

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01)

Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist – Updated March 2018

In summary – the key 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

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.

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.*

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 Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) underwent examination in 2013, and was adopted by Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole councils as Mineral Planning Authorities in 2014. It sets out the overarching strategy for the provision of minerals, safeguarding of undeveloped minerals and restoration of mineral sites for Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole. It also includes development management policies and a monitoring framework. However, it does not include any specific site allocations.</p> <p>The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01) (DMSP) has been prepared to be compliant with, and to deliver the relevant parts of the vision and objectives of, the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) primarily the allocation of sites, to maintain the supply of mineral to Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole and beyond. It also develops the safeguarding of mineral sites.</p> <p>Chapter 4 of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) sets out the Vision (reflecting the Key Issues identified in Chapter 3 of the Minerals Strategy 2014) and Objectives. The Objectives, together with the subsequent policies of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54), enable the delivery of the Vision. Figure 1 of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) (p.8) sets out these relationships in a Summary Diagram. The Key Issues, Vision and Objectives were developed through stakeholder involvement and repeated consultation of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54), were debated at Examination and found sound by the Inspector.</p> <p>The Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01) is intended to implement the Objectives/policies relating to provision of minerals, and to mineral safeguarding. The Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01) will rely primarily on mineral operators submitting planning applications for, and then developing, the various allocations of Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01), or sites within the Aggregates Area of Search and the Puddletown Road Policy Area. Safeguarding of mineral sites will be achieved through cooperation with and notification by local planning authorities. There are no specific infrastructure pre-requisites.</p> <p>Chapter 7 of the Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01) sets out the indicators that will monitor delivery of the Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01) and the need for review.</p>
<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</p>	<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). 	<p>The development needs of the Plan area, to be delivered through the Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01), are established by the adopted Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54). This includes the amount of minerals to be provided over the life of the Plan, and the spatial area the mineral will be sourced from. Different</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p>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> <p>—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</p> <p>—specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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>minerals are covered by separate chapters, and in each case the amount of mineral to be provided and where it is to come from are separately established.</p> <p>Within the context of the already established spatial location of development and the quantum of development, the Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01) (for mineral allocations) assesses the options available and proposes the allocation of specific mineral sites.</p> <p>The Mineral Planning Authority has sought to balance the requirement (under national minerals policy) to maintain an adequate and steady supply of minerals with the relatively high level of constraints of various kinds in Dorset. The Sustainability Appraisal MSPSD—03 describes the process undertaken to identify the most suitable sites for allocation. The Statement of Consultation MSPSD--05 indicates how the consultation process has contributed to shaping the selection of allocations.</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>Policy SS1 'Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development' is set out in the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) (Chapter 5). Although there is no specific, separate policy in the Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01) , Policy SS1 (together with the principles that underlie that Plan's approach to sustainable mineral development) are considered relevant and applicable.</p>
<p><i>Objectively assessed needs</i></p> <p>The economic, social and environmental needs of the authority area addressed and clearly presented in a fashion which makes effective use of land and specifically promotes mixed use development, and take account of cross-boundary and strategic issues.</p> <p>Note: Meeting these needs should be subject to the caveats specified in Paragraph 14 of the NPPF (see above).</p>	<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 Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) establishes and sets out the objectively assessed needs for mineral development.</p> <p>Chapter 3 describes the spatial characteristics of the Plan area.</p> <p>Chapter 5 describes the overall strategy for minerals provision, noting that it will identify where and how much mineral development is to take place during the Plan period. This is reflected in the Spatial Strategy of Chapter 5, and each chapter of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) which relates to a separate mineral type establishes the quantum and location of development, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 7 – Aggregates (including crushed rock) • Chapter 8 – Ball Clay • Chapter 9 – Purbeck Stone • Chapter 10 – Portland Stone <p>Other mineral types do not have a specific quantum of provision – it was accepted that this was not needed.</p>

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 Vision of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) (Chapter 4) has a clear commitment to supporting continuing economic growth in Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole.</p> <p>This is reflected in in Objective 1 (Chapter 4), supporting the economy of Dorset through the steady supply of aggregates, ball clay and hydrocarbons.</p> <p>The relevant policies of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) establish the amount/location of mineral development e.g. Policy AS1 (p.59); Policy BC1 (p.87); Policy PK1 (p.99) – and the Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01) in turn continues the implementation of the Vision/Objectives through proposing policies which will identify specific sites or areas of search intended to provide the mineral required to deliver the minerals strategy of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54).</p> <p>Regard has been had to the LEP (MSDCC-60 to MSDCC-64), although there is limited recognition of minerals.</p> <p>The appraisal methodology for site-specific proposals includes a criterion on economic impacts.</p>
<p>Recognise and seek to address potential barriers to investment, including poor environment or any lack of infrastructure, services or housing (21)</p>	Not applicable.	
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>	Not applicable.	
<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>	Not applicable.	
3. Supporting a prosperous rural economy (para 28)		
<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 	<p>Neither the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) or Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01) specifically refer to the rural economy but (as noted above) there are</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
	<p>diversification of agricultural businesses; support sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments, and support local services and facilities.</p>	<p>various references to supporting the economy of Dorset, and in a largely rural area such as Dorset this will include the rural economy.</p> <p>The site assessment criteria set out in Appendix 1 of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) include a specific criterion (C17 on pp. 260-261) considering economic issues. Each site that has been assessed for potential allocation has considered potential impacts on and benefit to the economy, including the rural economy.</p> <p>Mineral developments are usually in rural areas, and have the potential to benefit (or impact on) the local (rural) economy. Policy DM2 (Managing Impacts on Amenity) of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) addresses impacts associated with minerals development and seeks to minimise such impacts – to the benefit of local communities, including rural businesses.</p>
<p>4. Promoting sustainable transport (paras 29-41)</p>		
<p>Facilitate sustainable development whilst contributing to wider sustainability and health objectives. (29)</p> <p>Balance the transport system in favour of sustainable transport modes and give people a real choice about how they travel whilst recognising that different policies will be required in different communities and opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary from urban to rural areas. (29)</p> <p>Encourage solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and congestion (29) including supporting a pattern of development which, where reasonable to do so, facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport. (30)</p> <p>Local authorities should work with neighbouring authorities and transport providers to develop strategies for the provision of viable infrastructure necessary to support sustainable development. (31)</p> <p>Opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure. (32)</p> <p>Ensure that developments which generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised (34)</p>	<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 infrastructure could be developed to widen transport choice linked to the Local Transport Plan. 	<p>The Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) notes (paragraph 5.5, p. 34) that ‘in the case of minerals planning, any strategy is constrained by the fact that minerals can only be worked where they occur ... The options therefore for a spatial strategy for mineral extraction and associated development are prescribed to a large extent by the geological distribution of mineral resources within Dorset’.</p> <p>Policy DM8 Transport and Minerals Development (Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) pp. 194-199) relates to minerals transport and the control of possible adverse impacts. It also encourages and promotes the use of sustainable transport, e.g. rail, water, pipelines. This relates to, and specifically includes reference to, the Dorset Freight Map, indicating the designated road freight network for Dorset.</p> <p>The Mineral Planning Authority have the potential to exercise more control over the location of recycled aggregate facilities, and Policy RE1 Production of Recycled Aggregates (p.51 of Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54)) encourages recycled aggregate production through permitting long term or permanent facilities at locations near to the source of material to be recycled (including industrial locations and urban fringe sites).</p> <p>The site assessment criteria set out in Appendix 1 of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) include a specific criterion (C25 on p. 267) considering whether the access proposals are acceptable. Each site that has been assessed for potential allocation through the Draft Mineral Sites Plan (MSPSD-01) has considered the suitability of the access proposals, including highway safety and suitability of connecting roads.</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p>Plans should protect and exploit opportunities for the use of sustainable transport modes for the movement of goods or people. (35)</p> <p>Policies should aim for a balance of land uses so that people can be encouraged to minimize journey lengths for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities. (37)</p> <p>For larger scale residential developments in particular, planning policies should promote a mix of uses in order to provide opportunities to undertake day-to-day activities including work on site. Where practical, particularly within large-scale developments, key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties. (38)</p> <p>The setting of car parking standards including provision for town centres. (39-40)</p> <p>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>Chapter 6 of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) relates to Climate Change and considers options for reduction in CO₂ generation. Policy CC1 Preparation of Climate Change Assessments seeks to address this specifically, including minimising emissions from traffic generation.</p> <p>Policy SG3 Safeguarding of mineral sites and facilities (Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) p.162) safeguards mineral sites, including bulk transportation facilities such as pipelines and aggregate rail depots and wharves. This policy is developed further in the Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01) through Policy MS-9 Safeguarding Mineral Sites and Infrastructure, which requires local planning authorities to consult the Mineral Planning Authority over development that could affect mineral sites.</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>Not applicable/included.</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</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identification of: 	<p>Not applicable.</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
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)	<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 	
Identify a supply of developable sites or broad locations for years 6-10 and, where possible, years 11-15 (47).	<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 	Not applicable.
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)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A housing trajectory • Monitoring of completions and permissions (47) • Updated and managed SHLAA. (47) 	Not applicable.
Set out the authority's approach to housing density to reflect local circumstances (47).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy on the density of development. 	Not applicable.
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)	<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) 	Not applicable.
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).	<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. 	Not applicable.

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
In rural areas housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	
7. Requiring good design (paras 56-68)		
Develop robust and comprehensive policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area (58).	<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>The Vision and Objectives (Chapter 4 of Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54)) of the Minerals Strategy refer to 'enhancing the area's unique natural environment' and minimising adverse impacts of mineral working on the environment and local communities. Key Issue 8 (Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) p.28) refers to achieving high quality restoration as an integral part of all minerals development, taking into account landscape character.</p> <p>Policy DM1 Key Criteria for Sustainable Minerals Development of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) requires minerals development to address a series of issues that do address the need for high quality development.</p> <p>Other development management policies (DM2 – Amenity; DM3 – Water Environment; DM4 – Landscape; DM5 – Biodiversity and geodiversity; DM7 – Historic Environment; DM8 – Transport) and RS1 – Restoration, Aftercare and Afteruse of Minerals Development all contribute to ensuring high quality development, including restoration of mineral working.</p>
8. Promoting healthy communities (paras 69-77)		
Policies should aim to design places which: promote community interaction, including through mixed-use development; are safe and accessible environments; and are accessible developments (69).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusion of a policy or policies on inclusive communities. • Promotion of opportunities for meetings between members of 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) 	Not applicable.

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<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 RS1 Restoration, Aftercare and Afteruse of Minerals Development of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) seeks to strengthen and improve the green infrastructure network; linking site restoration to improved public access</p> <p>Paragraph 16.21 (p.183) of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) states</p> <p>"16.21 Other land uses such as public open space, Public Rights of Way and outdoor recreational facilities all contribute to the landscape setting of an area and are an important consideration for minerals development proposals. Minerals development should not result in the net loss or degradation of such features".</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>Policy RS1 Restoration, Aftercare and Afteruse of Minerals Development of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) seeks to strengthen and improve the green infrastructure network; linking site restoration to improved public access</p> <p>Paragraph 16.21 (p.183) of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) states that</p> <p>"16.21 Other land uses such as public open space, Public Rights of Way and outdoor recreational facilities all contribute to the landscape setting of an area and are an important consideration for minerals development proposals. Minerals development should not result in the net loss or degradation of such features".</p> <p>The site assessment criteria set out in Appendix 1 of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) include specific criteria (C23 and C24, pp.265-266) considering whether any proposed site allocation might have impacts on or benefits to recreational land and public rights of way.</p> <p>Each site that has been assessed for potential allocation through the Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01) has considered potential effects on public enjoyment of the countryside, and will take these into account in the final selection of sites.</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 	<p>Policy RS1 Restoration, Aftercare and Afteruse of Minerals Development of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) seeks to strengthen and improve the green infrastructure network; linking site restoration to improved public access</p> <p>Paragraph 16.21 (p.183) of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) states that</p> <p>"16.21 Other land uses such as public open space, Public Rights of Way and outdoor recreational facilities all contribute to the landscape setting of an area and are an important consideration for minerals development proposals. Minerals development should not result in the net loss or degradation of such features".</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
	green space should be consistent with policy for Green Belts. (78)	
<p>9. Protecting Green Belt land (paras 79-92)</p>		
<p>Local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. (81)</p> <p>Local planning authorities with Green Belts in their area should establish Green Belt boundaries in their Local Plans which set the framework for Green Belt and settlement policy. (83)</p> <p>When drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development. (84)</p> <p>Boundaries should be set using 'physical features likely to be permanent' amongst other things (85)</p>	<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>Policy RS1 Restoration, Aftercare and Afteruse of Minerals Development of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) seeks to ensure that minerals related and other uses in the Green Belt cease when extraction is completed and the site is restored in a manner appropriate to its original inclusion in the Green Belt.</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>Climate change, and addressing the potential impacts, is given high priority in the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54), and referred to several times.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Vision for Mineral Extraction in Dorset (Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) p.30) states "At the end of the plan period, mineral workings in Dorset will be making their contribution to the mitigation of and adaptation to climate change through the efficient use of resources, positive restoration of worked and completed sites, the sustainable transportation of mineral resources and the provision of materials for flood defences and coastal protection and stability. • Chapter 6 of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) is specifically focussed on Climate Change and considers options for reduction in CO₂ generation. Policy CC1 Preparation of Climate Change Assessments seeks to address this specifically, including minimising CO₂ emissions from traffic generation. It is placed at the front of the Plan to demonstrate the seriousness with which climate change is taken.

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mineral site restoration has a key role to play. Paragraph 15.19 states 'One of the potential impacts of climate change will be more extreme climate events, such as flooding. Careful site restoration can provide a buffer for existing areas/habitats from such events - for example, restored mineral workings can provide storage capacity during extreme flood events, thus helping to protect areas at risk of flooding.' Also, paragraph 15.21 states 'The green infrastructure that can be provided through minerals planning can make a significant contribution to mitigating and adapting to climate change.' Policy RS1 - Restoration, Aftercare and Afteruse of Minerals Development where opportunities arise, the after-use provides benefits to the local and wider community which may include enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity interests, linking of site restoration to other green infrastructure initiatives, enhanced landscape character, improved public access, employment, tourism or provision of climate change mitigation measures. Policy DM1 - Key Criteria for Sustainable Minerals Development Proposals for minerals development should support the delivery of social, economic and environmental benefits whilst any adverse impacts should be avoided or mitigated to an acceptable level. In order to achieve this, all proposals for minerals development must demonstrate that all the following criteria have been addressed satisfactorily: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. minimisation of impacts which could increase the effects of climate change; Policy DM5 - Biodiversity and geological interest This policy includes a reference to climate change: 'Proposals for minerals development must be accompanied by an objective assessment of the potential effects of the development on features of biodiversity and/or geological interest, taking into account cumulative impacts with other development and the potential impacts of climate change.'
<p>Help increase the use and supply of renewable and low carbon energy through a strategy, policies maximising renewable and low carbon energy, and identification of key energy sources. (97)</p>	<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) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 6 of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) is specifically focussed on Climate Change and considers options for reduction in CO₂ generation. . It is placed at the front of the Plan to demonstrate the seriousness with which climate change is taken. Policy CC1 Preparation of Climate Change Assessments (Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) p.43) seeks to address this specifically, including minimising CO₂ emissions from traffic generation. It does not specify how these matters should be addressed, but it does require that they are given consideration.

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
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 approach taken by the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) in addressing the potential risks of climate change is described above.</p> <p>Development of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan was informed by a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment MSPSD--09 that included consideration of the effects of climate change.</p> <p>Consideration of options for site-specific proposals included appraisal of flood risk (Criterion C14 – Does the proposal have any impact on flooding or coastal stability? pp.257-258 Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54)) as explained in the site appraisal methodology .</p> <p>Policy DM3 Managing the Impact on Surface Water and Ground Water Resources of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) addresses flood risk through requiring a Flood Risk Assessment in certain cases. There is no specific reference to applying the Sequential Test in assessing flood risk in the location of mineral development, but this approach is specifically required in the National Planning Policy Framework (e.g. paragraph 100). The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment provides further clarification in this regard.</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 policy Support of integrated coastal management (ICM) in coastal areas in line with the requirements of the MPS 	See separate checklist on integration of marine and terrestrial planning.
Manage risk from coastal change (106)	<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>Not applicable – addressed in district council Local Plans to which the Minerals Plan, and proposed future mineral development, has regard.</p> <p>It is not considered that any of the proposed allocation sites are close enough to the coast to impact on, or be affected by, the coastal environment.</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy RS1 - Restoration, Aftercare and After-use of Minerals Development (Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) p.172) requires, as part of the after-use of a mineral site, that the green infrastructure network will, where possible, be strengthened and improved; and the restored site be linked to other green infrastructure initiatives. • Policy DM1 (g) (Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) p. 177) protects soil resources throughout the life of the development and, where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary and there is a choice of location, requires that preference is given to the development of poorer quality land over higher quality or best and most versatile land. • Policy DM4 Protection and Enhancement of Landscape Character and the Countryside (Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) p. 185) protects designations of national importance (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and New Forest National Park) and also non-statutory designations. • Policy DM5 Biodiversity and Geological Interest (Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) p. 190) protects ecological designations of international, national, regional and local importance.
<p>Prevent unacceptable risks from pollution and land instability (109)</p>	<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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy DM1 Key Criteria for Sustainable Minerals Development (Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) p. 177) addresses the potential adverse impacts associated with minerals development, requiring that these be avoided or mitigated to an acceptable level. • This includes the effects of climate change; local amenity; biodiversity and geodiversity; heritage assets; landscape, keeping the production of mineral waste to a minimum; protection of soil resources; giving preference to the development of poorer quality land over higher quality or best and most versatile land; efficient use of water resources on the site and avoidance or mitigation of, or compensation for, adverse impacts on the water environment and flood risk; avoidance of cumulative impacts resulting from minerals or other development; use of sustainable transport; and restoration, aftercare and after-use proposals and compliance with the strategy for restoration. • The other development management policies of the Minerals Strategy develop some of the topics further e.g.; water (DM3), heritage (DM7), biodiversity and geodiversity (DM5), landscape (DM4).

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy PD1 - Underground Mining and High Wall Extraction of Portland Stone (Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54), p. 117) requires that any mines are designed to provide long-term land stability; • Policy DM2 - Managing Impacts on Amenity (Minerals Strategy – p. 179) requires that proposals for minerals development demonstrate ‘stability of the land at and around the site, both above and below ground level’.
<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>Policy DM1 - Key Criteria for Sustainable Minerals Development (Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) – p.177) requires protection and, where possible, enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity.</p> <p>Policy DM5 - Biodiversity and geological interest Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) – p. 190) provides protection for international, national and local biodiversity and geodiversity sites, as applicable.</p> <p>Policy RS1 - Restoration, Aftercare and After-use of Minerals Development (Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) – pp. 172-173) requires that ‘where the proposed after-use includes habitat creation, it should contribute to the delivery of the Dorset Biodiversity Strategy objectives where appropriate’.</p> <p>Proposed Policy MS-8 Puddletown Road Area Policy (Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01) – p.14) seeks to provide for a ‘consistent and coordinated approach to the development, working and restoration of land permitted for mineral development’ in the Puddletown Road area, an area where mineral development and potential for future mineral development and important nature conservation areas coincide.</p>
<p>12. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment (paras 126-141)</p>		
<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 Vision of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) (p.30) seeks the ongoing provision of mineral ‘while protecting and enhancing the area's unique natural and built environment, including the AONBs, the Jurassic Coast World Heritage Site, the internationally and nationally designated ecological and geological sites and Dorset's many heritage assets’.</p> <p>Objective 4 (Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) – p. 31) states that ‘To maximise the opportunities for environmental enhancement offered through the restoration of worked sites and outside worked areas to enhance Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole's unique natural environment, historic environment and potential for recreation’.</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
		<p>Policy DM1 - Key Criteria for Sustainable Minerals Development (Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) – p.177) requires the ‘protection and, where possible, enhancement of heritage assets.’</p> <p>Policy DM7 The Historic Environment (Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) – p. 194) requires that heritage assets and their settings be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance’.</p>
<p>13. Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals (paras 142-149)</p>		
<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>Maintenance of the supply of industrial, aggregate and other minerals is a central feature of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) and the emerging Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01) , as reflected in the Vision (see p.30, Minerals Strategy 2014), Objectives 1, 2, 3 and 6 (Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) pp. 31-32) and Policies AS1, BC1, PK1, BS1, HY1 and HY2, IS1 and also Policies MS 1 through MS7 of the Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01) .</p> <p>Policies DM1 to DM8, along with RS1 on restoration, all seek to address the various impacts of mineral development, including site restoration and after-use.</p> <p>Policies SG1 to SG3 relate to the safeguarding of mineral in the ground, protecting the undeveloped mineral resource. If it is necessary to carry out non-minerals development on safeguarded mineral bearing land, there is a provision that the Mineral Planning Authority will seek some level of prior extraction in advance of development.</p> <p>Dorset County Council is a member of the South West Aggregates Working Party and maintains contact with neighbouring Mineral Planning Authorities. The Local Aggregates Assessment, produced annually, is sent to Hampshire County Council (the only neighbouring Mineral Planning Authority not in the South West AWP) for their comment. It is also sent to the South East AWP for their comment. More information is provided in the Duty to Cooperate Statement</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. 		
<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.</p>	<p>The Dorset County Council Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) (April 2013) MSDCC-32 sets out how the Mineral Planning Authority will engage with</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
	<p>The statement should show that efforts have been made to consult hard to reach groups, key stakeholders etc.</p> <p>Reference SCI</p>	<p>the public on planning matters. All consultation has been carried out in compliance with the requirements of the SCI.</p> <p>The Statement of Consultation MSPSD--05 provides an overview of the consultations that have been carried out, including key stakeholders, and how it has influenced the plan.</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>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 Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54), setting out the Vision, Objectives, Spatial Strategy and the specific delivery strategy for each mineral type is already adopted. The list of evidence documents which supported its preparation is available from this page: https://www.dorsetforyou.gov.uk/mcs</p> <p>The Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01), focussing on specific provision of minerals through site allocation, has been developed and refined primarily through inviting the submission of potential allocation sites, followed by reviewing and assessing these through public consultation and Sustainability Appraisal [see Consultation Statement MSPSD—05 and Sustainability Appraisal MSPSD--03].</p> <p>For each stage of consultation, the key issues identified have been recorded, with officer response to the issues raised and how these might be addressed.</p> <p>Statutory requirements i.e. preparing a Habitat Regulations Appraisal MSPSD--07 has also assisted in the site selection process, identifying sites that are unlikely to be acceptable.</p> <p>Non site-specific proposals (e.g. Aggregates Area of Search and Puddletown Road Policy Area) are supported by Topic Papers prepared in-house MSDCC-52 and MSDCC-59 and also refined through consultation (both public consultation and more specific, focussed consultation) e.g. the Area of Search boundary has been extensively revised in consultation with Natural England.</p> <p>Heritage Assessments MSDCC-37 to MSDCC-42 and a Transport Assessment focussed on the Moreton/Crossways B3390 area MSDCC-35 and MSDCC-36.</p> <p>Setting the annual level of provision for aggregates is determined through the preparation of the annual Local Aggregates Assessment MSDCC-46 to MSDCC-51. This in turn contributes to determining how many sites need to be allocated to maintain supply during the Plan period.</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</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 	<p>The Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) sets out the Vision, Objectives and Spatial Strategy on which the Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01) is based, and with which it complies. It also sets out policies for the specific minerals, including both the quantum of development and the spatial location of future extraction, safeguarding and restoration and development management policies. The reports and consultation documents, including the Sustainability Appraisal, which</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p>arrived at? Where a balance had to be struck in taking decisions between competing alternatives, is it clear how and why the decisions were taken?</p> <p>Does the sustainability appraisal show how the different options perform and is it clear that sustainability considerations informed the content of the DPD from the start?</p>	<p>also the quantum of development, strategic policies and development management policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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>assessed the options and assisted in selecting the options/approach taken, can be seen at: https://www.dorsetforyou.gov.uk/mcs</p> <p>The Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01) comprises seven policies (MS1 to MS7) which will allocate specific sites for the production of minerals; one policy (MS8) designating the Puddletown Road Policy Area and one policy (MS9) developing the safeguarding requirements.</p> <p>For the mineral site allocation policies, the alternatives considered were the full range of sites as put forward. Assessment of the options was by various means, including the Sustainability Appraisal MSPSD--03, the Habitat Regulations Assessment MSPSD--07, the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment MSPSD--09, and the various public consultation processes e.g. MSDCC-05 to MSDCC-10.</p> <p>In terms of site assessment, Appendix 1 of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) set out a standardised list of 25 criteria to be applied to each site option. The criteria reflect the Sustainability Objectives and their completion comprises part of the Sustainability Appraisal of the site options. These criteria have been applied to each proposed allocation e.g. MSDCC-11 to MSDCC-30.</p> <p>The various consultation processes were an important part of selecting site allocations, and the key issues identified along with specific comments made and officer responses (for 2015 and 2016) e.g. MSDCC-05 to MSDCC-10.</p> <p>The Statement of Consultation MSPSD—05 sets out how development of the Plan has taken account of sustainability appraisal and public consultation and engagement.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal MSPSD—03 describes how alternatives have been developed, refined and selected.</p>

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

To be 'effective' a DPD needs to:

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

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<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? • Does the DPD explain how its key policy objectives will be achieved? 	<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 each DPD showing how they combine to provide a coherent policy structure. • 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>Chapter 7 of the Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01) identifies responsibilities for implementation/delivery of the Plan, provides an implementation and monitoring framework and addresses risks to implementation.</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 for implementation of the policies clearly identified? • 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"> • 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. • 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01) allocates specific sites for future mineral development. Responsibility for providing the necessary infrastructure remains with the developer. Site assessments of these sites have considered viability, which would include infrastructure provision. This is also reflected in the Sustainability Appraisal MSPSD—03 • The proposed site allocations all have an active promoter – either the landowner/agent, or a mineral developer. It is considered that an active promoter makes the site more viable – more likely to be prepared for development, including providing or changing the existing infrastructure as needed. • The site appraisals have also assessed access issues (e.g. Criterion C25 of Appendix 1 of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54)) – including access to the local network and the strategic network. The sites proposed for allocation are supported by the highway authority, and Highways England have also been consulted – for the allocations proposed for inclusion in the Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01), the Mineral Planning Authority is satisfied that there are no capacity problems or a solution is possible. • The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is not normally relevant to minerals development, given the way it is applied. Policy DM10 (Minerals Strategy

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<p><i>Co-ordinated Planning</i></p> <p>Does the DPD reflect the concept of spatial planning?</p> <p>Does it go beyond traditional land use planning by bringing together and integrating policies for the development and 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>	<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 for other strategies affecting the area 	<p>2014 (MSDCC-54) – p. 201) covers the use of planning obligations, including possibly CIL, in order to achieve the requirements of site development, including infrastructure – contributing to viability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole authorities are members of the South West Aggregates Working Party, providing an opportunity for Mineral Planning Authorities to work together in dealing with cross boundary issues, particularly through preparation and consultation of the annual Local Aggregates Assessment. <p><u>Minerals Strategy 2014</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 2 of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) sets out the policy context and background to the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54), referencing relationships with Bournemouth and Poole, and with the Mineral Planning Authorities surrounding Dorset. Chapter 3 of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) sets out the spatial characteristics of the Minerals Strategy 2014, leading to identification of the Key Issues, the Vision, Objectives and Spatial Strategy. This work was carried out in consultation and cooperation with relevant stakeholders, described in the Duty to Cooperate statement of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) and debated at the Examination into the Minerals Strategy 2014. It establishes the spatial pattern of development. <p><u>Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Duty to Cooperate Statement MSPSD—06 of the Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01) outlines ongoing cooperation with stakeholders, including planning authorities and other relevant bodies, to take into account their aspirations and interests. The Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01) has been produced in consultation and cooperation with a wide range of stakeholders, taking into consideration the comments made at each stage of consultation. Policy MS8 The Puddletown Road Area Policy of the Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01) will require the cooperation of the Mineral Planning Authority, the minerals operators and voluntary/interest groups for successful implementation.
<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. 	<p><u>Minerals Strategy 2014</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 17 of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) (paragraph 17.12) explains how a review of the Plan may be triggered as a result of the monitoring process showing that some targets are not being achieved. A partial review is generally preferred to a full review, demonstrating flexibility.

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy BC1 (Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) – p. 87) is a criteria-based policy, for future ball clay provision. Although a ball clay site is proposed an allocation in the Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01) (Policy MS3), the criteria based policy provides flexibility for bringing forward ball clay sites. • Policy AS1 (Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) – p. 59) refers to the “current agreed local annual supply requirement” in determining the size of the landbank from year to year. This local supply requirement is based on the annual supply figure determined through the Local Aggregates Assessment prepared each year, taking into consideration sources of aggregate supply and constraints to supply. The use of a variable figure, which is in turn normally based on the average of the previous ten-years of supply, provides far more flexibility than a fixed figure. <p><u>Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Implementation/Monitoring chapter of the Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01) sets out the monitoring framework, including how a review of the Plan may be triggered through the annual monitoring process. • Chapter 7 of the Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01) provides the framework for monitoring implementation of the Plan and future Monitoring Reports will enable implementation progress to be evaluated, including options for review if the policies are not being achieved. • The Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01) proposes the designation of an aggregates Area of Search, where future aggregate development of non-allocated sites will be encouraged provided certain criteria are met. This is intended to increase flexibility of the Plan, particularly if demand increases sharply or some of the allocated sites fall for unforeseen reasons.
<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 	<p><u>DRAFT MINERALS SITES PLAN (MSPSD-01)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Duty to Cooperate Statement MSPSD--06 describes how the Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01) has been prepared, with ongoing engagement with neighbouring mineral planning authorities, local planning authorities and other key stakeholders. • The Implementation/Monitoring chapter of the Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01) sets out how the Draft Minerals Sites Plan will be implemented, including the responsibilities of the agencies/bodies in the minerals sector and the relevant delivery agencies.

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
	<p>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>	
<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>When the Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01) is adopted, the monitoring framework set out in Chapter 7 will form the basis for the monitoring of the implementation of that Plan.</p> <p>The current Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) relies on the continued implementation of existing planning permissions, as driven by the market and implemented by the minerals industry, for the ongoing delivery of minerals and restoration of worked out sites. The development management policies are implemented by the Mineral Planning Authority; the safeguarding policies by local planning authorities and the Mineral Planning Authority.</p> <p>The majority of the policies of the emerging Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01) relate to the delivery of new or extended mineral sites. These will be delivered by the minerals industry, and their delivery timing and the speed at which they are worked (i.e. the ongoing implementation of policies) are market driven.</p> <p>Chapter 7 of the Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01) sets out the Implementation/Monitoring Framework for that Plan, including targets for policy/plan delivery.</p> <p>In terms of monitoring, the main focus is on aggregates sales, reserves and landbanks with annual preparation of a Local Aggregate Assessment MSDCC-46 to MSDCC-51 alongside Annual Monitoring Reports MSDCC-67 to MSDCC-69.</p> <p>Annual Monitoring Reports MSDCC-67 to MSDCC-69 produced since the adoption of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) are based on the targets/indicators set out in Chapter 17 of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54).</p>
<p><i>Consistent with national policy:</i> the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.</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? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sections of the DPD which explain where and how national policy has been elaborated upon and the reasons. 	<p>The Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01) has been prepared to be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance.</p>

Soundness Test and Key Requirements	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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"> 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>However, Policy MS-3 proposes an extension to Swanworth Quarry, a crushed rock quarry in the Dorset Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The Sustainability Appraisal MSPSD--03 sets out the reasoning for its inclusion.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report includes a review of relevant plans and policies that has informed that Appraisal (MSDCC-66 and see also: https://www.dorsetforyou.gov.uk/article/354652/Sustainability-appraisal---minerals-and-waste for the separate topic papers).</p> <p>The Statement of Consultation MSPSD—05 explains how sustainability appraisal and consultation responses, including relating to consistency with national policy, have been taken into account in developing the Plan.</p> <p>Statutory and other relevant consultees have had several opportunities to comment on the Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01) , with their responses taken into account in refining the policies.</p>

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.

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
- 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.

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.

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

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. 	<p>Pp. 65-68 of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) sets out the relationship with the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) and the Marine Policy Statement (MPS), making reference to the contribution of marine aggregates to aggregate supply in Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole.</p> <p>The Vision of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) refers to mineral workings making their contribution to 'the provision of materials for flood defences and coastal protection and stability.'</p>
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 	<p>The Mineral Planning Authority has engaged with the MMO during preparation of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) and the Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01) . The MMO has been consulted at each stage of preparation. It provided comments on the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54), but has not commented on the Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01) .</p> <p>It is not considered that any closer engagement was required for the Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01) , given the location of the proposed allocations. None of the proposed allocations/designations of the Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01) are considered to have a negative impact on the coastal zone. No aggregate wharves or other marine facilities are proposed.</p> <p>Criterion C14 (Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) Appendix 1 – pp. 257-258) refers to the need to consider coastal stability if proposed allocations are close to the coast.</p>
Sharing the evidence base and data where relevant and appropriate so as to achieve consistency in the data used in plan making and decisions	<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 provided by the MMO or the MPS • Explicit cross-referencing in local plan to MPS, the MMO, their roles, and relevant marine plans 	<p>Pp. 65-68 of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) sets out the relationship with the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) and the Marine Policy Statement (MPS), making reference to the contribution of marine aggregates to aggregate supply in Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole.</p> <p>The Vision of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) refers to mineral workings making their contribution to 'the provision of materials for flood defences and coastal protection and stability.'</p> <p>It has not been considered necessary to repeat this for the preparation of the Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01) .</p>
Marine Policy Statement- Chapter 2: General Principles for Decision-Making³		
Sections 2.1 -2.2: The UK vision for the marine environment		

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.

Policy Expectations	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
<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 	<p>Due to the very limited marine implications of the Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01), specific reference to the UK vision for the marine environment has not been considered necessary.</p> <p>Policies DM1, DM3 and DM5 of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) will contribute to achieving the vision for the marine environment.</p>
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 	<p>The Sustainability Appraisal Framework MSPSD--03 includes the following Sustainability Appraisal Objectives/indicators which are used in assessing policies and site allocations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SA4: To maintain, conserve and enhance the quality of ground, surface and sea waters and manage the consumption of water in a sustainable way. SA7: To maintain, conserve and enhance the landscape, including townscape, seascape and the coast.
Section 2.5: Economic, social and environmental considerations		
<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 SA Scoping Report (MSDCC-66 and see also: https://www.dorsetforyou.gov.uk/article/354652/Sustainability-appraisal---minerals-and-waste for the separate topic papers) considered relevant EU directives. However, no specific issues of relevance have been identified through the Sustainability Appraisal. The Water Framework Directive is referenced in the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) (p.181)</p> <p>Policies DM1, DM3 and DM5 of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) are relevant to the water environment and the coastal zone.</p>
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 	<p>The Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) (pp.66-68) identifies the relevant areas of importance for marine conservation.</p> <p>As already noted, the Draft Minerals Sites Plan (MSPSD-01) has limited impact on the coastal zone or the marine environment - Policies DM1, DM3 and DM5 of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) will have some beneficial effect on the marine environment.</p>

Policy Expectations	Possible Evidence	Evidence Provided
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 	<p>Policy AS-4 Wharves and Depots (Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) - p. 72) encourages the development of new or expanded aggregate wharves, where need can be demonstrated. It is not expected that this policy would have any negative impacts on the operation of the Port of Poole.</p> <p>Policy SG3 of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) safeguards the existing aggregates wharf at the Port of Poole.</p>
3.8 Fisheries		
<p>Consider potential economic, social and environmental impacts of other developments on fishing activity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where relevant, evidence that other policies minimise negative impacts on fishing activity and/or aquaculture 	<p>Minerals planning has limited impact on this issue. Policies DM1, DM3 and DM5 of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) will have some benefit on the marine environment, including fishing activity and aquaculture.</p>
3.9 Aquaculture		
<p>Consider the benefits of encouraging the development of efficient, competitive and sustainable aquaculture industries</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where relevant, evidence that the benefits of aquaculture industry development have been considered 	<p>Minerals planning has limited impact on this issue. Policies DM1, DM3 and DM5 of the Minerals Strategy 2014 (MSDCC-54) will have some benefit on the marine environment, including fishing activity and aquaculture.</p>
3.10 Surface water management and waste water treatment and disposal		
<p>Maximise opportunities for co-existence of waste water infrastructure with other activities in the marine environment</p>	<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 for waste water infrastructure to mitigate marine impacts through design or location 	<p>Not relevant to minerals planning.</p>
3.11 Tourism and recreation		
<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>Not relevant to minerals planning.</p>