

Newark & Sherwood Amended Core Strategy DPD Examination  
Inspector: Paul Griffiths BSc(Hons) BArch IHBC  
Programme Officer: Carmel Edwards  
[carmel.edwards@newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk](mailto:carmel.edwards@newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk)  
Tel: 07969 631930

HEARINGS AGENDAS

Hearing 1: Thursday 1 February 2018 (0930 to completion)

1. Are there any difficulties with the format or nature of the Plan overall?
2. Has the Duty to Co-operate been fulfilled?
3. Are the Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives sound?
4. Is the OAN reasonable, having regard to its derivation and out-turn?
5. Bearing in mind any conclusions on 4 above, do Spatial Policies 1 and 2 represent a sensible approach?
6. Are they likely to support a five year supply of deliverable housing sites?
7. Does Spatial Policy 3 work effectively in the context of 4 above?
8. Are Spatial Policies SP4A and SP4B (national policy) compliant in terms of their approach to Green Belt and do they properly reflect 4 above?
9. Is Spatial Policy 5 effective in strategic delivery terms?
10. Will Spatial Policy 6 act as a brake on development?
11. Is Spatial Policy 9 adequate in terms of coverage?

Hearing 2: Friday 2 February 2018 (0930 to completion)

12. Will Core Policy 1 function properly and deliver affordable housing?
13. Is Core Policy 3 sufficiently flexible?
14. Are Core Policies 4 and 5 a reasonable approach to the needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?
15. Is Core Policy 8 a proper reflection of national retail policy?
16. Can Core Policy 9 be said to sit all square with national policy on design?
17. Does Core Policy 10 demonstrate a proportionate response to issues around climate change?
18. Is the course taken by Core Policy 12 too restrictive?
19. Does Core Policy 14 relate clearly national policy towards the historic environment?
20. Should Policy NAP2A (Land South of Newark) be amended to provide for the early deliver of a large food-store or superstore?
21. Is Policy NAP2B (Land East of Newark) workable in its current format?
22. Does the employment allocation in Policy NAP2C (Land around Fernwood), as drafted, function as intended?
23. Would it be appropriate to amend Policy SoAP1 (Role and Setting of Southwell) to reflect the opportunities inherent in additional student accommodation?
24. Are the range of infrastructure requirements in Policy ShAP2 ((Role of Ollerton & Boughton) deliverable?
25. Is there a insoluble tension between heritage and nature conservation and the level of development envisaged in Policy ShAP3 (Role of Edwinstowe)?
26. Does Policy ShAP4 (Land at Thoresby Colliery) present a sound approach in terms of landscape impact, accessibility, and employment provision and in terms of its coal mining legacy? Is the allocation necessary bearing in mind 4 above?
27. Should Appendix F include triggers for bringing forward opportunity sites?