

## PAS LOCAL PLAN ROUTE MAPPER TOOLKIT PART 4: LOCAL PLAN SOUNDNESS & QUALITY ASSESSMENT

### Why you should use this part of the toolkit

The purpose of this assessment is to provide a ‘mock’ examination - as far as that is possible - of the drafts of your local plan policies update. It is intended to be particularly helpful for use as part of the development of your emerging local plan policies update and as a final check prior to publication of your Regulation 19 Submission Local Plan policies update. It will help you to identify areas for improvement and understand potential risks to the soundness of the plan or its usability.

### How to use this part of the toolkit

There are 50 ‘key questions’ in the assessment matrix below which might seem a lot to get through. But thinking through these questions now could save time and expense further down the line. If you are undertaking a partial plan policies update not all of the content will be relevant to you.

If you are completing this assessment or peer reviewing it for a colleague within or from another authority, you should put yourself into the mind of a Planning Inspector assessing the soundness of the draft local plan policies update by keeping in mind the ‘tests’ as follows. Is the draft local plan update:

- **Positively prepared** – providing a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area’s objectively assessed needs; and is informed by agreements with other authorities, so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated where it is practical to do so and is consistent with achieving sustainable development;
- **Justified** – an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence;
- **Effective** – deliverable over the plan period, and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common ground; and
- **Consistent with national policy** – enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the [National Planning Policy Framework](#) and other statements of national planning policy, where relevant.

For some elements, particularly those concerning clarity, you will also need to consider yourself as an end user of the Local Plan policies update.

Provide a brief answer to each question cross referring to evidence that has informed or supports the local plan policies update in order to justify your reasoning and the score you have attributed. Identify any likely implications of not changing your approach or ways in which you may potentially improve the score either through changes to the plan policies update, evidence or further engagement with developers or infrastructure providers recorded in your statement of common ground. But remember that the local plan policies update doesn’t need to be supported by reams of evidence. Evidence needs to be proportionate, clear and robust in line with [PAS advice on proportionate evidence](#).

If you find it helpful, you can score your local plan policies update on the degree to which you meet requirements underpinning the question. You can then add up the scores to calculate your confidence in the local plan policies update (on a scale from -100 to +100) and use this as a benchmark for future improvements. Where a particular question is not applicable to your circumstances, please score +2.

### **How to use the results of this part of the toolkit**

You can use the results of this tool throughout the plan making process to assess the extent to which your plan addresses key soundness requirements. There is no requirement to publish or submit this table to the Planning Inspectorate as part of the independent examination, but you may find the assessment (or some elements) helpful to inform changes to your plan or supporting documents.

	<b>KEY QUESTIONS</b>	<p align="center"><b>Assessment</b></p> <p align="center"><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i></p>
<b>Growth Strategy</b>		
<b>A</b>	<p><b>In no more than 100 words (excluding any referencing) summarise your strategy for delivering growth and development in your area</b></p>	<p>Spatial Policy 1 of Newark and Sherwood Amended Core Strategy (2019) (ACS) sets out that, between 2013 and 2033, Newark and Sherwood district needs to deliver a minimum of 9080 dwellings and 83.1 hectares of employment land.</p> <p>Spatial Policy 2 clarifies that development will be delivered as follows:</p> <p>The sub regional centre of Newark is on course to deliver 60% of the housing growth.</p> <p>Service Centres of Ollerton &amp; Boughton, Edwinstowe in the Sherwood Area, Southwell, and Clipstone and Rainworth in the Mansfield Fringe area are collectively on course to deliver 30% of housing growth.</p> <p>Principal Villages are delivering 10% of the growth.</p> <p>Employment:</p> <p>Newark Area 51.9            Southwell Area 4.5            Nottingham Fringe Area 0.1            Sherwood Area 16.2            Mansfield Fringe Area 10.4            Total 83.1</p>
<b>B</b>	<p><b>In no more than 100 words (excluding any referencing) identify the key factors which informed the distribution of development in the local plan policies update</b></p>	<p>Distribution of development is included in the Amended Core Strategy which was found sound by the Inspector that examined the Plan in 2018. It was adopted in March 2019.</p> <p>It is considered that the hierarchy is still the same/up to date and no changes are proposed. Newark remains the focus for the majority of development as it is a sub-regional centre with excellent connections via public transport, and sufficient services and facilities to support the growing town.</p>
<b>C</b>	<p><b>List each of the main growth areas and strategic sites and the key infrastructure needed to support delivery</b></p>	<p>See A above for areas.</p> <p>Strategic Sites allocated in the adopted Amended Core Strategy:</p> <p><u>Newark Urban Area</u></p>

	<b>KEY QUESTIONS</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Assessment</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i></p>				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy NAP 2A Land South of Newark (known as Middlebeck): Development has commenced and is progressing well. The site is allocated for new homes (in the region of 3,150 dwellings) with associated infrastructure, including a primary school, local centres, open space, cycle and walking routes and other green infrastructure, and 50 hectares of employment land. The Southern Link Road (SLR) is also being developed to connect from the A46 to the A1 to the south of the site. The new primary school opened in 2021.</li> <li>• Policy NAP 2B Land east of Newark: Site allocated for housing (in the region of 1000 dwellings) and a local centre, comprising retail, service, employment and community uses; and associated green, transport and other infrastructure.</li> <li>• Policy NAP 2C Land around Fernwood (southeast of the A1 from Newark): Development has commenced and is progressing well. The site is allocated for in the region of 3200 new homes with associated infrastructure, including a new primary school and secondary school, a local centre, contributions towards health facilities, and open space. Land is also allocated for 15 hectares of employment uses. The new secondary school is complete and opened in 2021.</li> </ul> <p>NB. A total of three new schools have been delivered and are now fully operational; two new primary schools and one new secondary school have been delivered in Newark:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Primary School at Middlebeck (initially 150 pupil places): extended Christ Church Primary School. This will continue to expand as the Middlebeck development progresses;</li> <li>• Fernwood: Chuter Ede Primary School (currently 210 places with scope to expand to 420 places as required); and</li> <li>• Fernwood: New Secondary school - Suthers School (NOVA), current capacity up to 830 pupil places (opened September 2021).</li> </ul> <p><u>Edwinstowe (Sherwood Area)</u> Policy ShAP 4 Land at Thoresby Colliery (Commenced development)</p> <p>This site is identified as a strategic site for housing (in the region of 800 dwellings); employment land uses (B uses: 10 hectares); a community centre, comprising leisure and community uses along with retail to meet local needs; and associated green, transport, a new primary school and other infrastructure.</p>				
		-2	-1	0	+1	+2

		<b>Assessment</b>				
<b>KEY QUESTIONS</b>		<i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
<b>1.</b>	<b>Overall does the local plan policies update clearly articulate the strategy for <u>where</u> and <u>how</u> sustainable development will be delivered and that this is ‘an appropriate strategy’ within the context of paragraph 35 of the NPPF?</b>	No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	<b>Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement</b>
		<b>Reason for score:</b> Newark and Sherwood Amended Core Strategy, adopted in 2019, clearly sets out the strategy for where and how sustainable development will be delivered.				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> N/A				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> N/A				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> No amendments required as this is up to date and sustainable development is being achieved (as evidenced by the Annual Monitoring Report): <a href="https://www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/monitoring/">https://www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/monitoring/</a>				
<b>2.</b>	<b>Is it clear how the amount of development identified for any growth areas or major site allocations has been determined – and that the level proposed is deliverable and justified?</b>	-2	-1	0	+1	<b>+2</b>
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	<b>Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement</b>
		<b>Reason for score:</b> The Core Strategy was adopted in 2019 and the annual housing completions from 1 <sup>st</sup> April 2013 to 31 <sup>st</sup> March 2023 have exceeded the housing requirement (5550 net dwellings against a requirement for 4540) <sup>1</sup> . Newark and Sherwood District currently has a 7.2 year housing land supply (totalling 2668 new dwellings).				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> Currently the district is in a very strong position to deliver the number of homes, employment land and infrastructure required. It is not considered necessary to implement an action plan at the current time.				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> Not necessary				
<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> Newark and Sherwood District Council has demonstrated an excellent track record of development delivery over the past 10 years and a very healthy housing land supply. The Amended Core Strategy was submitted for						

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/media/nsdc-redesign/documents-and-images/your-council/planning-policy/local-development-framework/ldf-monitoring/5-year-land-supply/Five-Year-Land-Supply-Statement-as-at-1st-April-2023.pdf>

	KEY QUESTIONS	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Assessment</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i></p>				
		<p>examination in 2018 within the NPPF transitional period, prior to the Standard Method requirement. The Standard Method housing requirement in 2019 (when the Amended Core Strategy was adopted) was 495 dwellings per annum. The adopted housing requirement (based on the Strategic Housing Market Area Assessment) is 454 dwellings per annum. The following data demonstrates that, if the standard method was adopted in 2019, the district still would have delivered more than enough development to meet that requirement.</p> <p><b><u>Housing requirement if the standard method was adopted in 2019:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From 1<sup>st</sup> April 2013 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2019 the housing requirement amounts to 2724 dwellings</li> <li>• From 1<sup>st</sup> April 2019 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2023 the housing requirement amounts to 1980 (495 dpa)</li> <li>• From 1<sup>st</sup> April 2023 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2033 the housing requirement amounts to 4950 dwellings (495 dpa)</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Total new homes required 2013 to 2023: 4704 dwellings</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Total new homes required 2013 to 2033: 9654 dwellings</i></b></p> <p><b><u>Actual housing delivery from 2019 to 2023 – (net housing completions):</u></b>                      From 1<sup>st</sup> April 2013 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2019: 2833 dwellings were delivered (109 dwelling oversupply)                      From 1<sup>st</sup> April 2019 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2023: 2717 net housing completions were delivered (standard method requirement would have been 1980 dwellings).</p> <p><b><i>Total (net) new homes delivered 2013 to 2023: 5550 dwellings</i></b></p> <p><b><u>Projected housing delivery from 2023 to 2033:</u></b>                      From 1<sup>st</sup> April 2023 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2031: 7032 new homes are projected to be delivered.</p> <p><b><u>Total housing delivery from 2013 to 2033:</u></b>                      Total housing expected to be delivered by 31<sup>st</sup> March 2033: 12582 dwellings (approximately 30% more development than the standard method requirement in 2019).</p> <p><i>NB. It should be noted that the standard method figure for Newark and Sherwood District in 2023 is 456 (a decrease of 39 dwellings per annum from the 2019 standard method figure). This is an increase of 2 dwellings per annum of the adopted housing requirement (454 dpa).</i></p>				
		-2	-1	0	+1	+2

<b>KEY QUESTIONS</b>		<b>Assessment</b>				
		<i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
<b>3.</b>	<p><b>Is it clear that the local plan policies update provides for the most appropriate level of housing growth using the standard methodology as a starting point? Can you clearly articulate why planned growth levels should not be higher or lower?</b></p> <p>If you are proposing any material change away from the level of housing indicated by the standard method, can you clearly justify this through evidence?</p> <p>Does the level of housing provide for an appropriate and justified buffer?</p>	No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: As demonstrated above, the Local Development Framework will deliver more development than the standard method figure. As such, it is not considered necessary to change the housing requirement figure.				
		Implications of taking no further action: None				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: No action necessary				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> In terms of new homes, the LDF will deliver far in excess of the standard method requirement figure.				
<b>4.</b>	<p><b>Is the distribution of development justified in respect of the need for, and approach to, Green Belt release and can you demonstrate that alternatives to Green Belt release have been fully considered? Can you demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist to justify green belt release?</b></p>	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		Reason for score: No green belt release proposed				
		Implications of taking no further action: N/A				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> Not applicable.				
<b>5.</b>	<p><b>Is it clear how sites have been selected and have site allocations been made on a consistent basis having regard to the evidence base, including housing and employment land availability</b></p>	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement

	<b>KEY QUESTIONS</b>	<p align="center"><b>Assessment</b></p> <p align="center"><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i></p>				
	<p><b>assessments, the Sustainability Appraisal and viability assessment? If not, can you justify why?</b></p>	<p><b>Reason for score:</b> No new housing or employment sites are proposed. Land is proposed for allocation for gypsy and travellers to meet the need identified in the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment.</p> <p>Sites taken forward as allocations have not changed and are considered deliverable. A small number of sites are proposed to be deallocated as they are not considered to be deliverable. There is more than enough land allocated for the required housing and employment.</p> <p><b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> No implications</p> <p><b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> None</p> <p><b>Reviewer Comments:</b> The evidence base has been updated (Whole Plan Viability Assessment, Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal) as part of the plan review. All evidence provides a clear indication that the approach taken is sound.</p>				
<p align="center"><b>6.</b></p>	<p><b>Does the local plan policies update identify a housing requirement for designated neighbourhood areas?</b></p>	<p align="center">-2</p> <p>No, we do not meet this requirement</p>	<p align="center">-1</p> <p>No, we may not fully meet this requirement</p>	<p align="center">0</p> <p>Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not</p>	<p align="center">+1</p> <p>Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement</p>	<p align="center">+2</p> <p>Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement</p>
		<p><b>Reason for score:</b> The 2019 Amended Core Strategy Appendix C sets out the Housing and Employment requirements for areas of the district where development will be supported from 2013 to 2033. This is used to inform neighbourhood plan requirements.</p> <p>The 2019 Amended Core Strategy identifies parish areas in figure 1 and provides analysis of the different areas in paragraph 2.11. The ACS clarifies that Neighbourhood Plans must be prepared in line with a local planning authority’s strategic policies. For the purposes of Neighbourhood Planning, it is considered that all policies are Strategic under the teams of the NPPF. Spatial Policy 1 details the hierarchy of settlements and Spatial Policy 2 details the distribution and quantum of development required in each area. These are still up to date and no amendments are necessary.</p> <p><b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> None</p> <p><b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> None</p> <p><b>Reviewer Comments:</b></p>				



	<b>KEY QUESTIONS</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Assessment</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i></p>				
		Spatial Policy 2 details the quantum of development required in each area of the district. Requirements for Neighbourhood Plans can be derived from these figures.				
7.	<p><b>Do site allocations include sufficient detail on the mix and quantum of development, including, where appropriate any necessary supporting infrastructure?</b></p>	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		<p><b>Reason for score:</b> Newark and Sherwood 2019 ACS provides sufficient detail for strategic sites. Site Allocations policies of the adopted 2013 Allocations and development management DPD have been reviewed and updated where necessary to ensure compliance with the NPPF. Evidence has also been updated, in particular the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Council’s Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is on track to deliver key pieces of strategic infrastructure. It has supported the delivery of improvements to Joseph Whitaker School in Rainworth. It will also fund improvements to the A1 Overbridge at Fernwood, the Tolney Lane Flood Alleviation scheme and other necessary highway improvements identified in the IDP and IFS.</p> <p>The scheme of improvements to the A1 Overbridge, which will support growth in Fernwood, is currently under review by Amey. The consultants are undertaking a detailed analysis of eight options identified in the 2019 WYG Report. This will identify the most appropriate option. CIL monies have been secured (£5.6 million) to deliver this scheme.</p> <p>At Middlebeck, the Southern Link Road (SLR) is nearing completion (expected summer 2024). This will unlock development by supporting the delivery of the whole development (currently only 650 dwellings can be delivered due to highway constraints).</p> <p>Tolney Lane in Newark will require the implementation of a flood alleviation scheme to support the delivery of new Gypsy and Traveller pitches on the site. The wider site is currently occupied by gypsy and traveller pitches which have resided there for a number of years.</p> <p>More information about infrastructure delivery can be viewed in the Infrastructure Funding Statement: <a href="https://www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/infrastructuretosupportgrowth/">https://www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/infrastructuretosupportgrowth/</a></p>				
<p><b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> Tolney Lane would not be capable of accommodating new Gypsy and Traveller pitches if the flood alleviation scheme is not implemented.</p>						

		<b>Assessment</b>				
<b>KEY QUESTIONS</b>		<i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> NSDC will continue to work with the Environment Agency to deliver an Appropriate Flood alleviation at Tolney Lane.				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> Newark and Sherwood District Council is working with Environment Agency to identify and deliver an appropriate flood alleviation scheme at Tolney Lane.				
<b>D</b>	<p><b>What targets have you set for non-residential floorspace or employment land and, if relevant, the number of jobs to be created over the plan period?</b></p> <p><b>List these targets and the evidence source for this 'need' target?</b></p>	<p>The adopted Amended Core Strategy has set a target of 83.1 hectares for employment land. The Employment Land Needs Study produced by Lichfields in 2021 concludes (in paragraph 10.22) that there is sufficient land allocated for employment uses:</p> <p>“the district already appears to have a substantial supply of committed and allocated employment land that would appear to meet the need in full.”</p> <p><a href="https://www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/media/nsdc-redesign/documents-and-images/your-council/planning-policy/local-development-framework/amended-allocations-and-development-management-dpd/Emp-2-Employment-Land-Needs-Study-May-21.pdf">https://www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/media/nsdc-redesign/documents-and-images/your-council/planning-policy/local-development-framework/amended-allocations-and-development-management-dpd/Emp-2-Employment-Land-Needs-Study-May-21.pdf</a></p>				
<b>8.</b>	<p><b>Where and how are the targets referred to above to be delivered? Do the sites and indicative capacities that you have identified demonstrate that these targets are achievable? If you are not allocating sites to meet needs identified, can you justify and explain how those needs will be met?</b></p>	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		<b>Reason for score:</b> The adopted Amended Core Strategy sets out the strategy (as set out above). The excellent track record of housing completions and delivery of new employment land demonstrates that Newark and Sherwood District is attractive to the market, thereby supporting continued growth. NSDC has allocated enough sites (in the ACS and AADMDPD) to meet the identified need.				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> N/A - NSDC are allocating sites to meet the needs of the district.				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> No action necessary				
<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> Annual monitoring of the LDF has demonstrated that development is being delivered to meet and exceed the needs of the district.						
		-2	-1	0	+1	+2

KEY QUESTIONS		<b>Assessment</b> <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
<p>9.</p>	<p>Does the local plan policies update: (i) identify infrastructure that is necessary to support planned growth; and (ii) enable provision of this infrastructure?</p>	<p>No, we do not meet this requirement</p>	<p>No, we may not fully meet this requirement</p>	<p>Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not</p>	<p>Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement</p>	<p>Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement</p>
		<p><b>Reason for score:</b> Infrastructure has been identified in the 2017 Infrastructure Delivery Plan and infrastructure providers have been consulted as part of the plan review and the list of infrastructure requirements has been updated where necessary. The 2023 IDP Update provides details of delivery and any new requirements. The IFS also provides details of infrastructure delivery. CIL monies are being used for the delivery of the A1 overbridge improvements at Fernwood and any secondary school improvements required. CIL will also be used to deliver the Tolney Lane Flood Alleviation scheme. Grant funding will also be used where these can be secured.</p>				
		<p><b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> NSDC are continuing to liaise with infrastructure providers, but no action is required at the current time.</p>				
		<p><b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> N/A</p>				
		<p><b>Reviewer Comments:</b> NSDC has a dedicated Lead Infrastructure Practitioner that works proactively with stakeholders to support infrastructure delivery. The IDP is a living document and is kept up to date and used to plan, monitor and manage infrastructure requirements.</p>				
<p>10.</p>	<p>Can you demonstrate that the transport and other infrastructure needed to support <u>each</u> growth area or strategic site identified in the local plan policies update: (i) can be funded and delivered; and (ii) is supported by the relevant providers/ delivery agents in terms of funding and timescales indicated?</p> <p>Have you identified the extent of any funding gap? If so, are you able to explain why you are confident that any gap can be addressed?</p>	<p>-2</p>	<p>-1</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>+1</p>	<p>+2</p>
		<p>No, we do not meet this requirement</p>	<p>No, we may not fully meet this requirement</p>	<p>Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not</p>	<p>Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement</p>	<p>Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement</p>
<p><b>Reason for score:</b> Funding for the majority of infrastructure required to support development is being secured through CIL and S106 developer contributions. Some monies have also been secured through the Levelling Up Fund (LUF) awarded to NSDC for improvements to Newark and Ollerton. The SLR is being funded by a mix of grant funding received (LUF and funding received from D2N2 LEP and Nottinghamshire County Council).</p> <p>Tolney Lane Flood Alleviation Scheme is included in the CIL list of projects. NSDC will also seek grant funding where possible for Tolney Lane Flood Alleviation scheme.</p> <p>NSDC’s Infrastructure Funding Statement provides details of CIL and s106 income and spend:  <a href="https://www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/infrastructuretosupportgrowth/">https://www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/infrastructuretosupportgrowth/</a></p>						

	<b>KEY QUESTIONS</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Assessment</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i></p>				
		<p><b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> N/A - NSDC is continuing to take action.</p>				
	<p><b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> Secure all funding for the Flood Alleviation Scheme at Tolney Lane.</p>					
	<p><b>Reviewer Comments:</b> NSDC’s IFS demonstrates that the Council is in a strong position regarding funding infrastructure delivery.</p>					
<p><b>Process and Outcomes (see also Toolkit Parts 2 and 3)</b></p>						
<b>E</b>	<p><b>What are the cross boundary strategic matters affecting your local plan policies update? List these.</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Meeting the housing needs of the housing market area (HMA) – including gypsy and traveller accommodation.</li> <li>2. Meeting employment land needs.</li> <li>3. Delivery infrastructure to meet the needs of development identified in the LDF.</li> <li>4. Protecting sites of importance for nature conservation e.g. Bilhaugh and Birklands SAC and the SSSI at Clumber Park.</li> </ol>				
<b>11.</b>	<p><b>Does your Duty to Cooperate Statement(s) of Common Ground: (i) identify these issues; (ii) identify the bodies you have engaged with or continue to engage with; and (iii) clearly set out not just the process, but the outcomes of this engagement highlighting areas of agreement and of difference?</b></p>	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		<p>No, we do not meet this requirement</p>	<p>No, we may not fully meet this requirement</p>	<p>Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not</p>	<p>Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement</p>	<p>Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement</p>
		<p><b>Reason for score:</b> No requests have been received from neighbouring authorities to meet the development needs of other areas. The Amended Core Strategy and AADMDPD continue to adequately meet the development needs of the district. NSDC continues to work with the Environment Agency to agree an appropriate flood alleviation scheme for Tolney Lane in Newark to support the delivery of newly allocated gypsy and traveller pitches.</p>				
		<p><b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> Employment land needs for logistics may not be met within the Nottingham Core and Nottingham Outer areas if no further action is taken.</p>				
		<p><b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> NSDC to continue to work with local planning authorities in the Nottingham Core and Nottingham Outer areas to ensure a strategic logistics site is identified and delivered.</p>				
<p><b>Reviewer Comments:</b> NSDC 2019 Amended Core Strategy DTC Statement sets out details of joint work that has taken place on strategic matters affecting cross boundary issues:</p>						

		<b>Assessment</b>				
<b>KEY QUESTIONS</b>		<p><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i></p>				
		<p><a href="https://www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/media/newark-and-sherwood/images-and-files/planning-policy/pdfs/publication-amended-core-strategy/CS.15-Statement-of-Compliance-with-the-Duty-to-Cooperate-2017.pdf">https://www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/media/newark-and-sherwood/images-and-files/planning-policy/pdfs/publication-amended-core-strategy/CS.15-Statement-of-Compliance-with-the-Duty-to-Cooperate-2017.pdf</a></p> <p>NSDC has and will continue to liaise with neighbouring authorities and other prescribed bodies on strategic matters. Full details can be found in the DTC Statement for the AADMDDP: <a href="#">CD13---Duty-to-Cooperate-Statement-(2024).pdf (newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk)</a></p>				
<b>F</b>	<p><b>Are there any aspects of the local plan policies update not in conformity with national policy (or where you will be relying on transitional provisions)? Please set these out and provide justification with reference to evidence for these. Are you satisfied you can robustly defend this on the basis of local evidence?</b></p> <p><i>For instance, are you seeking to require affordable housing on sites which are below the threshold of major development as defined by national planning policy?</i></p>	<p>No. NSDC is satisfied that the evidence supports the approach taken and feels confident that it can be robustly defended at examination.</p>				
<b>12.</b>	<p><b>Are there any specific policies in the local plan policies update where there are differences to any policy approach set out in a relevant strategic planning framework (e.g. the London Plan, or a plan produced by a Combined Authority or through voluntary agreement).</b></p>	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		<b>Reason for score:</b> There is no strategic plan at a regional level and there are no agreements in place to produce one.				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> None				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> None				

<b>KEY QUESTIONS</b>		<b>Assessment</b>				
		<i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> Each area is meeting its own development needs.				
<b>13.</b>	<b>Is the local plan policies update:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in conformity with any 'higher level' plans prepared by the Council; and</li> <li>• properly reflecting provisions of any made neighbourhood plan?</li> </ul>	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		<b>Reason for score:</b> Yes, the AADMDPD conforms with the Amended Core Strategy and aligns with neighbourhood plans.				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> None				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> None				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> The AADMPPD aligns with the ACS and accords with the NPPF.				
<b>14.</b>	<b>Does your Consultation Statement demonstrate how you have complied with the specific requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Local Plan) (England) Regulations 2012 and the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement to date [you should revisit and update this following the publication of your Regulation 19 local plan policies update]?</b>	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		<b>Reason for score:</b> The Consultation Statement includes details of all public consultation associated with the AADMDPD. The Plan has been through Regulation 18 and 19 public consultations, and all prescribed bodies and other stakeholders have been consulted at each stage, as evidenced by the Regulation 22 Statement of Consultation: <a href="#">Statement-of-Consultation-(2023).pdf (newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk)</a>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> None				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> None				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> No action required.				
<b>15.</b>	<b>Has the Sustainability Appraisal – incorporating the requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment legislation - evaluated all reasonable</b>	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement

<b>KEY QUESTIONS</b>		<b>Assessment</b>				
		<i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
	<b>alternatives? Is it clear why alternatives have not been selected?</b>	<b>Reason for score:</b> The 'Integrated Impact Assessment' is the Sustainability Appraisal of the Local Development Framework which has evaluated all reasonable alternatives. It has been undertaken by an officer who has had no involvement in the production of the LDF: <a href="https://www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/media/nsdc-redesign/documents-and-images/your-council/planning-policy/local-development-framework/amended-allocations-and-development-management-dpd/Integrated-Impact-Assessment-Sept-2023--Printed.pdf">https://www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/media/nsdc-redesign/documents-and-images/your-council/planning-policy/local-development-framework/amended-allocations-and-development-management-dpd/Integrated-Impact-Assessment-Sept-2023--Printed.pdf</a>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> None				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> None				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> No further action required.				
16.	<b>Does the Sustainability Appraisal adequately assess the likely significant effects of policies and proposals?</b>	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		<b>Reason for score:</b> The Integrated Impact Assessment includes a Sustainability Appraisal of policies and site allocations and their potential effect. This has helped to develop and improve policies where necessary.				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> N/A				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> N/A				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> At each stage of the Plan Review a Sustainability Appraisal of policies and proposals has been undertaken in accordance with the requirements of national policy and guidance.				
17.	<b>Is it clear how the Sustainability Appraisal has influenced the local plan policies update including how any policies or site allocations have been amended as a result and does it show (and conclude) that the local plan policies update is an appropriate strategy?</b>	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		<b>Reason for score:</b> Section 6 of the IIA provides an appraisal summary for IIA topics and appendix 2 provides full details of the appraisals for each policy.				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> None				

<b>KEY QUESTIONS</b>		<b>Assessment</b>				
		<i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: None</b>				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> The IIA methodology is in compliance with national policy and guidance.				
<b>18.</b>	<b>Is it clear how an Equalities Impact Assessment has influenced the local plan policies update?</b>	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		<b>Reason for score:</b> The impact on equality is included in the assessment of policies and proposals in the IIA.				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> None				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> None				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> The IIA adequately assesses impact on equality.				
<b>19.</b>	<b>Does the Habitats Regulations Assessment consider the local plan policies update in combination with other plans and projects?</b>	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		<b>Reason for score:</b> Yes- covered in Section 8 of the HRA: <a href="https://www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/media/nsdc-redesign/documents-and-images/your-council/planning-policy/local-development-framework/amended-allocations-and-development-management-dpd/Habitat-Regulation-Assessment-September-2023---being-printed.pdf">https://www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/media/nsdc-redesign/documents-and-images/your-council/planning-policy/local-development-framework/amended-allocations-and-development-management-dpd/Habitat-Regulation-Assessment-September-2023---being-printed.pdf</a>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> None				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> None				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> See section 8 of the HRA.				
<b>20.</b>	<b>If the Habitats Regulations Assessment has identified, through ‘Appropriate Assessment’ that mitigation measures are required, does the local plan policies</b>	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement



<b>KEY QUESTIONS</b>		<b>Assessment</b>				
		<p><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i></p>				
	<b>update adequately identify the measures required and the mechanisms for delivering them?</b>			this requirement or not		
		<p><b>Reason for score:</b> The HRA has made the following recommendations regarding the AADMDPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strengthening of policy wording to ensure the protection of the SAC. This included updating of SANG requirements for all new dwellings within an 8.9km ZOI.</li> <li>• Strengthening of policy wording to ensure protection of the ppSPA. This included the requirement for a risk-based approach to be taken for all sites within 400m.</li> <li>• Policy wording strengthened for Policy OB/E/3 and Policy CI/MU/1 to require more detailed project assessment of functionally linked land potential, once site details and layout are known.</li> </ul> <p>These recommendations have been taken forward in the AADMDPD.</p>				
		<p><b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> None</p>				
		<p><b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> None</p>				
		<p><b>Reviewer Comments:</b> Policy wording has been updated to accord with the recommendations of the HRA.</p>				
21.	<b>Is it clear how the outcomes and conclusions of the Habitats Regulations Assessment have influenced the local plan policies update?</b>	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		<p><b>Reason for score:</b> Yes, policies have been amended in response to the recommendations of the HRA.</p>				
		<p><b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> None</p>				
		<p><b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> None</p>				
<p><b>Reviewer Comments:</b> NPPF Compliant</p>						
<b>Housing Strategy</b>						
22.	<b>Can you demonstrate that the policies and proposed allocations in your local plan policies update meet your housing requirement in full and that this can be achieved as a minimum? If not [for</b>	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement

<b>KEY QUESTIONS</b>		<b>Assessment</b>				
		<i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
	<i>instance, because another local authority has agreed to plan for your unmet need], can you explain and robustly justify why?</i>	<b>Reason for score:</b> Yes, see answer to question 2.				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action for local plan soundness and/or effectiveness:</b> None				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> None				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> This response is covered in question 2.				
<b>G</b>	<i>Is there any unmet need in neighbouring areas that you have been formally asked to accommodate? If yes, then list the amount by each local authority area.</i>	No				
<b>23.</b>	<b>Does your local plan policies update accommodate any of this unmet need where you can sustainably to do so?</b>	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		<b>Reason for score:</b> N/A				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> N/A				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> N/A				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> N/A				
<b>24.</b>	<b>Is there a housing trajectory which illustrates the expected rate of housing delivery and ensures the maintenance of a 5-year supply during the plan period? Is your strategy for delivery and implementation clearly articulated and justified to support the trajectory?</b>	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		<b>Reason for score:</b> Yes, on page 201 of the AADMDPD: <a href="https://www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/plan-review-aadmdpd---2-pub-stage---clean-version.pdf">Plan-Review-AADMDPD---2-Pub-Stage---Clean-Version.pdf (newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk)</a>				
		Yes, the strategy is already proving successful with the progression of development at Middlebeck, Fernwood, and Thoresby Vale (in Edwinstowe) strategic sites. Housing delivery is exceeding development requirements. Key infrastructure is being delivered to support growth with the Southern Link Road due for completion in summer				

<b>KEY QUESTIONS</b>		<b>Assessment</b>				
		<i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
		2024 and CIL monies are in place to deliver the A1 overbridge improvements and other necessary infrastructure projects.				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> N/A				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> N/A				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> NSDC is demonstrating that development is being delivered and will continue to be delivered due to infrastructure being delivered to support growth.				
<b>25.</b>	Can you confirm: (i) that the local plan policies update will provide for a 5-year supply of specific deliverable sites on adoption; and (ii) that beyond this 5 year period sites are developable and (iii) if relevant, you have included a 5 or 20 percent buffer to deal with under-delivery.	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		<b>Reason for score:</b> Yes, as demonstrated in the 2023 Five Year Housing Land Supply Statement and Housing Monitoring Report: <a href="#">Five-Year-Land-Supply-Statement-as-at-1st-April-2023.pdf (newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk)</a> <a href="#">2022-23-Housing-Monitoring-and-5-Year-Land-Supply-Report-Final.pdf (newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk)</a> And the Housing Trajectory on page 201 of the AADMDPD.				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> None				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> None				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> Housing delivery is continuing to exceed the housing requirement.				
<b>26.</b>	Does the level of supply provide any 'head room' (that is additional supply above that required) to enable you to react quickly to any unforeseen changes in circumstances and to ensure that the full requirement will be met during the plan period?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		<b>Reason for score:</b> See response to question 2. The Plan the housing trajectory indicates that 12582 new homes will be delivered by 2033 (against a requirement for 9080)				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> None				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> None				

<b>KEY QUESTIONS</b>		<b>Assessment</b>				
		<i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> There is plenty of headroom in the housing supply.				
<b>27.</b>	<b>Is the Council reliant on the delivery of any ‘windfall’ sites (sites not specifically identified in the development plan) during the plan period and if so, how many and when? Is there compelling evidence to confirm that such sites will continue to come forward?</b>	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		<b>Reason for score:</b> The Council is not relying on windfall sites. The trajectory on page 201 of the AADMDPD does include a windfall allowance of 75 dwellings per annum from 2026/27 onwards (equating to 525 dwellings up to 2033) but this is just based on evidence of past delivery. There is enough housing supply in allocations and planning consents to meet the housing requirement (12582 – 525 = 12,057).				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> None				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> None				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> No action required.				
<b>28.</b>	<b>Does the local plan policies update make it clear what size, type and tenure of housing is required?</b>	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		<b>Reason for score:</b> Chapter 8 of the AADMDPD includes detailed policies of the type and mix of homes required.				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action:</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> None				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> NPPF Compliant - no further actions required.				
<b>29.</b>	<b>Does the local plan policies update specifically address the needs of different groups in the community?</b>	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		<b>Reason for score:</b> As well as market and affordable housing, the AADMDPD allocates land for gypsies and travellers to meet the needs identified in the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation needs assessment.				

<b>KEY QUESTIONS</b>		<b>Assessment</b>				
		<i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> None				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> None				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> The AADMDPD adequately identifies land and infrastructure required to support the delivery of new homes for different groups in the community.				
<b>30.</b>	<p><b>Can your affordable housing requirements, including any geographical variations, be justified?</b></p> <p><b>Does the local plan policies update provide for the delivery of the full need for affordable housing? If not, can you explain and justify why?</b></p>	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		<b>Reason for score:</b> The new policy in chapter 8 of the AADMDPD has been taken into account in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. The policy also complies with the requirements of the NPPF and PPG.				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> None				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> None				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> NPPF Compliant - no further actions required.				
<b>31.</b>	<p><b>Have the needs for travellers and travelling showpeople been adequately assessed in accordance with national policy and have they been based on robust evidence?</b></p> <p><b>Does the local plan policies update make adequate provision for the identified needs?</b></p>	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		<b>Reason for score:</b> Yes - See response to question 29. GTTA undertaken independently by Opinion Research Services: <a href="https://www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/gt-1-nsdc-gypsy-and-traveller-accommodation-assessment-feb-2020.pdf">GRT-1-NSDC-Gypsy-and-Traveller-Accommodation-Assessment-Feb-2020.pdf (newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk)</a>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> None				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> None				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> Compliant with the NPPF and national Planning Policy for Traveller sites (August 2015)				
<b>32.</b>	<b>Will the local plan policies update provide for a 5-year supply of deliverable travellers and travelling</b>	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement

	<b>KEY QUESTIONS</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Assessment</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i></p>
	<p><b>showpeople pitches to meet identified needs?</b></p>	<p><b>Reason for score:</b> The AADMDPD sufficiently allocates land for the required number of pitches in the GTAA. See Chapter 8: <a href="http://newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/Plan-Review-AADMDPD--2-Pub-Stage--Clean-Version.pdf">Plan-Review-AADMDPD--2-Pub-Stage--Clean-Version.pdf (newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk)</a></p> <p><b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> None</p> <p><b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> None</p> <p><b>Reviewer Comments:</b> Compliant with the NPPF and national Planning Policy for Traveller sites (August 2015).</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>H</b></p>	<p><b>List any travellers and travelling showpeople sites identified to meet need and the timescales for their delivery</b></p>	<p>A total of 78 additional gypsy and traveller pitches will be delivered on the following existing sites:</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;"><u>Site Pitch Allocation Newark</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NUA/GRT/1 Park View, Tolney Lane (13 pitches)</li> <li>• NUA/GRT/2 Sandhill Sconce, Tolney Lane (11 pitches)</li> <li>• NUA/GRT/3 The Paddocks, Tolney Lane (3 pitches)</li> <li>• NUA/GRT/4 Hiram’s Paddock, Tolney Lane (7 pitches)</li> <li>• NUA/GRT/5 Taylor’s Paddock, Tolney Lane (1 pitch)</li> <li>• NUA/GRT/6 Price’s Paddock, Tolney Lane (1 pitch)</li> <li>• NUA/GRT/7 Land at Shannon Falls, Tolney Lane (21 pitches)</li> </ul> <p style="margin-left: 40px;"><u>Site Pitch Allocation Ollerton</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OB/GRT/1 Shannon Caravan Site, Wellow Road (9 pitches)</li> <li>• OB/GRT/2 The Paddock, Wellow Road (3 pitches)</li> <li>• OB/GRT/3 The Stables, Wellow Road (4 pitches)</li> <li>• OB/GRT/4 Dunromin, Wellow Road (4 pitches)</li> <li>• OB/GRT/5 – Greenwood, Wellow Road (1 pitch)</li> </ul> <p>19 Gypsy and Traveller pitches will be brought back into use on the following sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NUA/GRT/8 - Church View, Tolney Lane, Newark (10 pitches)</li> <li>• NUA/GRT/9 - Riverside Park, Tolney Lane, Newark (9 pitches)</li> </ul> <p>New site allocations (62-74 pitches)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NUA/GRT/10 – Land at Chestnut Lodge Barnby Road, Barnby-in-the-Willows (19 pitches)</li> <li>• NUA/GRT/11 - Former Belvoir Ironworks, Bowbridge Lane, Newark (15-27 pitches)</li> </ul>

KEY QUESTIONS		<b>Assessment</b>				
		<p><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i></p>				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NUA/GRT/12 - The Old Stable Yard, Land North of Winthorpe Road, Newark (14 pitches)P</li> <li>• NUA/GRT/13 - Land at Appleby Lodge, Barnby Road, Newark (8 pitches)</li> <li>• OB/GRT/6 – Land East of Newark Road, Ollerton (6 pitches)</li> </ul>				
<b>Justified approaches to plan policy and content</b>						
<b>33.</b>	<p><b>Where thresholds are set in policies which trigger specific policy requirements, are these thresholds justified by evidence and is this clear in the supporting text?</b></p> <p><b>[You may wish to check each policy setting a threshold]</b></p>	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		<p><b>Reason for score:</b> Policies in the LDF are supported by evidence and national policy and national guidance regarding infrastructure requirements and affordable housing, including the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Also, Nottinghamshire County Council sets the requirements for Education, Transport and Libraries in their Developer Contributions Strategy:  <a href="https://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/media/5077594/nccdevelopercontributionsstrategy.pdf">https://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/media/5077594/nccdevelopercontributionsstrategy.pdf</a></p>				
		<p>In response to consultation requests for clarity on the evidence to be taken into consideration in decision making, amendments have been made to Policy DM3 supporting text para. 7.5 which now reads:</p> <p><i>“Planning Obligations for appropriate infrastructure to meet the needs of development will take into account Amended Core Strategy Policy for Affordable Housing, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, and the Open Space Assessment &amp; Strategy and supporting evidence, including adopted Supplementary Planning Documents.”</i></p>				
		<p>These requirements have been taken into consideration in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment and are considered deliverable.</p>				
		<p><b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> None</p>				
		<p><b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> None</p>				
		<p><b>Reviewer Comments:</b> Policies are clear and justified by supporting evidence. NPPF Compliant - no further actions required.</p>				
		-2	-1	0	+1	+2

		<b>Assessment</b>				
<b>KEY QUESTIONS</b>		<i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
<b>34.</b>	<b>Does the local plan policies update avoid deferring details on strategic matters to other documents? If it does, is it clear why matters will be covered in other Development Plan Documents or Supplementary Planning Documents and why this is appropriate?</b>	No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		<b>Reason for score:</b> Yes. The Amended Core Strategy (2019) covers strategic matters. NB. Policies in the ACS that are considered out of date have been amended in line with national policy (e.g. affordable housing) and included in the AADMDPD. The AADMDPD makes it clear that supplementary planning documents are to be used as guidance, not policy. For example, supporting text to Policy DM3 Developer Contributions and Planning Obligations states:				
		“Para. 7.5 Planning Obligations for appropriate infrastructure to meet the needs of development will take into account Amended Core Strategy Policy for Affordable Housing, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, and the Open Space Assessment & Strategy and supporting evidence, including adopted Supplementary Planning.”				
		The AADMDPD is the second part of the LDF. The adopted Amended Core Strategy deals with strategic matters. This is explained in the supporting text of both documents.				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> None				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> None				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> NPPF Compliant - no further actions required.				
<b>35.</b>	<b>Where the local plan policies update defines a hierarchy do policies throughout the Plan consistently: (i) reflect this hierarchical approach; (ii) make clear the level of protection afforded to designations depending on their status within the hierarchy; and (iii) is the approach consistent with National Policy? [For example, hierarchies could relate to nature conservation, heritage assets, town centres/retail, settlements.]</b>	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		<b>Reason for score:</b> With the exception of Gypsy and Traveller site allocations, the AADMDPD is not proposing to include new allocations. As such, the policies and proposals in the AADMDPD continue to clearly accord with the hierarchy in the ACS.				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> None				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> None				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> The AADMDPD proposes no changes to the adopted hierarchy and is compliant with the ACS and NPPF.				
		-2	-1	0	+1	+2



<b>KEY QUESTIONS</b>		<b>Assessment</b>				
		<i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
<b>36.</b>	<p><b>Where policies seek to limit certain uses, is this justified by evidence and is the rationale clear in the supporting text to the policy and in the evidence.</b></p> <p><b>[For example, policies relating to town centres, employment or retail may seek to limit certain uses.]</b></p>	No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		<p><b>Reason for score:</b> Policies which restrict development relate to Open Breaks, Green Belt, Public Open Space, some heritage assets (e.g., Listed Buildings), and designated areas which require special protection to preserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity. LDF evidence relating to such matters e.g. the 2019 Open Break Assessment, 2022 Open Space Assessment, supports the approach taken. This approach is also compliant with national policy and guidance.</p>				
		<p><b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> None</p>				
		<p><b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> None</p>				
		<p><b>Reviewer Comments:</b> NPPF Compliant - no further actions required.</p>				
<b>37.</b>	<p><b>Is it clear that any standards proposed for development are justified and deliverable, taking into account the scale of the development? Where relevant, are they consistent with the principles set out in the National Design Code and National Model Design Code?</b></p> <p><b>[For example, onsite provision of open space, optional technical standards, internal and external space standards.]</b></p>	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		<p><b>Reason for score:</b> Policy DM5(a) The Design Process requires development to be consistent with the principles set out in the National Design Code. The supporting text includes a commitment for the Council to produce a design code in accordance with the NDC.</p>				
		<p>Whilst the policy and supporting text don't make reference to the National Model Design Code, it is the intention of the Council that the new Design Code will be in compliance with this document.</p>				
		<p><b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> None</p>				
<p><b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> Include a commitment for the Design Code to be in compliance with the National Model Design Code.</p>						
<p><b>Reviewer Comments:</b> The Policy is considered compliant with the NPPF and National Design Code but it could be strengthened by including a reference to the National Model Design Code.</p>						
<b>Deliverability</b>						

<b>KEY QUESTIONS</b>		<b>Assessment</b>				
		<i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
<b>38.</b>	<b>Has the viability of the local plan policies update been suitably tested and does this testing cover all requirements including in respect of any required standards, affordable housing provision and transport and other infrastructure needs and if relevant the implications of CIL?</b>	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		<b>Reason for score:</b> See Whole Plan Viability Assessment and supporting documents: <a href="#">WP-1-Whole-Plan-and-Cil-Viability-Assessment-May-21.pdf (newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk)</a> <a href="#">Valuation Study (newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk)</a> <a href="#">Microsoft Word - N&amp;SDC WPVA.docx (newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk)</a>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> None				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> None				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> Compliant with the NPPF. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment (2021) supports the findings of the Council's previous Local Plan/CIL viability evidence undertaken for the 2019 ACS.				
<b>39.</b>	<b>Does the local plan policies update reflect the conclusions and recommendations of your viability evidence?</b>  <b>Is it clear the viability and delivery of development will not be put at risk by the requirements in the local plan policies update?</b>	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		<b>Reason for score:</b> The Annual Monitoring Report provides evidence that development has been delivered in excess of what was expected since the first Core Strategy was adopted in 2013: <a href="https://www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/monitoring/">https://www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/monitoring/</a>				
		There are no significant changes to the plan in this respect and the Council considers that the risk that the requirements won't be met to be very low.				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> None				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> None				
<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> NPPF Compliant - no further actions required.						
<b>40.</b>	<b>Does the monitoring framework clearly set out what matters will be monitored,</b>	-2	-1	0	+1	+2

<b>KEY QUESTIONS</b>		<b>Assessment</b>				
		<i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
<b>40.</b>	<b>and the indicators used? Are these measurable and can the data be readily secured/captured?</b>	No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
	<b>Reason for score:</b> Yes, see Appendix C of the AADMDPD and the Annual Monitoring Report: <a href="https://www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/monitoring/">https://www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/monitoring/</a>					
	<b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> None					
	<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> None					
	<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> NPPF Compliant - no further actions required.					
<b>41.</b>	<b>Does the local plan policies update and monitoring framework identify a clear framework for plan review?</b>	-2 No, we do not meet this requirement	-1 No, we may not fully meet this requirement	0 Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	+1 Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	+2 Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
	<b>Where triggers for plan review and/or update are identified are they justified and proportionate?</b>	<b>Reason for score:</b> Yes, see Appendix C of the AADMDPD and the Annual Monitoring Report: <a href="https://www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/monitoring/">https://www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/monitoring/</a>				
	<b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> None					
	<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> None					
	<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> NPPF Compliant - no further actions required.					
	<b>Plan effectiveness (and associated policy clarity)</b>					
<b>42.</b>	<b>Does the local plan policies update clearly set out the timeframe that it covers? Is it clear which policies are strategic? Will the strategic policies provide for a minimum of 15 years from adoption? Does the evidence relied on to support those policies</b>	-2 No, we do not meet this requirement	-1 No, we may not fully meet this requirement	0 Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	+1 Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	+2 Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
	<b>Reason for score:</b> The ACS was submitted for examination in November 2017 and has an end date of 2033 (covering a period of 16 years). The AADMDPD is the second part of the Plan Review process. Whilst there is less					

	<b>KEY QUESTIONS</b>	<p align="center"><b>Assessment</b></p> <p align="center"><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i></p>				
	<p><b>correspond/cover this whole period? Where larger scale developments are proposed as part of the strategy, does the vision look further ahead (at least 30 years)?</b></p>	<p>than 15 years left until the end date of the ACS (2033), in terms of housing land supply, there is a 38% buffer (Total housing expected to be delivered by 31<sup>st</sup> March 2033 is 12582 dwellings against a requirement of 9080 from 2013 to 2033). In years, 12582 dwellings equates to 27 years of housing supply based on 454 dwellings per annum (covering the period 2013 to 2040).</p> <p>Paragraph 70 of the NPPF indicates that land should be identified for the first five years of the plan and sites or broad locations should be identified for years 6 to 10 of the plan. It stresses that, where possible, land should also be identified from years 11 to 15. Newark and Sherwood Districts Council’s LDF contains more than 15 years of housing land supply.</p> <p><b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> None</p> <p><b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> The NPPF requires plans to be reviewed at least every 5 years. This should enable the Council to plan, monitor and manage planning requirements and development delivery.</p> <p><b>Reviewer Comments:</b> This is a review of the 2013 to 2033 Allocations and Development Management DPD and it is considered that the amendments proposed will ensure the LDF is compliant with the NPPF.</p>				
<p><b>43.</b></p>	<p><b>Does the local plan policies update clearly set out which adopted Development Plan policies it supersedes?</b></p>	<p align="center">-2</p> <p>No, we do not meet this requirement</p>	<p align="center">-1</p> <p>No, we may not fully meet this requirement</p>	<p align="center">0</p> <p>Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not</p>	<p align="center">+1</p> <p>Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement</p>	<p align="center">+2</p> <p>Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement</p>
		<p><b>Reason for score:</b> This is set out in Appendix A.</p> <p>At each consultation stage of the AADMDPD all amendments have been clearly demonstrated by striking through the existing policy text and underlining the new text. Chapter 8 provides an explanation of the changes to housing policies in the ACS i.e. the affordable housing policy and housing type and mix policy replace the existing policies in the ACS.</p> <p><b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> None</p> <p><b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> None</p> <p><b>Reviewer Comments:</b> NPPF Compliant - no further actions required.</p>				

<b>KEY QUESTIONS</b>		<b>Assessment</b>				
		<i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
		-2	-1	0	+1	+2
<b>44.</b>	<p><b>Are the objectives the policies are trying to achieve clear, and can the policies be easily used and understood for decision making?</b></p>	<p>No, we do not meet this requirement</p>	<p>No, we may not fully meet this requirement</p>	<p>Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not</p>	<p>Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement</p>	<p>Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement</p>
		<p><b>Reason for score:</b> The AADMDPD is in compliance with the ACS in terms of the objectives identified. It seeks to deliver, and can demonstrate, that the quantum of sustainable development identified in the ACS is achievable. The AADMDPD has been amended to ensure it complies with the NPPF.</p>				
		<p><b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> None</p>				
		<p><b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> None</p>				
		<p><b>Reviewer Comments:</b> NPPF Compliant - no further actions required.</p>				
<b>45.</b>	<p><b>For each policy area you have designated or defined in the Plan: (i) are these clearly referenced and explained in the Plan; and (ii) clearly defined on the Policies Map?</b> <b>Where you have included maps or graphics within the local plan policies update are these legible and is it clear if and how they are to be used in decision making?</b></p>	<p>No, we do not meet this requirement</p>	<p>No, we may not fully meet this requirement</p>	<p>Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not</p>	<p>Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement</p>	<p>Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement</p>
		<p><b>Reason for score:</b> All sites designated by Newark and Sherwood District Council have been clearly explained in the Plan and referenced on the Policies Map.</p>				
		<p><b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> None</p>				
		<p><b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> None</p>				
		<p><b>Reviewer Comments:</b> NPPF Compliant - no further actions required.</p>				
<b>46.</b>	<p><b>Does each local plan policies update policy: (i) make clear the type of development it will promote; (ii) use positive rather than negative wording?</b></p>	<p>No, we do not meet this requirement</p>	<p>No, we may not fully meet this requirement</p>	<p>Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not</p>	<p>Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement</p>	<p>Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement</p>

<b>KEY QUESTIONS</b>		<b>Assessment</b>				
		<i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
		<p><b>Reason for score:</b> The ADMDPD was adopted in 2013. This is an update that makes amendments to ensure compliance with national policy and guidance. The 2013 ADMDPD has continued to provide a robust and unambiguous document in the decision-making process. This is carried through into the AADMDPD. Amendments have been made following the public consultations where consultees have requested more clarity. Policy wording is positive and seeks to deliver well designed, sustainable development.</p> <p><b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> None</p> <p><b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> None</p> <p><b>Reviewer Comments:</b> NPPF Compliant - no further actions required.</p>				
<b>47.</b>	<p><b>Do policies make clear where they are intended to be applied differently for the purposes of decision-making dependent on (i) scale; (ii) use; or (iii) location of development proposed.</b></p> <p><b>[Note: If you have said ‘all development’ this implies equal application irrespective of the development scale/use/location and this may not be either justified or deliverable]</b></p>	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		<p><b>Reason for score: No significant changes have been made in this respect.</b> ACS and AADMDPD policies continue to provide sufficient detail about scale, use, and location of development and there are individual policies for each site allocation.</p>				
		<p><b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> None</p>				
		<p><b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> None</p> <p><b>Reviewer Comments:</b> NPPF Compliant - no further actions required.</p>				
<b>I</b>	<p><b>State how many policies are in your local plan update?</b></p> <p><b>Can you list any policies within the local plan update that: (i) repeat parts of other policies within the plan; (ii) replicate or repeat paragraphs in the NPPF (iii) cross reference other policies.</b></p>	<p>There are 107 policies in the AADMDPD. These are split into the following sections of the AADMDPD:                      Allocations: 81 policies                      Development Management: 17 policies                      Homes for all: 9 policies</p>				
		-2	-1	0	+1	+2

<b>KEY QUESTIONS</b>		<b>Assessment</b>				
		<i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i>				
<b>48.</b>	<p><b>Based on the above, have you tried to avoid unnecessary repetition (of the NPPF or other policies within the local plan policies update) and cross referencing in policies?</b></p> <p><b>If you find duplication or repetition you may want to take minute to consider whether this is appropriate.</b></p>	No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		<p><b>Reason for score:</b> All site allocation policies are specific to each site. Development Management Policies also cover specific areas, for example Developer Contributions, Biodiversity, Public Open Space, Design. There is no repetition within the Plan and, with the exception of the First Homes Policy and minimum 10% biodiversity net gain requirement (which sets specific requirements in national policy and guidance) there is no repetition of the NPPF. The Council’s First Homes Policy provides more detail of requirements and how they apply when considering affordable housing delivery as a whole in the district.</p>				
		<p><b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> None</p>				
		<p><b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> None</p>				
		<p><b>Reviewer Comments:</b> NPPF Compliant - no further actions required.</p>				
<b>49.</b>	<p><b>Do policies avoid duplicating other regulatory requirements (for example, building regulations)?</b></p>	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement
		<p><b>Reason for score:</b> All policies are compliant with the requirements of the NPPF.</p>				
		<p><b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> None</p>				
		<p><b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> None</p>				
		<p><b>Reviewer Comments:</b> NPPF Compliant - no further actions required.</p>				
<b>50.</b>	<p><b>Does the wording of plan policies avoid ambiguity? Are requirements clear to the decision-maker?</b></p>	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
		No, we do not meet this requirement	No, we may not fully meet this requirement	Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not	Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement	Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement

	<b>KEY QUESTIONS</b>	<p align="center"><b>Assessment</b></p> <p align="center"><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.</i></p>
	<p><b>[For instance, policies should avoid using overly subjective terms such as “to the Council’s satisfaction”, “considered necessary by the Council” or “appropriate” without associated clarification.]</b></p>	<p><b>Reason for score:</b> Policies have been written and amended to avoid ambiguity and are compliant with the NPPF.</p>
		<p><b>Implications of taking no further action:</b> None</p>
		<p><b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b> None</p>
		<p><b>Reviewer Comments:</b> NPPF Compliant - no further actions required.</p>

<b>Date of assessment:</b>	18 <sup>th</sup> January 2024
<b>Assessed by:</b>	D. Broad
<b>Checked by:</b>	M. Norton
<b>Overall Score:</b>	95
<b>Comments:</b>	<p>Based on ongoing monitoring of the current Amended Core Strategy and Allocations and Development Management DPD, the Council is confident that the Amended Allocations and Development Management DPD is a deliverable Plan which meets the requirements of the NPPF in terms of the tests of soundness. In terms of Gypsy and Traveller Accommodations needs, it allocates enough land to meet the requirements of the community.</p> <p>Scores of +1 have been applied to infrastructure as, although the Council is confident that developer contributions will be secured to meet the needs of the district, there is ongoing work to address the flood alleviation requirements at Tolney Lane. NSDC is continuing work with the Environment Agency in this respect.</p>