

## 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 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>
<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>Whilst the extant Borough Plan was only adopted in 2019, the development strategy, of the Borough Plan Review, reassesses the borough’s requirements for growth and directs this to the most sustainable locations; whilst taking the opportunity to include the latest legislation requirements set out within the 2021 NPPF, PPG and Environment Act. The Review utilises new evidence base work providing a supportable level of housing and employment and focusing on urban areas. Both strategic and non-strategic sites have been reassessed to ensure sustainability and deliverability, with two of the strategic sites (Sites HSG4 and HSG7) being removed from the plan.</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>Sustainability underpins the distribution of growth. In turn, development is directed to places with good transport links and in close proximity to existing town centres where landowners have confirmed intentions to develop, contributing to the growth of the borough. Key considerations such as heritage and landscape have influenced where growth will take place and the nature of it.</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>Nuneaton:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SHA1 – Land at Top Farm, North of Nuneaton (key infrastructure required to support delivery can be found in Policy SHA1).</li> <li>• SHA2 – Arbury (Policy SHA2).</li> <li>• SHA3 – Land at Tuttle Hill (Judkins Quarry) (Policy SHA3).</li> <li>• SEA4 – Coventry Road (Policy SEA4).</li> </ul> <p>Bedworth:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SHA4 – Hospital Lane (Policy SHA4).</li> <li>• SHA6 – Land at former Hawkesbury Golf Course (Policy SHA6).</li> <li>• SEA6 – Bowling Green Lane (Policy SEA6).</li> </ul>

<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>				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CEM1 – Land north of Marston Lane, Bedworth (Policy CEM1).</li> </ul> <p>Bulkington:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SHA5 – West of Bulkington (Policy SHA5).</li> </ul> <p>(Closer to Coventry than a main growth area):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEA2 – Wilsons Lane (Policy SEA2).</li> <li>SEA3 – Prologis Extension (Policy SEA3).</li> </ul>				
<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>	-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: +2</b>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> Strategic housing, employment and mixed-use allocations are provided in the Borough Plan Review, directing large developments to the most sustainable locations whilst ensuring a supply of housing and employment land is available in the borough. Sustainable development may also be brought forward through non-strategic allocations and through adhering to other policy requirements such as policy DS2 – Settlement hierarchy.				
<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	+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: +2</b>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> The strategic sites allocated within the Borough Plan Review include a minimum housing yield. This is determined by a number of factors including planning application or pre-application engagement,				

<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>				
		representations and discussions with the landowners and high level assessments of site capacity based on site size and local character.				
<b>3.</b>	<p>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?</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>	-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: +2</b>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>				
		<p><b>Reviewer Comments:</b> The 'standard method' set out in the NPPG, utilises the 2014 household projections over a 10-year period and applies the most recent affordability ratio. The 'standard method' figure for Nuneaton and Bedworth is 434 dwellings per annum. However, in order to provide a more up-to-date assessment of housing need within the Coventry and Warwickshire housing market area, the Coventry and Warwickshire authorities appointed Icen Projects to undertake an updated sub-regional HEDNA. This took account of the 2021 Census data and looked to address previous inaccuracies in ONS estimates for authorities within the HMA and utilised 10-year mitigation trends. The sub-regional HEDNA concluded a housing need figure of 409 dwellings per annum and employment need of 47.7ha which was significantly lower than the figures in the draft HEDNA.</p> <p>It was considered that given the aspirations for the Borough including employment growth and the extraordinary need for affordable housing, a bespoke report should also be prepared to reflect the Borough's unique position. This report 'Towards a Housing Requirement for Nuneaton and Bedworth' considers the objectively assessed housing need set out within the HEDNAs as well as other considerations which may influence the Council's decision on an appropriate housing and employment requirement. The report concluded a housing figure of 545 dwellings per annum and employment provision of 80.5ha was appropriate for the borough. These are the figures which are set out in the Publication version of the Borough Plan Review.</p>				
<b>4.</b>	<p>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</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: +2</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>				
	that exceptional circumstances exist to justify green belt release?	<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b> <b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b> <b>Reviewer Comments:</b> No green belt land has been released as part of the Borough Plan Review.				
5.	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 assessments, the Sustainability Appraisal and viability assessment? If not, can you justify why?	-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: +2</b>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> Public consultation has been undertaken (Call for Sites, Issues and Options, Preferred Options) and a thorough search of sites has been undertaken. The sites have then been examined by or had regard to evidence in the Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment, Sustainability Assessment and Habitat Regulation Assessment and therefore, are considered justifiably allocated for development.				
6.	Does the local plan policies update identify a housing requirement for designated neighbourhood areas?	-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: +2</b>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> Not applicable – The Borough has no neighbourhood areas.				
7.	Do site allocations include sufficient detail on the mix and quantum of development, including, where appropriate any necessary supporting infrastructure?	-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: +2</b>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>				

		<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>Reviewer Comments:</b> Yes, sufficient detail is included.				
<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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•68.45ha of employment land for local industrial and distribution / warehousing development (including 5.35ha for replacement provision).</li> <li>•19.4ha of employment land for strategic B8 warehousing and distribution development (indicative).</li> <li>•2ha of employment land for office space.</li> </ul> <p>(Iceni Projects (2023). <i>Review of Nuneaton &amp; Bedworth Employment Land Portfolio</i>).</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: +2</b>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>				
		<p><b>Reviewer Comments:</b>  Employed land has been identified and allocated which will meet the need identified. The sites can be found in the Borough Plan Review 'Strategic Employment Allocations'. The delivery of the sites is supported by site specific policies in the Borough Plan Review and associated policies throughout the plan.</p> <p>The Strategic Employment Allocations show the area of the land in hectares. A ratio has been applied to allow for the required floorspace, additional infrastructure and open space. The allocated sites demonstrate evidence that progress has been made towards securing planning permission which indicates the targets are achievable over the plan period. Indications are that most sites will deliver the short term (5 years).</p>				
<b>9.</b>	<p><b>Does the local plan policies update: (i) identify infrastructure that is necessary to support planned growth; and (ii) enable provision of this 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
		<b>Reason for score: +2</b>				

		<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>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>				
		<p><b>Reviewer Comments:</b> Chapter 7 – Strategic allocations identifies the infrastructure required to support each of the strategic housing/employment/mixed-use allocations through either stating it should be provided on-site or through financial contributions paid. Policy HS1 aims to support the provision and delivery of infrastructure whilst policy HS2 requires measures to deal with the issues of air quality. Policy HS3 supports the provision of superfast broadband infrastructure.</p>				
10.	<p><b>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?</b></p> <p><b>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?</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: +2</b>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>				
		<p><b>Reviewer Comments:</b> The Infrastructure Delivery Plan/Infrastructure Funding Statement demonstrates that transport and other infrastructure needed to support each strategic site identified can be funded, delivered and is supported by the relevant providers.</p>				
<b>Process and Outcomes (see also Toolkit Parts 2 and 3)</b>						
E	<p><b>What are the cross boundary strategic matters affecting your local plan policies update? List these.</b></p>	<p>Strategic and cross boundary matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Transport.</li> <li>- Housing delivery.</li> <li>- Strategic B8 employment land.</li> <li>- Green Infrastructure.</li> </ul>				



		<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>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
		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: +2</b>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> Yes, discussions with relevant prescribed bodies and neighbouring authorities have taken place.				
<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>	No – as a Council we feel the Borough Plan Review conforms with national policy. It can be robustly defended based on local evidence.				
<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: +2</b>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> Not applicable.				

<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>				
13.	<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: +2</b>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> The Borough Plan review conforms with the Council's Corporate Plan – Building a Better Borough (2022). In terms of neighbourhood areas, this is not applicable to the Borough.				
14.	<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: +2</b>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> The Consultation Statement is in compliance.				
15.	<b>Has the Sustainability Appraisal – incorporating the requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment legislation - evaluated all reasonable alternatives? Is it clear why alternatives have not been selected?</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: +2</b>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> The SA has incorporated the SEA requirements, evaluated all reasonable alternatives and made it clear why alternatives have not been selected.				
		-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>16.</b>	<b>Does the Sustainability Appraisal adequately assess the likely significant effects of policies and proposals?</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: +2</b>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> The SA adequately assesses the likely significant effects of policies and proposals.				
<b>17.</b>	<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: +2</b>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>				
<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> The SA has influenced the Borough Plan Review policies and site allocations. It demonstrates that the Borough Plan Review update is an appropriate strategy.						
<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: +2</b>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>				
<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> Yes.						
		-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>19.</b>	<b>Does the Habitats Regulations Assessment consider the local plan policies update in combination with other plans and projects?</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: +2</b>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> Yes.				
<b>20.</b>	<b>If the Habitats Regulations Assessment has identified, through 'Appropriate Assessment' that mitigation measures are required, does the local plan policies update adequately identify the measures required and the mechanisms for delivering them?</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: +2</b>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> <p>Given the Environment Agency's advice to Warwickshire County Council in 2019 regarding the Mineral Plan, it was recommended in the HRA of the Preferred Options that a further requirement is explicitly added to Policy NE4 that 'All new housing and employment allocations with piled foundations or basements within 1km of Ensor's Pool SAC should undertake a hydrogeological study to confirm it will not affect groundwater flows or quality at the SAC'. This recommendation has now been added in the Water Quality part of Policy NE4.</p> <p>It was recommended in the HRA of the Preferred Options that, for the general health of the SAC, the policy for site SHA2 (Arbury) includes a requirement for the developer to work with landowners and Natural England to provide support (either financial or in kind through the services of an estate management company for the adjacent development) to aid with litter collection and patrolling of the SAC. The Council ultimately decided that it was unnecessary to include this recommendation in policy because the Council's Parks Department already have a long lease on the Pool which enables the Council to maintain the area.</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>				
21.	Is it clear how the outcomes and conclusions of the Habitats Regulations Assessment have influenced the local plan policies update?	-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: +2</b>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>				
		<b>Reviewer Comments: Yes.</b>				
<b>Housing Strategy</b>						
22.	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 instance, because another local authority has agreed to plan for your unmet need], can you explain and robustly justify why?	-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: +2</b>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action for local plan soundness and/or effectiveness: N/A</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> The plan sets out the requirement for 545 dwellings per annum to be delivered. This figure is higher than standard methodology figure for the borough and the figure established in the sub-regional HEDNA as the borough has economic growth aspirations and a significant affordable housing need. The housing trajectory shows that the plan will deliver in excess of this 545 dwellings per annum across the plan period and therefore can meet the housing requirements in full.				
G	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.	We have not been formally asked to accommodate any unmet need from neighbouring areas, as of yet, due to their Local Plan Reviews being at an earlier stage than where we are in the process.				
		-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>				
23.	Does your local plan policies update accommodate any of this unmet need where you can sustainably do so?	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: +2</b>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> We have not been formally asked to accommodate any unmet need from neighbouring areas, as of yet, due to their Local Plan Reviews being at an earlier stage than where we are in the process.				
24.	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?	-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: +2</b>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> Yes – policy DS4.				
25.	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: +2</b>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> Yes – policy DS4.				
		-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>26.</b>	<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?</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: +2</b>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>				
<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> Yes – policy DS4.						
<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: +2</b>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>				
<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> The Council is not reliant on the delivery of any ‘windfall’ sites during the plan period.						
<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: +2</b>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>				
<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> Yes – policies H1 and H2.						
<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>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>30.</b>		<b>Reason for score: +2</b>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> Yes, for example policy H5 relates to Accessible and Adaptable Homes ensuring that people with disabilities and long-term limiting illnesses are accommodated for, in the Borough, whilst policy H1 refers to self-build and custom build housing, providing the community with the opportunity to develop their own houses.				
<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: +2</b>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> Yes – policy H2.				
<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: +2</b>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> Policy H3 refers to Gypsies and Travellers. However, the Council is in the process of adopting a Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations DPD which looks into this topic further.				
<b>32.</b>	<b>Will the local plan policies update provide for a 5-year supply of deliverable travellers</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



<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>and travelling showpeople pitches to meet identified needs?</b>						will meet this requirement	
	<b>Reason for score: +2</b>						
	<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>						
	<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>						
	<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> Policy H3 refers to Gypsies and Travellers. However, the Council is in the process of adopting a Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations DPD which looks into this topic further. Once adopted, we will have a 5-year supply.						
<b>H</b>	<b>List any travellers and travelling showpeople sites identified to meet need and the timescales for their delivery</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• G TSA1 – Sunrise Cottage for three additional pitches within the existing site.</li> <li>• G TSA2 – The Old Nursery for five to six new pitches within the site.</li> <li>• G TSA3 – Winter Oak for six additional pitches within the existing site.</li> </ul>					
<b>Justified approaches to plan policy and content</b>							
<b>33.</b>	<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>  [You may wish to check each policy setting a threshold]	-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: +2</b>					
		<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>					
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>					
<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> Evidence base work justifies any thresholds stated in the Borough Plan Review.							
<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</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: +2</b>					
		<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>					
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</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>35.</b>	<b>Supplementary Planning Documents and why this is appropriate?</b>  [For example, hierarchies could relate to nature conservation, heritage assets, town centres/retail, settlements.]	<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> Matters of non-strategic detail will be covered in supporting Supplementary Planning Documents. The Council is at an advanced stage, currently consulting on Main Modifications, following a hearing on its Gypsy and Traveller DPD last October. It provides criteria to be used to identify potential locations. The DPD states in the vision states: "The vision for this DPD is for the needs of the travelling community in and visiting the borough to be provided with sufficient pitches so that they can live, work, and rest in the borough. Pitches will be well located and integrated into the environment and the local community thereby providing good access to essential services."				
<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?</b>  [For example, hierarchies could relate to nature conservation, heritage assets, town centres/retail, settlements.]	-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: +2</b>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> The settlement hierarchy is defined within the Borough Plan Review. The Heritage policy makes clear the different level of protection afforded to different types of heritage asset, having regard to their significance and designation. It differentiates between designated and non-designated heritage assets and provides different criteria for different types of assets. This is in line with national policy.				
<b>36.</b>	<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>  [For example, policies relating to town centres, employment or retail may seek to limit certain uses.]	-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: +2</b>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>				

		<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>Reviewer Comments:</b> Yes – all policies which seek to limit certain uses, such as hot foot takeaways, within 400m walking distance of a school, are supported by evidence.				
<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>[For example, onsite provision of open space, optional technical standards, internal and external space standards.]</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: +2</b>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>				
<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> Yes, for example policies H4 and BE3.						
<b>Deliverability</b>						
<b>38.</b>	<p><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></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: +2</b>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>				
<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> Yes, the Borough Plan Review is supported by a viability appraisal which has tested the policies within the plan. Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council is not a CIL charging authority.						
<b>39.</b>	<p><b>Does the local plan policies update reflect the conclusions and recommendations of your viability evidence?</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: +2</b>				

		<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>				
	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>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> Yes, policies such as the affordable housing policy are informed by the viability test.				
40.	Does the monitoring framework clearly set out what matters will be monitored, and the indicators used? Are these measurable and can the data be readily secured/captured?	-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: +2</b>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> Each policy has a table of indicators and targets, at the end, specifying how the policy will be monitored.				
41.	Does the local plan policies update and monitoring framework identify a clear framework for <u>plan review</u> ?  Where triggers for plan review and/or update are identified are they justified and proportionate?	-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: +2</b>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action:</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</b>				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> Yes – Policy DS9.				
<b>Plan effectiveness (and associated policy clarity)</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>42.</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 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)?	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: +2				
		Implications of taking no further action: N/A				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
		Reviewer Comments: The plan period is defined as 2021-2039 which will allow for a minimum 15 year period from adoption, on the proviso we adopt in 2024.				
<b>43.</b>	Does the local plan policies update clearly set out which adopted Development Plan policies it supersedes?	-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: +2				
		Implications of taking no further action: N/A				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
Reviewer Comments: Yes - Paragraph 1.4.						
<b>44.</b>	Are the objectives the policies are trying to achieve clear, and can the policies be easily used and understood for decision making?	-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: +2				
		Implications of taking no further action: N/A				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
Reviewer Comments: Yes.						
		-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>45.</b>	<p>For each policy area you have designated or defined in the Plan: (i) are these clearly referenced and explained in the Plan; <u>and</u> (ii) clearly defined on the Policies Map?</p> <p>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?</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: +2				
		Implications of taking no further action: N/A				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
		Reviewer Comments: Yes.				
<b>46.</b>	<p>Does each local plan policies update policy: (i) make clear the type of development it will promote; (ii) use positive rather than negative wording?</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: +2				
		Implications of taking no further action: N/A				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
Reviewer Comments: Yes.						
<b>47.</b>	<p>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.</p> <p>[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]</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: +2				
		Implications of taking no further action: N/A				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A				
Reviewer Comments: Yes.						

		<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>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>	47 policies are contained within the Borough Plan Review.				
<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>	-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: +2</b>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> We have avoided unnecessary repetition of the NPPF or other policies within the local plan policies.				
<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
		<b>Reason for score: +2</b>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>				
		<b>Reviewer Comments:</b> Yes.				
		-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>50.</b>	<b>Does the wording of plan policies avoid ambiguity? Are requirements clear to the decision-maker?</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
	[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>Reason for score: +2</b>				
		<b>Implications of taking no further action: N/A</b>				
		<b>Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: N/A</b>				
		<b>Reviewer Comments: Yes.</b>				

<b>Date of assessment:</b>	19/07/2023
<b>Assessed by:</b>	Jade Bagley – Planning Policy Officer
<b>Checked by:</b>	Sarah Matile – Principal Planning Policy Officer
<b>Overall Score:</b>	100/100
<b>Comments:</b>	