 email: programmeofficer@carmeledwards.com

This document sets out Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQs) on the submitted Bassetlaw Local Plan. They will inform the hearing sessions which are due to start on Tuesday 29th November 2022.

Please see the enclosed 'Hearings Programme' for details of the hearing dates. Further information on the examination process is set out in the accompanying 'Examination Guidance Note'.

Written Statements

In order to ensure the hearing events are focused, representors are invited to respond to the questions in this document. **Written statements should be submitted to the Programme Officer by Friday 4th November 2022 (5pm)**, via the above email address. Late responses and further documents received after this date will not be accepted.

Participants should only respond to the questions which directly relate to their previously submitted written representations on the plan. Please clearly indicate in your statement(s) the question(s) you are answering.

You may choose to respond to all or some of the questions. There is no requirement to submit a hearing statement and you may wish to rely on your original representations to the Plan. All previous written representations on the submission draft Plan will be taken into account.

In responding to questions regard should be had to the Council's response to comments on the plan (SUB-007) and the modifications it has proposed to the plan (SUB-008 and SUB-009).

Statements should be proportionate in length to the number of questions being answered and should not, in total, exceed 3,000 words per Matter. Extensive appendices will not be accepted. Separate statements should be submitted on each Matter. The Council's hearing statements should cover every question and respond to objections made at the submission Plan stage. The word limit does not apply to the Council as they are required to respond to every question.

We are examining the plan as submitted by the Council. Therefore, we will not, at this stage, be considering the merits of sites for development not included in the plan (“omission sites”). Should we determine that there is a need for additional or different sites to be allocated, we will, in the first instance, ask the Council to consider how they would wish to proceed with the Examination.

The questions concerning soundness are primarily focussed on the plan’s policies. Insofar as they relate to the plan’s soundness other elements of the plan, including the supporting text, will be considered as part of the discussion of the relevant policies.

Evidence documents

The submitted Local Plan and other evidence documents can be viewed on the Council’s examination webpage in the Local Plan Examination Library. A number of new documents have been added in the last few months, including the Inspector’s Pre-Hearing Questions (and the Council’s responses).

The hearing sessions

The hearing sessions are due to start on Tuesday 29th November 2022 and will run for 3 weeks. It is intended to hold the sessions mainly at Worksop Town Hall, but some sessions will be held at Retford Town Hall and some will be run virtually.

If you wish to speak at the hearing sessions you will need to contact the Programme Officer in email/writing by Friday 4th November 2022 (5pm). You should indicate:

- Which matter/question number this relates to, and
- Who you are representing (where relevant)

Alternatively, you may prefer to watch the hearing sessions, rather than take an active part in the discussions. If you wish to observe any of the sessions, could you please notify the Programme Officer by the same date and respond to the questions above.

Further information

Please check the Council’s examination website for regular updates regarding the timing and format of the hearings.

If you have any questions about this document or the hearing sessions, please contact the Programme Officer.

**Bassetlaw Local Plan Examination in Public
Provisional Hearings Programme (may be subject to change)**

Tuesday 29th November 2022 at 9.30 Worksop Town Hall

Matter 1a & 1b Legal Compliance and Overarching Issues
Matter 2 Spatial Strategy

Wednesday 30th November 2022 at 9.30 Worksop Town Hall

Matter 3 Employment Land Need and Allocations
Matter 4 Priority Regeneration Areas

Thursday 1st December 2022 at 9.30 Worksop Town Hall

Matter 5 The Housing Requirement
Matter 6 Housing Allocations

Friday 2nd December AM – Reserve Session

Tuesday 6th December 2022 at 9.30 Retford Town Hall

Matter 6 Housing Allocations
Matter 6 Housing Allocations

Wednesday 7th December 2022 at 9.30 Worksop Town Hall

Matter 7 Housing Supply
Matter 8 Housing Needs Policies

Thursday 8th December 2022 at 9.30 Worksop Town Hall

Matter 9 ~~Retail, Character and Distinctiveness and Healthy Communities~~ **Visitor Economy
and Retail & Town Centres**
Matter 10 Local Character and Distinctiveness
Matter 11 Healthy Communities

Friday 9th December 2022 - Reserve Session

Tuesday 13th December 2022 at 9.30 Virtual via Teams

Matter 40 **12** Greening Bassetlaw
Matter 44 **13** Transport and Connectivity
Matter 42 **14** Infrastructure and Delivery, **and Monitoring**

Wednesday 14th December – Reserve Session (Virtual)

Thursday 15th December – Reserve Session (Virtual)

The venue for each session will be confirmed 2 weeks before the event.

Matter 1a – Legal Compliance

Issue 1: Has the Council complied with the duty to co-operate and other relevant procedural and legal requirements in the preparation of the Local Plan.

- 1.1 In preparing the plan did the Councils engage constructively, actively and on an on-going basis with neighbouring authorities and other relevant organisations on cross-boundary issues, in respect of the Duty to Co-operate?

[Note: this question concerns the engagement undertaken by the Councils during the preparation of the plan and does not directly relate to the content of the plan and whether or not it is sound which is considered under other Matters]

- 1.2 Has the plan been prepared in accordance with the adopted Local Development Scheme (May 2022)?

- 1.3 Has consultation on the plan been carried out in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (Jan 2020 and June 2021 Update) and the requirements of the 2004 Act (as amended) and the 2012 Regulations?

- 1.4 Does the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) provide a comprehensive and robust basis to inform the strategy and contents of the plan, particularly in terms of:

- a) Its assessment of the likely effects of the plan's policies and allocations?
- b) Its consideration of reasonable alternatives, including the eight spatial strategy options? Does it capture all reasonable alternative site options put forward in the plan preparation process? Can these be compared on a like for like basis?
- c) Its explanation of why the preferred strategy and policies were selected?
- d) Its assessment of the amount of development that would arise as a result of the provisions in the plan?

[Note: This question focusses on the legal compliance of the SA in broad terms. The implications of the SA for the soundness of the plan is considered under other Matters.]

- 1.5 Is the Habitats Regulations Assessment (May 2022) adequate and does the plan include all the recommendations identified in the assessment as necessary to ensure compliance with the Habitats Regulations? Is it robust and convincing in its conclusion that the plan will have no likely significant effects on the integrity of any European sites?

- 1.6 Does the plan include policies to address the strategic priorities for the development and use of land in Bassetlaw?

- 1.7 Does the plan include policies designed to ensure that the development and use of land in Bassetlaw contributes to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change?
- 1.8 How have issues of equality been addressed in the Local Plan?
- 1.9 Does the plan comply with all other relevant legal requirements, including in the 2004 Act (as amended) and the 2012 Regulations?

Matter 1b - Overarching Matters

- 1.10 Is the plan period (2020 – 2038) justified, effective and consistent with national policy? If so, should the requirements/timescales for review of the plan be set out in policy?
- 1.11 Are there any 'made' Neighbourhood Plans, or any being prepared or in the pipeline? If so, how have these been taken into account and where is this evident? How has the emerging Worksop DPD been taken into account in the preparation of the plan?

Matter 2 – Vision & Objectives, Spatial Strategy & Location of New Development, and the Site Selection Process

(Policies ST1 and 2)

Issue 2 – Are the provisions of the plan in relation to the Spatial Strategy & Location of New Development justified and consistent with national policy?

This matter focusses on the broad spatial distribution of new development and on the process by which proposed development sites have been selected for inclusion in the plan (Policies ST1 and ST2). The merits of individual site allocations are considered under Matters 3 and 6)

- 2.1 Is the proposed spatial strategy and the distribution of development (as set out in policies ST1 and ST2) supported by robust and up-to-date evidence and otherwise soundly based? In particular:
 - a) Does it reflect the vision and objectives of the plan?
 - b) To what degree is the spatial framework in Policy ST2 based on the settlement hierarchy in Policy ST1? Is the focus on strategic allocations in the larger urban settlements justified and soundly based?
 - c) Would the pattern of development proposed meet the needs of larger settlements in the district?
- 2.2 What is the evidential basis for the settlement hierarchy in policy ST2? Does this accurately reflect the pattern of settlements across the district? Is this up-to-date? How does this inform the development strategy? What other factors influenced the strategy, such as physical and environmental constraints?
- 2.3 What other spatial strategies and distributions of growth were considered during plan preparation, and why were they discounted? Where is the evidence for this? Were alternative approaches tested in the Sustainability Appraisal work?
- 2.4 Do policies ST1 and ST2 allow sufficient development in large rural settlements, small rural settlements and other villages to comply with para 79 of the Framework? How were the proportions of development proposed for each settlement arrived at?
- 2.5 Are the proposed settlement development boundaries appropriately drawn? What factors were taken into account in designating these? Is the approach taken in relation to settlement boundaries in Small Rural Settlements justified and consistent with national policy?
- 2.6 Have the sites allocated for development in the plan been appraised and selected in comparison with possible alternatives using a robust and objective process?

- 2.7 Are the plans assumptions in relation to the amounts and timing of development to be delivered through neighbourhood plans and the Worksop Central Development Plan soundly based?
- 2.8 Are policies ST1 and ST2 otherwise justified and consistent with national policy?
Are there any omissions in the policies and are they sufficiently flexible?
- 2.9 Do the vision and objectives of the plan adequately address matters of climate change and air quality?
- 2.10 Are the Council's proposed modifications to the policies necessary for soundness?

Matter 3 – Employment Land

(Policies ST7, 9, ST10 and ST11)

Issue 3 – Are the provisions of the plan in relation to the provision of employment land justified and consistent with national policy? Would the allocations be developable, deliverable and otherwise soundly based?

- 3.1 Is the supply of 183 ha of local employment land justified in order to provide for future employment needs in the district? How were the sites selected? Were they selected in comparison with possible alternatives using a robust and objective process?
- 3.2 Is the restriction to B2, B8 and Class E (g) justified for new employment allocations?
- 3.3 In relation to strategic employment needs:
 - a) Is the allocation of 119ha at Apleyhead, in addition to land identified for “General and Larger Unit Employment Sites” justified and consistent with national policy?
 - b) What factors led to its allocation? Is it based on up-to-date evidence?
 - c) Has the allocation had appropriate regard to the potential wider strategic impact of the development?
- 3.4 Are the requirements of policies ST7 and Policy 9 clear, and would the criteria identified to assess proposals on these sites be likely to be effective? In particular:
 - a) Is the requirement of 3(e) necessary and what does it seek to achieve?
 - b) Is there sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the site can be implemented and that all necessary infrastructure and mitigation measures required to support it are achievable and can be delivered?
 - c) What assumptions have been made in relation to the timescale for delivery and are these justified?
- 3.5 In relation to policy ST10 is the policy based on up-to-date evidence and is the policy consistent with national policy?
- 3.6 In relation to policies ST11 and ST12, are the policies justified by appropriate available evidence, having regard to national guidance, and local context? Do the policies provide clear direction as to how a decision maker should react to a development proposal? In relation to camping, caravanning and chalets, do the proposals pay appropriate regard to the biodiversity impacts of such proposals?
- 3.7 Are there any omissions in the policies and are they sufficiently flexible?
- 3.8 Are the Council’s proposed modifications to these policies and the supporting text necessary for soundness?

Matter 4 – Priority Regeneration Areas

(Policies ST5 and ST6)

Issue 4 – Are the provisions of the plan in relation to the Priority Regeneration Areas justified and consistent with national policy?

- 4.1 Are the assumptions of the amount of development to be delivered through the Worksop DPD justified and based on sound evidence? Having regard to the constraints imposed in relation to development in the flood plain, are the projected timescales for delivery of the plan and development proposed within it soundly based?
- 4.2 In relation to Policy ST6 is there sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the site can be viably redeveloped and served by appropriate infrastructure? Does the policy provide sufficient guidance in relation to future land uses to enable the regeneration of the site?
- 4.3 Are policies ST5 and ST6 otherwise justified and consistent with national policy?
- 4.4 Are there any omissions in the policies and are they sufficiently flexible?
- 4.5 Are the Council's proposed modifications to these policies and the supporting text necessary for soundness?

Matter 5 The Housing Requirement

Issue 5 - Is the identified housing requirement in Policy ST1, justified and consistent with national policy?

- 5.1 Is the Plan period 2020 to 2038 justified and consistent with national policy which requires strategic policies to look at least 15 years ahead from adoption?
- 5.2 Is the housing requirement of 10,476 homes during the 2020-2038 period (policy ST1) and the proposed uplift above Local Housing Need (LHN), to a figure of 582 dwellings per annum (dpa), justified by the Council's evidence? Are the assumptions of the 2019 Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment and Addenda (SS-010, SS-007 and SS-024) soundly based, particularly in relation to:
 - a) Identifying a baseline figure;
 - b) Forecasts for economic growth;
 - c) Alignment of jobs and workers; and
 - d) Assumptions of housing requirements arising from economic growth.
- 5.3 In relation to Affordable Housing Needs, is the identified need for 214 dpa been based on robust, up-to-date information? How has this been considered in the overall housing requirement? Based on the thresholds and requirements in Policy ST29, will affordable housing needs be met?
- 5.4 Should there be a housing requirement for designated neighbourhood areas in Policy ST1? (paragraph 67 in the NPPF) If so, what should this be?

Matter 6 Housing Allocations

(Policies 16 –28)

Issue 6 – Are the proposed housing allocations justified, effective, developable, deliverable, in line with national policy and otherwise soundly based?

Note: This matter focusses on the merits of individual site allocations, the process for selecting site allocations is dealt with in Matter 2.

- 6.1 Do the sites allocated for residential development provide an appropriate range of sites in terms of their type and size?
- 6.2 Is the site allocated as an urban extension at Peaks Hill Farm sound, and in particular:
 - a) Are the various requirements set out in in the policy clear, justified and effective?
 - b) Have the site constraints, indicative yield, development mix and viability considerations been adequately addressed?
 - c) Is there sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the site can be implemented and that all necessary infrastructure and mitigation measures required to support it are achievable and can be delivered?
 - d) Is there evidence that the development of the allocation is viable and developable during the plan period?
 - e) Are there any omissions in the policy, and is it sufficiently flexible?
 - f) Are the main modifications suggested to the Policy necessary to make the plan sound?
- 6.3 Are the other 4 housing allocations in Worksop sound, and in particular:
 - a) Are the criteria set out in in the policies clear, justified and effective?
 - b) Have the site constraints, indicative yield, development mix and viability considerations been adequately addressed?
 - c) Is there evidence that the development of the allocations is viable and developable during the plan period?
 - d) Are there any omissions in the policies, and are they sufficiently flexible?
 - e) Are the main modifications suggested to the Policies necessary to make the plan sound?

- 6.4 Is the site allocated as an urban extension at Ordsall South sound and in particular:
- a) Are the criteria set out in in the policy clear, justified and effective?
 - b) Have the site constraints, indicative yield, development mix and viability considerations been adequately addressed?
 - c) Is there sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the site can be implemented and that all necessary infrastructure and mitigation measures required to support it are achievable and can be delivered?
 - d) Is there evidence that the development of the allocation is viable and developable during the plan period?
 - e) Are there any omissions in the policy, and is it sufficiently flexible?
 - f) Are the main modifications suggested to the Policy necessary to make the plan sound?
- 6.5 Are the other 6 housing allocations in Retford and the allocation in Tuxford sound, and in particular:
- a) Are the criteria set out in in the policies clear, justified and effective?
 - b) Have the site constraints, indicative yield, development mix and viability considerations been adequately addressed?
 - c) Is there evidence that the development of the allocations is viable and developable during the plan period?
 - d) Are there any omissions in the policies, and are they sufficiently flexible?
 - e) Are the main modifications suggested to the Policies necessary to make the plan sound?

Matter 7 – Housing Land Supply

(Policy ST15)

Issue 7 - Does the Plan provide an appropriate supply of deliverable and developable sites to meet identified needs and align with national policy?

Note: This Matter focusses on the overall supply of land for housing. The merits of individual site allocations are considered under Matter 6, although our consideration of this question will also be informed by detailed discussion of the deliverability of specific site allocations in Matter 6.

In the light of Matter 5, we will reach a conclusion on whether or not the objectively assessed need for housing of 582 dwellings for the 2020-2038 period is justified. However, without prejudice to that, these questions work on the assumption that 582 dwellings is a soundly based housing requirement figure.

- 7.1 Are the assumptions that have been made to inform the trajectory justified in relation to the delivery of housing sites, in particular in relation to:
 - a) lead in times for grant of full permissions, outline and reserved matters and conditions discharge?
 - b) site opening up and preparation; and dwelling build out rates?
- 7.2 Is there a reasonable prospect that a total of 5,995 new dwellings will be provided by 31/03/38 on sites that had planning permission at 31/03/22?
- 7.3 Is there a reasonable prospect that a total of 438 new dwellings will be provided by 31/03/38 on sites allocated in made Neighbourhood Plans?
- 7.4 Is there a reasonable prospect that a total of a further 635 new dwellings will be provided by 31/03/38 on sites in the Worksop Central DPD area?
- 7.5. Is there a reasonable prospect that the total of 2742 new dwellings to be delivered through local plan allocations?
- 7.6 Is there compelling evidence to justify a windfall allowance of 1200 over the plan period and to demonstrate that they will provide a reliable source of supply?
- 7.7 Has appropriate consideration been given to non-implementation lapse rates?
- 7.8 Overall, is there convincing evidence that:
 - a) Having regard to assumptions about commitments, allocations and windfalls the housing requirement across Bassetlaw between 2021 and 2038 is likely to be met?
 - b) A 5 year supply of deliverable housing land will exist on adoption?
 - c) An ongoing 5 year supply of deliverable or developable housing land is likely to exist throughout the plan period?

Matter 8 – Meeting Housing Needs of different groups in the community

(Policies ST29 – ST34)

Issue 8 - Does the Plan set out positively prepared policies to meet affordable housing needs and the housing needs of other groups, which are justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

- 8.1 a) In Policy ST29 is the 20%/25% (brownfield/greenfield) affordable housing requirements justified, and will it be effective in helping to maximise affordable housing and not undermining deliverability?
- b) Is there convincing evidence to justify the proposed tenure split for affordable housing units? Would this accurately reflect the requirements for affordable housing in the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment and Addenda (SS-010, SS-007 and SS-024)?
- c) Is Policy ST29 sufficiently clear in the approach to be taken for off-site and/or financial contributions in lieu of on-site provision?
- d) Are the suggested main modifications to ST29 and the supporting text necessary for soundness?
- 8.2 a) Does ST30 provide an effective framework for ensuring an appropriate mix of housing will be delivered over the plan period?
- b) Is the requirement in ST30 to provide 2% of plots on housing allocations over 100 for self-build plots justified? Will the policy approach be effective in ensuring the delivery of an adequate supply of custom and self-build plots over the plan period?
- c) Is the suggested main modification to the supporting text necessary for soundness.
- 8.3 a) Are the requirements of ST31 relating to the provision of homes that comply with M4(2) of the building regulations justified by evidence relating to need and viability?
- b) Does ST31 provide an effective framework to ensure the needs for specialist housing over the plan period will be met? Will the criteria ensure such housing is provided in appropriate locations?
- c) Are the main modifications to the policy and supporting text suggested necessary for soundness?

- 8.4
- a) Would ST32 provide an adequate framework to ensure the need for additional accommodation for Gypsy and Travellers can be met as required by national policy? Are the requirements of the policy clear, and would they be effective?
 - b) Is the Bassetlaw Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment and the Update 2022 up-to-date and robust in its identification of needs for plots and pitches?
 - c) Have the sites allocated been selected against possible alternatives using a robust and objective process?
 - d) Does the Council's approach in relation to traveller sites generally conform with the expectations of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (August 2015)?
 - e) Are there any omissions in the policy, and is it sufficiently flexible?
 - f) Are suggested main modifications to the Policy and the supporting text necessary for soundness?
- 8.5 Is the main modification suggested to policy ST33 1c) necessary for soundness?

Matter 9 – Visitor Economy and Retail & Town Centres

(Policies ST12 – 14)

Issue 9 – Does the Plan set out a positively prepared strategy and policies for retailing and town centres and the visitor economy which is justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

- 9.1 Would Policy ST12 be effective in supporting tourism development whilst protecting the built and natural environment?
- 9.2 a) Is the retail hierarchy defined in ST13 justified and consistent with national policy?
- b) Are the boundaries for the town centres and primary shopping areas justified and will they be effective?
- c) Is there convincing justification for the thresholds for retail impact assessments set out in ST13(8)?
- d) Is the approach to changes of use and loss of premises used as a local shop in ST13(10) justified and consistent with national policy?
- e) Are the proposed main modifications to the Policy and supporting text necessary for soundness?
- 9.3 a) Would the framework in ST14 be effective in supporting the vitality and viability of main town centres? Is it consistent with national policy?
- b) Are the proposed main modifications necessary for soundness?

Matter 10 – Local Character and Distinctiveness

(Policies ST35 – ST43)

Issue 10 – Does the Plan set out a positively prepared strategy and policies for local character and distinctiveness which is justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

- 10.1 Are the main modifications suggested to Policy ST35 and the supporting text necessary for soundness?
- 10.2 Is the suggested main modification to ST37 necessary for soundness?
- 10.3
 - a) Is the approach taken by policy ST38 consistent with the Framework and the aims of sustainable development? In relation to the location and extent of Green Gaps, are these supported by robust and up-to-date evidence?
 - b) Is the proposed use of buffer zones for the green corridors in ST39 justified and would they be effective? Is it supported by appropriate evidence? Does it duplicate other policies in the plan?
 - c) Are the suggested main modifications to Policy ST39 and the supporting text necessary for soundness?
- 10.4
 - a) Would ST40 provide an effective framework to protect and enhance the biodiversity and geodiversity of the district? Is it justified by robust evidence including on viability?
 - b) Are the potential impacts arising from development proposed in the plan on Clumber Park SSSI adequately addressed?
 - c) Are the proposed main modifications to Policy ST40 and the supporting text necessary to make the plan sound?

Matter 11 – Healthy Communities

(Policies ST44 – Policy 49)

Issue 11 – Does the Plan set out a positively prepared strategy and policies for healthy communities which is justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

- 11.1 Are the requirements in ST44(2) for all residential developments 50+ houses to submit a Rapid Health Impact Assessment Matrix justified and consistent with national policy?
- 11.2 Is the approach of protecting existing community facilities in ST45 justified and consistent with national policy? Will it be effective in both retaining valuable facilities and making effective use of land and buildings?
- 11.3 a) Are requirements in ST46 for the provision of open space on sites of 100+ dwellings and by other major residential developments justified by evidence and is the policy consistent with National Planning Policy Framework?
b) Are the proposed main modifications to supporting text needed for soundness?
- 11.4 a) Is the approach is protecting existing sport and recreational facilities in ST47 justified and consistent with national policy? Will it be effective in both retaining valuable facilities and making effective use of land and buildings?
b) Are the proposed main modifications to supporting text needed for soundness?
- 11.5 Are the proposed main modifications to Policy 49 and the supporting text needed for soundness?

Matter 12 – Greening Bassetlaw

(Policies ST50 – ST53)

Issue 12 – Does the Plan set out a positively prepared strategy and policies relating to the historic and natural environment which are justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

- 12.1 a) Is Policy ST50 justified and consistent with national policy? Are the requirements of the Policy clear, and would they be effective? Are they supported by appropriate evidence of need and viability?
- b) Do the requirements of the Policy reflect guidance in paragraphs 153 and 154 of the National Planning Policy Framework, and are they in line with the Housing: Optional Technical Standards? What is the justification for setting the water efficiency requirement at 110ltrs per day? How is this supported by evidence?
- c) What are the reasons for the Council's proposed modifications to the Policy? Are they necessary for soundness? If so, are they clearly articulated and supported by clear evidence?
- 12.2 a) Is Policy ST51 justified and consistent with national policy? Are the requirements of the Policy clear, and would they be effective?
- b) How was the "area of best fit" arrived at? Is it supported by robust evidence?
- c) In the case of wind turbines does the Policy reflect guidance in Planning Practice Guidance and the Written Ministerial Statement of 18th June 2015?
- d) Are there any omissions from the Policy? Is it appropriately flexible?
- e) What are the reasons for the Council's proposed modifications to the Policy? Are they necessary for soundness? If so, are they clearly articulated and supported by clear evidence?
- 12.3 a) Are Policies ST52 and ST53 justified and consistent with national policy? Are the requirements of the Policies clear, and would they be effective?
- b) Are the Policies supported by appropriate evidence? In the case of ST53 is the Bassetlaw Water Cycle Study 2010 sufficiently up-to-date? How was the River Ryton Flood Management Impact Zone defined?
- c) Are there any omissions from the Policies? Are they appropriately flexible? What are the reasons for the Council's proposed modifications to Policy ST53? Are they necessary for soundness? If so, are they clearly articulated and supported by clear evidence?

Matter 13 – Transport and Connectivity

(Policies ST54-55)

Issue 13 – Does the Plan set out a positively prepared strategy and policies for transport and connectivity which is justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

- 13.1 a) Is there robust evidence to demonstrate that the likely significant impacts on the road network arising from the development proposed in the Plan have been adequately assessed. Is there robust evidence that these can be effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree and that, if required, such mitigation can be delivered?
- b) Are the modifications suggested by the Council to the Policy ST54 and the supporting text necessary for soundness?
- 13.2 a) Are the requirements for major developments in ST55(2) justified?
- b) Does the Policy provide effective framework to achieve sustainable transport and active travel?
- c) Are the modifications suggested by the Council to the Policy and the supporting text necessary for soundness?
- 13.3 Are the Policies justified and consistent with national policy? Are the requirements of the Policies clear, and would they be effective?
- 13.4 Are there any omissions from the Policies? Are they appropriately flexible?

Matter 14 – Infrastructure and Delivery, and Monitoring

(Policies ST56 – 58)

Issue 14 – Does the Plan set out a positively prepared strategy and policies for infrastructure, delivery and monitoring which is justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

- 14.1 a) Does Policy ST56 provide an effective framework to ensure the delivery of the necessary infrastructure? In particular, is the requirement to safeguard the land to deliver area-wide or site-specific infrastructure justified and consistent with national policy? Would the policy be effective particularly with regard to enabling the delivery of future transport schemes?
- b) Are the policy's requirements supported by up-to-date evidence?
- c) Have the implications of the policy in relation to viability been appropriately tested?
- d) Is the policy sufficiently flexible?
- e) Are there any omissions from the proposed policy and supporting text?
- 14.2 a) Are the requirements for the provision of digital infrastructure in Policy ST57 justified, would they be viable and does the policy provided an effective framework to deliver this infrastructure?
- b) Is the suggested main modification necessary for soundness?
- 14.3 a) Are the requirements of Policy ST58 clear, justified and consistent with national policy? Would they be effective?
- b) Is there robust and convincing evidence to demonstrate that the Policy's provision not to charge CIL on developments of over 50 dwellings, justified by robust evidence? Would this secure the necessary infrastructure to support the development proposed in the Plan? Would this approach adequately address the cumulative impacts of development?
- c) Is sufficient clarity provided with regard to the review mechanism?
- d) Is the policy sufficiently flexible?
- e) Are there any omissions from the proposed policy and supporting text?
- f) Are the suggested main modifications to the supporting text necessary for soundness?
- 14.4 Is the plan sufficiently clear as to how its implementation will be monitored?