

## **CUMBRIA MINERALS AND WASTE DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK**

**SELF-ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE OF SUBMISSION DRAFT CORE STRATEGY AND  
GENERIC DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENTS.**

**APRIL 2008**

<b>Title of development plan document</b>	CUMBRIA MINERALS AND WASTE DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK SUBMISSION DRAFT CORE STRATEGY AND GENERIC DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES		
<b>Local authority(ies) preparing the DPD</b>	CUMBRIA COUNTY COUNCIL		
<b>Submission date</b>	21 APRIL 2008		
	<b>Name</b>	<b>Telephone</b>	<b>Email</b>
<b>Inspector</b>			
<b>Contact at the authority</b>	Richard Evans	01539 773425	richard.evans@cumbriacc.gov.uk
<b>Programme Officer</b>	Frank Lee		franklee@kendal2001.freeseve.co.uk

# template 1: statutory requirements

## stage 1: pre-production

Activity	Statutory Requirement	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
Is the DPD identified in the LPA's adopted local development scheme?	The Act s19(1)	(Depending on any transitional arrangements) the adopted LDS at the time of - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• commencement of the DPD</li> <li>• participation on the preferred options</li> <li>• current adopted DPD</li> </ul>	Yes. Work commenced in May 2005. The original MWDS came into effect 18 April 2005. it indicated ongoing consultations about issues and options commencing June '05. The process was started in May '05. The Core Strategy and GDC Policies are described in the MWDS and the subsequent ones that have been adopted and are shown on their programme charts. The current MWDS came into effect 16 November 2007. Documents 1 and 2
Have you recorded the commencement of the DPD?		Report or other document confirming when work began	County Council Minute 106 20 January 2005. Document 3
Have any details set out in the LDS such as the role, rationale or scope of	The Act s19(1)	Reference to relevant section of the current LDS	Sections 3 and 10 of the current MWDS.

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Statutory Requirement</b>	<b>Possible evidence</b>	<b>Evidence provided</b>
the DPD been met?			Document 2
Is baseline information being collected and evidence being gathered to set the framework for the SA?	The Act s19(5)	SA scoping document Other document dealing with collection of baseline information SA Report	Final SA Scoping Report July 2006 Document 4 Appendices of Stage 1 SA of Issues and Options Document 5
Are you collecting information on the conservation objectives of any European wildlife (Natura 2000) sites?	Conservation (Natural Habitats &c) (Amendment)(England and Wales) Regulations 2006 [forthcoming]	Copies of reports and documents relevant to these sites	See Habitats Regulations Assessment
Have you consulted the four statutory environment consultation bodies for five weeks on the scope and level of detail of the environmental information to be included in the SA Report?	Regulations 9 and 13 of The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 specify the consultation procedures for plans requiring SEA.	Copies of the consultation letters sent to the bodies	Letters dated 23 December 2005. Document 6

Stage 2: issues and options (Regulation 25 consultation)

Activity	Statutory Requirement	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
Have the “specific consultation bodies” been consulted – or are there any of these bodies which, because of the nature of this DPD, do not need to be consulted at this stage?	Regulation 25(1)(a) [Specific Consultation Bodies are defined in Regulation 1]	Consultation statement Copies of documents consulting these bodies A brief statement setting out the reasons why any bodies have been omitted from consultation at this stage	See Pre-submission Consultations Statement Appendix 3 (a) and (b)
Have the “general consultation bodies” been identified and consulted - and are those bodies consulted consistent with the approach set out in the adopted SCI?	Regulation 25(1)(b) [General Consultation Bodies are defined in Regulation 1]	Copies of documents consulting these bodies Consultation statement Relevant sections of the SCI	See Pre-submission Consultations Statement Appendix 3 (a) and (b)
Does the consultation contribute to the development and sustainability appraisal of the options?	The Act s19(5)	Reports prepared by the authority during the development of the DPD A statement as to how the consultation was framed so as to encourage consultees to identify particular issues and options within them SA report	See Issues and Options Discussion Paper June 2006. Document 7 Stage 1 SA report Document 8 See Pre-submission Consultations Statement. Set of questions sent with the Discussion Paper See example of presentation. Document 9
Are you keeping a record of the bodies being consulted; how they are being consulted, and the main issues	Regulation 28(1)(c)	Report by the authority on the Regulation 25 consultation	See Pre-submission Consultations Statement Appendices

Activity	Statutory Requirement	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
they have raised?		Consultation statement	
Are you developing a framework for monitoring the effects of the DPD?	Regulation 17 of The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 specifies the requirements for monitoring the significant environmental effects of implementation of plans	The SA report The AMR Report or document setting out the appraisal and monitoring framework	Future AMRs will monitor these. Chapter 11 of the Core Strategy and Chapter 6 of the Generic DC Policies.
<i>Have you arranged to send to the GO copies of documents used in consultation?</i>	<i>Not statutory, but will assist the later stages where the Secretary of State has a statutory role</i>	<i>Copies of the letter to the GO enclosing copies of the documents sent to consultation bodies</i>	Consultation letters 12/6/06, 28/2 and 30/10/07 Document 10

stage 3: preferred options (Regulation 26 participation)

Activity	Statutory Requirement	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
<p>Is the DPD being prepared in accordance with the LDS?</p>	<p>The Act s19(1)</p>	<p>Adopted LDS at the time of participation on the preferred options</p> <p>Adopted LDS at time of submission</p>	<p>MWDS came into effect 17 March 2006. Preferred Options had fallen 3 months behind schedule mainly because of extended consultation period for Issues and Options.</p> <p>Revised MWDS was adopted to come into effect 27 April 2007 but GONW letter directed it should not come into effect</p> <p>Document 1</p> <p>Current MWDS came into effect 16 November 2007 at start of repeated Reg 26 consultations.</p> <p>Document 2</p>
<p>Have you assessed the preferred options against -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• consistency with national policy?</li> <li>• general conformity with the RSS or SDS for London?</li> <li>• conformity with the core strategy DPD or old policy (unless the DPD will supersede the old policy)?</li> </ul>	<p>The Act s19(2), s24 and Schedule 8</p> <p>Regulation 13(6)</p>	<p>Preferred options report</p> <p>Pre-submission proposals documents</p> <p>Correspondence with GOs and RPBs (or Mayor of London)</p> <p>Reports of the Regulation 25 consultations</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>See sections 2 and 3 of Pre-submission Consultations Statement</p> <p>No conflicts with national policy raised by GONW.</p> <p>Repetition of national police was pointed out at the First Preferred Options stage.</p> <p>Conflict with Defra LLW radioactive waste policy raised by NDA.</p> <p>Conflict with Aggregates guidelines raised by QPA and industry.</p>

Activity	Statutory Requirement	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
			<p>RPB only raised issue of policy for building stones.</p> <p>These have been addressed in the submission draft.</p>
<p>Are you having regard to -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• adjoining RSSs, the SDS for London or Welsh Spatial Plan (as appropriate where either of these adjoin the plan area)?</li> <li>• the National Planning Framework for Scotland?</li> </ul>	<p>The Act s19(2)</p> <p>Regulation 15(1)(g)</p>	<p>Preferred options report</p> <p>Pre-submission proposals documents</p> <p>Correspondence with the relevant bodies</p> <p>Reports on the Regulation 25 consultations</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>The only significant issues from adjoining regions have been:</p> <p>Northern</p> <p>The need to protect the setting of the Northumberland National Park.</p> <p>Consideration of policy for zinc mining in the North Pennines AoNB near the Cumbria/Northumberland/Durham boundaries.</p> <p>NWRAP Annual Reports comment that the sub-regional apportionment to Cumbria includes an apportionment from the Northern region. No details of this have been able to be found. It may date back to when Cumbria was in the Northern region. It has been agreed that future RAP reports will not refer to this.</p> <p>Yorks and Humberside</p> <p>National and regional policies may lead to reduced quarrying in the Yorkshire Dales NP which could put increased pressure on Cumbria for supplies of high spec roadstone.</p> <p>No significant issues have been found in</p>

Activity	Statutory Requirement	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
<p>Are you having regard to -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the community strategy of the authority or other authorities whose area comprises part of the area of the LPA?</li> <li>• any other LDD adopted by the authority?</li> </ul>	<p>PCPA 2004 s.19(2)</p>	<p>The community strategies</p> <p>Reports on the Regulation 25 consultations</p> <p>Preferred Options report</p> <p>Pre-submission proposals documents</p>	<p>connection with the NPF for Scotland.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>There are six CSs in Cumbria see Ch 5 of Core Strategy and Appendices B and C.</p>
<p>Are you having regard to the other matters and strategies relating to -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• resources?</li> <li>• the RDA's Regional Economic Strategy?</li> <li>• infrastructure provision and any transport plan?</li> <li>• <i>utilities infrastructure?</i></li> <li>• <i>integration of transport and land use policies?</i></li> <li>• waste strategies?</li> <li>• hazardous substances and accidents?</li> <li>• <i>climate change?</i></li> </ul>	<p>The Act s19(2)</p> <p>Regulation 15</p> <p><i>This list includes matters referred to in Annex B of PPS12 additional to the requirements set out in the Act and Regulations</i></p>	<p>Preferred options report</p> <p>Pre-submission proposals documents</p> <p>Correspondence with the relevant bodies and the GO.</p> <p>Reports on the Regulation 25 consultations.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>There has been close working with the Joint Municipal Waste Management Partnership, mostly through the waste disposal authority.</p> <p>Waste Strategy 2000 and subsequently 2007 have been major considerations see Ch 7 of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>High priority has been given throughout to climate change issues Core Strategy Ch 3 and Policy 1.</p> <p>Reference is made to regeneration initiatives in accordance with regional economic strategy.</p> <p>The accessibility principles and road hierarchy of the Local Transport Plan are taken into account.</p> <p>United Utilities programmes for waste water treatment schemes have been taken into account but no specific policy is proposed.</p>

Activity	Statutory Requirement	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
			No need for additional hazardous waste facilities has been identified.
Have you undertaken the necessary sustainability appraisal of alternatives in arriving at the preferred options?	The Act s19(5)	SA report Documents supporting the SA	Yes See SA reports.
Have you prepared the Sustainability Report?	The Act s19(5)	SA report	Prepared by Land Use Consultants Ltd
Have you screened the plan options for likely significant effects on European Wildlife (Natura 2000) sites?	Conservation (Natural Habitats &c) (Amendment) (England and Wales) Regulations 2006 [forthcoming Regulation 85B]	Report on the likely effects of options on these sites Sections of the Preferred Options Report or SA report containing the screening information	Yes See Habitats Regulations Assessment
If necessary (see above) have you made an Appropriate Assessment of the plan options in Habitats terms?	Draft Habitats Regulations no 85B Conservation (Natural Habitats &c) (Amendment) (England and Wales) Regulations 2006 [forthcoming Regulation 85B]	Report on the Appropriate Assessment Copies of consultation letters sent to the appropriate nature conservation body	No requirement for Appropriate Assessment identified at this stage but possible locations where it may be needed at the Site Allocations stage have been identified. Natural England has asked for amendments but agrees with the conclusions.
Have you set out clear reasons for the preferred options and a précis of the alternatives and why they were rejected?	Regulation 13(1)	Preferred options report Pre-submission proposals documents SA report	See Preferred Options and Changes to the Preferred Options Core Strategy reports, SA reports and section 3 of the Pre-submission Consultations Statement.
Are you ready to seek participation on the preferred options and consult on the sustainability report (including any findings on Appropriate Assessment)?	Regulation 26	Reports requesting authorisation to proceed Preferred options report SA report	Consultations March to April and November to December 2007

Activity	Statutory Requirement	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
		Report on the appropriate assessment	
<i>Have you prepared a housing trajectory (where relevant to the DPD being prepared)?</i>	<i>Non-statutory, although Regulation 48 requires information on net additional dwellings to be given in the AMR. See PPS12 paras 4.25 and 4.48.</i>	<i>Reports on the housing trajectory Preferred options report The AMR</i>	n/a
Where sites are to be identified or areas for the application of policy defined, are you preparing sufficient illustrative material to -  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• enable you to amend the currently adopted proposals map? and</li> <li>• inform the community about the location of proposals?</li> </ul>	Regulation 9	The adopted Proposals Map  Reports on proposals to amend the Proposals Map  Illustrative material that shows how the Proposals Map will be amended or replaced	Sites not identified, only broad locations.  At the earlier Preferred Options Site Allocations Policies and Illustrative Maps did identify sites. These will all be reassessed for the Changes to Preferred Options Site Allocations Policies later in 2008. The Reg 26 consultation process will be repeated.
Have you made copies of the “pre-submission proposals documents” and a statement of the “proposals matters” available for inspection?	Regulation 26(a).  Regulation 27 allows anyone to make representations and specifies a period of six weeks.  The LPA must consider all representations received (see Regulation 27(3)).	The preferred options report  Pre-submission proposals documents  Pre-submission proposals matters	Yes  See sections 2 and 3 of the Pre-submission Consultations Statement and its Appendices 5 to 9.
Have you published the pre-submission proposals documents, proposals matters and a statement that the documents are available for inspection (at specified places and	Regulation 26(b)  Regulation 24 gives definitions and Regulation 27 facilitates representations (see above)	Preferred options report  Pre-submission proposals matters  Copy of the statement that documents are available for inspection	Yes  See sections 2 and 3 of the Pre-submission Consultations Statement and its Appendices 5 to 9.

Activity	Statutory Requirement	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
times) on the website?			
<p>Have you sent to the “DPD bodies” (ie all those you consulted at the Regulation 25 stage)-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the proposals for the DPD?</li> <li>• supporting documents that are relevant to the body?</li> <li>• notice of proposals matters?</li> <li>• a statement that the documents are available for inspection (at specified places and times)?</li> </ul>	<p>Regulation 26 (c)</p> <p>Regulation 24 gives definitions and Regulation 27 facilitates representations (see above)</p>	<p>Copies of correspondence</p> <p>Records of sending the relevant documents to the DPD bodies</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>See sections 2 and 3 of the Pre-submission Consultations Statement and its Appendices 5 to 9.</p>
<p>Have you advertised in a local paper giving notice of the proposals matters and where and when the pre-submission proposals documents can be inspected?</p>	<p>Regulation 26(d)</p> <p>Regulation 24 gives definitions and Regulation 27 facilitates representations (see above)</p>	<p>Copy of advertisement(s)</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>See sections 2 and 3 of the Pre-submission Consultations Statement and its Appendices 5 to 9.</p>
<p>Do the participation arrangements comply with the SCI?</p>	<p>The Act s19(3)</p>	<p>The SCI</p> <p>Report of proposed participation arrangements</p> <p>Consultation statement</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>See sections 2 and 3 of the Pre-submission Consultations Statement and its Appendices 5 to 9.</p>
<p><i>Have you sent the Government Office and the Planning Inspectorate copies of the proposals for the DPD and supporting documents?</i></p>	<p><i>Not statutory, but will assist the later stages where the Secretary of State and the Inspector have statutory roles.</i></p>	<p><i>Preferred options report</i></p> <p><i>Copy of statement of the proposals matters</i></p> <p><i>Copy of the statement that documents are available for inspection</i></p>	<p>GONW letters 28/2/07, 30/10/07</p> <p>Document 10</p>
<p>Are you keeping a record of the number of representations made and</p>	<p>Regulation 28(1)(d)</p>	<p>Report on the representations made under Regulation 27 at the Regulation</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>See Pre-submission consultations report</p>

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Statutory Requirement</b>	<b>Possible evidence</b>	<b>Evidence provided</b>
the issues raised?		26 participation. Reports on the participation showing issues raised and summaries / statistical information of the responses, including alternatives raised. Copies of the responses Consultation statement	and its Appendix 10. Consultee responses and outcomes are on the County Council website.

stage 4: submission

Activity	Statutory Requirement	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
Have you prepared the DPD in accordance with the LDS?	The Act s19(1) and s20(5) Regulation 9	Adopted LDS at a specified earlier stage Adopted LDS at time of submission	Yes The programme is in accordance with the current MWDS which came into effect 16 November 2007.
Have you prepared the DPD in compliance with the SCI and the Regulations? (or the minimum requirements set out in Regulations where no SCI is yet adopted?)	The Act s19(3) and s20(5) Regulation 28(1)	Consultation statement	Yes See Pre-submission consultations statement
Have you undertaken sustainability appraisal and prepared an SA Report?	The Act s19(5) and 20(5) Regulation 28(1)	SA report	Yes See submitted SA report
Have you amended the screening (and Appropriate Assessment where needed) to take account of any changes since Reg 26 participation?	Draft Habitats Regulations no 85B Conservation (Natural Habitats &c) (Amendment ) (England and Wales) Regulations 2006 [forthcoming Regulation 85B]	Report on the Appropriate Assessment and any reissue if necessary	No HRA report has been amended following Natural England comments 3/3/08 but this did not raise any disagreements about the conclusions.
Have you considered representations made on the preferred options?	Regulation 27(3)	Report on the representations made under Regulation 27 at the Regulation 26 participation. Consultation statement	Yes See spreadsheet Document 11 and County Council website.
Are you likely to be in general conformity with the RSS [or SDS in London]?	The Act s24 Regulation 30	Correspondence with the RPB or Mayor of London Representations from the RPB or	Yes See NWRA letter 13/12/07

Activity	Statutory Requirement	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
		Mayor of London on the preferred options.	Document 12 and my letter 21/4/08 re conformity.
Is the DPD to be submitted consistent with national policy and in conformity with the core strategy DPD or old policy (unless the DPD will supersede the old policy)?	The Act s19(2) and Schedule 8 Regulation 13(6)	Preferred options report Correspondence with GOs Representations from GOs on the preferred options Adopted LDS Brief statement by the authority showing how conformity within the LDF has been achieved	Yes See sections 2 and 3 of Pre-submission Consultations Statement No conflicts with national policy raised by GONW. Repetition of national policies was pointed out at the First Preferred Options stage. Conflict with Defra LLW radioactive waste policy raised by NDA. Conflict with Aggregates guidelines raised by QPA and industry. These have been addressed in the submission draft.
Have you had sufficient regard to all those matters required by the Act, including in respect of any changes made since the preparation of the preferred options?	The Act s19(2) Regulation 15	Preferred options report SA report Report on the representations made under Regulation 27 at the Regulation 26 participation	Yes Updates have been needed for emerging national policies, particularly for radioactive wastes. See outcomes of “disagree” representations Document 11.
<i>Have you prepared a housing trajectory (where relevant to the DPD being prepared)?</i>	<i>Non-statutory, although Regulation 48 requires information on net additional dwellings to be given in the AMR. See PPS12 paras 4.25 and 4.48.</i>	<i>Reports on the housing trajectory. Preferred options report Current AMR</i>	n/a
Are there any policies applying to	Regulations 6, 9, 13(4) and	Submission proposals map	N/a

Activity	Statutory Requirement	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
sites or areas by reference to an Ordnance Survey map or to amend an adopted proposals map? If so, have you prepared a submission proposals map?	14	Preferred options report Brief statement by the authority if a submission proposals map is not required	
Have you identified all policies that are to be superseded by a policy or policies in the DPD?	Regulation 13(5)	Preferred options report	See superceded policies report Document 13
Are you ready for submission? Have you a good evidence base to support your DPD, and does it contain sufficient reasoned justification?	The Act s20(5)(b) Regulation 13(1) and 13(2) Regulation 28(1)	Preferred options report SA Report Reports providing the evidence base	See Background Information section of the Issues and Options Discussion Paper. Appendices of the SA report. List of evidence base documents. Document 14
Have you got all your supporting documents ready?	Regulation 28(1)(e)	Preferred options report SA Report Consultation statement Reports on the Regulation 25 consultation and the representations made under Regulation 27 at the Regulation 26 participation	Yes See Preferred Options Core Strategy and Generic Development Control Policies; Changes to the Preferred Options Core Strategy; SA report and Pre-submissions consultations statement
Have you - <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• summarised the issues raised in the consultation on issues and options?</li><li>• prepared the statement on the consultation, the issues and how they have been addressed?</li></ul>	Regulation 28(1)	Consultation statement Report on the Regulation 25 consultation	See Pre-submission consultations statement.

Activity	Statutory Requirement	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
<p>Have you -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• summarised the issues raised in representations on participation on the preferred options?</li> <li>• prepared a statement on the representations and how the issues have been addressed?</li> </ul>	Regulation 28(1)	<p>Consultation statement</p> <p>Report on the representations made under Regulation 27 at the Regulation 26 participation</p>	<p>See Pre-submission consultations statement</p> <p>See spreadsheet</p> <p>Document 11</p> <p>And consultations on CC website.</p>
<p>Have you considered how the plan will be implemented and set out how it is to be monitored?</p>	<p>The Act s20(5)(b) and s.35</p> <p>Regulation 48</p>	<p>Preferred options report</p> <p>SA Report</p> <p>Current AMR</p>	<p>3<sup>rd</sup> AMR 2006/7</p> <p>Document 15.</p> <p>CS Chapter 11, monitoring matrix Table 11.1, GDC Policies Ch 6.</p>
<p>Do you have evidence that the DPD can deal with changing circumstances?</p>	The Act s20(5)(b)	<p>Preferred options report</p> <p>SA Report</p> <p>Current AMR</p>	<p>The extent of the hard rock and sand and gravel landbanks and CC resolutions to grant further permissions and the wide range of the waste management capacity figures being used provide flexibility for changed circumstances.</p> <p>Account is taken of the two different bids for the municipal waste contract paras 7.25 to .27. An alternative centralised system is not ruled out pars 7.24, 4.11.</p> <p>Climate change initiatives refer to both energy use and carbon reduction.</p> <p>CS para 7.33 10.10, 10.11.</p>
<p>Has your authority approved the DPD for submission?</p>	<p>Regulation 2 of the Local Authorities Functions Regulations</p>	Report and Resolution of the authority	<p>Report to Full County Council Document 16 (not yet formally minuted)</p>
<p>Have you sent the Secretary of State copies of the following:</p>	The Act s20(1)	Record of sending	Letters 19 March and 21 April 2008

Activity	Statutory Requirement	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the DPD?</li> <li>• the submission proposals map (unless there are no site allocation policies)?</li> </ul>	Regulation 13(4)		Document 17 Site Allocations Policies to be submitted later in 2009
Have you sent the Secretary of State copies of the following : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SA Report (as amended after consultation / participation)?</li> <li>• SCI (if adopted)?</li> <li>• statement on Regulation 25 consultation?</li> <li>• statement on representations made under Regulation 27 at the Regulation 26 participation?</li> </ul>	The Act s20(3) Regulation 28(1) and (2)	Record of sending	Document 17
Have you sent the Secretary of State copies of the supporting documents?	The Act s20(3) Regulation 28(1) and (2)	Record of sending	Document 17
Have you made copies of the following available for inspection - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the DPD?</li> <li>• the SA report?</li> <li>• the statement on Regulation 25 consultation?</li> <li>• supporting documents?</li> <li>• a statement of the “DPD matters”?</li> </ul>	Regulation 28 (3)	Report on where and when made available Record of where and when made available	Inspection copies at County Offices Kendal, The Courts Carlisle, District Council planning offices and all public libraries (except mobile libraries)

Activity	Statutory Requirement	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
<p>Have you published on your website the following -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the DPD Documents?</li> <li>• the DPD matters?</li> <li>• details of where and when documents can be inspected?</li> </ul>	Regulation 28(3)	Record of publication	<p>County Council webpage for MWDF and list of documents on web.</p> <p>Document 18.</p>
<p>Have you sent to the bodies consulted under Regulation 25 the following -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the DPD?</li> <li>• the SA report?</li> <li>• the statement on Regulation 25 consultation?</li> <li>• supporting documents relevant to the body?</li> <li>• notice of the “DPD matters”?</li> <li>• details of where and when documents can be inspected?</li> </ul>	Regulation 28(3)	<p>Copies of correspondence</p> <p>Record of sending</p>	<p>Consultation letters</p> <p>Document 19</p> <p>Lists of consultees</p> <p>Document 20</p>
<p>Have you advertised in a local paper covering the whole of your area the following?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the DPD matters?</li> <li>• details of where and when documents can be inspected?</li> </ul>	Regulation 28(3)	Copy of advertisement	<p>Copies of notices placed in the Westmorland Gazette (South lakeland); Whitehaven News (Copeland), North West Evening Mail (Barrow) ; Cumberland News (Carlisle and north Allerdale); West Cumberalnd Times and Star (south Allerdale); Cumberland and Westmorland Herald (Eden);.</p> <p>Document 21</p>

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Statutory Requirement</b>	<b>Possible evidence</b>	<b>Evidence provided</b>
Have you informed those who asked at Regulation 26 stage to be notified of the submission of the DPD?	Regulation 28(3)	Copies of correspondence	Documents 19 and 20
Have you requested the opinion of the RPB (or the Mayor in London) on the general conformity of the DPD with the RSS (or SDS)?	PCPA 2004 s.24 Regulation 30	Copies of correspondence	Letter dated 21/4/08 Document 22

## template 2: soundness

test 1

**The DPD has been prepared in accordance with the Local Development Scheme**

<b>Key question</b>	<b>Possible evidence</b>	<b>Evidence provided</b>
<b>Is the DPD identified in the authority's LDS?</b>	The adopted LDS at the time consultation was undertaken on issues and options (Regulation 25). The current adopted LDS	Yes. Documents 1 and 2
<b>Have the details set out in the LDS such as the role, rationale or scope of the DPD been met?</b>	The section of the current adopted LDS containing the profile given for the DPD A brief statement of how the details have been met	Sections 3 and 10 of the current MWDS

test 2

**The DPD has been prepared in compliance with the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), or with the minimum requirements set out in the regulations where no SCI exists**

<b>Key question</b>	<b>Possible evidence</b>	<b>Evidence provided</b>
<b>Having regard to the nature of the DPD, have all the relevant consultation / participation procedures set out in the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) been carried out?</b>	<p>The adopted SCI (s) at the time consultation was carried out under Regulation 25 and participation under Regulation 26.</p> <p>The section of the consultation statement showing how the consultation procedures were carried out and how they relate to the SCI and the Regulations</p>	See Pre-submission Consultations Statement appendices
<b>If no SCI exists, have the minimum requirements of the Regulations been met?</b>	The section of the consultation statement showing how the consultation procedures were carried out and how they relate to the Regulations	n/a

test 3

**The plan and its policies have been subjected to Sustainability Appraisal**

<b>Key Question</b>	<b>Possible Evidence</b>	<b>Evidence provided</b>
<b>Has Sustainability Appraisal (SA) been carried out in relation to the particular DPD in question?</b>	<p>The SA report prepared for the preferred options participation (Regulation 26) identifying the process carried out for SA, the baseline information used and the outcomes of the process</p> <p>The SA report as amended after the Regulation 26 participation and submitted with the DPD. Depending on the extent of change, this may take the form of an annex to the SA report prepared for Regulation 26 or more extensive supplementary material or rewriting.</p> <p>A brief statement of the main changes made</p>	SA Report

test 4

**It is a spatial plan which is consistent with national planning policy and in general conformity with the RSS for the region or the Spatial Development Strategy if in London, and it has properly had regard to any other relevant plans, policies and strategies relating to the area or adjoining areas**

**(a) it is a spatial plan which has regard to other relevant plans, policies and strategies**

Key Question	Possible Evidence	Evidence provided
<p><b>Does the DPD reflect the guidance on spatial planning which is set out in national planning policy?</b></p>	<p>The evidence will depend on the type and nature of the DPD, but may include sections of the DPD, SA report, consultation statement and technical papers (which may be identified under Test 7) which demonstrate that -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The DPD contains a vision for development and change of the area</li> <li>• the DPD is truly spatial in its concepts and presentation</li> <li>• The DPD delivers social, economic and environmental objectives related to (but not confined to) the use of land</li> <li>• The preparation process has been participative, integrated with other strategies, including the community strategy, responsive to change and deliverable.</li> </ul>	<p>The only objections regarding conflict with national policies were those raised by the NDA and other parts of the nuclear industry in respect of Low Level Radioactive Waste. A national role for the LLW repository is now accepted by the County Council in CS Policy 12.</p> <p>CS para 1.4 and the Appendices document set out the spatial context. The Spatial Vision is set out in Box 1 after para 2.14 of the CS.</p> <p>Strategic Objectives are set out in Box 2 after para 2.16 of the CS</p> <p>A matrix which relates objectives to policies, indicators and targets is set out in Table 11.1 after para 11.11 in the CS.</p> <p>See Pre-submission Consultations Statement re public engagement.</p>

Key Question	Possible Evidence	Evidence provided
<p><b>Has adequate account been taken of the relationship between the proposals in the DPD and other requirements, such as those of utility companies and agencies providing services in the area including their future plans or strategy and any requirements for land and premises, which should be prepared in parallel?</b></p>	<p>Sections of the DPD that reflect the plans or strategies of other bodies</p> <p>Representations from bodies responsible for other strategies affecting the area.</p> <p>Reports or copies of correspondence as to how the representations have been considered and dealt with. These should either make clear the issues raised in the representation or include a copy of the substance of the representation.</p>	<p>Responses by United Utilities Document 23 and the Environment Agency. Document 24</p>
<p><b>Is it clear how the DPD relates to other plans and strategies such as local transport plans which will influence the delivery of policies and proposals within the plan?</b></p>	<p>Sections of the DPD identifying other strategies and their relationship to delivery of the strategy in the DPD. Evidence for Test 8 will also be relevant.</p> <p>Representations from bodies responsible for other strategies affecting the area.</p> <p>Reports or copies of correspondence as to how the representations have been considered and dealt with</p>	<p>CS Chapter 5 and Appendices B and C GDC Policy 1 and Key Diagram for primary and county strategic roads..</p>
<p><b>In two tier areas, does the DPD integrate effectively with plans prepared by the county council/district council?</b></p>	<p>Sections of the DPD that reflect the plans or strategies of the county council / district council as relevant.</p> <p>Representations from the relevant council. Reports or copies of correspondence as to how the representations have been considered and dealt with</p>	<p>No objections have been received from district councils. There are regular meetings with the districts.</p> <p>One of the issues had been the role of the LLWR as a national facility and the related need for a community benefits package. We have worked very closely with Copeland BC on both of these matters.</p>

**(b) It is consistent with national planning policy**

<b>Key Question</b>	<b>Possible Evidence</b>	<b>Evidence provided</b>
<p><b>Does the DPD contain any policies or proposals which are not consistent with national planning policy and, if so, is there a local justification?</b></p>	<p>Sections of the DPD which refer to PPGs and PPSs and justify why any policies are not consistent with national policy</p> <p>Community strategy, local studies forming evidence for the DPD or other information which provide the basis for departing from national planning policy</p> <p>Evidence provided from the sustainability appraisal (including reference to the SA report) and/or from the results of community involvement</p> <p>Representations from GOs on preferred options or the submitted DPD</p> <p>Reports or copies of correspondence as to how GO representations have been considered and dealt with</p>	<p>No inconsistencies with national policies have been identified.</p> <p>CS Chapter 10 includes references to MPS 1. Chapter 8 to national radioactive waste policies. Chapter 7 to Waste Strategy 2007. Para 3.54 to environmental policies. Appendix F sets out the most relevant ones.</p>

**(c) The plan is in general conformity with Regional Spatial Strategy or, where relevant, the Spatial Development Strategy in London.**

Key Question	Possible Evidence	Evidence provided
<p><b>Does the DPD contain any policies and proposals which are not in general conformity with the RSS, or SDS in London? If so, is there a local justification?</b></p>	<p>Sections of the DPD which refer to or implement policies in the RSS or SDS</p> <p>Community strategy, local studies forming evidence for the DPD or other information which provide the basis for departing from regional planning policy</p> <p>Evidence provided from the sustainability appraisal (including reference to the SA report) and/or from the results of community involvement</p> <p>Representations from the relevant Regional Planning Body or the Mayor of London</p> <p>Reports or copies of correspondence as to how RPB's / Mayor's representations have been considered and dealt with</p>	<p>The only matter raised by the NWRPB at earlier stages was the lack of a policy for building stones, this is now covered by CS Policy 17.. CS para 7.32 explains why a lower landfill figure than the draft RSS one is being used (but see subsequent Changes to RSS)</p> <p>NWRA letter 13/12/07 re Changes to Preferred Options.</p> <p>Document 12</p> <p>Letter 21/04/08 to NWRA re conformity addresses the points raised by RPB.</p>

test 5

**It has had regard to the authority’s community strategy.**

<b>Key Question</b>	<b>Possible Evidence</b>	<b>Evidence provided</b>
<p><b>Does the DPD have regard to the Community Strategy, by setting out policies and proposals which deliver key components of that strategy so that they are consistent with or in general conformity with higher level planning policy and relate to the use and development of land?</b></p>	<p>Sections of the DPD which set out how the objectives of the community strategy relate to the plan and how key components of the community strategy relating to development and the use of land will be delivered</p> <p>Sections of the community strategy (in two tier areas the community strategies of both relevant authorities)</p> <p>Representations from the Local Strategic Partnership where they have prepared the community strategy</p> <p>Reports or copies of correspondence as to how the LSP’s representations have been considered and dealt with</p>	<p>The six community strategies.</p> <p>See CS Chapter 5 and Appendix B. the most relevant part of the community strategies has been the Sub-regional Spatial Strategy see CS para 5.3.</p> <p>The Spatial Vision reflects the regeneration and renewal and development needs stressed by the Community Strategies.</p> <p>CS policy 2 stresses the need to ensure that minerals and waste developments do not prejudice regeneration and development initiatives.</p> <p>CS policies relating to waste reflect the emphasis given in community strategies for recycling etc and the waste hierarchy.</p>

test 6

**The strategies / policies / allocations in the plan are coherent and consistent within and between Development Plan Documents prepared by the authority and by neighbouring authorities, where cross-boundary issues are relevant.**

Key Question	Possible Evidence	Evidence provided
<p><b>Do the policies clearly relate to the objectives in the submitted DPD or a related DPD (e.g. the Core Strategy)?</b></p>	<p>Sections of the DPD and documents used in community involvement which show how the policies in the DPD relate to the objectives.</p> <p>If the DPD is not a core strategy DPD, sections of the DPD which show how the DPD conforms with the core strategy. In the case of a joint DPD, sections of the DPD which show how it conforms with the core strategies of the participating authorities</p>	<p>Monitoring matrix CS Table 11.1 sets out themes, objectives and policies.</p> <p>The main cross boundary issues have been the role of the LLWR as part of the UK's radioactive waste management capabilities, addressed by CS Policy 12; and the current role of landfills in Lancashire for waste from the south of the county. With regard to this the approach in the MWDF is to seek to provide for all of Cumbria's wastes CS Policy 8.</p> <p>The national or regional role of the gypsum mine, high specification roadstone quarries and High greenscoe Quarry brickmaking mudstones are recognised in CS Policy 13.</p> <p>Policies for National parks may lead to reduced output from quarries in the Yorks Dales NP and increased pressure on Cumbria for high spec roadstone, CS para 10.15</p>
<p><b>Are the policy objectives within the DPD themselves consistent?</b></p>	<p>Sections of the DPD, documents used in community involvement, and technical papers which demonstrate that the objectives are consistent</p> <p>A brief statement explaining how the authority considers its objectives</p>	<p>See monitoring matrix Table 11.1 in CS</p>

Key Question	Possible Evidence	Evidence provided
	are consistent	
<p><b>Is it clear how the DPD relates to other plans in the authority's Local Development Framework and to other relevant plans prepared by neighbouring authorities?</b></p>	<p>The adopted LDS, showing how the LDDs in the LDF relate together LDSs of neighbouring authorities and if necessary commentary on how the DPD is consistent with them</p> <p>Sections of the DPD setting out its purpose, depending on the type of DPD</p> <p>Sections of the DPD and documents used in community involvement which show how the DPD relates to other DPDs and to the DPDs of neighbouring authorities</p> <p>Joint studies, reports and technical papers conducted by or for the authority and neighbouring authorities (in two tier areas, may include joint county / district work)</p> <p>Key diagram or other relevant presentation material</p> <p>Representations from neighbouring authorities</p> <p>Reports or copies of correspondence as to how the representations have been considered and dealt with</p>	<p>No issues have been raised by neighbouring authorities</p> <p>Joint work with all Cumbria districts, LDNPA and involving Lancashire with scoping for SA. Joint work with 3 Cumbria districts and LDNPA on SFRA.</p> <p>Close working with Copeland BC re radioactive waste and related policies.</p>
<p><b>Where there are overlaps, are these consistent / complementary?</b></p>	<p>Sections of the DPD and documents used in community involvement which explain overlaps with other DPDs and/or make clear how the later policies will supersede the earlier</p> <p>Representations on the consistency of policies</p> <p>Reports or copies of correspondence as to how the representations have been considered and dealt with</p>	<p>No overlaps identified.</p>
<p><b>Are there any obvious gaps in the coverage of the DPD having regard to its purpose and the relevant requirements set out in national planning policy statements?</b></p>	<p>Representations referring to plan coverage</p> <p>Representations from GOs</p> <p>Reports or copies of correspondence as to how the representations have been considered and dealt with</p>	<p>It has not been possible to be as specific as we may have liked about some waste streams because of national/regional problems with data for commercial, industrial, construction and demolition wastes and recycled aggregates.</p> <p>Representations have referred to content re hazardous waste, CS para 6.23..</p>
<p><b>Is it clear how cross boundary</b></p>	<p>Sections of the DPD and documents used in community involvement</p>	<p>Cs para 7.10 re relationship with</p>

<b>Key Question</b>	<b>Possible Evidence</b>	<b>Evidence provided</b>
<p><b>issues are addressed?</b></p>	<p>which explain cross boundary issues                      Representations from neighbouring authorities                      Representations referring to issues which cross the authority's boundary                      Reports or copies of correspondence as to how representations on cross boundary issues have been considered and dealt with</p>	<p>Lancashire for landfill.                      Approach of the CS is to provide for Cumbria's wastes. Cumbria generally meets its own needs for minerals and supplies other areas/regions.                      National/regional roles recognised in CS policies 10, 12 and 13.</p>

test 7

**The strategies / policies / allocations represent the most appropriate in all the circumstances, having considered the relevant alternatives, and they are founded on a robust and credible evidence base.**

Key Question	Possible Evidence	Evidence provided
<p><b>Is it clear that the local planning authority considered all reasonable options and alternatives in preparing the DPD?</b></p>	<p>Sections of the consultation statement showing how the community was involved in considering issues, alternatives and options</p> <p>Documents used in community involvement (during Regulation 25 consultations) to encourage the community (including stakeholder interests) to identify the issues and options they wished to see considered</p> <p>The report produced at the end of the issues and options stage setting out the issues and options raised</p> <p>Sections of the preferred options report explaining -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• how alternative strategies were developed and evaluated, and</li> <li>• why alternatives and options were rejected in favour of the preferred options</li> </ul> <p>Sections of the SA report showing the options and alternatives and explaining how they were objectively assessed.</p> <p>Any other documentation showing how alternatives were developed and evaluated</p>	<p>Issues and Options Discussion Paper Document 7.</p> <p>Preferred Options and Changes to Preferred Options documents.</p> <p>Pre-submission Consultations Statement.</p> <p>Presentations given during Reg 25 issues and options.</p> <p>Document 9 is an example of a presentation</p> <p>Pre-submissions Consultation Statement paras 3.22 and 3.23.</p> <p>Chapter 7 of the SA report</p>
<p><b>Are the assumptions in the DPD set out clearly and are they supported by evidence?</b></p>	<p>Sections of the DPD setting out the assumptions</p> <p>Sections of the SA report setting out the assumptions</p> <p>A brief statement for each assumption as to how the evidence led to the assumption</p>	<p>Cs para 7.14 re RSS Panel recommendations, 7.29 and 7.30 re waste streams, 7.32 re landfill capacity, 8.6, 8.8, 8.19, 8.21 and 8.22re radioactive waste. 9.8 and 9.9 and 10.7</p>

Key Question	Possible Evidence	Evidence provided
	Reference to national or regional policy, correspondence from bodies consulted or technical papers that provide the basis for assumptions	to 10.21 and 10.23, 10.29 to 10.31, 10.35, 10.39, 10.40, 10.41 re minerals
<p><b>Does the evidence clearly support the policies in the DPD?</b></p>	<p>Sections of the DPD which show how the evidence points towards the selected strategy, policies or proposals</p> <p>Sections of the pre-submission proposals documents</p> <p>Sections of the preferred options report</p> <p>Sections of the SA report which set out its main conclusions in relation to the policies in the DPD</p> <p>Sections of the consultation statement OR a brief statement of how the main findings of consultation support the policies, with reference to -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the statements on the issues raised during the Regulation 25 consultation</li> <li>• the issues raised at the Regulation 26 participation, and how they have been addressed,</li> <li>• Any other information on community views and preferences</li> </ul> <p>The studies, reports and technical papers, which provide the evidence for the policies set out in the DPD.</p> <p>OR for each policy (or group of policies dealing with the same issue) a brief statement of the evidence documents relied upon and how they support the policy (where this is not already clear in the reasoned justification in the DPD)</p> <p><i><b>Note:</b> the PINS Guide, at Paragraph 1.4.12, provides examples of the types of documents that would constitute supporting evidence. The particular documents will depend on the type and nature of the DPD.</i></p>	<p>CS Tables 3.1; 6.1 and 6.2 re waste arisings and targets etc. Cs paras 7.12 to 7.32 re facilities and capacities. 8.4 to 8.8; 8.14 to 8.20 re radioactive wastes. 9.3 to 9.11; 10.13 to 10.18, 10.23, 10.25, 10.30, 10.33, 10.36, 10.37, 10.42 re minerals.</p> <p>Pre-submission Consultations Statement.</p>

Key Question	Possible Evidence	Evidence provided
<p><b>Is the evidence robust and credible - ie has it been prepared in accordance with national policy and good practice guidance?</b></p>	<p>Sections of the SA report which set out the methodology followed and how it conforms with the SA guidance</p> <p>For each other main source of evidence, either -</p> <p>Sections of the relevant evidence documents which show how their production has followed national policy and/or good practice guidance,</p> <p>OR a brief statement as to how evidence accords with national policy and/or good practice guidance</p> <p>Representations on the process of plan preparation or any methodologies used, including any representations made by GOs, the RPB or Mayor of London</p> <p>Reports or copies of correspondence as to how representations on plan preparation have been considered and dealt with</p> <p>In relation to matters on which there is no national policy or good practice guidance, sections of relevant evidence documents which show that the data relied upon is robust and sufficiently comprehensive for valid conclusions to be drawn from it, and that the data have been rigorously analysed in drawing conclusions.</p>	<p>SA report Chapter 6.</p> <p>The aggregates industry has questioned the accuracy of reserves and landbank figures. These are figures provided to the RAWP by the industry and are considered to be issues for the RAWP.</p> <p>Best available information about waste streams and their management has been used, some shortfalls and inconsistencies have been identified.</p>
<p><b>Where a balance has been struck in taking decisions between competing alternatives - is it clear how these decisions have been taken?</b></p>	<p>Sections of the preferred options report explaining -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• how alternatives were developed and evaluated, and</li> <li>• why alternatives were rejected in favour of the preferred options</li> </ul> <p>Sections of the SA report showing the options and alternatives and explaining how they were objectively assessed</p> <p>Reports prepared during the plan preparation process (including after the preferred options participation) contributing to the decisions made on the inclusion of policies in the DPD</p> <p>Sections of the consultation statement explaining how the main</p>	<p>Changes to Preferred Options and Preferred options documents and Pre-submission Consultations Statement..</p> <p>CS para 3.36.</p>

Key Question	Possible Evidence	Evidence provided
	<p>findings of consultation support the decisions,                      OR a brief statement of the influence upon decisions of -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the issues raised during the Regulation 25 consultation</li> <li>• the issues raised at the Regulation 26 participation, and how they have been addressed</li> </ul> <p>Any other documentation showing how alternatives were developed and evaluated</p> <p>A brief statement and any other supporting documentation of the way decisions have been taken</p>	

test 8

**There are clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring.**

<b>Key Question</b>	<b>Possible Evidence</b>	<b>Evidence provided</b>
<b>Does the DPD contain targets and milestones which relate to the delivery of the policies, including housing trajectories where the DPD contains housing allocations?</b>	<p>Sections of the DPD setting out indicators, targets and milestones</p> <p>Sections of the current AMR which report on indicators, targets, milestones and trajectories</p> <p>Reference to any other reports or technical documents which contain information on the delivery of policies</p>	CS Tables 6.1, 6.2, para 7.21, 8.19 to 8.23 and monitoring matrix Table 11.1
<b>Is it clear how these are to be measured and are these linked to the production of the Annual Monitoring Report?</b>	<p>Sections of the DPD setting out indicators, targets and milestones</p> <p>Sections of the current AMR and the SA report setting out the framework for monitoring, including monitoring the effects of the DPD against the sustainability appraisal</p> <p>Reference to any other reports or technical documents which contain information on the collection or measurement of indicators</p>	<p>monitoring matrix Table 11.1.</p> <p>RAWP and RTAB AMRs.</p>
<b>Are the delivery mechanisms and timescale for implementation for the policies clearly identified?</b>	<p>Sections of the DPD setting out delivery mechanisms and timescale</p> <p>Brief statements on how other stakeholders intend to support the delivery of the policies, with any supporting correspondence or reports by the authority or the relevant stakeholder</p> <p>Representations from stakeholders on delivery mechanisms and timescale</p> <p>Reports or copies of correspondence as to how representations on delivery and implementation have been considered and dealt with</p>	monitoring matrix Table 11.1
<b>Is it clear who is intended to implement each policy? Where the actions required to implement policy are outside the direct control of the LPA is there</b>	<p>Sections of the DPD setting out responsibilities for delivery</p> <p>Correspondence showing how other stakeholders intend to support the delivery of the policies</p>	Several policies set out what information will be required as part of planning application proposals eg CS1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12 and 16 and the GDC policies. Others relate to further work by the CC on

Key Question	Possible Evidence	Evidence provided
<b>evidence that there is the necessary commitment from the relevant organisation to implementation of the policies?</b>	<p>Reports by the authority or the relevant stakeholder</p> <p>Representations from stakeholders on implementation</p> <p>Reports or copies of correspondence as to how representations on delivery and implementation have been considered and dealt with</p>	<p>site allocation policies eg CS 7, 8, 9, 13, 14.</p> <p>CS policies 6, 15, 16, 17 and 18 relate to the CC's consideration of planning applications.</p>
<b>Do the processes for measuring the success of the DPD accord with national guidance?</b>	<p>Sections of the DPD, the current AMR and any supporting technical documents that national guidance has been followed</p> <p>Representations by the GO</p> <p>Reports or copies of correspondence as to how the representations have been considered and dealt with</p>	<p>Monitoring of carbon reduction measures will need to follow developing practice.</p> <p>Assumptions about waste generation and management will need to be particularly closely monitored.</p> <p>See also para 3.60, 3.63, 3.70, 4.11. 7.22</p>
<b>Does the DPD explain how its key policy objectives will be achieved?</b>	<p>Sections of the DPD</p> <p>Other supporting material, for example, commitments in the Community Strategy or action plans derived from it, or the Local Area Agreement, which will support the delivery of the strategy in the DPD</p>	<p>CS Table 11.1 monitoring matrix.</p> <p>Municipal Waste Management Strategy, Cs 3.31</p>

test 9

**It is reasonably flexible to enable it to deal with changing circumstances.**

Key Question	Possible Evidence	Evidence provided
<p><b>Is the DPD flexible enough to respond to a variety of, or unexpected changes in, circumstances?</b></p>	<p>Sections of the DPD setting out the assumptions of the plan (see Test 7) and identifying the circumstances when policies might need to be reviewed</p> <p>Sections of the AMR and SA report describing how the authority will monitor -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the effectiveness of policies and what evidence is being collected to undertake this</li> <li>• changes affecting the baseline information and any information on trends on which the DPD is based.</li> </ul> <p>Statements or correspondence from stakeholders which commit to providing information to be used in monitoring the progress of the policies and changes in the baseline</p> <p>Risk analysis of the strategy and policies to demonstrate robustness and how the plan could cope with changing circumstances, or what would trigger a review of the DPD</p> <p><i>Note: Paragraph 1.4.14 of the PINS Guide gives some examples</i></p>	<p>See page 17 re changing circumstances.</p> <p>Re carbon reduction CS 3.17; 3.23, 3.24, 3.25, 3.27,</p> <p>Economic and community benefits 3.37, 3.42.</p> <p>Environmental assets 3.60, 3.63,</p> <p>Planning obligations 3.70,</p> <p>Minerals 4.10 to 4.12, 6.21, 9.7; 9.11; 10.13; 10.19; 10.20; 10.23; 10.24; 10.45; 10.47; 10.48.</p> <p>Land availability 5.9,</p> <p>Wastes 6.22 to 6.25; 7.11; 7.17; 7.22; 7.30; 7.31; 7.33; 7.36; 8.11; 8.13; 8.17; 8.23;</p> <p>CS Chapter 11 and Table 11.i</p>
<p><b>Are Development Control Policies written in a generic form to enable them to provide a robust and consistent framework for considering planning applications?</b></p>	<p>Representations from GOs or others on the form of the Development Control policies</p> <p>Reports or copies of correspondence as to how representations on the form of development control policies have been considered and dealt with</p>	<p>Pre-submission Consultations Statement para 2.6 and 2.8.</p> <p>Policies 1,2 and 3 apply to all developments; 4 to 9 to types of minerals and waste developments and resources;</p> <p>Policies have been amended to avoid repeating national policies</p>



