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

Autumn 2024

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 policy 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.

	KEY QUESTIONS	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Assessment</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the evidence base/which may include only 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>
	Growth Strategy	
A	<p>In no more than 100 words (excluding any referencing) summarise your strategy for delivering growth and development in your area</p>	<p>The development strategy seeks to meet an identified need of 5,040 homes over the plan period (2020-2041). This includes a contribution to meeting the city of Leicester’s unmet need.</p>
B	<p>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</p>	<p>The distribution of development within the local plan has primarily been identified and guided by the supporting evidence base: Strategic Growth Plan Site assessments/SHELAA Housing & Employment Land study- HENA Sustainability Appraisal</p>
C	<p>List each of the main growth areas and strategic sites and the key Infrastructure needed to support delivery</p>	<p>The borough is very small so does not really have growth areas. It has a variety of sites, shown on the proposals map. All supporting infrastructure is set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>

<p>KEY QUESTIONS</p>		<p><i>Assessment</i></p> <p><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the 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>				
		-2	-1	0	+1	+2
<p>1.</p>	<p>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?</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, meets requirements of relevant NPPF para				
		Implications of taking no further action:				
		Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:				
		Reviewer Comments:				
<p>2.</p>	<p>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?</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 , derived from evidence (HENA), site selection paper and housing topic paper				
		Implications of taking no further action:				
		Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:				
		Reviewer Comments:				
<p>3.</p>	<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>	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, overall housing need based on standard method but provides more than this to take a proportion of the city's unmet need.				
		Implications of taking no further action:				
		Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:				
		Reviewer Comments:				

KEY QUESTIONS		<i>Assessment</i>				
		<i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the 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>				
4.	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?	-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: N/A – Not a green belt authority				
		Implications of taking no further action:				
		Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:				
		Reviewer Comments:				
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
		Reason for score: +2, consistent site assessments which have taken evidence base, SA and viability into account.				
		Implications of taking no further action:				
		Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:				
		Reviewer Comments: Commitment to joint working on cross boundary sites and evidence.				
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
		Reason for score: N/A – there are no neighbourhood areas in the authority				
		Implications of taking no further action:				
		Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right: Identify housing requirement at examination.				
		Reviewer Comments:				
		-2	-1	0	+1	+2

		<i>Assessment</i>				
KEY QUESTIONS		<p><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the 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>				
7.	<p>Do site allocations include sufficient detail on the mix and quantum of development, including, where appropriate any necessary supporting infrastructure?</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 policies set out site requirements further evidence in the IDP.				
		Implications of taking no further action:				
		Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right				
		Reviewer Comments:				
D.	<p>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?</p> <p>List these targets and the evidence source for this 'need' target?</p>	<p>The IcenI HEDNA study (2022) shows very low levels of predicted need within the authority for the plan period</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 4.1ha employment land 				
8.	<p>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?</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, HENA by IcenI derived the target, have 20 years to deliver a very low level of growth.				
		Implications of taking no further action:				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:				
		Reviewer Comments:				
		-2	-1	0	+1	+2

KEY QUESTIONS		<i>Assessment</i> <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - Examination focused on 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>				
9.	<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>	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, infrastructure is identified. Delivery will be by third parties out of LA's control.				
		Implications of taking no further action:				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:				
		Reviewer Comments:				
10.	<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>	-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, An infrastructure study has been carried out on the plan. The level of growth identified is not of a scale that developers cannot fund this.				
		Implications of taking no further action:				
		Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:				
		Reviewer Comments:				
Process and Outcomes (see also Toolkit Parts 2 and 3)						
E.	<p>What are the cross boundary strategic matters affecting your local plan policies update? List these.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Housing (including G&T) · Employment · Environment · Infrastructure (Including transport and education) 				

		<i>Assessment</i>				
KEY QUESTIONS		<p><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the 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>				
11.	<p>Does your Duty to Cooperate Statements) 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?</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, SoCGs are ongoing no one has given any indication that they will be unable to sign up to a SoCG.				
		Implications of taking no further action:				
		Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:				
		Reviewer Comments:				
F.	<p>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?</p> <p>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?</p>	No. Local plan is in compliance with national policy				
12.	<p>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.</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

		Assessment				
	KEY QUESTIONS	<p><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the 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>				
	the London Plan, or a plan produced by a Combined Authority or through voluntary agreement).	Reason for score: +2 local plan is in compliance with the non-statutory strategic growth plan.				
		Implications of taking no further action:				
		Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:				
		Reviewer Comments:				
13.	Is the local plan policies update: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In conformity with any 'higher level' plans prepared by the Council; and properly reflecting provisions of any made neighbourhood plan? 	-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: N/A – neither situation applies				
		Implications of taking no further action:				
		Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:				
		Reviewer Comments:				
14.	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)?	-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, The Statement of Consultation clearly outlines how the council has complied with the requirements of the regulations.				
		Implications of taking no further action:				
		Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:				
		Reviewer Comments:				
15.	Has the Sustainability Appraisal - Incorporating the requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment legislation - evaluated all reasonable	-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

		<i>Assessment</i>				
KEY QUESTIONS		<p><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the 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>				
	alternatives? Is it clear why alternatives have not been selected?	Reason for score: +2, all reasonable alternatives were evaluated, and the SA was updated in advance of the Regulation 19 consultation.				
		Implications of taking no further action:				
		Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:				
		Reviewer Comments:				
16.	Does the Sustainability Appraisal adequately assess the likely significant effects of policies and proposals?	-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, the SA includes a full assessment of plan policies and site allocations.				
		Implications of taking no further action:				
		Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:				
		Reviewer Comments:				
17.	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?	-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, mitigations have been considered for proposed site allocations, and policy recommendations have been taken into account. Policies were amended following SA recommendations in line with paragraph 32 of the NPPF.				
		Implications of taking no further action:				
		Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:				
		Reviewer Comments:				
		-2	-1	0	+1	+2

KEY QUESTIONS		<i>Assessment</i>				
		<i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the 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>				
18.	Is It clear how an Equalities Impact Assessment has Influenced the local plan policies update?	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, separate EQIA has been prepared and it has influenced policy wording				
		Implications of taking no further action:				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:				
		Reviewer Comments:				
19.	Does the Habitats Regulations Assessment consider the local plan policies update in combination with other plans and projects?	-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, Yes. External consultants did this as part of HRA.				
		Implications of taking no further action:				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:				
Reviewer Comments:						
20.	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?	-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, N/A				
		Implications of taking no further action:				
		Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:				

		Assessment				
	KEY QUESTIONS	<i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the pion 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>				
		Reviewer Comments:				
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
		Reason for score: +2, N/A				
		Implications of taking no further action:				
		Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:				
		Reviewer Comments:				
	Housing Strategy					
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
		Reason for score: +2, based upon our supply evidence we are able to meet our Local Plan housing target.				
		Implications of taking no further action for local plan soundness and/or effectiveness:				
		Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:				
		Reviewer Comments:				

		<i>Assessment</i>				
KEY QUESTIONS		<i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the pion 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.	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.	City of Leicester – 42 dwellings p.a.				
24.	Does your local plan policies update accommodate any of this unmet need where you can sustainably to do so?	-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 , Yes, SA suggests that this level can be accommodated				
		Implications of taking no further action:				
		Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:				
		Reviewer Comments:				
25.	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
		Reason for score: +2 , the Local Plan includes our housing trajectory.				
		Implications of taking no further action:				
		Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:				
		Reviewer Comments:				
		-2	-1	0	+1	+2

		<i>Assessment</i>				
	KEY QUESTIONS	<i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the 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>				
26.	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.	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 , We will have a 5-year housing land supply on adoption, and we have identified developable sites beyond the first 5-year period. The 5-year housing land supply will include a buffer upon adoption.				
		Implications of taking no further action:				
		Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:				
		Reviewer Comments:				
27.	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
		Reason for score: +2 , the proposed housing target, which is based on anticipated supply, includes a buffer.				
		Implications of taking no further action:				
		Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:				
Reviewer Comments:						
28.	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?	-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 , No. Proposed allocations exceed targets so windfalls are not needed.				
		Implications of taking no further action:				
		Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:				
Reviewer Comments:						

KEY QUESTIONS		<i>Assessment</i>				
		<i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the 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>				
29.	Does the local plan policies update make it clear what size, type and tenure of housing is required?	-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, the local plan's housing mix policy is based upon latest evidence.				
		Implications of taking no further action:				
		Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:				
		Reviewer Comments:				
30.	Does the local plan policies update specifically address the needs of different groups in the community?	-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, the local plan's housing policy is based upon latest evidence, which is in compliance with NPPG.				
		Implications of taking no further action:				
		Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:				
		Reviewer Comments:				
31.	Can your affordable housing requirements, including any geographical variations, be justified?	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
	Does the local plan policies update provide for the delivery of the full need for	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, geographical variations have been informed by relevant evidence. Plan policies seek a affordable housing requirement based upon viability.					
	Implications of taking no further action:					

		<i>Assessment</i>				
KEY QUESTIONS		<p><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the 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>				
	affordable housing? If not, can you explain and justify why?	Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:				
		Reviewer Comments:				
32.	<p>Have the needs for travellers and travelling showpeople been adequately assessed in accordance with national policy and have they been based on robust evidence?</p> <p>Does the local plan policies update make adequate provision for the identified needs?</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 evidence base complied by ORS shows no need for G&T provision.				
		Implications of taking no further action:				
		Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:				
		Reviewer Comments:				
33.	<p>Will the local plan policies update provide for a 5-year supply of deliverable travellers and travelling showpeople pitches to meet identified needs?</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, N/A see qu 34.				
		Implications of taking no further action: may be raised at examination				
		Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:				
		Reviewer Comments:				
F.	List any travellers and travelling showpeople sites identified to meet need and the timescales for their delivery	N/A				

KEY QUESTIONS		Assessment				
		<p><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the 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>				
Justified approaches to plan policy and content						
34.	<p>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?</p> <p>[You may wish to check each policy setting a threshold]</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, thresholds are justified by evidence and explained in supporting text.				
		Implications of taking no further action:				
		Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:				
		Reviewer Comments:				
35.	<p>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?</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, where we are proposing to produce SPDs, it is clear why we are proposing to do this				
		Implications of taking no further action:				
		Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:				
		Reviewer Comments:				
36.	<p>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</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: Explained in relevant policies				

		<i>Assessment</i>				
	KEY QUESTIONS	<p><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the 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>hierarchy; and (iii) is the approach consistent with National Policy?</p> <p>[For example, hierarchies could relate to nature conservation, heritage assets, town centres/retail]</p>	<p>Implications of taking no further action:</p> <p>Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</p> <p>Reviewer Comments:</p>				
37.	<p>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.</p> <p>[For example, policies relating to town centres, employment or retail may seek to limit certain uses.]</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. Yes restrictions evidence based and comply with NPPF				
		Implications of taking no further action				
		Mitigation/ Action required if necessary to move scale to right:				
		Reviewer Comments:				
38.	<p>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?</p> <p>[For example, on site 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
		Reason for score:+2, proposed standards are in line with national advice and own design code				
		Implications of taking no further action:				
		Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:				
		Reviewer Comments:				

KEY QUESTIONS		<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Assessment</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the 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>				
		Reviewer Comments:				
39.	<p>Has the viability of the local plan policies update been suitably tested and does the 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?</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, HDH Viability Study shows suitable extensive testing.				
		Implications of taking no further action:				
		Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:				
		Reviewer Comments:				
40.	<p>Does the local plan policies update reflect the conclusions and recommendations of your viability evidence? Is it clear that the viability and delivery of development will not be put at risk by the requirements in the local plan policy update?</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, policies reflect HDH study				
		Implications of taking no further action:				
		Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:				
		Reviewer Comments:				

KEY QUESTIONS		<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Assessment</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the 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>				
41.	<p>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?</p> <p>Does the local plan policies update and monitoring framework Identify a clear framework for plan review?</p> <p>Where triggers for plan review and/or update are Identified are they justified and proportionate?</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, Yes framework is clear as are triggers				
		Implications of taking no further action:				
		Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:				
		Reviewer Comments:				
42.	<p>Do the local plan policies update clearly set out the timeframe it covers? Is it clear which policies are strategic? Will strategic policies provide for a minimum of 15 years? 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</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, Policies clearly state which are strategic and cover a 15 year period.				
		Implications of taking no further action:				
		Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:				
		reviewer Comments:				

KEY QUESTIONS		Assessment				
		<i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the 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>				
43.	Does the local plan policies update clearly set out which <u>adopted</u> 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, it is explicit in the plan that the Local Plan 2011-2031 will be superseded.				
		Implications of taking no further action:				
		Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:				
		Reviewer Comments:				
44.	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, we are confident that the objectives that the policies are trying to achieve are clear, and the policies can be easily used and understood.				
		Implications of taking no further action:				
		Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:				
		Reviewer Comments:				
45.	For each policy area you have designated or defined in the Plan: (i) are these clearly referenced and explained in the Plan; (ii) clearly defined on the Policies Map?	-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
	Where you have included maps or graphics within the local plan policies update are	Reason for score: +2, Map is clear and cross references explicit.				
		Implications of taking no further action:				
Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:						

<i>Assessment</i>											
KEY QUESTIONS	<p><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the 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>these legible and is it clear if and how they are to be used in decision making?</p> <p>Reviewer Comments:</p>										
46.	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">-2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">-1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">+1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">+2</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">No, we do not meet this requirement</td> <td style="text-align: center;">No, we may not fully meet this requirement</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement</td> </tr> </table>	-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
	-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>Reason for score: +2, policies are clear in the type of development they aim to promote, and are worded positively</p>										
	<p>Implications of taking no further action:</p>										
	<p>Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</p>										
<p>Reviewer Comments:</p>											
47.	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">-2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">-1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">+1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">+2</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">No, we do not meet this requirement</td> <td style="text-align: center;">No, we may not fully meet this requirement</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement</td> </tr> </table>	-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
	-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>Reason for score: +2, certain policies are applied differently and are justified accordingly, this is made clear in supporting text.</p>										
	<p>Implications of taking no further action:</p>										
	<p>Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:</p>										
<p>Reviewer Comments:</p>											
<p>F.</p>											
<p>State how many policies are in your local plan update?</p> <p>Can you List any policies within the local plan update that: (I) repeat para of other policies within the plan; (II) replicate or repeat</p>	<p>37 Policies</p> <p>See local plan for full list of policies.</p>										

		Assessment				
KEY QUESTIONS		<p><i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the 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>				
	<i>paragraphs in the NPPF (iii) cross reference other policies.</i>					
48.	<p>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?</p> <p>If you find duplication or repetition you may want to take minute to consider whether this is appropriate.</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 , cross references between policies are appropriate.				
		Implications of taking no further action:				
		Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:				
Reviewer Comments:						
49.	<p>Do policies avoid duplicating other regulatory requirements (for example, building regulations)?</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, to provide clarity brief mentions of other regulatory requirements have been mentioned in policies, mainly to provide benchmarks.				
		Implications of taking no further action:				
		Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:				
Reviewer Comments:						
50.	<p>Does the wording of plan policies avoid ambiguity? Are requirements clear to the decision-maker?</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 , the Council's Development Management team have played an active role in policy wording to ensure that requirements are clear.				

	KEY QUESTIONS	Assessment <i>Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the 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>
	[For instance, policies should avoid using overly subjective terms such as “to the Councils satisfaction”, “considered necessary by the Council” or “appropriate” without associated clarification.]	Implications of taking no further action:
		Mitigation/ Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:
		Reviewer Comments:

Date of assessment:	31/10/2024
Assessed by:	Internally
Checked by:	Internally
Overall Score:	88/88 - 12 marks do not apply.
Comments:	The Council has used this document as a self-assessment and has been checked internally. This is intended to be an informal document.