

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

This note was key prepared by AMEC and URS on behalf of the Planning Advisory Service. It aims to help local authorities prepare their plans in advance of an examination, taking into account the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework. A separate checklist looks at legal compliance.

In summary – the requirements of plan preparation are:

- Has the plan been positively prepared i.e. based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed requirements?
- Is the plan justified?
- Is it based on robust and credible evidence?
- Is it the most appropriate strategy when considered against the alternatives?
- Is the document effective?
- Is it deliverable?
- Is it flexible?
- Will it be able to be monitored?
- Is it consistent with national policy?

The Tests of Soundness at Examination

The starting point for the examination is the assumption that the Council has submitted what it considers to be a sound plan. Those seeking changes should demonstrate why the plan is unsound by reference to one or more of the soundness criteria.

The tests of soundness are set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (para 182): “The Local Plan will be examined by an independent inspector whose role is to assess whether the plan has been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate, legal and procedural requirements, and whether it is sound. A local planning authority should submit a plan for examination which it considers is ‘sound’ “, namely that it is:

1. Positively Prepared: based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements

This means that the Development Plan Document (DPD) should be 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. The NPPF, together with the Marine Policy Statement (MPS) set out principles through which the Government expects sustainable development can be achieved.

2. Justified: the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

This means that the DPD should be based on a robust and credible evidence base involving:

- Research/fact finding: the choices made in the plan are backed up by facts.
- Evidence of participation of the local community and others having a stake in the area; and

The DPD should also provide the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives. These alternatives should be realistic and subject to sustainability appraisal. The DPD should show how the policies and proposals help to ensure that the social, environmental, economic and resource use objectives of sustainability will be achieved.

3. Effective: deliverable over its period based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities

This means the DPD should be deliverable, requiring evidence of:

- Sound infrastructure delivery planning;
- Having no regulatory or national planning barriers to delivery;
- Delivery partners who are signed up to it; and
- Coherence with the strategies of neighbouring authorities, including neighbouring marine planning authorities.
- The DPD should be flexible and able to be monitored.

The DPD should indicate who is to be responsible for making sure that the policies and proposals happen and when they will happen. The plan should be flexible to deal with changing circumstances, which may involve minor changes to respond to the outcome of the monitoring process or more significant changes to respond to problems such as lack of funding for major infrastructure proposals. Although it is important that policies are flexible, the DPD should make clear that major changes may require a formal review including public consultation. Any measures which the Council has included to make sure that targets are met should be clearly linked to an Annual Monitoring Report.

4. Consistent with national policy: enabling the delivery of sustainable development

The demonstration of this is a 'lead' policy on sustainable development which specifies how decisions are to be made against the sustainability criterion (see the Planning Portal for a model policy www.planningportal.gov.uk). If you are not using this model policy, the Council will need to provide clear and convincing reasons to justify its approach.

The following table sets out the requirements associated with these four tests of soundness. Suggestions for evidence which could be used to support these requirements are set out, although these have to be viewed in the context of the plan being prepared. Please don't assume that you have got to provide all of these, they are just suggestions of what could be relevant.

In addition, the Legal Compliance checklist (a separate document, see www.pas.gov.uk) should be completed to ensure that this aspect is covered.

The Duty to Co-operate will also be assessed as part of the examination process.

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<i>Positively Prepared: 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.</i>		

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sections of the DPD and other documents which set out (where applicable) the vision, strategic objectives, key outcomes expected, spatial portrait and issues to be addressed. • Relevant sections of the DPD which explain how policies derive from the objectives and are designed to meet them. • The strategic objectives of the DPD, and the commentary in the DPD of how they derive from the spatial portrait and vision, and how the objectives are consistent with one another. • Sections of the DPD which address delivery, the means of delivery and the timescales for key developments through evidenced infrastructure delivery planning. • Confirmation from the relevant agencies that they support the objectives and the identified means of delivery. • Information in the local development scheme, or provided separately, about the scope and content (actual and intended) of each DPD showing how they combine to provide a coherent policy structure. 	<p>The Local Plan Sites Document (LPSD) is one of a number of DPD's that form the Ryedale Plan – the development plan for Ryedale to 2027. The relationship between the documents that comprise the development plan is outlined in the Local Development Scheme.</p> <p>The vision, objectives, spatial strategy and strategic policies of the Ryedale Plan were established through the adoption of the LPS in 2013 after it was examined and found sound. (PS02 - Inspector's report on the examination into the Ryedale Plan-Local Plan Strategy)</p> <p>The objectives established in the LPS are aligned to the District-wide sustainability issues and appraisal objectives established for the SA process. The Sustainability Appraisal process embodies a Site Selection Methodology (SSM) which was established to inform site selection for the LPSD.(SD03 – Sustainability Appraisal and Site Selection Methodology tables)</p> <p>Following adoption of LPS and prior to the assessment of sites, the Local Planning Authority revised the Sustainability Appraisal scoping report</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		to identify/reflect locally specific sustainability issues. The aim was to ensure a more fine grained approach to the sustainability appraisal of sites based on place specific sustainability issues. The link between the strategic objectives of the plan and the local sustainability issues used to inform site selection is reflected in the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping report. (TE01- SA Scoping Report).
<p><i>The presumption in favour of sustainable development (NPPF paras 6-17)</i></p> <p>Plans and decisions need to take local circumstances into account, so that they respond to the different opportunities for achieving sustainable development in different areas.</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"> —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 —specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An evidence base which establishes the development needs of the plan area (see Justified below) and includes a flexible approach to delivery (see ‘Section 3 Effective’, below). • An audit trail showing how and why the quantum of development, preferred overall strategy and plan area distribution of development were arrived at. • Evidence of responding to opportunities for achieving sustainable development in different areas (for example, the marine area) 	<p>Site choices in the LPSD have taken account and weighed in the balance, the sustainability issues that are specific to individual settlements. This is evidenced in the application of the Site Selection methodology/SA (SD03) and in the settlement specific background papers. (TE02) For example, in Pickering, residual housing requirements are proposed to be met without the need for further incursions into regionally significant historic strip field systems. At Malton and Norton, the proposed allocations are sites which support the provision of necessary infrastructure; are less sensitive in landscape terms and are sites that can be satisfactorily accommodated in terms of the highway network.</p> <p>A range of technical evidence</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p>including landscape character assessment, highway assessments and infrastructure requirements have informed the choice and combination of sites proposed.</p> <p>The adopted Local Plan Strategy establishes the development needs for the Plan and the Inspector appointed to assess the soundness of that Plan considered its policy framework to be sufficiently flexible to deal with changing circumstances. (PS02).The LPSD has been prepared to align with the LPS.</p>
<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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A policy or policies which reflect the principles of the presumption in favour of sustainable development (see model policy at www.planningportal.gov.uk) 	<p>A policy covering the presumption in favour of sustainable development is included in the adopted Local Plan Strategy.(PS01 - Policy SP19) It has been used (in conjunction with the LPS as a whole) to support the release of housing , employment and retail sites in advance of the publication of the LPSD.(It is of note that revisions to the National Planning Policy Framework recently proposed by the Government are more akin to the model policy/SP19 of the Local Plan Strategy.)</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background evidence papers demonstrating requirements based on population forecasts, employment projections and community needs. • Technical papers demonstrating how the aspirations and objectives of the DPD are related to the evidence, and how these are to be met, including from consultation and associated with the Duty to Co-operate. 	<p>The adopted Local Plan Strategy establishes the development requirements for the Plan, which are the objectively assessed needs. In terms of residential development, this has continued to be appropriate as evidenced by the SHMA (2016) (TE15).</p> <p>The LPSD proposes residential land allocations which (together with completions and commitments) meet and exceed planned minimum requirements</p> <p>Proposed housing sites are well located and accessible to existing communities and community and cultural facilities. Site choices have reflected the need for and ability to secure social infrastructure improvements.</p> <p>The plan identifies land to meet employment and retail requirements in line with strategic policies SP6 and SP7 of the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>The risk of flooding is identified in the 2010 Flood Risk Assessment. (TE14a) The SA/SSM assessment has also utilised updated data layers provided</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p>by the Environment Agency and assessed the sites in terms of risk of surface water drainage. Both allocations and commitments have been subject to sequential testing both through the SSM and at the planning application stage. Resulting in one commitment being reduced in size to remove land in Flood Zone 2.</p> <p>None of the development sites proposed in the LPSD will result in the loss of internationally, nationally or locally protected habitat and a Habitat Regulations assessment and Appropriate Assessment have been undertaken to support the plan(PD10 and PD10a). The Site Selection Methodology/SA recognise s that biodiversity gains are likely to be achieved following through the proposed change of use of agricultural land to include residential gardens.</p> <p>The impact of sites on the character and form of the existing built environment has been fully considered as part of the application of the site selection methodology/SA process and is reflected in the settlement background papers.</p> <p>The choices of development sites has also taken other environmental</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p>matters into account including landscape impact and archaeology and this is summarised in the Settlement Background Papers (TE02)and Site Selection methodology tables.(SD03)</p> <p>The Principal Town of Malton and Norton has Air Quality Management Area, a product of traffic generated NO₂. In order to establish the impact on air quality, an Air Quality Impact Assessment (TE13)was produced which assessed the impact of plan-led growth (in the proposed development scenario) coupled with background changes to emissions, and took account of the increased frequency of rail crossings. It concluded a predicted net reduction in emissions over the plan period.</p> <p>The LPSD proposes a number of additional 'Visually Important Undeveloped Areas'. These are proposed either to protect the historic environment/assets or to protect the character and form of the built environment of a settlement. The rationale for these is set out in the VIUA Background Paper (TE03).</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
NPPF Principles: Delivering sustainable development		
1. Building a strong, competitive economy (paras 18-22)		
<p>Set out a clear economic vision and strategy for the area which positively and proactively encourages sustainable economic growth (21),</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Articulation of a clear economic vision and strategy for the plan area linked to the Economic Strategy, LEP Strategy and marine policy documents where appropriate. 	<p>The Inspectors report into the examination of the Local Plan Strategy confirms that the LPS establishes a sound economic vision and strategy for the Plan (PS02 - LPS Inspectors Report).</p> <p>The LPSD includes specific policies that support the delivery of sustainable economic growth in line with the LPS (PS01) ; the Ryedale Economic Action Plan (PS12) and the Strategic Economic Plan prepared by the LEP(PS07).</p> <p>The LSPD proposes the allocation of employment land at Pickering in line with the Policy SP6 of the Local Plan Strategy and a priority of the Ryedale Economic Action Plan (PS12) to support additional employment sites in northern Ryedale.</p> <p>The LPSD and Policies map reflect existing employment land commitments. In particular, this includes Eden Park at Old Malton – the Malton Food Enterprise Zone and Agri- Business Park site and the</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p>Malton Enterprise Park at York Road. The FEZ scheme is a priority project in the Ryedale Economic Action Plan (PS12) and supports the aims of the Local Economic Partnership.</p> <p>The proposed 'in-principle' policy support for additional development within the current site boundaries of the National Agri-Food Innovation Campus reflects the priority given to this project in the Strategic Economic Plan of the Local Economic Partnership (PS07) and a priority of the Ryedale Economic Action Plan. (PS12)</p> <p>The proposed residential site at Norton (Policies SD2 and SD3 of the LPSD) includes provision for a link road in south-east Norton which is a priority in the Ryedale Economic Action Plan. (PS12)</p>
<p>Recognise and seek to address potential barriers to investment, including poor environment or any lack of infrastructure, services or housing (21)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A criteria-based policy which meets identified needs and is positive and flexible in planning for specialist sectors, regeneration, infrastructure provision, environmental enhancement. • An up-to-date assessment of the deliverability of allocated employment sites, to meet local needs, (taking into account that LPAs should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of an allocated site being used for that purpose) para (22) 	<p>There are no longstanding allocated employment sites. All but one of the committed sites are under construction. The site not under construction is 0.78ha.</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
2. Ensuring the vitality of town centres (paras 23-37)		
<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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Plan and its policies may include such matters as: definition of networks and hierarchies; defining town centres; encouragement of residential development on appropriate sites; allocation of appropriate edge of centre sites where suitable and viable town centre sites are not available; consideration of retail and leisure proposals which cannot be accommodated in or adjacent to town centres. 	<p>Policy SP7 (Town Centres and Retailing) of the adopted Local Plan Strategy defines Ryedale’s Town Centre hierarchy and lists the Primary Retail frontages at each of the Town Centres. The policy identifies retail requirements and the way in which the plan seeks to address these based on the opportunities which exist to meet requirements and to support the overall spatial approach of the plan. <i>“The amended and updated retail strategywill provide a soundly based framework for meeting the full range of Ryedale’s retail needs and for making development decisions and site allocations”.</i>(Para 88 Inspector’s report on the examination into the Ryedale Plan- Local Plan Strategy.)</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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An assessment of the need to expand (the) town centre(s), considering the needs of town centre uses. Primary and secondary shopping frontages identified and allocated. 	<p>The LPSD proposes a revision to the Malton Town Centre limits. This is to include the Malton Livestock Market site within the Town Centre. Planning permission exists for a predominantly food- led retail scheme on the site. The site is capable of meeting quantitative food retailing needs identified in the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>The LPSD identifies a further site for</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p>retailing at Norton, reflecting an existing permission for A1 and D1 uses. Following the publication of the Plan an application for a petrol filling station and forecourt shop sales building has been made. It is unlikely that this site will be available for wider A1 uses.</p> <p>The Local Plan Strategy commits to the allocation of land for non-food retailing at Malton and Norton. The LPSD recognises that the plan does not identify sufficient land to meet non-food retail requirements at Malton and Norton and that a small shortfall exists. The Local Planning Authority has been unable to identify further specific sites in or on the edge of the town centres to address this requirement. On this basis, applications for further non-retail development will be considered against Policy SP7 of the Local Plan Strategy.</p>
<p>3. Supporting a prosperous rural economy (para 28)</p>		
<p>Support sustainable economic growth in rural areas. Planning strategies should promote a strong rural economy by taking a positive approach to new development. (28)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where relevant include a policy or policies which support the sustainable growth of rural businesses; promote the development and diversification of agricultural businesses; support sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments, and support local 	<p>Relevant strategic policies are included in the adopted Local Plan Strategy. This includes policies: SP6 Delivering and Distributing</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
	services and facilities.	<p>Employment Land and Premises; SP8 Tourism; SP9 The Land-Based and Rural Economy; SP10 Physical Infrastructure; SP11 Community Facilities and Services. In particular, Paragraphs 77,89,92 of the Inspector’s report of the examination of the Ryedale Plan – Local Plan Strategy (PS02) considered the policy approach to be consistent with national policy.</p> <p>Policy SD13 of the LPSD allocates three sites for the future expansion of existing major employers at Kirkbymoorside and Amotherby.</p>
4. Promoting sustainable transport (paras 29-41)		
<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</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint working with adjoining authorities, transport providers and Government Agencies on infrastructure provision in order to support sustainable economic growth with particular regard to the facilities referred to in paragraph 31. • Policies encouraging development which facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport and a range of transport choices where appropriate, particularly the criteria in paragraph 35. • A spatial strategy and policy which seeks to reduce the need to travel through balancing housing and employment provision. • Policy for major developments which promotes a mix of uses and access to key facilities by sustainable transport modes. • If local (car parking) standards have been prepared, are they justified and necessary? (39) • Identification and protection of sites and routes where 	<p>The proposed allocations in the Sites Document are at locations which are served by public transport. All of the sites are in walking distance of services and facilities in each settlement.</p> <p>A requirement for improved cycling and pedestrian facilities to support planned growth ,place-making and the local transport plan (TE20) is reflected in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan(TE22 & TE22a); CIL Regulation 123 list (TE19)and in the Local Plan Strategy.(PS01)</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p>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</p>	<p>infrastructure could be developed to widen transport choice linked to the Local Transport Plan.</p>	<p>The nature and level of public transport provision and accessibility to services by walking and cycling was a consideration in the distribution of development established in the Local Plan Strategy. The process also took account of the need to reduce the need to travel by balancing housing and employment provision.</p> <p>The sites that are the subject of Policy SD15 (Flamingo Land and the National Agri-Food Innovation Campus) are also served by the daily regular coastliner bus service.</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p>provision for town centres. (39-40)</p> <p>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)</p>		
<p>5. Supporting high quality communications infrastructure (paras 42-46)</p>		
<p>Support the expansion of the electronic communications networks, including telecommunications’ masts and high speed broadband. (43)</p> <p>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)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy supporting the expansion of electronic communications networks, including telecommunications and high speed broadband, noting the caveats in para 44. 	<p>Policy SP10 in the LPS provides, amongst other matters, the strategic support to the delivery of mobile telecommunications and broadband connectivity, subject to considerations around landscape sensitivity. The policy was endorsed by the Inspector’s Report (PS02 paragraph 100).</p>
<p>6. Delivering a wide choice of high quality housing (paras 47-55)</p>		
<p>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)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) five years or more supply of specific deliverable sites; plus the buffer as appropriate • Where this element of housing supply includes windfall sites, inclusion of ‘compelling evidence’ to justify their inclusion (48) • A SHLAA 	<p>The LPSD proposes residential land allocations to meet planned housing requirements, taking account of completions and commitments from the base date of the Plan (2012).</p> <p>The adopted Local Plan Strategy commits to the delivery of a (net) 3,000 new homes. In addition, the LPS commits Ryedale to incorporating a 20% supply buffer into the plan,</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p>through the allocation/identification of land to provide a further 600 homes.</p> <p>The LPS makes it clear that Ryedale is committed to identifying sufficient land to meet these requirements without applying a windfall assumption to residual housing requirements.</p> <p><i>“The LPS is not fundamentally flawed or will lead to a serious under –supply of housing as some would suggest and further flexibility and boosting of housing supply would be enabled by providing the 20%NPPF buffer of sites and the 25% additional ‘Zone of Tolerance’. The proposed commitment to reviewing housing needs within five years, including the SHMA and the SHLAA, would ensure that this key element of the plan is kept up to date”. (Para 49 of the Inspectors Report of the examination into the Ryedale Plan -Local Plan Strategy PS02)</i></p> <p>Housing supply is monitored regularly and reported in detail annually via the Council’s SHLAA (Part 1).(TE06). At 31st March 2017 the Council could demonstrate a deliverable supply of housing land equivalent to 6.0 years</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p>or 6.5 years based on projected plot delivery.</p> <p>This supply has been achieved as a result of the release of sites in advance of the LPSD which align with the strategic policies and strategies for growth in the adopted Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>A review of housing needs in a new Strategic Housing Market Assessment (TE15) undertaken in 2016 has confirmed that that Policy SP2 of the Local Plan Strategy remains up to date.</p>
<p>Identify a supply of developable sites or broad locations for years 6-10 and, where possible, years 11-15 (47).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of a supply of developable sites or broad locations for: a) years 6-10; b) years 11-15 	<p>The LPSD proposes the allocation of residential land to meet residual requirements to the end of the plan period (2027).</p> <p>Appendix 2 of the LPSD outlines the position. (and also takes account of major permissions granted between the supply position as reported in the SHLAA @31 March 2017 and the publication of the plan).</p>
<p>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)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A housing trajectory • Monitoring of completions and permissions (47) • Updated and managed SHLAA. (47) 	<p>The Local Plan Strategy includes a housing trajectory and sets out the Housing Implementation Strategy for the Ryedale Plan. (Policy SP2)</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p>Housing supply, housing completions and the rate of anticipated completions are monitored annually and reported in the SHLAA (Part 1) document. The Housing Trajectory is updated annually in the SHLAA (Part 1).(TE06)</p> <p>The Local Planning Authority has not included a housing trajectory in the Sites Document for this reason. A version of the trajectory will be prepared for the 2108 SHLAA update that includes the proposed allocations and this can be included in the plan if required.</p>
<p>Set out the authority’s approach to housing density to reflect local circumstances (47).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy on the density of development. 	<p>The Local Plan Strategy does not prescribe density standards. The supporting text to Policy SP2 of the Local Plan Strategy provides an indicative guide to density.</p> <p>In considering the housing yield from the proposed residential allocations these indicative densities and have been taken into account together with any layout/masterplan work produced by developers. Policy SD2 of the LPSD makes it clear the yields are indicative and that different numbers may be more appropriate in terms of design and character as detailed schemes are compiled to support subsequent</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		planning applications.
<p>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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy on planning for a mix of housing (including self-build, and housing for older people • SHMA • Identification of the size, type, tenure and range of housing required in particular locations, reflecting local demand. (50) • Evidence for housing provision based on up to date, objectively assessed needs. (50) • Policy on affordable housing and consideration for the need for on-site provision or if off-site provision or financial contributions are sought, where these can these be justified and to what extent do they contribute to the objective of creating mixed and balanced communities. (50) 	<p>Policies SP2 and SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy are used to negotiate an appropriate mix of housing and affordable housing provision. The implementation of these policies is supported by information in the SHMA .(TE15). In 2015 the Council resolved to implement its affordable housing policy in line with the 2014 ministerial statement.</p> <p>The Local Plan Strategy and Sites Document do not contain policies to specifically secure plots for self builders. Since the introduction of the CIL in Ryedale, the majority of those developing small (windfall) plots have applied for self build exemption and this is a source of supply which will in part address self build requirements.</p> <p>A ‘minded to approve’ decision subject to the completion of a Section 106 agreement has been made on one site (land to the north of Swineherd Lane at Kirkbymoorside – Policy SD9 of the LPSD) for 6 self build plots. The Council will also look to negotiate the provision of further self build plots on suitable sites using national policy. It will use the review of the Ryedale Plan to review its housing mix policies and</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p>to allocate further land to address self build requirements.</p> <p>The 2016 SHMA (TE15) reveals that the housing provision in the Local Plan Strategy and the sites proposed in the LPSD will meet objectively assessed need.</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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of allowing some market housing to facilitate the provision of significant additional affordable housing to meet local needs. • Consideration of the case for resisting inappropriate development of residential gardens. (This is discretionary)(para 53) • Examples of special circumstances to allow new isolated homes listed at para 55. 	<p>Policy SP3 of the Local Plan Strategy sets out the framework for the provision of Exception Sites, and the circumstances where the use of market housing would be considered acceptable to cross-subsidise such sites.</p> <p>Policies SP1, SP2 and SP21 of the Local Plan Strategy provide a framework for housing across the District including the wider rural area.</p>
<p>7. Requiring good design (paras 56-68)</p>		
<p>Develop robust and comprehensive policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area (58).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusion of policy or policies which seek to increase the quality of development through the principles set out at para 58 and approaches in paras 59-61, linked to the vision for the area and specific local issues 	<p>Policy SP16 of the adopted Local Plan Strategy provides a strategic design policy for the development plan. It is based on vision and objectives of the plan and locally specific issues. The policy includes 'Visually Important Undeveloped Areas' as designations aimed at retaining undeveloped areas which are considered to make a particular contribution to the form</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p>and character of settlements or the setting of heritage assets.</p> <p>Policies SD3-SD11 of the LPSD establish development principles for the proposed residential land allocations. These principles reflect the fact that each of the sites have their own local context and are aimed at reflecting this, securing opportunities to improve connectivity or, to mitigate impact on the locality/visa versa.</p> <p>The LPSD also proposes the designation of a number of additional VIUA sites. VIUA's are a policy tool used locally to help shape and manage growth and change at settlements across the District. They are a significant way in which the development plan as a whole aims to secure the successful integration of new development into the environment, by recognising the qualities of spaces which make a significant contribution to settlement form and character by virtue of their undeveloped nature.</p>
8. Promoting healthy communities (paras 69-77)		
Policies should aim to design places which: promote community interaction, including	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusion of a policy or policies on inclusive communities. • Promotion of opportunities for meetings between members of 	These matters are addressed through the application of a number of policies

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p>through mixed-use development; are safe and accessible environments; and are accessible developments (69).</p>	<p>the community who might not otherwise come into contact with each other, including through mixed-use developments which bring together those who work, live and play in the vicinity; safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion; and accessible developments, containing clear and legible pedestrian routes, and high quality public space, which encourage the active and continual use of public areas. (69)</p>	<p>in the Local Plan Strategy including SP16 (Design); SP20-(Generic Development Management Policy) and SP15 (Green Infrastructure).</p> <p>The development sites proposed in the LPSD are considered to be in locations which area accessible to existing services and facilities and in this respect will promote interaction and inclusive communities. Development Principles , to be used in conjunction with the application of Policy SP16, have been used to ensure pedestrian connectivity.</p>
<p>Policies should plan positively for the provision and use of shared space, community facilities and other local services (70).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusion of a policy or policies addressing community facilities and local service. • Positive planning for the provision and integration of community facilities and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments; safeguard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services; ensure that established shops, facilities and services are able to develop and modernize; and ensure that housing is developed in suitable locations which offer a range of community facilities and good access to key services and infrastructure. 	<p>Policy SP10 of the Local Plan Strategy recognises the need to make additional school provision based on planned levels of growth. (Revised school infrastructure requirements based on the Education Authority’s latest school roles/ forecasts have been included in an addendum to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.(TE11a)</p> <p>Land for an additional primary school at Norton will be secured through the proposed land allocation to the east of Beverley Road in Norton.(Policies SD2 and SD3 of the LPSD)</p> <p>The proposed site specific policies in the LPSD reflect the spatial strategy</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p>and settlement hierarchy of the adopted Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p><i>“The settlement hierarchyreflects the levels of accessibility and services at each settlement and..... is soundly based “(Para 27 Inspector’s report on the examination into the Ryedale Plan- Local Plan Strategy PS02) . “The preferred strategy...makes effective use of existing services and facilities and accessibility as well as sustaining and enhancing their existing roles in line with the NPPF” .(Para 28 Inspector’s report on the examination into the Ryedale Plan- Local Plan Strategy (PS02)</i></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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area. (73) • A policy protecting existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land from development, with specific exceptions. (74) • Protection and enhancement of rights of way and access. (75) 	<p>These matters are addressed through Policies SP10 (Physical Infrastructure) and SP11 (Community Facilities and Services) of the adopted Local Plan Strategy. <i>“These local open space standards are positively prepared, based on up-to-date evidence, justified, effective and consistent with national policy, without being unduly onerous for developers”.</i> (Para 99 Inspector’s report on the examination in to the Ryedale Plan- Local Plan Strategy.(PS02)</p> <p>Read as a whole, the standards in the Local Plan Strategy will be used to</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p>secure on-site recreational space on the proposed residential land allocations in the LPSD.</p> <p>The proposed allocation of land for development in the LPSD would not result in the loss of existing public open space or recreational space.</p> <p>Where allocations have a PRoW running through the site (SD7 and SD10) this has been identified explicitly within the development principles that PRoW is to be retained in principle.</p> <p>Policies SD3,SD5,SD6,SD7,SD10 and SD11 of the LPSD contain development principles for the larger proposed residential sites. These policies include a requirement to incorporate cycle and pedestrian only routes within sites and to improve connectivity to the surrounding area, including the Public Rights of Way network, where appropriate.</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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy enabling the protection of Local Green Spaces. (Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared or reviewed, and be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period. The designation should only be used when it accords with the criteria in para 77). Policy for managing development within a local green space should be consistent with policy for Green Belts. (78) 	<p>The Local Plan Strategy does not refer to the designation. This is because the strategic plan was at an advanced stage in its production when the designation was introduced in the NPPF. With no policy ‘hook’ for such sites in the Local Plan Strategy, sites</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		for Local Green Space have not been identified in the LPSD. The Council will work with local communities that are looking to identify sites for Local Green Space in Neighbourhood Plans and will consider the use of the designation as part of a full plan review. The Inspector appointed to examine the Local Plan Strategy drew comparisons between Local Green Space and Ryedale’s local VIUA policy and a number of VIUA’s are likely to meet the criteria for Local Green Space.
9. Protecting Green Belt land (paras 79-92)		
<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>When drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where Green Belt policies are included, these should reflect the need to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt. (81) ○ Accord with criteria on boundary setting, and the need for clarity on the status of safeguarded land, in particular. (85) ○ Specify that inappropriate development should not be approved except in very special circumstances. (87) ○ Specify the exceptions to inappropriate development (89-90) ○ Identify where very special circumstances might apply to renewable energy development. (91) 	<p>A small proportion of the York Green Belt is within the Ryedale Plan area. It is located in the south of the District adjacent to the boundary with the City of York.</p> <p>The extent of the Green Belt in Ryedale and the definition of the outer boundary of the York Green Belt in Ryedale was first established through the adoption of an earlier development plan (The Ryedale Local Plan 2002). This was carried forward when the Local Plan Strategy was adopted. (Para 29 of the Inspector’s</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p>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>report on the examination into the Ryedale Plan- Local Plan Strategy PS02)</p> <p>The LPSD does not propose the release of any Green Belt land or changes to the boundary of the Green Belt in Ryedale.</p>
<p>10. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change (paras 93-108)</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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning of new development in locations and ways which reduce greenhouse gas emissions. • Support for energy efficiency improvements to existing building. • Local requirements for a building’s sustainability which are consistent with the Government’s zero carbon buildings policy . (95)) 	<p>The sites proposed in the LPSD align with the spatial strategy established in the Local Plan Strategy. The strategy was considered to be sound , in part because its spatial strategy was considered to support development in locations which would reduce the need to travel.</p> <p><i>“The preferred strategy.....reduces the need to travel and ensures a sustainable pattern of development” (Para 28 Inspectors report on the examination into the Ryedale Plan, Local Plan Strategy PS02)</i></p> <p>The Local Plan Strategy includes Policy SP18 which, in part covers some of these issues.</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
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)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A strategy and policies to promote and maximise energy from renewable and low carbon sources, • Identification of suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy sources, and supporting infrastructure, where this would help secure the development of such sources (see also NPPF footnote 17) • Identification of where development can draw its energy supply from decentralised, renewable or low carbon supply systems and for co-locating potential heat customers and suppliers. (97) 	<p>The Local Plan Strategy includes Policy SP18 which covers some of these issues.</p> <p>The LPSD does not include specific on-site renewable energy targets.</p> <p>The identification of areas suitable for renewable and low carbon energy is to be addressed in a separate DPD (PD03b)/ review of the plan.</p>
Minimise vulnerability to climate change and manage the risk of flooding (99)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Account taken of the impacts of climate change. (99) • Allocate, and where necessary re-locate, development away from flood risk areas through a sequential test, based on a SFRA. (100) • Policies to manage risk, from a range of impacts, through suitable adaptation measures 	<p>The Council has applied the sequential test to sites put forward for consideration as part of the plan process. This is integral to its Sustainability Appraisal/Site Selection Methodology Framework. (SD03) This is informed by Strategic Flood Risk assessments (TE14 &TE14a) and the latest flood maps published by the Environment Agency.</p>
Take account of marine planning (105)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure early and close co-operation on relevant economic, social and environmental policies with the Marine Management Organisation • Review the aims and objectives of the Marine Policy Statement, including local potential for marine-related economic development • Integrate as appropriate marine policy objectives into emerging 	<p>Ryedale does not overlap a UK Marine Area. The MMO is aware of the Ryedale Plan although it has not sought to engage in the process on the basis that it is unlikely that the plan will affect a marine area. The Habitats Regulations Assessment has considered the potential impact of the</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
	<p>policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support of integrated coastal management (ICM) in coastal areas in line with the requirements of the MPS 	<p>LPSD on the Humber Estuary due to the course of the River Derwent. (PD10)</p>
<p>Manage risk from coastal change (106)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of where the coast is likely to experience physical changes and identify Coastal Change Management Areas, and clarity on what development will be allowed in such areas. • Provision for development and infrastructure that needs to be re-located from such areas, based on SMPs and Marine Plans, where appropriate. 	<p>Ryedale does not have any coastal environment/habitat and there is no requirement for infrastructure to be relocated from such areas into Ryedale.</p>
<p>11. Conserving and enhancing the natural environment (paras 109-125)</p>		
<p>Protect valued landscapes (109)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A strategy and policy or policies to create, protect, enhance and manage networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure. • Policy which seeks to minimise the loss of higher quality agricultural land and give great weight to protecting the landscape and scenic beauty of National Parks, the Broads and AONBs. 	<p>The site selection /assessment process has taken into account agricultural land grades and the need to minimise the loss of higher quality agricultural land has been balanced against other objectives.(SD03)</p> <p>The LPSD does not propose to allocate development sites which are considered to have an adverse effect on the setting of the North York Moors National Park or the Howardian Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p> <p>Policy SP13 (Landscapes) of the Local Plan Strategy was considered to be soundly based. (PS02). The LPS identifies local Areas of High Landscape Value which cover most of the District outside of the National</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		Park and AONB. Most of the sites proposed for development in the LPSD fall within one of these locally valued landscapes. The policy does not preclude development. It is designed to ensure that the effect of new development is carefully considered on the landscape.
Prevent unacceptable risks from pollution and land instability (109)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy which seeks development which is appropriate for its location having regard to the effects of pollution on health, the natural environment or general amenity. 	<p>These matters are covered by Policy SP17 of the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>The juxtaposition of potential development sites to neighbouring land uses has been taken into account in the application of the site selection methodology. (SD03)</p>
<p>Planning policies should minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity (117)</p> <p>Planning policies should plan for biodiversity at a landscape-scale across local authority boundaries (117)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identification and mapping of local ecological networks and geological conservation interests. Policies to promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the recovery of priority species 	<p>Policies SP14 and SP15 of the Local Plan Strategy address these matters. “<i>...the suite of environmental policies provides an appropriate, justified, effective and soundly-based framework for protecting and enhancing the natural, built and historic environment in Ryedale, including addressing landscape, biodiversity....., which is consistent with national policy</i>”. (Para 113 of the Inspectors report in to the examination of the Ryedale Plan –</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p>Local Plan Strategy)</p> <p>All of the sites put forward for consideration as part of the preparation of the LPSD have been assessed in terms of ecological sensitivity (SD03 – Site selection Methodology tables). A Habitat Regulation Assessment has been undertaken and Natural England is satisfied with the conclusions of the Appropriate Assessment.(PD10 &PD10a)</p>
12. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment (paras 126-141)		
<p>Include a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk (126)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A strategy for the historic environment based on a clear understanding of the cultural assets in the plan area, including assets most at risk. • A map/register of historic assets • A policy or policies which promote new development that will make a positive contribution to character and distinctiveness. (126) 	<p>The adopted Local Plan Strategy embodies a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment. This is reflected in the Aims and Objectives established for the Plan and addressed in particular by Policies SP12 (Heritage) and SP13 (Landscapes) and SP16 (Design). “...the suite of environmental policies provides an appropriate, justified, effective and soundly-based framework for protecting and enhancing the natural, built and historic environment in Ryedale, including addressing heritage assets, landscape....., which is consistent with national policy”. (Para 113 of the Inspectors report in to the</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p>examination of the Ryedale Plan – Local Plan Strategy)</p> <p>The Local Planning Authority has considered the effect that new development sites would have on heritage assets as part of the site selection process and the application of the site selection methodology. The Council’s Building Conservation Officer and archaeologists from North Yorkshire County Council have provided information to inform this process.</p> <p>The Council has prepared further detailed assessments of the effect that development sites proposed in the LPSD will have on specific heritage assets. This is in response to representations made by Historic England. The work expands upon the conclusions/site commentaries included in the Site Selection methodology and settlement background papers.</p> <p>Where appropriate, the mitigation of impacts on heritage assets is addressed through the use of development principles to guide/shape development of the site. For example, Policy SD11 establishes a development principle for the site</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p>which aims to protect the mature trees aligning The Balk which are a significant feature of this part of the Slingsby Conservation Area.</p> <p>The LPSD proposes a number of additional 'Visually Important Undeveloped Areas'. A number of these sites are proposed on the basis of that as undeveloped areas, they contribute to the setting of Heritage Assets.(TE03).</p>
13. Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals (paras 142-149)		
<p>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)</p> <p>Minerals planning authorities should plan for a steady and adequate supply of industrial materials (146)</p>	<p>Account taken of the matters raised in relation to paragraph 143 and 145, including matters in relation to land in national / international designations; landbanks; the defining of Minerals Safeguarding Areas; wider matters relating to safeguarding; approaches if non-mineral development is necessary within Minerals Safeguarding Areas; the setting of environmental criteria; development of noise limits; reclamation of land; plan for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates. This could include evidence of co-operation with neighbouring and more distant authorities.</p>	<p>Ryedale District Council is not a Minerals and Waste Planning Authority. However, the District Council has engaged in the production of the Joint Minerals and Waste Plan, and there has been engagement and awareness of the spatial approach utilising land currently subject to emerging safeguarding policies, but which is adjacent to the built-edge of settlements and not suitable for extraction. (SD03)</p>
<p>Justified: <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"> • 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. • The most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives. 		

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p><i>Participation</i></p> <p>Has the consultation process allowed for effective engagement of all interested parties?</p>	<p>The consultation statement. This should set out what consultation was undertaken, when, with whom and how it has influenced the plan. The statement should show that efforts have been made to consult hard to reach groups, key stakeholders etc. Reference SCI</p>	<p>The justification for the location and distribution of development in the Ryedale Plan formed a significant part of the examination into the soundness of the Local Plan Strategy. (PS02 Inspectors Report on the examination into the Ryedale Plan). Against this background, the Local Planning Authority consider that the strategic approach to the location and distribution of development has been justified, including through effective engagement of interested parties.</p> <p>To ensure that the relationship between the strategic and site specific parts of the development plan were understood and participation and awareness maximised, early consultation on the Ryedale Plan included site specific as well strategic policy options. This included a series of 19 exhibitions across Ryedale which displayed all sites put forward for consideration by landowners/ developers, mainly as part of calls for sites. (SD04 Consultation Statement). These exhibitions allowed the Council to compile a large consultation database of individuals who expressed an interest in being informed of the plan process. All individuals have been consulted at each stage of the plan</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p>process since.</p> <p>A framework for the assessment of sites - the 'Site Selection Methodology' (SSM) was subject to prepared at an early stage in the plan process and subject to consultation before being finalised. The SSM Framework has also evolved following consultation on a revised SA Scoping Report in January 2014 prior to application of the SSM. (TE01).</p> <p>This early work, together with publicity associated with the examination and adoption of the Local Plan Strategy together with publicity associated with major planning applications for development, including appeals, has raised awareness of the proposed development sites and the site selection/plan process.</p> <p>The Council has used its web-site to make sites information continually available and has regularly updated this as new sites have been put forward by landowners/ developers. All sites have been mapped on a settlement basis. These plans/ maps are familiar to Parish and Town Councils, landowners, partners and to local residents and others with an</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p>interest in the site specific part of the plan process. https://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/local-plan-sites</p> <p>Consultation on site specific policy choices was undertaken in 2015 (PD07 2015 Sites Consultation) and this was followed by consultation on proposed new 'Visually Important Undeveloped Areas' in 2016.(PD08 2016 VIUA Consultation).</p> <p>The Publication Version of the Plan was produced following this consultation and was supported by updated sites information (SD03 Sustainability Appraisal and Site Selection Methodology tables) and a series of settlement background papers (PD09 Settlement Background papers). A summary of comments received following consultation was included in a report to Members as they agreed the plan. (PD03)</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? 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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The studies, reports and technical papers that provide the evidence for the policies set out in the DPD, the date of preparation and who they were produced by. <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sections of the DPD (at various stages of development) and SA Report which illustrate how evidence supports the strategy, policies and proposals, including key assumptions. 	<p>The site specific proposals in the plan are supported by a range of evidence. The evidence base includes a range of information relating to the constraints/opportunities, infrastructure requirements and deliverability. It has been compiled using information commissioned by</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
	<p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A very brief statement of how the main findings of consultation support the policies, with reference to: reports to the council on the issues raised during participation, covering both the front-loading and formulation phases; and any other information on community views and preferences. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For each policy (or group of policies dealing with the same issue), a very 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>the Council, provided by Duty to Co-Operate partners or by developers/landowners themselves.</p> <p>It includes a range of technical studies covering Highway Assessments, Air Quality Assessment, Habitat Regulation and Appropriate Assessment, Flood Risk Assessment and Landscape Assessment.</p> <p>The evidence base includes relevant information used to support the production of the Local Plan Strategy as well as more recent studies that have been specifically commissioned to consider the implications of site specific policy choices. The Highway assessments that have been commissioned to inform the plan are a specific example. The examination document list prepared by the Council lists the range of technical information that has been used to support the preparation of the Sites Document.</p> <p>Site- specific factual information is included in the Site Selection Methodology tables (SD03). These tables have been used to pull together and hold a range of information relating to individual sites. The series of settlement background papers (TE02) have been prepared to assist</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p>the comparison of sites on a settlement-wide basis.</p> <p>The evidence base as a whole is sufficient in scope to allow informed choices to be made as part of the process.</p> <p>Consultation material (PD07 and PD08) and reports to Committee (PD03) outline how evidence has been used to balance a range of issues and considerations in order to select sites. The Sites Document itself (SD01) also provides a 'headline' justification for the allocation of specific sites.</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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports and consultation documents produced in the early stages setting out how alternatives were developed and evaluated, and the reasons for selecting the preferred strategy, and reasons for rejecting the alternatives. This should include options covering not just the spatial strategy, but also the quantum of development, strategic policies and development management policies. • An audit trail of how the evidence base, consultation and SA have influenced the plan. • Sections of the SA Report showing the assessment of options and alternatives. • Reports on how decisions on the inclusion of policy were made. • Sections of the consultation document demonstrating how options were developed and appraised. 	<p>The approach to the assessment of sites was established in the early stages of the Ryedale plan process. (PD03). The Site Selection Methodology (SSM) framework has been prepared to assess/align site choices with the objectives of the Ryedale Plan and is designed to form part of the Sustainability Appraisal of sites put forward for consideration as part of the process. All of the sites put forward by landowners/ developers within the Market Towns and Service Villages Parishes have been through the SSM process. The SSM tables have</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any other documentation showing how alternatives were developed and evaluated, including a report on how sustainability appraisal has influenced the choice of strategy and the content of policies. 	<p>been regularly updated to reflect any changes to the information supporting sites. Copies of earlier iterations of the SSM tables have been retained and are available.</p> <p>The Sites Consultation in 2015 (PD07) was used to consult on the (then) preferred development sites at the villages and options for combinations of development sites at the towns. The SSM tables were made available as part of the consultation and explanations provided to support the sites/options chosen.</p> <p>Since the 2015 consultation the SSM tables have been updated to reflect any further information, including evidence and residual development requirements. This did lead to changes in the sites which were taken forward and proposed as allocations.</p> <p>A similar approach was followed in terms of the proposed 'VIUA' designations.</p> <p>Consultation material (PD07 and PD08), the Sustainability Appraisal Report (SD03) and report to Committee (PD03) outline how a range of issues have been considered/balanced as part of the</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		process of selecting the sites proposed in the plan. The Sites Document itself (SD01) also provides a general explanation for the proposed allocation of specific sites.
<p>Effective: <i>the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities.</i></p> <p>To be 'effective' a DPD needs to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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"> • 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? • Are the policies internally consistent? • Are there realistic timescales related to the objectives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sections of the DPD which address delivery, the means of delivery and the timescales for key developments and initiatives. • Confirmation from the relevant agencies that they support the objectives and the identified means of delivery, such as evidence that the plans and programmes of other bodies have been taken into account (e.g. Water Resources Management Plans and Marine Plans). • Information in the local development scheme, or provided separately, about the scope and content (actual and intended) of 	<p>The relationship between the Sites Document and Policies Map to the Local Plan Strategy and Helmsley Plan is outlined in each of the documents that form the Ryedale Plan and in the Local Development Scheme.</p> <p>The site selection process has included sustainability appraisal (SA) which</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the DPD explain how its key policy objectives will be achieved? 	<p>each DPD showing how they combine to provide a coherent policy structure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section in the DPD that shows the linkages between the objectives and the corresponding policies, and consistency between policies (such as through a matrix). 	<p>incorporates a Site Selection Methodology (SSM), complied to inform the plan process. The SA/SSM process has ensured that the objectives of the Ryedale Plan (Section 3 of the Local Plan Strategy) have informed the site selection process. This is evidenced in the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report and in the Site Selection Methodology tables.</p> <p>The delivery framework for the Ryedale Plan is established in the Local Plan Strategy. The documents produced as part of the Plan are designed to be read as a whole.</p> <p>The site allocations proposed in the plan cover the plan period (to 2027). The Sites Document does not propose any phasing restrictions on the delivery of sites.</p> <p>The deliverability of sites proposed for allocation in the Sites Document or identified as commitments on the Policies Map, has informed the site selection process.</p> <p>The Local Planning Authority can evidence that all of the proposed residential land allocations and committed residential sites</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p>are/remain available for development.</p> <p>All of the proposed residential land allocations have been submitted by landowners/ developers in response to call for sites. All of the proposed sites and existing commitments are controlled or owned by developers or landowners who have expressed an interest to develop/ sell land for residential use.</p> <p>In addition, the Local Planning Authority is not aware of any legal restrictions to the development of any of these sites. A covenant exists on the Ryedale House site at Malton although this does not relate to the principle of the development of the site for housing.</p> <p>All of the proposed and committed residential sites are in locations which conform with Policy SP1 of the Local Plan Strategy and on that basis are considered to be suitable locations for residential development.</p> <p>The Site Selection Methodology (part of and appended to the Sustainability Appraisal SD03) has considered the suitability of the proposed residential sites and alternative sites, against factors such as flood risk, residential</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p>amenity, heritage, landscape and nature conservation. The application of the methodology has also been informed by work with North Yorkshire County Council , particularly in terms of the heritage sensitivities and implications/ opportunities for infrastructure .</p> <p>Document TE04 known as ‘Settlement Analysis’ was prepared for the Local Plan Strategy examination and played a key role in establishing the relationship between sites in the 2009 SHLAA (TE05) and a range of landscape constraints.</p> <p>A range of other technical studies have been used to inform the application of the Site Selection Methodology and in the assessing the suitability of residential sites. These include a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (TE14); Habitat Regulation Assessment and Appropriate Assessment (SD06) ;</p> <p>The suite of Settlement Background Papers (TE02) have been produced to draw this information together on a place specific basis.</p> <p>A more detailed explanation of the conclusions of the Site Selection</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p>Methodology has been prepared (TE16) to address concerns raised by Historic England about the impact on heritage assets of two residential site allocations at Slingsby and Pickering.</p> <p>The Local Planning Authority is confident that development of the proposed residential allocations is achievable. A number of the larger proposed allocations are being promoted by major national housebuilders and the Ryedale Strategic Housing Market Assessment (TE15) notes that the District has a high demand housing market. There is no evidence to indicate that the proposed allocations would not be attractive to the market.</p> <p>The proposed allocations are not supported by site specific viability assessments, with the exception of the proposed allocation at Norton. The sites are largely typical of the sites that were used to inform the viability work which supported the Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule. (TE18: CIL Viability Assessment Addendum Report) This work took account of the Council’s affordable housing policy and was fully considered as part of the CIL examination. (TE17 :CIL Examination</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p>Inspectors Report)</p> <p>The Council has no evidence which suggests that development on the committed sites (used to inform residual housing requirements) is not achievable. Sites with planning permission which are not considered to be deliverable are discussed in the SHLAA Part 1 Update 2017. (TE06)</p> <p>The deliverability of a large number of the sites put forward for consideration as part of the plan process is assessed in the 2009 SHLAA (TE05). The deliverability of sites submitted after the completion of that study was considered using the same methodology and included as part of the application of the Site Selection Methodology, which covered all sites within the Parishes of the Market Town or Service Villages.</p> <p>The SHLAA Part 1 Update (2017) (TE06) considers the deliverability of committed housing sites (and two housing allocations in the Helmsley Local Plan (PS03)).</p>
<p><i>Infrastructure Delivery</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have the infrastructure implications of the policies clearly been identified? • Are the delivery mechanisms and timescales 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A section or sections of the DPD where infrastructure needs are identified and the proposed solutions put forward. • A schedule setting out responsibilities for delivery, mechanisms and timescales, and related to a CIL schedule where appropriate. 	<p>The Local Plan Strategy (PS01) sets out the infrastructure requirements required to support planned growth to</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p>for implementation of the policies clearly identified?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is it clear who is going to deliver the required infrastructure and does the timing of the provision complement the timescale of the policies? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmation from infrastructure providers that they support the solutions proposed and the identified means and timescales for their delivery, or a plan for resolving issues. • Demonstrable plan-wide viability, particularly in relation to the delivery of affordable housing and the role of a CIL schedule. 	<p>2027.</p> <p>An Infrastructure Delivery Plan (TE20) was produced to support the LPS and it forms the basis of the Council’s CIL Regulation 123 list.(TE19)</p> <p>A brief update to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (TE20a) has been prepared to clarify changes to infrastructure requirements arising from the specific sites/combinations of sites proposed in the sites document. It also updates the requirements of infrastructure providers.</p> <p>The viability work which supported the Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule. (TE18: CIL Viability Assessment Addendum Report) work took account of adopted policy requirements and was fully considered as part of the CIL examination. (TE17 :CIL Examination Inspectors Report)</p>
<p><i>Co-ordinated Planning</i></p> <p>Does the DPD reflect the concept of spatial planning? Does it go beyond traditional land use planning by bringing together and integrating policies for the development and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sections of the DPD that reflect the plans or strategies of the local authority and other bodies • Policies which seek to pull together different policy objectives • Expressions of support/representations from bodies responsible 	<p>The proposed site allocations and the process of preparing the document reflects the concept of spatial planning. Site specific choices have been made taking into account of the</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p>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>for other strategies affecting the area</p>	<p>implications of development and the opportunities provided by specific site choices.</p> <p>The Council has worked closely with North Yorkshire County Council (and within the context of their plans and strategies such as the Local Transport Plan, TE21) to consider the implications of sites/ site combinations in different locations on highways and school infrastructure.</p> <p>For example, the combination of sites proposed at Pickering is acceptable in terms of highway impact at the central Vivis Lane junction and can be accommodated without triggering a need for a new primary school at the Town. (Any additional sites at Pickering would trigger a need for a new school. Whilst land for a new school is available as part of an alternative site (which has not been taken forward) the County Council's priority for CIL/School funding is the provision of a new primary school at Norton. There would be insufficient CIL to fund two new schools and a new school at Malton/Norton is the priority for the County Council.</p> <p>At Malton and Norton, the allocation of the site at Beverley Road will allow</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p>land for a new primary school to be secured which will then be funded predominantly by CIL. The perimeter link road to be provided as part of the scheme is necessary to accommodate the development proposed in terms of highway impact. Notwithstanding this the road will also be a significant addition to the local highway network.</p> <p>The above – the relationship between site choices at Malton and Norton and the resulting implications for infrastructure provide a good example of the way in which choices in the plan are co-ordinated so as to ensure development is sustainable.</p> <p>The Development Principles of the proposed sites have identified opportunities for Green Infrastructure, two key examples are the site SD6 and SD3. SD6 at Pickering, specifically retains and expands a corridor to the east of Pickering Beck to enhance a pre-existing recreational resource; provide flood water management (as the land is flood zone 2) and provides an important buffer zone between the proposed allocation and a Grade II Listed Building- multifunctional green space. Site SD3 is proposed to have a range of Green Infrastructure, including opportunities to manage</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		surface water, and also provide informal recreational opportunities to reduce any potential impact on the River Derwent, and improve connectivity with the open countryside.
<p><i>Flexibility</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the DPD flexible enough to respond to a variety of, or unexpected changes in, circumstances? • Does the DPD include the remedial actions that will be taken if the policies need adjustment? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sections of the DPD setting out the assumptions of the plan and identifying the circumstances when policies might need to be reviewed. • Sections of the annual monitoring report and sustainability appraisal report describing how the council will monitor: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the effectiveness of policies and what evidence is being collected to undertake this b. changes affecting the baseline information and any information on trends on which the DPD is based • Risk analysis of the strategy and policies to demonstrate robustness and how the plan could cope with changing circumstances • Sections within the DPD dealing with possible change areas and how they would be dealt with, including mechanisms for the rate of development to be increased or slowed and how that would impact on other aspects of the strategy and on infrastructure provision • Sections of the DPD identifying the key indicators of success of the strategy, and the remedial actions which will be taken if adjustment is required. 	<p>The document has been prepared as part of several which together form the development plan. As a whole, the development plan provides flexibility to deal with changing circumstances.</p> <p>The Plan provides significant flexibility in terms of housing land supply, with an additional supply of 20% being identified. Policies in the Local Plan Strategy (PS01) provide a framework to support the release of further land to meet development requirements should any of the allocated sites or committed sites fail to come forward.</p> <p>This includes: Policy SP2 (Delivery and Distribution of New Housing) of the LPS and the accompanying Implementation and Monitoring table; Policy SP6 (Delivery and Distribution of Employment /Industrial Land and Premises) and SP7 (Town Centres and Retailing).</p> <p>At the outset of the Ryedale Plan process, it was anticipated that the</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p>release of development sites would be phased over the plan period. Given that the Sites Document has been produced five years into the plan period, it does not seek to phase the release of proposed sites. In this respect the Plan is flexible.</p> <p>Furthermore, the proposed housing sites, together with commitments provide for a range of sites of different sizes in different locations. This is considered to provide flexibility in terms of meeting housing market demand.</p>
<p><i>Co-operation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the Duty to Co-operate has been undertaken appropriately for the plan being examined? • 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? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A succinct Duty to Co-operate Statement which flows from the strategic issues that have been addressed jointly. A 'tick box' approach or a collection of correspondence is not sufficient, and it needs to be shown (where appropriate) if joint plan-making arrangements have been considered, what decisions were reached and why. • The Duty to Co-operate Statement could highlight: the sharing of ideas, evidence and pooling of resources; the practical policy outcomes of co-operation; how decisions were reached and why; and evidence of having effectively co-operated to plan for issues which need other organisations to deliver on, common objectives for elements of strategy and policy; a memorandum of understanding; aligned or joint core strategies and liaison with other consultees as appropriate. 	<p>See Duty to Co-Operate Statement which has been prepared as part of the legal compliance statement. (PD05).</p> <p>The strategic policies of the Local Plan Strategy form the basis for the proposed policies in the Sites Document. In this respect, it of note that the Inspector appointed to examine the LPS concluded that the legal requirements of the Duty to Co-Operate were met when that document was prepared and that “<i>there is conclusive evidence to show that RDC has engaged actively and</i></p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<i>constructively on an ongoing basis with a range of neighbouring authorities and other organisations to address key strategic development and infrastructure requirements for Ryedale". (PS02)</i>
<p><i>Monitoring</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the DPD contain targets, and milestones which relate to the delivery of the policies, (including housing trajectories where the DPD contains housing allocations)? • 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? • 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? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sections of the DPD setting out indicators, targets and milestones • Sections of the current annual monitoring report which report on indicators, targets, milestones and trajectories • Reference to any other reports or technical documents which contain information on the delivery of policies • Sections of the current annual monitoring report and the sustainability appraisal report setting out the framework for monitoring, including monitoring the effects of the DPD against the sustainability appraisal 	<p>The monitoring framework for the Ryedale Plan is established in the Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>The Council uses its Annual Monitoring report (TE21) to report the information it monitors. However, from 2016-17, and in the context of reduced resources, the scope of the information monitored has been significantly reduced in the interim.</p> <p>The Council regularly monitors housing delivery and housing land supply. The position is reported annually in the SHLAA Part 1 Update and each annual revision of the document includes a revised housing trajectory (TE06). The latest trajectory can be revised to include the proposed housing land allocations and included in the Sites Document if this is considered to be necessary.</p> <p>No significant effects were identified through the Habitats Regulation Assessment for the majority of</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		allocations. However, due to the proximity of the River Derwent SAC, an Appropriate Assessment concluded that with a range of informal recreational provision, the Norton Lodge Site (Policy SD3) would not lead to a significant effect on the SAC conservation objectives. The Council will be monitoring open space provision and developing on the back of the LPSD a Green Infrastructure Strategy.
<p><i>Consistent with national policy: the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.</i></p> <p>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.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the DPD contain any policies or proposals which are not consistent with national policy and, if so, is there local justification? • Does the DPD contain policies that do not add anything to existing national guidance? If so, why have these been included? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sections of the DPD which explain where and how national policy has been elaborated upon and the reasons. • Studies forming evidence for the DPD or, where appropriate, other information which provides the rationale for departing from national policy. • Evidence provided from the sustainability appraisal (including reference to the sustainability report) and/or from the results of community involvement. • Where appropriate, evidence of consistency with national marine policy as articulated in the UK Marine Policy Statement • Reports or copies of correspondence as to how representations have been considered and dealt with. 	<p>The Sites Document and Policies Map do not contain policies which are inconsistent with national policy in the National Planning Policy Framework. There are no policies proposed in the Sites Document which are considered to represent a departure from National Policy.</p> <p>The Sites Document contains local site specific policies/ proposals which are aligned with the adopted Local Plan Strategy. The LPS was considered to be consistent with national policy as part of the examination into the soundness of that document. The LPS itself includes Policy SP19 (The Presumption in Favour of Sustainable</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p>Development) which mirrors the model presumption drafted by the Planning Inspectorate and which is consistent with the presumption as drafted in national policy.</p> <p>The Inspector appointed to examine the Local Plan Strategy concluded : <i>“I can conclude that with the recommended Main Modifications set out in the Appendix, The Ryedale Plan-Local Plan Strategy satisfies the requirements of Section 20(5) of the 2004 Act and meets the criteria for soundness in the National Planning Policy Framework”</i>. (Report on the examination into the Ryedale Plan – Local Plan Strategy. August 2013).</p> <p>On 5 March 2018, the Government issued a set of revisions to the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>Whilst the Local Planning Authority is aware that the revised NPPF is in draft form, it notes that revisions have been made to clarify the application of the tests of soundness to different plans. The LPA considers that this does not represent a change in policy but rather clarification of the way in which the existing tests of soundness should be applied. This is a point which is particularly relevant to the</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p>examination into the assessment of the soundness of the Sites Document and to this Self-Assessment of Soundness. The relevant paragraph 37 reads as follows:</p> <p><i>“These tests of soundness will be applied to local policies in a proportionate way, taking into account the extent to which they are consistent with relevant strategic policies for the area”</i></p> <p>The ministerial statement (WCWS42) on wind energy was made by Greg Clark on 18/6/15. The statement was made post adoption of the Local Plan Strategy and after a substantial amount of work and consultation on the Sites Document (the policy scope of which mirrors the submitted plan). Against that context, the Local Planning Authority resolved to prepare a Renewable Energy DPD to include the identification of areas suitable for wind energy development) and included this within the Local Development Scheme. For a range of reasons, (including a need to identify a five year housing land supply , together with a significant decline in planning applications for energy generation from wind), the LPA has prioritised the production of the</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p>Sites Document ahead of this further DPD. It relies on Policy SP18 (Renewable and Low Carbon Energy) of the Local Plan Strategy, together with national policy / the ministerial statement to inform the determination of any planning applications for wind energy generation.</p> <p>Other changes to national policy which have already been introduced through ministerial statements have had implications for the application of existing adopted policies of the Local Plan Strategy (e.g. ministerial statement on affordable housing) and are not specific to the scope/content of the Sites Document.</p> <p>The Local Planning Authority's response to individual representations that have raised concerns about consistency with national policy are included as an Appendix to the submitted Consultation Statement.(SD05)</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 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 (March 2014)

Policy Expectations	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p>Policy A: Using evidence to plan positively and manage development (para 6)</p>		<p>A Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment undertaken in 2008, informed Policy SP5 (Sites for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople) of the adopted Local Plan Strategy.</p> <p>A further assessment was undertaken in 2016 (TE09) to inform whether further sites would need to be identified in the Sites Document. The assessment concluded that there was no requirement to provide/identify additional pitch provision in the Sites Document.</p>
<p>Early and effective community engagement with both settled and traveller communities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early and effective engagement undertaken, including discussing travellers’ accommodation needs with travellers themselves, their representative bodies and local support groups. 	<p>The evidence base has been compiled following early engagement with traveller communities.</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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstration of a clear understanding of the needs of the traveller community over the lifespan of your development plan. • Collaborative working with neighbouring local planning authorities. • A robust evidence base to establish accommodation needs to inform the preparation of your local plan and make planning 	<p>See Above</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Policy Expectations	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
	decisions.	
Policy B: Planning for traveller sites (paras 7-11)		
<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>Ensure that traveller sites are sustainable economically, socially and environmentally.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification, and annual update, of a supply of specific, deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5 years worth of sites against locally set target. Identification of a supply of specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth for years 6-10, and, where possible, for years 11-15. • An assessment of the need for traveller sites, and where an unmet need has been demonstrated a supply of specific, deliverable sites been identified. • Policy which takes into account criteria a-h of para 11 	See above
Policy C: Sites in rural areas and the countryside (para 12)		
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.		See above
Policy D: Rural exception sites (para 13)		
If there is a lack of affordable land to meet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If a rural exception site policy is used, and if so clarity that such sites 	See above

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Policy Expectations	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p>local traveller needs, LPAs in rural areas, where viable and practical, should consider allocating and releasing sites solely for affordable travellers' sites.</p>	<p>shall be used for affordable traveller sites in perpetuity.</p>	
<p>Policy E: Traveller sites in Green Belt (paras 14-15)</p>		
<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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt boundary revisions made in response to a specific identified need for a traveller site, undertaken through the plan making process. 	<p>See above.</p>
<p>Policy F: Mixed planning use traveller sites (paras 16-18)</p>		
<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of the need for sites for mixed residential and business use (having regard to safety and amenity of the occupants and neighbouring residents), or separate sites in close proximity to one another. • N.B. Mixed use should not be permitted on rural exception sites 	<p>See above</p>
<p>Policy G: Major development projects (para</p>		

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Policy Expectations	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
19)		
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where a major development proposal requires the permanent or temporary relocation of a traveller site, the identification of a site or sites suitable for re-location of the community. 	See above

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist

Integration of marine and terrestrial planning

As the UK marine area and marine plan area boundaries extend up to the level of mean high water spring tides while terrestrial planning boundaries generally extend to mean low water spring tides (including estuaries), the marine plan area will physically overlap with that of some terrestrial plan. Local authorities with any tidal frontage, even if far inland and not conventionally regarded as coastal, must therefore take full account of the MMO, the MPS and marine plans under S.58 of the Marine and Coastal Access Act and the Duty to Co-operate in Section 110 of the Localism Act 2011. A full list of the local planning authorities whose areas overlap with the UK marine area appears in Appendix One.

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Furthermore, the Duty to Co-Operate requires all local planning authorities, even if landlocked, to take account, where relevant, of the MMO's plans and activities when preparing their Local Plans. Finally, the NPPF requires LPAs to take the MPS into account under the tests of soundness (specifically, to test if an emerging DPD is consistent with national policy, which includes the MPS).

The Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 (the Act) provided for the introduction of a marine planning system for England's inshore and offshore marine area, establishing the Secretary of State as the Marine Planning Authority for these areas. The Act also provided for the establishment of the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) and for the Secretary of State to delegate various planning functions. The planning functions including preparation and review were delegated to the MMO in 2010. The Act also provided for the adoption of the UK Marine Policy Statement (MPS). The MPS was adopted on 18 March 2011 and provides the policy framework for marine planning and for all decisions likely to affect the marine area.

There are eleven plan areas in English waters, for each of which a Marine Plan will be prepared by the MMO and adopted by the Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs.

In practical terms, all activities undertaken in the marine area require land based infrastructure, without which our ability to benefit economically and socially from activities in the marine area would be extremely limited.

The UK Government's vision for the marine environment, as articulated in the MPS, is:

'clean, healthy, safe, productive and biologically diverse oceans and seas'.

In the absence of a marine plan prepared by the MMO and adopted by the Secretary of State the MPS is the relevant marine policy document. Where a marine plan has been adopted both the MPS and the Marine Plan are relevant marine policy documents for the marine plan area.

As articulated in the Marine and Coastal Act and the MPS, the Government aims for the MPS and marine planning systems to sit alongside and interact with existing planning regimes across the UK. Specifically, s.58 of the Marine and Coastal Access Act requires all¹ public bodies to:

- take authorisation or enforcement decisions that affect or might affect the UK marine area in accordance with the MPS and relevant Marine Plans, unless relevant considerations indicate otherwise
- state their reasons where authorisation or enforcement decisions are not taken in accordance with the MPS and relevant Marine Plans

¹ Like the Duty to Co-Operate, no distinction is made by the Marine and Coastal Access Act between public authorities with a tidal frontage and those without. Emphasis is placed on the likelihood of the decision being made affecting the marine area.

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

- have regard to the MPS and relevant Marine Plans when taking decisions that affect or might affect the UK marine area which are not authorisation or enforcement decisions²

In addition, the MPS seeks integration of marine planning and the terrestrial planning system through:

- Consistency between marine and terrestrial policy documents and guidance
- Liaison between respective responsible authorities for terrestrial and marine planning, including in plan development, implementation and review stages
- Sharing the evidence base and data where relevant and appropriate so as to achieve consistency in the data used in plan making and decisions

These aims are further supported by footnote 36 in the NPPF.

² For example, decisions about what representations they should make as a consultee or about what action they should carry out themselves.

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Policy Expectations	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
Key requirements under the Duty to Co-Operate		
Consistency between marine and terrestrial policy documents and guidance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstration of consistency of aim between relevant local plan policies and marine policy documents (i.e. the MPS and any relevant adopted marine plans) • Proof of collaborative working with the MMO and that the MPS has been taken into account. 	Ryedale is both landlocked and not overlapping a UK Marine Area. That said, the District Council has sought to engage with the MMO on the Local Plan Sites Document. The MMO has not responded and therefore it is unlikely that the plan will affect a marine area.
Liaison between respective authorities responsible for terrestrial and marine planning, including in plan development, implementation and review stages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early and effective policy development engagement undertaken, including discussions with the MMO • Evidence of iteration of policies and plans as a result of engagement with the MMO • Evidence of engagement with the MMO in relation to monitoring, implementation and throughout the policy cycle • Support of integrated coastal management (ICM) in coastal areas in line with the requirements of the MPS 	Ryedale is both landlocked and not overlapping a UK Marine Area. That said, the District Council has sought to engage with the MMO on the Local Plan Sites Document. The MMO has not responded and therefore it is unlikely that the plan will affect a marine area.
Sharing the evidence base and data where relevant and appropriate so as to achieve consistency in the data used in plan making and decisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the LPA has shared or provided relevant data to the MMO that can help inform Marine Plans or MPS review • Demonstration that local plan policy has been underpinned by data 	Ryedale is both landlocked and not overlapping a UK Marine Area. That said, the District Council has sought to engage with the MMO on the Local Plan

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Policy Expectations	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
	<p>provided by the MMO or the MPS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explicit cross-referencing in local plan to MPS, the MMO, their roles, and relevant marine plans 	Sites Document. The MMO has not responded and therefore it is unlikely that the plan will affect a marine area.
Marine Policy Statement- Chapter 2: General Principles for Decision-Making³		
Sections 2.1 -2.2: The UK vision for the marine environment		
<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"> • Reference in DPD where appropriate to UK vision for the marine environment • Contribution to the vision through local plan policies and supporting text 	Ryedale is both landlocked and not overlapping a UK Marine Area. That said, the District Council has sought to engage with the MMO on the Local Plan Sites Document. The MMO has not responded and therefore it is unlikely that the plan will affect a marine area.
Section 2.4: Considering benefits and adverse effects in marine planning		
<p>Consider benefits and adverse effects of plan policies</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of benefits and adverse effects of policy on the marine area as appropriate within the DPD's sustainability appraisal 	Ryedale is both landlocked and not overlapping a UK Marine Area. That said, the District Council has sought to engage

³ 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 (March 2014)

Policy Expectations	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		with the MMO on the Local Plan Sites Document. The MMO has not responded and therefore it is unlikely that the plan will affect a marine area.
<p>Section 2.5: Economic, social and environmental considerations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	
<p>Contribute to the objectives of relevant EU Directives (Marine Strategy Framework Directive and Water Framework Directive)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference to relevant EU Directives in DPD and sustainability appraisal • Consideration of contribution of DPD policies to the objectives of relevant EU Directives 	<p>The Habitat Regulations Assessment produced for the Local Plan Strategy considered, and concluded, no likely significant effects on the potential impacts on the SPA's of Flamborough Head and Bempton Cliffs SPA, the Flamborough Head European Marine Site. The HRA (PD10 and PD10a) appropriate assessment of the Local Plans Sites Document concluded that subject to identified mitigation, there would be no likely significant effects on the River Derwent SAC and the Lower Derwent Valley, and therefore accordingly, the Humber Estuary in terms of water quality and due to the land being taken out of agricultural</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Policy Expectations	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		production- a net benefit through reduced agri-chemical run off, and through the use of SuDs. This was endorsed by Natural England at the Publication of the Plan.
Marine Policy Statement- Chapter 3: Policy Objectives for Key Activities		
3.1 Marine Protected Areas		
<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"> • Identification of relevant areas and features of importance for nature conservation within relevant marine plan area(s) • Consideration of impacts of policy and/or terrestrial development on those areas and features of importance • Measures to mitigate, monitor and manage negative impacts on those areas and features of importance 	Ryedale is both landlocked and not overlapping a UK Marine Area. That said, the District Council has sought to engage with the MMO on the Local Plan Sites Document. The MMO has not responded and therefore it is unlikely that the plan will affect a marine area.
3.4 Ports and shipping		
<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"> • Evidence that policy with potential impact on ports and shipping minimises negative impacts on sector • Where relevant, evidence that economic, employment and transport policies are protective of ports and shipping sector 	Ryedale is both landlocked and not overlapping a UK Marine Area. That said, the District Council has sought to engage with the MMO on the Local Plan Sites Document. The MMO has not responded and therefore it is unlikely that the plan will

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Policy Expectations	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		affect a marine area.
3.8 Fisheries		
Consider potential economic, social and environmental impacts of other developments on fishing activity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where relevant, evidence that other policies minimise negative impacts on fishing activity and/or aquaculture 	Ryedale is both landlocked and not overlapping a UK Marine Area. That said, the District Council has sought to engage with the MMO on the Local Plan Sites Document. The MMO has not responded and therefore it is unlikely that the plan will affect a marine area.
3.9 Aquaculture		
Consider the benefits of encouraging the development of efficient, competitive and sustainable aquaculture industries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where relevant, evidence that the benefits of aquaculture industry development have been considered 	Ryedale is both landlocked and not overlapping a UK Marine Area. That said, the District Council has sought to engage with the MMO on the Local Plan Sites Document. The MMO has not responded and therefore it is unlikely that the plan will affect a marine area.
3.10 Surface water management and waste water treatment and disposal		
Maximise opportunities for co-existence of waste water infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference to and consideration of the co-existence of waste water infrastructure with other marine activities, including the potential 	The HRA (PD10 and PD10a) Appropriate Assessment of the

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Policy Expectations	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p>with other activities in the marine environment</p>	<p>for waste water infrastructure to mitigate marine impacts through design or location</p>	<p>Local Plans Sites Document concluded that subject to identified mitigation, there would be no likely significant effects on the River Derwent SAC and the Lower Derwent Valley, and accordingly the Humber Estuary in terms of water quality and due to the land being taken out of agricultural production- a net benefit through reduced agri-chemical run off, and through the use of SuDs. This was endorsed by Natural England at the Publication of the Plan.</p>
<p>3.11 Tourism and recreation</p>		
<p>Consider the potential for tourism and recreation in the marine environment and the benefits this will bring to the economy and local communities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where relevant, reference to marine tourism and recreation • Evidence that the potential for marine tourism and recreation has been recognised in plan-making 	<p>Ryedale is both landlocked and not overlapping a UK Marine Area. That said, the District Council has sought to engage with the MMO on the Local Plan Sites Document. The MMO has not responded and therefore it is unlikely that the plan will affect a marine area.</p>

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Appendix One

This is an alphabetical list of all local planning authorities in England whose area overlaps with the UK marine area.

Adur	City of Peterborough	Gravesham	Medway
Allerdale	City of Plymouth	Great Yarmouth	Middlesbrough
Arun	City of Portsmouth	Greenwich	New Forest
Babergh	City of Southampton	Halton	New Forest National Park
Barking and Dagenham	City of Westminster	Hambleton	Newark and Sherwood
Barrow-in-Furness	Colchester	Hammersmith and Fulham	Newcastle upon Tyne
Basildon	Copeland	Hartlepool	Newham
Bassetlaw	Cornwall	Hastings	North Devon
Bexley	County Durham	Havant	North East Lincolnshire
Blackpool	Dartford	Havering	North Lincolnshire
Boston	Doncaster	Horsham	North Norfolk
Bournemouth	Dover	Hounslow	North Somerset
Broadland	East Cambridgeshire	Huntingdonshire	North Tyneside
Broads Authority	East Devon	Ipswich	North York Moors National Park
Canterbury	East Lindsey	Isle of Wight	Northumberland
Carlisle	East Riding of Yorkshire	Isles of Scilly	Norwich
Castle Point	Eastbourne	Kensington and Chelsea	Poole
Chelmsford	Eastleigh	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Preston
Cheshire West and Chester	Exeter	Lake District National Park	Purbeck
Chichester	Exmoor National Park	Lambeth	Redcar and Cleveland
Chorley	Fareham	Lancaster	Richmond upon Thames
Christchurch	Fenland	Lewes	Rochford
City of London	Fylde	Lewisham	Rother
City of Brighton and Hove	Gateshead	Liverpool	Scarborough
City of Bristol	Gloucester	Maidstone	Sedgemoor
City of Kingston upon Hull	Gosport	Maldon	

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist (March 2014)

Sefton	West Dorset
Selby	West Lancashire
Shepway	West Lindsey
South Cambridgeshire	West Somerset
South Downs National Park	Weymouth and Portland
South Gloucestershire	Winchester
South Hams	Wirral
South Holland	Worthing
South Lakeland	Wyre
South Norfolk	York
South Ribble	
South Somerset	
South Tyneside	
Southend-on-Sea	
Southwark	
Stockton-on-Tees	
Stroud	
Suffolk Coastal	
Sunderland	
Swale	
Taunton Deane	
Teignbridge	
Tendring	
Test Valley	
Thanet	
Thurrock	
Tonbridge and Malling	
Torbay	
Torridge	
Tower Hamlets	
Wandsworth	
Warrington	
Waveney	
Wealden	
West Devon	