



**GOSPORT**  
Borough Council



# **Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 (Submission Version)**

## **Soundness Self Assessment Checklist**

November 2014



## Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029

### Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (November 2014)

#### Introduction

The Borough Council have completed a checklist for the Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 to ensure that the policies are sound and take into account the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

This assessment follows the checklist published by the Planning Advisory Service (PAS) in March 2014. As a result of this assessment it is concluded that the Publication Version of the Local Plan is sound and complies with the requirements of the NPPF.

# Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (November 2014)

| Soundness Test and Key Requirements  | Evidence Provided   |
|--|---|
| <p><b>Positively Prepared:</b> the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development.</p>   |   |
| <p><i>Vision and Objectives</i></p> <p>Has the LPA clearly identified what the issues are that the DPD is seeking to address? Have priorities been set so that it is clear what the DPD is seeking to achieve?</p> <p>Does the DPD contain clear vision(s) and objectives which are specific to the place? Is there a direct relationship between the identified issues, the vision(s) and the objectives?</p> <p>Is it clear how the policies will meet the objectives? Are there any obvious gaps in the policies, having regard to the objectives of the DPD?</p> <p>Have reasonable alternatives to the quantum of development and overall spatial strategy been considered?</p> <p>Are the policies internally consistent?</p> <p>Are there realistic timescales related to the objectives?</p> <p>Does the DPD explain how its key policy objectives will be achieved?</p> | <p>Only one DPD is being prepared, the Gosport Borough Local Plan (2011-2029). The LDS sets out the timetable as amended by comments on the GBC website.</p> <p>The Local Plan identifies key issues in Chapter 3 (Gosport Profile and Key Issues),</p> <p>The vision is set out in Chapter 4 (The Vision for Gosport Borough and Local Plan Objectives) and is followed by a series of objectives to meet the development needs of the Borough.</p> <p>Also supported by background papers.</p> <p>Alternatives to the strategy have been considered in the SA.</p> <p>Delivery dealt with in the Infrastructure Assessment Report and Infrastructure Delivery Plan (includes consultation with the relevant agencies)</p> |
| <p><i>The presumption in favour of sustainable development (NPPF paras 6-17)</i></p> <p>Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>–any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or</li> <li>–specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.</li> </ul>  | <p>The Local Plan identifies the quantum of development proposed and sites have been identified that are capable of meeting the development needs of the Borough. These are shown in the Chapter on regenerating Gosport through the delivery of high quality sites. The development scenarios for these sites are sufficiently flexible to allow for change. The SA assessed different options for the sites. The Local Plan has been prepared having regard to the South Hampshire Strategy (October 2012) which was adopted by the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire. This strategy sets out the district quantum of development to meet the needs of the sub region.</p>  |

# Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (November 2014)

| Soundness Test and Key Requirements  | Evidence Provided  |
|--|--|
| <p>Policies in Local Plans should follow the approach of the presumption in favour of sustainable development so that it is clear that development which is sustainable can be approved without delay. All plans should be based upon and reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development, with clear policies that will guide how the presumption should be applied locally.</p>                                   | <p>The Plan supports the principles of sustainable development and this is evidenced by the first policy in the plan, LP1.</p>   |
| <p><i>Objectively assessed needs</i></p> <p>The economic, social and environmental needs of the authority area addressed and clearly presented in a fashion which makes effective use of land and specifically promotes mixed use development, and take account of cross-boundary and strategic issues.</p> <p>Note: Meeting these needs should be subject to the caveats specified in Paragraph 14 of the NPPF (see above).</p> | <p>South Hampshire – October refresh document (PUSH South Hampshire Strategy October 2012). PUSH has prepared a Duty to Co-operate statement as well. The Borough Council has also prepared a Duty to Co-operate statement.</p> <p>PUSH also produced a South Hampshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment SHMA (2014) (PUSH SHMA 2014), the result of which has informed the Local Plan.</p> |
| <p><b>NPPF Principles: Delivering sustainable development</b></p>  |  |
| <p><b>1. Building a strong, competitive economy (paras 18-22)</b></p>  |  |
| <p>Set out a clear economic vision and strategy for the area which positively and proactively encourages sustainable economic growth (21),</p>   | <p>A clear and positive economic vision is set out in the spatial strategy (LP3) reflecting the economic growth strategy for PUSH South Hampshire Strategy October 2012, with positive topic policies in LP16 and LP17.</p> <p>PUSH authorities worked very closely with LEP and the South Hampshire Strategy was refined through discussions with Solent LEP.</p>                             |
| <p>Recognise and seek to address potential barriers to investment, including poor environment or any lack of infrastructure, services or housing (21)</p>  | <p>The particular economic issues affecting the Gosport peninsula are addressed in Policy LP16 and the regeneration policies LP4-7. The PUSH Economic Development Strategy is a key piece of evidence that has been used in developing the policies.</p>   |

# Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (November 2014)

| Soundness Test and Key Requirements  | Evidence Provided   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>The Gosport Employment Land Review 2010 along with the 2012 update provides up to date assessments of the deliverability of allocated employment sites. The employment background paper provides further justification. Furthermore, progress on site allocations is monitored annually as part of the Annual Monitoring Report.</p>   |
| <p><b>2.Ensuring the vitality of town centres (paras 23-37)</b></p>  |   |
| <p>Policies should be positive, promote competitive town centre environments, and set out policies for the management and growth of centres over the plan period (23)</p>                                  | <p>The Vision and the Spatial Strategy set out the direction for the future of centres.</p> <p>The role and hierarchy of centres is set out in policy LP27. Gosport is the main centre and it is supported by the district centres at Lee-on-the-Solent and Stoke Road. In addition there are a number of neighbourhood centres that provide support at the local level.</p> <p>Policies LP28 and LP29 deal with retail proposals in and out of the defined centres.</p>  |
| <p>Allocate a range of suitable sites to meet the scale and type of retail, leisure, commercial, office, tourism, cultural, community services and residential development needed in town centres (23)</p> | <p>Needs assessments are part of the evidence base. The Borough Council commissioned a new retail study in 2014 to update earlier studies carried out to support the Local Plan. The retail background paper along with the Annual Monitoring Reports, provide further evidence.</p> <p>Following an assessment of the centres it was considered that a distinction between primary and secondary frontages was only required in the Stoke Road district centre. This assessment reviewed the boundaries of all the centres and amended them where appropriate this is set out in the Retail Background Paper (2014).</p> |
| <p><b>3.Supporting a prosperous rural economy (para 28)</b></p>  |   |

# Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (November 2014)

| Soundness Test and Key Requirements   | Evidence Provided  |
|---|--|
| Support sustainable economic growth in rural areas. Planning strategies should promote a strong rural economy by taking a positive approach to new development. (28)  | There are no rural areas within the Gosport Borough.   |
| <b>4.Promoting sustainable transport (paras 29-41)</b>  |  |
| <p>Facilitate sustainable development whilst contributing to wider sustainability and health objectives. (29)</p> <p>Balance the transport system in favour of sustainable transport modes and give people a real choice about how they travel whilst recognising that different policies will be required in different communities and opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary from urban to rural areas. (29)</p> <p>Encourage solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and congestion (29) including supporting a pattern of development which, where reasonable to do so, facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport. (30)</p> <p>Local authorities should work with neighbouring authorities and transport providers to develop strategies for the provision of viable infrastructure necessary to support sustainable development. (31)</p> <p>Opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure. (32)</p> <p>Ensure that developments which generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised (34)</p> <p>Plans should protect and exploit opportunities for the use of sustainable transport modes for the movement of goods or people. (35)</p> <p>Policies should aim for a balance of land uses so that people can be encouraged to minimize journey lengths for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities. (37)</p> <p>For larger scale residential developments in particular, planning policies should promote a mix of uses in order to provide opportunities to undertake day-to-day activities including work on site. Where practical, particularly within large-scale developments, key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties. (38)</p> <p>The setting of car parking standards including provision for town centres. (39-40)</p> | <p>Policies LP21, LP22 and LP23 set out the Council’s approach to achieving sustainable development by linking it to a sustainable transport network.</p> <p>The Plan has been developed in conjunction with key stakeholders including Hampshire County Council (Highway Authority), the Highways Agency (statutory consultee), Solent Transport (the partnership for Transport in South Hampshire and the Isle of Wight area) and neighbouring Districts.</p> <p>Gosport is an urban borough but the policies recognise it is important to secure transport options outside of the borough.</p> <p>Policy LP22 recognises the importance of public transport, cycling and walking as alternative means of transport. Policy LP22 recognises the need to accommodate low emission vehicles particularly through the provision of charging points.</p> <p>The plan refers to Transport Statement for Gosport which identifies key strategic transport initiatives. Many of these lie outside the Borough in Fareham but they will make an important contribution to ease the transport congestion issues on the Gosport peninsula.</p> <p>The Council has produced a Car Parking SPD that sets parking standards for the Borough this will have regard to the NPPF and the policies in the Local Plan.</p> <p>The Local Plan safeguards land for the extension of the Bus Rapid Transport scheme. Phase 1 was opened in 2012 using a disused railway line.</p> |

# Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (November 2014)

| Soundness Test and Key Requirements   | Evidence Provided   |
|---|---|
| Local planning authorities should identify and protect, where there is robust evidence, sites and routes which could be critical in developing infrastructure to widen transport choice. (41)   | Solent Transport, a partnership between the Isle of Wight Council, Southampton City Council, Hampshire County Council and Portsmouth City Council, published the Transport Delivery Plan 2012-2026 which identifies a number of schemes that will support the proposed development of Gosport.  |
| <b>5.Supporting high quality communications infrastructure (paras 42-46)</b>  |   |
| Support the expansion of the electronic communications networks, including telecommunications’ masts and high speed broadband. (43)<br><br>Local planning authorities should not impose a ban on new telecommunications development in certain areas, impose blanket Article 4 directions over a wide area or a wide range of telecommunications development or insist on minimum distances between new telecommunications development and existing development. (44) | Policy LP20 positively promotes the development of ICT embedded sites and premises.<br><br>Policy LP20 will grant planning permission for infrastructure proposals provided that they have been considered against a number of criteria such as design, impact on nature conservation and character of the area and mast sharing, interference. |
| <b>6.Delivering a wide choice of high quality housing (paras 47-55)</b>   |   |
| Identify and maintain a rolling supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years’ worth of housing against their housing requirements; this should include an additional buffer of 5% or 20% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to ensure choice and competition in the market for land. 20% buffer applies where there has been persistent under delivery of housing(47)   | Policy LP3 (Spatial Strategy) addresses the issue of the rolling 5 year land supply. This is evidenced by the SHLAA update 2014 and the AMRs. The AMRs for the past 5 years show that Gosport has a good record of housing delivery.  |
| Identify a supply of developable sites or broad locations for years 6-10 and, where possible, years 11-15 (47).   | The housing trajectory associated with Policy LP3 shows how housing will be delivered over the span of the plan period. Subsequent AMRs will also show how LP3 will be delivered going forward.   |
| Illustrate the expected rate of housing delivery through a trajectory; and set out a housing implementation strategy describing how a five year supply will be maintained. (47)   | The Local Plan includes a housing trajectory which will be updated annually as part of the AMR. The policies allocate sufficient land to allow for flexibility  |

# Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (November 2014)

| Soundness Test and Key Requirements   | Evidence Provided  |
|---|--|
|   | to ensure that a five year supply is maintained.   |
| Set out the authority's approach to housing density to reflect local circumstances (47).  | Policy LP24 addresses the issue of housing density and the reasoned justification provides a matrix of indicative densities that relate to local circumstances.  |
| Plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic and market trends, and needs of different groups (50) and caters for housing demand and the scale of housing supply to meet this demand. (para 159)   | <p>Policy LP24 plans for a mix of housing types based on current demographic trends and in particular the PUSH SHMA (2014).</p> <p>Policy LP24 seeks to achieve 40% affordable housing on site unless it can be demonstrated that it is not economically viable. This policy is supported by the PUSH SHMA (2014) and the Gosport Housing Viability Assessment Report.</p> |
| <p>In rural areas be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs, particularly for affordable housing, including through rural exception sites where appropriate (54).</p> <p>In rural areas housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.</p> | <p>There are no rural areas in Gosport Borough.</p> <p>Policy LP10 on design considers the issues of inappropriate development in residential gardens.</p>   |
| <b>7.Requiring good design (paras 56-68)</b>  |  |
| Develop robust and comprehensive policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area (58).  | Policy LP10 deals with design issues and is supported by a Design SPD which has regard to the Gosport Townscape Assessment, 2013.  |
| <b>8.Promoting healthy communities (paras 69-77)</b>  |  |
| Policies should aim to design places which: promote community interaction, including through mixed-use development; are safe and accessible environments; and are accessible developments (69).   | <p>The Spatial Strategy policy LP3 promotes a number of mixed use developments as do the Regeneration policies LP4 – LP8.</p> <p>The Local Plan is supportive of community interaction through the provision</p>   |



# Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (November 2014)

| Soundness Test and Key Requirements  | Evidence Provided   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>and protection of community facilities (LP32), the promotion of open space through the Green Infrastructure policy (LP41 and LP35) and the promotion and retention of local centres (LP28)</p> <p>The quality of life and the reduction in the fear of crime is embedded in the design policy (LP 10).</p> <p>Policy LP22 seeks to locate development in accessible locations.</p> |
| <p>Policies should plan positively for the provision and use of shared space, community facilities and other local services (70).</p>  | <p>See above</p>  |
| <p>Identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities; and set locally derived standards to provide these (73).</p>   | <p>Policy LP34 addresses the issue of open space needs and refers to local standards. These are supported by the Open Space Monitoring Report 2014 and the open space standards report.</p> <p>Policy LP34 also considers the issues of protecting and improving pedestrian and cycling access particularly along the coast and to the countryside.</p>                               |
| <p>Enable local communities, through local and neighbourhood plans, to identify special protection green areas of particular importance to them – ‘Local Green Space’ (76-78).</p>   | <p>There are no areas that meet the criteria set out in paragraph 77. Policy LP35 does protect existing open space and Policy LP3 protects the Gap between Lee-on-the-Solent and Gosport.</p>   |
| <p><b>9. Protecting Green Belt land (paras 79-92)</b></p>  |   |
| <p>Local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. (81)</p> <p>Local planning authorities with Green Belts in their area should establish Green Belt boundaries in their Local Plans which set the framework for Green Belt and settlement policy. (83)</p> | <p>There are no Green Belts in Gosport Borough.</p>   |

# Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (November 2014)

| Soundness Test and Key Requirements  | Evidence Provided   |
|--|---|
| <p>When drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development. (84)</p> <p>Boundaries should be set using 'physical features likely to be permanent' amongst other things (85)</p> |   |
| <p><b>10.Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change (paras 93-108)</b></p>   |   |
| <p>Adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change taking full account of flood risk, coastal change and water supply and demand considerations. (94)</p>   | <p>Policy LP22 (Accessibility to New Developments) aims to ensure that new development is served by public transport and is accessible by walking and cycling minimising greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Policy LP38 (Energy Resources) states that the Borough Council will work with partners to improve the energy efficiency of existing buildings.</p> <p>LP45 (Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion) steers development away from areas at risk from flooding and coastal erosion.</p>   |
| <p>Help increase the use and supply of renewable and low carbon energy through a strategy, policies maximising renewable and low carbon energy, and identification of key energy sources. (97)</p>   | <p>In accordance with the South Hampshire Strategy the Borough Council will work with PUSH and its partners to help facilitate 20% of all electricity to be generated by renewable sources by 2020 across South Hampshire as a whole by encouraging renewable energy installations and projects.</p> <p>Within the Borough developers will be encouraged to maximise energy efficiency through design, connect to existing combined heat and power (CHP) and District heating/Cooling networks where possible or use renewable energy technology to produced required energy on-site. Policy LP38 on Energy Resources addresses this issue.</p> |

# Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (November 2014)

| Soundness Test and Key Requirements   | Evidence Provided   |
|---|---|
| Minimise vulnerability to climate change and manage the risk of flooding (99) | Policy LP45 (Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion) requires a site specific Flood Risk Assessment for development proposals on those sites which are 1ha or more in Flood Zone 1 and for all development proposals within Flood Zones 2 and 3. Also, the SFRA studies for Gosport provides evidence.  |
| Take account of marine planning (105)   | <p>The reference to the Marine Planning Statement is to be updated to refer to the Marine Policy Statement.</p> <p>A number of policies in the Gosport Borough Local Plan support the vision of the Marine Policy Statement, most notably policies; LP19 Marinas and Moorings; LP42 Internationally and Nationally important habitats; LP44 Protecting Species and other Feature of Nature Conservation Importance and LP45 Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion.</p> |
| Manage risk from coastal change (106)   | <p>The Local Plan seeks to avoid development in areas at risk of coastal erosion (Policy LP45).</p> <p>The Local Plan also has regard to the North Solent Shoreline Management Plan which confirms that no Coastal Change Management Areas need to be identified in Gosport.</p>  |
| <b>11.Conserving and enhancing the natural environment (paras 109-125)</b>    |   |
| Protect valued landscapes (109)   | <p>There are no National Parks, or AONBs within the Borough. Also there is no agricultural land.</p> <p>Internationally and nationally important habitats are protected through Policy LP42. Locally designated nature conservation sites are protected by Policy LP43. Other features of nature conservation importance are protected under Policy LP44.</p> <p>Policy LP41 (Green Infrastructure) requires that developments maintain and</p>                 |

# Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (November 2014)

| Soundness Test and Key Requirements  |  | Evidence Provided   |
|--|--|---|
|  |  | enhance the Borough's green infrastructure network.   |
| Prevent unacceptable risks from pollution and land instability (109)   |  | Policy LP46 deals with pollution control and Policy LP47 deals with contaminated and unstable land. These policies seek to prevent inappropriate development.   |
| Planning policies should minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity (117)<br>Planning policies should plan for biodiversity at a landscape-scale across local authority boundaries (117)  |  | Gosport subscribes to the Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre (HBIC). HBIC provided evidence on local ecological networks through a series of annual surveys. Policy LP44 seeks enhancement of biodiversity and has had regard to the Hampshire Biodiversity Action Plan. |
| <b>12.Conserving and enhancing the historic environment (paras 126-141)</b>  |  |   |
| Include a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk (126)   |  | Strategies set out in Policies LP11-13, and evidence provided through the Townscape Assessment and Historic Environmental Record.   |
| <b>13.Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals (paras 142-149)</b>   |  |   |
| It is important that there is a sufficient supply of material to provide the infrastructure, buildings, energy and goods that the country needs. However, since minerals are a finite natural resource, and can only be worked where they are found, it is important to make best use of them to secure their long-term conservation (142)<br>Minerals planning authorities should plan for a steady and adequate supply of industrial materials (146) |  | This is covered by the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan.   |

# Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (November 2014)

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p><b>Justified:</b> <i>The plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence.</i></p> <p>To be 'justified' a DPD needs to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Founded on a robust and credible evidence base involving: research / fact finding demonstrating how the choices made in the plan are backed up by facts; and evidence of participation of the local community and others having a stake in the area.</li> <li>• The most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives.</li> </ul> |  |
| <p><i>Participation</i></p> <p>Has the consultation process allowed for effective engagement of all interested parties?</p>  | <p>The Core Strategy Regulation 25 Statement of Consultation (2011) and the Local Plan Regulation 18 Consultation Statement (2013) set out this information in accordance with the Council's adopted SCI (published initially in 2007 and reviewed in 2012 whereby changes to the planning system were taken into account).</p>  |
| <p><i>Research / fact finding</i></p> <p>Is the plan justified by a sound and credible evidence base? What are the sources of evidence?</p> <p>How up to date, and how convincing is it?</p> <p>What assumptions were made in preparing the DPD? Were they reasonable and justified?</p>   | <p>The Local Plan is supported by a number of evidence studies: Annual Monitoring Reports (2005-2013), Employment Land Review (2012), Habitats Regulation Assessment, SHLAA 2014, Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People Assessments, Affordable Housing Viability Assessment (2010), PUSH South Hampshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2014), Infrastructure Assessment Report and Delivery Plan (2014), Solent Waders and Brent Goose Strategy (2010), Open Space Monitoring Report (2014), GBLP Local Open Space Standards, Playing Pitch and Sports Facility Assessment (2013), Gosport Retail Capacity Study (2014), Gosport Waterfront Report, Daedalus SPD, Haslar Enquiry by Design, Alver Village Planning Application, SFRA (2012 and 2014), Sustainability Profile, Transport Assessment (2014)</p> |
| <p><i>Alternatives</i></p> <p>Can it be shown that the LPA's chosen approach is the most appropriate given the reasonable alternatives? Have the reasonable alternatives been considered and is there a clear audit trail showing how and why the preferred approach was arrived at? Where a balance had to be struck in taking decisions between competing alternatives is it clear how and why the decisions were taken?</p> <p>Does the sustainability appraisal show how the different options perform and is it clear that sustainability considerations informed the content of the DPD from the start?</p>      | <p>The chosen approaches and reasonable alternatives where these apply for the Spatial Strategy, Regeneration Areas and thematic policies are shown in the Interim Sustainability Report for the Core Strategy (September 2009), Interim Sustainability Appraisal for the draft Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 and the Sustainability Appraisal for the Publication Gosport Borough Local Plan (2104). Other key documents setting out the chosen approaches and reasonable alternatives for the site allocations and Regeneration Areas are set out in the Assessment of potential allocations for</p>  |

# Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (November 2014)

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | inclusion in the draft Gosport Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 and the Assessment of Proposed Allocations for inclusion in the Submission Local Plan 2011-2029. |
|--|--|

# Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (November 2014)

**Effective:** the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities.

To be 'effective' a DPD needs to:

- Be deliverable
- Demonstrate sound infrastructure delivery planning
- Have no regulatory or national planning barriers to its delivery
- Have delivery partners who are signed up to it
- Be coherent with the strategies of neighbouring authorities
- Demonstrate how the Duty to Co-operate has been fulfilled
- Be flexible
- Be able to be monitored

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><i>Deliverable and Coherent</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is it clear how the policies will meet the Plan's vision and objectives? Are there any obvious gaps in the policies, having regard to the objectives of the DPD?</li> <li>• Are the policies internally consistent?</li> <li>• Are there realistic timescales related to the objectives?</li> <li>• Does the DPD explain how its key policy objectives will be achieved?</li> </ul> | <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan has been consulted on, all relevant agencies were consulted and in particular work with Hampshire County Council who have produced their own infrastructure statement.</p> <p>The Local Development Scheme outlines all DPDs and updates on progress are published on the GBC website.</p> <p>The SA shows linkages between the objectives and the corresponding policies.</p> |
| <p><i>Infrastructure Delivery</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have the infrastructure implications of the policies clearly been identified?</li> <li>• Are the delivery mechanisms and timescales for implementation of the policies clearly identified?</li> <li>• Is it clear who is going to deliver the required infrastructure and does the timing of the provision complement the timescale of the policies?</li> </ul>                      | <p>The infrastructure policy, LP2 and the regeneration policies, LP4-7 identify the infrastructure requirements and how they would be addressed.</p> <p>The council is preparing a CIL charging schedule supported by the Infrastructure Assessment 2014, the Housing Viability Study and CIL Viability Study 2013.</p>  |
| <p><i>Co-ordinated Planning</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the DPD reflect the concept of spatial planning? Does it go beyond traditional land use</li> </ul>  | <p>Policy LP2 sets out that the Borough Council and its partners will work together to review existing infrastructure and identify new infrastructure</p>  |

# Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (November 2014)

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>planning by bringing together and integrating policies for development and the use of land with other policies and programmes from a variety of agencies / organisations that influence the nature of places and how they function?</p>  | <p>needs. The skills policy, LP17 has regard to the PUSH Economic Development Strategy and the council will work with organisations on initiatives to improve skill levels in the borough.</p>  |
| <p><i>Flexibility</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the DPD flexible enough to respond to a variety of, or unexpected changes in, circumstances?</li> <li>• Does the DPD include the remedial actions that will be taken if the policies need adjustment?</li> </ul>  | <p>Chapter 13 of the Local Plan deals with implementation and delivery. It also sets out a number of output indicators against which the plan can be monitored in the AMR.</p>  |
| <p><i>Co-operation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the Duty to Co-operate has been undertaken appropriately for the plan being examined?</li> <li>• Is it clear who is intended to implement each part of the DPD? Where the actions required are outside the direct control of the LPA, is there evidence that there is the necessary commitment from the relevant organisation to the implementation of the policies?</li> </ul>  | <p>Gosport Borough is a member of the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) which is a consortium of local authorities to facilitate cross-boundary joint working. PUSH has no statutory powers but works collaboratively with the Solent Local Enterprise Board. PUSH has signed memoranda of understanding with a number of the public bodies set out in Part 2 of the Town &amp; Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, and as a member of PUSH, Gosport Borough is therefore committed to liaising with these agencies on matters of mutual responsibility and interest.</p> <p>A Duty to Co-operate Statement (2014) has been prepared by the Borough Council.</p> |
| <p><i>Monitoring</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the DPD contain targets, and milestones which relate to the delivery of the policies, (including housing trajectories where the DPD contains housing allocations)?</li> <li>• Is it clear how targets are to be measured (by when, how and by whom) and are these linked to the production of the annual monitoring report?</li> <li>• Is it clear how the significant effects identified in the sustainability appraisal report will be taken forward in the ongoing monitoring of the implementation of the plan, through the annual monitoring report?</li> </ul> | <p>Indicators, targets and milestones are set out in Chapter 13.</p>  |



# Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (November 2014)

**Consistent with national policy:** *the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.*

The DPD should not contradict or ignore national policy. Where there is a departure, there must be clear and convincing reasoning to justify the approach taken.

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Does the DPD contain any policies or proposals which are not consistent with national policy and, if so, is there local justification?</li><li>• Does the DPD contain policies that do not add anything to existing national guidance? If so, why have these been included?</li></ul> | As a result of the Gosport Retail Capacity Study 2014 the Council has set a 1,000 m <sup>2</sup> threshold for requiring an impact assessment on new retail development as opposed to the 2,500m <sup>2</sup> set by the NPPF. The 2014 study provides the relevant local evidence. |
|---|---|

# Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (November 2014)

## Planning policy for traveller sites

Planning Policy for Traveller Sites was published in 23 March 2012 and came into effect on 27 March 2012. Circular 01/06: Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites and Circular 04/07: Planning for Travelling Showpeople have been cancelled. Planning Policy for Traveller Sites should be read in conjunction with the National Planning Policy Framework, including the implementation policies of that document.

The government's aim in relation to planning for traveller sites is:

'To ensure fair and equal treatment for travellers, in a way that facilitates the traditional and nomadic life of travellers whilst respecting the interests of the settled community'.

Government's aims in respect of traveller sites are:

- That local planning authorities (LPAs) make their own assessment of need for the purposes of planning
- That LPAs work collaboratively, develop fair and effective strategies to meet need through the identification of land for sites
- Plan for sites over a reasonable timescale
- Plan-making should protect green belt land from inappropriate development
- Promote more private traveller site provision whilst recognising that there will always be those travellers who cannot provide their own sites
- Aim to reduce the number of unauthorised developments and encampments and make enforcement more effective.

In addition local planning authorities should:

- Include fair, realistic and inclusive policies
- Increase the number of traveller sites in appropriate locations with planning permission, to address under provision and maintain an appropriate level of supply
- Reduce tensions between settled and traveller communities in plan-making and decision-taking
- Enable provision of suitable accommodation from which travellers can access education, health, welfare and employment infrastructure
- Have due regard to protection of local amenity and local environment

# Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (November 2014)

| Policy Expectations   | Evidence Provided  |
|---|--|
| <b>Policy A: Using evidence to plan positively and manage development (para 6)</b>  |  |
| <p>Early and effective community engagement with both settled and traveller communities.</p>  | <p>The Traveller Accommodation Assessment for Hampshire 2013 forms part of the evidence base for the Local Plan. It has provided an assessment about the current and future accommodation needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF. The assessment was carried out on behalf of a partnership of local authorities across Hampshire, including Gosport Borough Council, East Hampshire District Council, Eastleigh Borough Council, Fareham Borough Council, Havant Borough Council, New Forest District Council, New Forest National Park Authority, South Downs National Park Authority, Test Valley District Council and Winchester City Council.</p> |
| <p>Co-operate with travellers, their representative bodies and local support groups, other local authorities and relevant interest groups to prepare and maintain an up-to-date understanding of likely permanent and transit accommodation needs of their areas.</p>   | <p>Traveller Accommodation Assessment for Hampshire Study – collaborated with other Local Authorities and Forest Bus Ltd who had established links with members of the travelling communities.</p>   |
| <b>Policy B: Planning for traveller sites (paras 7-11)</b>  |  |
| <p>Set pitch targets for gypsies and travellers and plot targets for travelling showpeople which address the likely permanent and transit site accommodation needs of travellers in your area, working collaboratively with neighbouring LPAs.</p> <p>Set criteria to guide land supply allocations where there is identified need.</p> | <p>As above</p>  |

# Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (November 2014)

| Policy Expectations  | Evidence Provided                           |
|--|---|
| Ensure that traveller sites are sustainable economically, socially and environmentally.  |   |
| <b>Policy C: Sites in rural areas and the countryside (para 12)</b>  |   |
| When assessing the suitability of sites in rural or semi-rural settings LPAs should ensure that the scale of such sites do not dominate the nearest settled community.   | There are no rural areas in the Borough.    |
| <b>Policy D: Rural exception sites (para 13)</b>   |   |
| If there is a lack of affordable land to meet local traveller needs, LPAs in rural areas, where viable and practical, should consider allocating and releasing sites solely for affordable travellers sites.   | As above.                                   |
| <b>Policy E: Traveller sites in Green Belt (paras 14-15)</b>   |   |
| <p>Traveller sites (both permanent and temporary) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.</p> <p>Exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (which might be to accommodate a site inset within the Green Belt) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site ... should be done only through the plan-making process.</p> | There is no green belt land in the Borough. |
| <b>Policy F: Mixed planning use traveller sites (paras 16-18)</b>  |   |
| Local planning authorities should consider, wherever possible, including traveller sites suitable for mixed residential and business uses, having regard to the safety and amenity of the occupants and neighbouring residents.  | This is covered in Policy LP26.             |

# Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (November 2014)

| Policy Expectations  | Evidence Provided |
|--|-------------------|
| <b>Policy G: Major development projects (para 19)</b>  |                   |
| Local planning authorities should work with the planning applicant and the affected traveller community to identify a site or sites suitable for relocation of the community if a major development proposal requires the permanent or temporary relocation of a traveller site. | Not applicable.   |

| Policy Expectations  | Possible Evidence  | Evidence Provided  |
|--|--|--|
| <b>Key requirements under the Duty to Co-Operate</b>                     |  |  |
| Consistency between marine and terrestrial policy documents and guidance | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstration of consistency of aim between relevant local plan policies and marine policy documents (i.e. the MPS and any relevant adopted marine plans)</li> <li>• Proof of collaborative working with the MMO and that the MPS has been taken into account.</li> </ul> | <p>The South Inshore Marine Plan has not yet been written.</p> <p>THE MMO was consulted on the Publication version Gosport Borough Local Plan. Letter Dated 31<sup>st</sup> of July 2014.</p> <p>The Borough Council is a partner on the Solent Forum. The Forum will be working with the MMO throughout the planning process to provide stakeholder engagement services to support development of the</p> |

# Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (November 2014)

| Policy Expectations  | Possible Evidence   | Evidence Provided  |
|--|---|--|
|  |   | South Marine Plan.   |
| <p>Liaison between respective authorities responsible for terrestrial and marine planning, including in plan development, implementation and review stages</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Early and effective policy development engagement undertaken, including discussions with the MMO</li> <li>• Evidence of iteration of policies and plans as a result of engagement with the MMO</li> <li>• Evidence of engagement with the MMO in relation to monitoring, implementation and throughout the policy cycle</li> <li>• Support of integrated coastal management (ICM) in coastal areas in line with the requirements of the MPS</li> </ul> | <p>THE MMO was consulted on the Publication version Gosport Borough Local Plan. Letter Dated 31<sup>st</sup> of July 2014.</p> <p>A response was received letter dated 9<sup>th</sup> of September.</p> <p>The MMO has not outlined any specific policy requirements in its correspondence with the Borough Council.</p> <p>The Borough Council is working in partnership with both the East Solent Coastal Partnership and the Solent Forum to deliver a number of coastal management projects.</p> |
| <p>Sharing the evidence base and data where relevant and appropriate so as to achieve consistency in the data used in plan making and decisions</p>            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the LPA has shared or provided relevant data to the MMO that can help inform Marine Plans or MPS review</li> <li>• Demonstration that local plan policy has been underpinned by data provided by the MMO or the MPS</li> <li>• Explicit cross-referencing in local plan to MPS, the MMO, their roles, and relevant marine plans</li> </ul>   | <p>The MMO had not produced any data when the Consultation Draft Local Plan was published in December 2012.</p>  |

# Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (November 2014)

| Policy Expectations   | Possible Evidence  | Evidence Provided   |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Marine Policy Statement- Chapter 2: General Principles for Decision-Making<sup>1</sup></b>   |  |   |
| <b>Sections 2.1 -2.2: The UK vision for the marine environment</b>  |  |   |
| <p>The UK vision for the marine environment ('clean, healthy, safe, productive and biologically diverse oceans and seas')</p> <p>Achieving the vision through marine planning</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference in DPD where appropriate to UK vision for the marine environment</li> <li>• Contribution to the vision through local plan policies and supporting text</li> </ul> | <p>The reference to the Marine Planning Statement is to be updated to refer to the Marine Policy Statement.</p> <p>A number of policies in the Gosport Borough Local Plan support the vision of the Marine Policy Statement, most notably policies; LP19 Marinas and Moorings; LP42 Internationally and Nationally important habitats; LP44 Protecting Species and other Feature of Nature Conservation Importance and LP45 Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion.</p> |
| <b>Section 2.4: Considering benefits and adverse effects in marine planning</b>   |  |   |

<sup>1</sup> As the Marine Policy Statement was not targeted specifically at terrestrial planning authorities, some of its sections are, in practice, relevant to marine planning authorities only and/or there is already a comprehensive policy framework governing terrestrial development (e.g. energy infrastructure), Where this is considered to be the case, i.e. where it is considered likely that a terrestrial planning DPD would be found sound without referencing that section, the section in question has been omitted from this checklist.

# Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (November 2014)

| Policy Expectations   | Possible Evidence   | Evidence Provided   |
|---|---|---|
| Consider benefits and adverse effects of plan policies  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration of benefits and adverse effects of policy on the marine area as appropriate within the DPD's sustainability appraisal</li> </ul>   | The Sustainability Appraisal could not determine the impact of the Development Plan Policies as the MMO has not produced a plan against which to assess them.   |
| <b>Section 2.5: Economic, social and environmental considerations</b>   |   |   |
| Contribute to the objectives of relevant EU Directives (Marine Strategy Framework Directive and Water Framework Directive)  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference to relevant EU Directives in DPD and sustainability appraisal</li> <li>• Consideration of contribution of DPD policies to the objectives of relevant EU Directives</li> </ul>  | Both the Gosport Borough Local Plan and the Sustainability Appraisal contribute to the objectives of EU directives.   |
| <b>Marine Policy Statement- Chapter 3: Policy Objectives for Key Activities</b>   |   |   |
| <b>3.1 Marine Protected Areas</b>   |   |   |
| <p>Incorporate identified areas and features of importance for nature conservation</p> <p>Activities or developments that may result in adverse impacts on biodiversity should be designed or located to avoid such impacts</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification of relevant areas and features of importance for nature conservation within relevant marine plan area(s)</li> <li>• Consideration of impacts of policy and/or terrestrial development on those areas and features of importance</li> <li>• Measures to mitigate, monitor and manage negative impacts on those areas and features of importance</li> </ul> | <p>The South Onshore Marine Plan has not yet been developed; no offshore areas have as yet been identified.</p> <p>Policy LP42 of the Local Plan looks to protect RAMSAR sites, Special Protection Areas and Special Areas of Conservation. .</p> |



# Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (November 2014)

| Policy Expectations   | Possible Evidence  | Evidence Provided  |
|---|--|--|
| <b>3.4 Ports and shipping</b>   |  |  |
| <p>Take into account and seek to minimise any negative impacts on shipping activity, freedom of navigation and navigational safety</p> <p>Protect the efficiency and resilience of continuing port operations</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that policy with potential impact on ports and shipping minimises negative impacts on sector</li> <li>Where relevant, evidence that economic, employment and transport policies are protective of ports and shipping sector</li> </ul> | <p>Policy LP19 of the Local Plan on Marinas and Moorings looks to ensure that the level of marine activity in Portsmouth Harbour is appropriate.</p>                     |
| <b>3.8 Fisheries</b>  |  |  |
| <p>Consider potential economic, social and environmental impacts of other developments on fishing activity</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where relevant, evidence that other policies minimise negative impacts on fishing activity and/or aquaculture</li> </ul>  | <p>Policy LP39 looks to prevent developments which could have an adverse effect on coastal water quality.</p>  |
| <b>3.9 Aquaculture</b>  |  |  |
| <p>Consider the benefits of encouraging the development of efficient, competitive and sustainable aquaculture industries</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where relevant, evidence that the benefits of aquaculture industry development have been considered</li> </ul>  | <p>Policy LP39 looks to prevent developments which could have an adverse effect on coastal water quality. There is no commercial aquaculture within Gosport Borough.</p> |
| <b>3.10 Surface water management and waste water treatment and disposal</b>   |  |  |
| <p>Maximise opportunities for co-existence of waste water infrastructure</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reference to and consideration of the co-existence of waste water infrastructure with other marine activities, including the potential</li> </ul>   | <p>Policy LP39 looks to prevent developments which could have</p>  |

# Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (November 2014)

| Policy Expectations   | Possible Evidence  | Evidence Provided  |
|---|--|--|
| with other activities in the marine environment   | for waste water infrastructure to mitigate marine impacts through design or location   | an adverse effect on coastal water quality.  |
| <b>3.11 Tourism and recreation</b>  |  |  |
| Consider the potential for tourism and recreation in the marine environment and the benefits this will bring to the economy and local communities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where relevant, reference to marine tourism and recreation</li> <li>• Evidence that the potential for marine tourism and recreation has been recognised in plan-making</li> </ul> | Policy LP19 looks at the appropriate development of Marinas and Mooring supporting marine tourism. |