



## **Purbeck Core Strategy Development Plan Document**

### **Examination into the soundness of the plan**

#### **PURBECK DISTRICT COUNCIL STATEMENT ON THE IMPLICATIONS TO THE CORE STRATEGY OF THE PUBLICATION OF THE NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (NPPF)**

## **1.0 Introduction**

1.1 This statement comprises 2 parts:

1. Summary of the main implications by section of the NPPF
2. Appendix 1: Completed PAS Compatibility Self Assessment Checklist

1.2 Council officers have reviewed the Core Strategy in light of the NPPF, and completed the Planning Advisory Service Toolkit. Officers are suggesting changes to the Core Strategy that would bring it into conformity with the NPPF. These changes are set out in the Schedule of Main Modifications (SD26a), which officers consider to be major changes to the Core Strategy and need examination. A further schedule sets out the Additional Modifications (SD26b), which officers consider are minor changes and do not need examination. These two schedules will replace the submitted library document SD26 - Minor Changes Schedule

1.3 Following the hearing sessions, officers will recommend to Council the publication of the Schedule of Main Modifications for six weeks public consultation in June/July. All responses will be passed to the Inspector for his consideration ahead of publishing his report on the examination.

1.4 In preparing these modifications, officers sought advice from the Inspector. The Inspector confirmed that the NPPF and Core Strategy would be read together in determining planning applications are therefore it is not necessary for the Core Strategy to repeat policies that are in the NPPF, e.g. AONB and Green Belt. The Inspector did point out that there was one exception. The new national policy stance of the presumption in the favour of sustainable development needs to be reflected in the Core Strategy. The Inspector made officers aware of a model policy that must be inserted into the Core Strategy to meet the soundness tests. Therefore officers have included this change in the main modifications.

1.5 Officers recommend that the Core Strategy is renamed the 'Purbeck Local Plan' to reflect the new planning regulations.

## **2.0 The implications of the NPPF to the Core Strategy**

The implications are set out below by section of the NPPF:

### **2.1 Section 1A: Achieving sustainable development**

2.1.1 As described above, the Core Strategy needs to include reference to the presumption in the favour of sustainable development. However, in Purbeck this presumption must be balanced against the adverse impacts upon European protected sites. This exception to meeting objectively set needs (such as housing) is set out in para 14 of the NPPF. The Council has objectively assessed the implications of higher housing targets through the Habitats Regulations Assessment process (HRA). The housing target in the Core Strategy reflects the advice of Natural England in ensuring that the housing target can be delivered with certainty that appropriate mitigation can ensure that there are no adverse effects upon European protected sites.

#### **2.1.2 Main Modifications:**

- Insert government's model policy on presumption in the favour of sustainable development with acknowledgment of the special circumstances in Purbeck.

### **2.2 Section 1: Building a strong, competitive economy (paras 18-22)**

2.2.1 The Core Strategy supports economic development by protecting a suitable supply of employment land on a choice of sites spread around the District. The Core Strategy would benefit from modifications that state explicitly what the economic priorities are for each of the five spatial areas, as this is not currently clear.

2.2.2 The Core Strategy allocates only one new employment site. This is part of a mixed use development at Huntick Road, Lytchett Matravers. All other existing employment sites will be rolled forward as safeguarded employment allocations to provide a good choice of sites.

2.2.3 Ahead of preparation of the Site Allocations Plan and Swanage AAP, the Council will consider preparing an economic strategy that is consistent with the emerging LEP strategy. The economic strategy will inform the subsequent plans which will allocated sites for employment uses. The Council will also undertake Employment Land Review Part 3 (ELR3). ELR 3 will confirm which sites will be best for which sectors and could recommend the release of employment sites or allocation of additional land.

#### **2.2.4 Modifications**

- Add text to each spatial policy setting out the economic priorities for that area.

## **2.3 Section 2: Ensuring the vitality of town centres (paras 23-27)**

2.3.1 The Core Strategy focusses on supporting the vitality and viability of town centres as required by the NPPF. The Core Strategy includes retail floor space targets that reflect needs and will promote growth in town centres and local centres (including villages). The Site Allocations Plan and Swanage Area Action Plan (AAP) will allocate specific sites, review the town centre boundaries and define primary and secondary shopping frontages, where appropriate.

2.3.2 The NPPF allows Councils to set an appropriate threshold whereby a developer would need to submit an impact assessment. Officers consider that any new retail, office or leisure proposal in excess of 1,000sqm outside of a town centre could have an impact upon the town centres, and therefore requests to the Inspector that a modification is made to the Core Strategy. Officers suggest the 1,000sqm threshold as it equates with the size of the two principal food stores in Wareham and Swanage town centres.

### **2.3.3 Modifications**

- Reinforce the town centre focus to retail development in Policy RFS
- Include a 1,000sqm threshold for the submission of an impact assessment for new retail, office or leisure proposals.

## **2.4 Section 3: Supporting a prosperous rural economy (para 28)**

2.4.1 In accordance with the NPPF, the Core Strategy is supportive of development that will expand the rural economy. Policy CO: Countryside and the spatial policies (Policies NW, SW, CEN, NE and SE) all support small scale economic growth, community facilities and the expansion of tourism facilities in rural areas, through both conversion or new build. In addition, Policy CO also supports farm diversification and Policy CF: Community Facilities encourages the development of new community facilities, whilst safeguarding existing. Policy TA: Tourist Accommodation and Attractions directs development to the most appropriate locations to ensure sustainability and to minimise impact on AONB and greenbelt.

### **2.4.2 Modifications**

- None

## **2.5 Section 4: Promoting sustainable transport (paras 29-41)**

2.5.1 The Core Strategy plans the improved self sufficiency of each spatial area by concentrating growth at the towns and key service villages that act as service centres to the surrounding rural settlements. The Purbeck Transportation Strategy (PTS) mitigates any adverse impact of this growth on the constrained road network. The PTS focusses on the delivery of sustainable transport modes

including rail, bus, park and ride, cycling and walking. The outcome will be better public transport linked to housing and employment growth that will help improve the self sufficiency of towns and key service villages and help reduce gas emissions. Large developments will be expected to provide travel plans.

2.5.2 The Core Strategy does not include specific reference to local parking standards, but these are set out in the supporting guidance to the Local Transport Plan 3. It would be clearer for developer's if reference to parking standards is included in the Core Strategy. The parking guidance is sufficiently flexible in accordance with the NPPF.

### 2.5.3 Modifications

- Add reference to car parking standards in Policy IAT: Improving Accessibility and Transport.

## 2.6 **Section 5: Supporting high quality communications infrastructure (paras 42-46)**

2.6.1 There are no new national requirements for communications infrastructure. The Core Strategy only makes one reference to supporting communication growth (para 8.18.1).

### 2.6.2 Modifications

- None

## 2.7 **Section 6: Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes (paras 47-55)**

2.7.1 The housing target reflects Natural England advice of what level and location of development can successfully be mitigated, but this falls short of meeting housing needs. The Council will continue to investigate means of achieving higher housing growth once this Core Strategy has been adopted. The Core Strategy includes sufficient new housing to provide both a 5 and 15 year land supply. There are also sufficient deliverable sites to provide an additional 5% to the 5 year land supply. The Council has not needed to include windfall within the first 10 years of the plan period, despite this providing the bulk of supply in recent years.

2.7.2 The Core Strategy provides a balance of housing types, through the provision of settlement extensions that will provide new family housing (affordable and market) to balance out the increase in flats built and sold on the open market in the first part of the plan period. The policy of setting new thresholds and proportions for affordable housing provision (Policy AH: Affordable Housing) is evidence based and in accordance with the NPPF.

2.7.3 The ability of the Council to consider market housing to encourage rural exception sites to come forward is welcomed. The Council, is through a Policy

Development Panel, considering how best to implement this policy. A modification is needed to Policy RES: Rural Exception Sites to make reference to market housing.

2.7.4 The Core Strategy does not set out specific housing densities. Instead all proposals will be assessed against the Council's townscape character assessments that include detail of appropriate densities for each neighbourhood in the towns and key service villages. The Core Strategy would benefit from clearer reference to this requirement in Policy D: Design.

2.7.5 The Core Strategy does not provide protection of garden development. Subsequent plans, such as the Swanage AAP or neighbourhood plans, can provide local policy to protect gardens from infill development.

#### 2.7.6 Modifications

- Make clearer reference to density requirements in Policy D.
- Clarify 5 year supply position with additional 5% in para 6.3.2
- Add reference to mix of housing provided on settlement extensions in para 6.4.1
- Modify Policy RES to include reference to market housing bringing forward significant additional affordable housing.
- Amend Policy CO, to ensure that the conversion of rural buildings enhances the immediate setting as required by the NPPF.

### 2.8 **Section 7: Requiring good design (paras 56-68)**

2.8.1 Policy D as set out in the Modifications Schedule will promote local distinctive design that is adaptable to changing demography and climate change. Design codes will be looked at in District Design guidance. Development briefs for the three allocated housing sites includes detail on how to ensure the developments are locally distinctive.

#### 2.8.2 Modifications

- None

### 2.9 **Section 8: Promoting healthy communities (paras 69-78)**

2.9.1 The Core Strategy guides economic, housing and retail growth to most sustainable locations to support improved self sufficiency of communities, improving resident's accessibility to services. Policy CF allows the provision of new and replacement community facilities.

2.9.2 There is plenty of opportunity to access the countryside in the District. The Core Strategy will help improve accessibility through the provision of SANGs accompanying housing development that are linked to new or existing public rights of way. Recreational space needs are set out in the Sport and Recreation Audit and Assessment (2006) and any re-development of these spaces will have to pass the tests of para 74 of the NPPF.

2.9.3 The Council has worked with Dorset County Council to ensure that the re-organisation of schooling in Purbeck from three tier to two tier provides sufficient facilities linked to residential growth. In addition, Policy SE: South East Purbeck and Policy NW: North West Purbeck includes criteria based policies that will help bring two new schools forward, which will enable more pupils to attend a local school in Swanage and Bere Regis, reducing the need to travel to schools in other settlements.

#### 2.9.4 Modifications

- Make reference to improving public rights of way in Policy GI.

### **2.10 Section 9: Protecting Green Belt land (paras 79-92)**

2.10.1 The Core Strategy does not include a specific Green Belt policy as it would be unnecessary repetition of the NPPF. Reference to the Green Belt in Policies NE and CEN refer to changes to the extent of Green Belt, but do not provide additional restrictions that would conflict with the NPPF.

2.10.2 The Core Strategy Proposals Map defines the extent of Green Belt in accordance with the 5 tests in the NPPF, using clearly recognisable physical features. Some flexibility with the Green Belt boundary has been made at Holton Heath to allow additional economic growth to come forward if necessary, in this plan period, or the next. The Green Belt boundary has been re-drawn around the three housing allocations to enable them to come forward for development.

2.10.3 The exception for 'limited affordable housing' development in the Green Belt remains in the NPPF and is allowed by Policy RES: Rural Exception Sites.

2.10.4 New SANGs are being sought in the Green Belt linked to public rights of way, improving access and beneficial use of the Green Belt to local residents.

#### 2.10.5 Modifications

- None

## **2.11 Section 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change flooding and coastal change (paras 93-108)**

2.11.1 The spatial development strategy is aimed at improving the self sufficiency of settlements that provide services to the surrounding rural areas, reducing the need to travel. The transport strategy will provide improved public transport, reducing carbon emissions. Map 18 in the Core Strategy sets out opportunities and potential for renewable energy. However, this is indicative and a local energy plan would need to be prepared and the findings incorporated into a subsequent plan. Policy D requires that new development should 'at least match' national targets. Industrial and commercial buildings should aim for a BREEAM very good or higher rating. Developments of 10 or more dwellings should ensure that 10% of energy is through the use of renewable energy systems. These requirements do not go beyond the requirements of Part L of the Building Regulations and therefore don't conflict with the NPPF.

2.11.2 The NPPF encourages active support from Councils for improvements to the energy efficiency of existing buildings. The Core Strategy would benefit from a modification to highlight this.

2.11.3 The sequential test has been applied to ensure new development minimises the risk of flooding and the EA has not objected to the Core Strategy allocations or Policy FR: Flood Risk.

2.11.4 The Council is committed to identifying a coastal change management area centring on Swanage, which will be considered in subsequent plans. Policy CE: Coastal Erosion also includes policies controlling development within indicative erosion zones and 400metre no-water discharge consultation zone around the coastline.

### **2.11.5 Modifications**

- Add a sentence to Policy D supporting energy efficiency measures in existing buildings.

## **2.12 Section 11 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment (paras 109-125)**

2.12.1 The natural environment is of critical importance in Purbeck. New development is being managed to ensure that any adverse effects can be mitigated. Policy BIO: Biodiversity and Geodiversity provides protection to sites not protected through national policy. Para 113 of the NPPF requires Councils to set criteria based policies that makes distinctions between the hierarchy of protected sites. This requirement is unclear. Sites of national and international importance are already covered by national policy and repetition in the Core Strategy appears excessive. Instead, Policy BIO provides suitable policy to ensure other sites are protected.



2.12.2 In response to Natural England representations and the new requirement to protect future SPAs and SACs modification to Policy BIO is required.

2.12.3 Purbeck has recently been designated as a Nature Improvement Area (NIA). A number of projects will take place to improve connectivity of natural habitats and their adaptability to climate change. The Core Strategy makes specific reference to two NIA projects, the achievement of Wild Purbeck (Policy BIO) and the management of visitors to Arne / Hartland Moor (para 7.3.8). Para 117 of the NPPF requires Councils to set out what types of development will be appropriate in these areas. As the NIA projects focus on areas that are already protected by extensive designations, further policy is not required. The Council will seek advice from Natural England on what modifications to Policy BIO are required in light of this requirement. In the meantime, Policy BIO would benefit from reference to the NIA.

2.12.4 The NPPF provides protection for the AONB and Heritage Coast and therefore a specific policy is not required in the Core Strategy.

2.12.5 Policies D and LHH would benefit from reference to mitigating the adverse impacts of light pollution generated by new development.

#### 2.12.6 Modifications

- Add a sentence to Policy BIO to include reference to a risk based approach for potential SPAs and possible SACs.
- Amend Policy D and Policy LHH to include reference to light pollution
- Refer to the NIA in Policy BIO (Wild Purbeck)

### **2.13 Section 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment (paras 126 – 141)**

2.13.1 The Council has agreed through a statement of common ground with English Heritage to modify para 8.17.4 to ensure that the Core Strategy is positive to the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment.

#### 2.13.2 Modifications

- Update section 8.17 in line with statement of common ground with English Heritage

### **2.14 Section 13: Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals (paras 142-149)**

2.14.1 This section is only applicable to Dorset County Council Minerals Local Plan.

#### 2.14.2 Modifications

- None

## **Plan Making**

### **2.15.1 Local Plans (paras 150-157)**

2.15.2 As the Council has already submitted the Core Strategy (Local Plan) for examination, it is not possible at this late stage to include all of the additional requirements set out in the NPPF. To delay adoption to prepare a local plan containing all of the requirements of the NPPF would unduly delay economic development (e.g. house building). Therefore additional development plan documents are justifiable to support the Core Strategy. The Swanage AAP and Site Allocations DPD's will provide additional detail including the allocation of housing, retail and employment sites. The Heathland DPD will provide strategic mitigation to unlock housing development in South East Dorset. The Dorset Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations DPD will enable joint working of all Dorset Councils to make suitable provision.

2.15.3 The Core Strategy has been prepared following extensive and meaningful engagement with the community and reflects the spatial aspirations, as set out in a community's town or parish plan. This engagement has shaped the strategic priorities for the District.

2.15.4 The Core Strategy has objectively assessed needs. Targets for employment and retail growth are achievable, but it is not possible to meet housing needs due to constraints posed by the prevalence of European protected sites. There are similar constraints across South East Dorset that makes meeting the needs of the housing market area difficult. The Council will work with West Dorset District Council on its recent proposals for Crossways, which could help meet some housing needs in South West Purbeck.

2.15.5 With reference to the requirements of NPPF para 157, the Core Strategy is positive towards development, plans for just under a 15 year period, has co-operation from adjacent Councils and the support of statutory organisations (including Natural England, English Heritage, Environment Agency, Highways Agency and Dorset County Council), sets out where strategic development will take place, allocates sites, protects employment land, and conserves and enhances European protected sites and heritage assets.

### **2.15.6 Modifications**

- None

### **2.16 Using a proportionate evidence base (paras 158-177)**

2.16.1 The Core Strategy evidence base has been prepared over a number of years and therefore parts have been updated. The evidence is proportionate to what is required. A key requirement of the NPPF is that sustainable development is viable and deliverable. The Council has used consultants, Three Dragons, to

advise on the deliverability of housing development once Policy AH and Policy DEV are implemented. Three Dragons has advised that the policies are deliverable as there will be sufficient residual land values, in their opinion, to make development attractive to landowners. The consultants also included tested various Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) rates to ensure schemes will remain viable beyond the introduction of CIL in 2014.

2.16.2 This analysis has also looked at the three allocated housing sites. Where development costs for particular sites are higher than normal, the Core Strategy is sufficiently flexible to ensure development goes ahead by allowing the use of an open book approach to negotiation on the affordable housing targets. The Council will undertake a similar assessment of employment and retail site allocations through subsequent plans.

### 2.16.3 Modifications

- None

## 2.17 **Planning strategically across local boundaries**

2.17.1 The Council's duty to co-operate statement and its response to two Inspector's questions provides detail on the Council's cross boundary work. The Core Strategy has been prepared in co-operation with other Dorset local authorities, in particular in South East Dorset. Bournemouth, Poole and Christchurch Councils that make up the conurbation, have all indicated to the Council that their adopted or nearly adopted plans make sufficient provision for their housing and employment needs. In fact, there is likely to be an over-provision of housing in the conurbation that could help towards meeting Purbeck needs. Borough of Poole is also safeguarding over 30 hectares of additional unallocated employment land to meet longer term requirements beyond the plan period. This urban focus to growth in South East Dorset was the aim of the Regional Spatial Strategy and is consistent with the NPPF's objectives for achieving sustainable development.

2.17.2 The Council is also working with West Dorset District Council with its recent cross boundary proposals for large scale growth at Crossways, which may contribute to meeting some housing needs in South West Purbeck.

### 2.17.3 Modifications

- Add reference to the Council's commitment to the duty to co-operate in planning for strategic matters.

## 2.18 **Examining Local Plans (para 182)**

2.18.1 The Core Strategy has been positively prepared to meet objectively assessed needs. Where there is the potential for an adverse impact, mitigation will be

required. The one concern is the shortfall in meeting housing needs. However, further delays to find deliverable solutions would unduly delay housing in the short term. A partial review can be undertaken to assess higher housing growth options.

#### 2.18.2 Modifications

- None

### **2.19 Planning Policy for Traveller Sites**

2.19.1 The Council is preparing a Dorset Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations DPD on a joint basis with all Dorset Councils, including Bournemouth and Poole. This DPD can address all of the new requirements set out in the new national policy, including the requirement to find a 5, 10 and 15 year land supply. The Council will have to re-assess needs to define this supply and therefore table 4 in Policy GT is redundant and should be deleted.

2.19.2 Policy GT was intended to provide policy guidance to any gypsies and travellers who wish to submit a planning application to secure a site ahead of the DPD. With the publication of this new national policy, planning applications will also be judged against the criteria set out in para 11 of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites. This supersedes the criteria in Policy GT and officers recommend that it is deleted.

#### 2.19.3 Modifications

- Delete criteria in Policy GT and table 4



**Local Plans  
and the  
National Planning Policy Framework**

**Compatibility  
Self Assessment Checklist**

**(April 2012)**

Note: Council officers have completed the third and fourth columns in response to questions the second column.

## Introduction

We have produced a checklist to help you assess the content of your local plan<sup>1</sup> against requirements in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) that are new or significantly different from national policy previously set out in PPGs and PPSs.

*These elements are highlighted in red and in italics.*

Although not part of the NPPF it also includes the 'Planning policy for traveller sites' published on 23 March 2012.

## How will it help?

We want to help local authorities to get up-to-date plans in place. This tool will help you to:

- assess your local plan against national policy
- identify gaps
- understand risks
- start to plan how to manage those risks.

This will help you to:

- respond proactively and speedily to the NPPF
- prepare for an examination
- make robust planning decisions
- implement your policies.

PAS will continue to work with authorities through the NPPF transition period.

## Why does it matter?

It matters because to have a plan-led system we need to have sound plans in place. The transition arrangements give authorities with an adopted plan a year to get their policies 'up to date' (in conformity with the NPPF). After that, the policies will be judged by their degree of conformity and the presumption in favour of sustainable development will apply. If you haven't got a plan in place, you need to do so as soon as possible; the further along the process you are, and the closer the conformity of your policies, the more weight they will have (for full details see Annex 1 'Implementation' paragraphs 208-219).

For PAS's interpretation of what you need to know about transition, see ['Things we think you should know about the NPPF'](#).

---

<sup>1</sup> We use the term "local plan" throughout this document. However, adopted plans may comprise a number of development plan documents prepared under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, in which case it may be all of those documents that a local planning authority may wish to consider in the context of the NPPF using this document.

### **Who should use it?**

The checklist was written with adopted plans in mind, but it should also be useful as a check for emerging local plans. It is for all planning authorities in England, including counties and National Parks.

### **What it doesn't do**

It is not an interpretation of national planning policy or a prescribed solution. It excludes the implications of the Localism Act. It doesn't deal with the process of plan-making or aspects of the NPPF which relate specifically to decision making. Nor does it list the things that you *don't* have to do any more as requirements have been dropped.

### **What else are PAS doing?**

There are more parts to this document to follow, including

- a comprehensive checklist of all requirements, new and retained,
- An understanding of what the 'gaps' or discrepancies might mean for you (your risks)
- Some actions you could take to address these risks

### **How should you use it?**

We have structured the checklist in the order of the NPPF, but you might want to prioritise the areas that you think are most important to your area and your overall strategy, and concentrate on the policy areas where you have the most development pressure.

The checklist has used, wherever possible, the same wording as that set out in the NPPF. However, our focus has been to capture the main 'prompts' that you need to consider while keeping the checklist to a reasonable length. However you should cross-refer to the NPPF itself whilst going through the checklist. We have provided paragraph references to help you do this.

Note, however, that this document highlights the new/significantly different bits of the NPPF compared to PPGs and PPSs. You'll need to think about whether, if you've quite an old adopted plan, it was fully compliant with more recent bits of government guidance (eg PPS3 revised June 2011).

The checklist concentrates on identifying where the gaps (or incompatibilities) are; you might want to also keep your own audit trail of the evidence you have identified to demonstrate compatibility, or otherwise, with the NPPF.

### **How we made it**

- We looked at the NPPF and the Impact Assessment published alongside the draft NPPF.
- We identified the main things that it asks or requires local plans to include, and highlighted those that are significantly different from previous national policy and guidance as set out in PPGs and PPSs.

- We turned this into a checklist, and set out some ideas about how local planning authorities could identify parts of their local plan that may be most at odds with this, what may happen as a result, and things they could do to manage this (*to follow*).
- We developed these ideas in consultation with a selection of local planning authorities.

We've worked with the Planning Inspectorate on this and it builds on pilot work done by the Inspectorate. The checklist is intended to provide a constructive starting point for any assessment of how the Framework impacts on plan preparation and is an important element of the support service referred to in paragraph 217 of Annex 1 to the National Planning Policy Framework

### **What will happen to this document in the future?**

It will be reviewed in the light of feedback from local planning authorities that have used it and other stakeholders and updated again as necessary later in 2012.

If you have any feedback please send it to PAS at:

Email: [alice.lester@local.gov.uk](mailto:alice.lester@local.gov.uk)

### **Disclaimer**

This is a PAS document and has not been endorsed by the Department for Communities and Local Government. We are positive that if you go through this exercise you will be able to make a judgment, with confidence, about how your plan relates to the requirements of the NPPF. It will also give you some indication of the sort of actions you may wish to pursue if you need to move towards alignment with the NPPF in any of the policy areas.



**1A: Achieving sustainable development**

The presumption in favour of sustainable development and core planning principles (para 6-17)			
What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
<p><i>Policies in local plans should follow the approach of the presumption in favour of sustainable development and guide how it should be applied locally (15).</i></p>	<p><i>Does the plan positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of the area?</i></p> <p><i>Does the plan meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, (subject to the caveats set out in para14)?</i></p> <p><i>Do you have a policy or policies which reflect the principles of the presumption in favour of sustainable development? A <a href="#">model policy</a> is provided on the Planning Portal in the Local Plans section, as a suggestion (but this isn't prescriptive).</i></p>	<p>Plan is positive in meeting needs except where there are insurmountable constraints. There has been close co-operation between the Council and other Dorset Councils.</p> <p>Employment and Retail needs are met. Housing needs cannot be met due to constraints posed by European protected sites.</p> <p>This policy is not included.</p>	<p>No significant differences or affect on strategy</p> <p>Significant difference, but para 14 of NPPF includes exception to meeting needs where there is a significant adverse effects</p> <p>The model policy will need to be inserted into the Core Strategy</p>
<p>The NPPF sets out a set of 12 core land-use principles which should underpin plan-making (and decision-making) (17)</p>			

**1B: Delivering sustainable development**

1. Building a strong, competitive economy (paras 18-22)			
What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
Set out a clear economic vision for the area which positively and proactively encourages sustainable economic growth (21).	<i>Is there an up to date assessment of the deliverability of allocated employment sites, to meet local needs, to justify their long-term protection (taking into account that LPAs should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of an allocated site being used for that purpose) para (22)?</i>	<p>The Core Strategy doesn't include an economic strategy.</p> <p>The Council has not prepared a specific assessment of the deliverability of employment sites.</p>	<p>Without being explicit, the Core Strategy has different economic priorities for each of the spatial areas. These priorities could be highlighted. Therefore the Council has put forward modifications to ensure the particular strategy is clear for each spatial area.</p> <p>The Core Strategy doesn't allocate employment land. Instead, it carries forward the existing sites with a commitment to future review. There is a supply of 35hectares of employment in Purbeck and a forecast need of 11.5hectares with the majority available and being marketed for business use. The Workspace Strategy (2008) is currently being updated. The findings will inform ELR Part 3 and the subsequent Site Allocations Plan and Swanage AAP. If sites have no reasonable prospect of employment use, they can be de-allocated and considered for other purposes. through the update to the Workspace Strategy.</p> <p>If employment sites are de-allocated they will not adversely affect the spatial strategy. For example, delivery of employment growth at Dorset Green is not linked to housing growth in South West Purbeck</p>

2. Ensuring the vitality of town centres (paras 23-27)			
What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
Set out policies for the management and growth of centres over the plan period (23).	<i>Have you undertaken an assessment of the need to expand your town centre, considering the needs of town centre uses? Have you identified primary and secondary shopping frontages?</i>	No, the potential expansion of the town centre has been passed down to Swanage AAP and Site Allocations Plan. Core Strategy highlights potential extensions to town centres at Swanage (Railway station, Pierhead).  Primary shopping frontages are carried forward from Local Plan onto the Proposals Map and will be reviewed in subsequent plans.	Too much detail for Core Strategy so best passed to subsequent plan. This will not affect the overall strategy.

3. Supporting a prosperous rural economy (para 28)			
What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
Policies should support economic growth in rural areas in order to create jobs and prosperity by taking a positive approach to sustainable new development (28).	<i>Do your policies align with the objectives of para 28?</i>	The Core Strategy supports the rural economy in accordance with the NPPF. Policy CO and the spatial policies support small scale economic growth, community facilities and the expansion of tourism facilities in rural areas, through conversion or new build. Policy CO supports farm diversification. Policy CF promotes new and safeguards existing village services. Tourism accommodation is being directed to appropriate locations that will minimise impact on AONB and greenbelt.	No significant differences or affect on strategy

4. Promoting sustainable transport (paras 29-41)			
What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
<p>Policies that facilitate sustainable development but also contribute to wider sustainability and health objectives (29).</p> <p>Different policies and measures will be required in different communities and opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary from urban to rural areas (29).</p>	<p><i>If local (car parking) standards have been prepared, are they justified and necessary? (39)</i> <i>(The cancellation of PPG13 removes the maximum standards for major non-residential development set out in Annex D. PPS4 allowed for non-residential standards to be set locally with Annex D being the default position. There is no longer a requirement to set non-residential parking standards as a maximum but that does not preclude lpas from doing so if justified by local circumstances).</i></p> <p>Has it taken into account how this relates to other policies set out elsewhere in the Framework, <i>particularly in rural areas? (34).</i></p> <p><i>Have you worked with adjoining authorities and transport providers on the provision of viable infrastructure?</i></p>	<p>The Core Strategy does not include specific reference to local parking standards, but these are set out in the supporting guidance to the Local Transport Plan 3. It would be clearer for developer's if reference to parking standards is included in the Core Strategy. The parking guidance is sufficiently flexible in accordance with the NPPF.</p> <p>PTS will provide better public transport linked to housing and employment growth that will help improve the self sufficiency of towns and key service villages. These settlements provide service centres to surrounding smaller settlements. Core Strategy underpinned by Purbeck Transportation Strategy to ensure that the necessary infrastructure accompanies housing.</p> <p>The Council has worked with Dorset County Council on preparing the PTS, who in turn have been working with other authorities including Poole and Bournemouth on their transport strategies to ensure suitable joined up provision of appropriate infrastructure.</p>	<p>No significant differences or affect on strategy. Add reference to car parking standards in Policy IAT: Improving Accessibility and Transport</p>

<b>5. Supporting high quality communications infrastructure (paras 42-46)</b>			
There are no new or significantly different requirements for the policy content of local plans in this section of the NPPF.			

6. Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes (paras 47-55)			
What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
Identify and maintain a rolling supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years' worth of housing against their housing requirements; this should include an additional buffer of <i>5% or 20% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to ensure choice and competition in the market for land (47)</i> .	<p><i>What is your record of housing delivery?</i></p> <p><i>Have you identified:</i>  a) five years or more supply of specific deliverable sites;  b) an additional buffer of 5% (moved forward from later in the plan period), or  c) If there has been a record of persistent under delivery have you identified a buffer of 20% (moved forward from later in the plan period)? [Para 47].</p> <p><i>Does this element of housing supply include windfall sites; if so, to what extent is there 'compelling evidence' to justify their inclusion (48)?</i></p>	<p>Good - first 6 years of Plan period delivery has exceeded the housing target of 120 dwellings per annum.</p> <p>(a) Yes (b) Yes (c) n/a</p> <p>No, windfall sites not required until years 11-15</p>	No significant differences or affect on strategy
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).	<i>To what extent does the removal of national and regional brownfield targets have an impact on housing land supply?</i>	None, as there is insufficient brownfield land in appropriate locations to meet housing target.	No significant differences or affect on strategy

Planning Advisory Service  
Local Plans and National Planning Policy Framework: LPA Self Assessment

<p>Plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic and market trends, and needs of different groups (50), and caters for housing demand and the scale of housing supply to meet this demand (para 159)</p>	<p><i>Does the plan include policies requiring affordable housing? Do these need to be reviewed in the light of removal of the national minimum threshold? Is your evidence for housing provision based on up to date, objectively assessed needs</i></p>	<p>Yes, Policy AH lowers the minimum threshold, supported by up to date evidence of housing need in the 2012 strategic housing market assessment</p>	<p>No significant differences or affect on strategy</p>
<p>In rural areas be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs, particularly for affordable housing, including through rural exception sites where appropriate (54).</p>	<p><i>Have you considered whether your plan needs a policy which allows some market housing to facilitate the provision of significant additional affordable housing to meet local needs?</i></p>	<p>No policy is currently included.</p>	<p>This is a major change that the Council welcomes as it will help deliver much needed affordable housing. The Council has put forward a modification to the Inspector to add greater flexibility to Policy RES. Additional housing sites will improve the flexibility of the Core Strategy and support smaller settlements that do not benefit from a housing allocation</p>
	<p><i>Have you considered the case for setting out policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens? (This is discretionary)(para 53)</i></p>	<p>No policy is included. A subsequent plan could consider such a policy. E.g. the Swanage Area Action Plan is considering a houses in large gardens policy.</p>	<p>No significant differences or affect on strategy</p>
<p>In rural areas housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.</p>	<p><i>Examples of special circumstances to allow new isolated homes listed at para 55 (note, previous requirement about requiring economic use first has gone).</i></p>	<p>Policy CO needs updating in light of this policy change.</p>	<p>A major change is required to Policy CO to permit the conversion of rural buildings for all types of housing (not just affordable housing). This has the potential to affect the overall strategy, only if a large amount of development comes forward.</p>



<b>7. Requiring good design (paras 56-68)</b>			
There are no new or significantly different requirements for the policy content of local plans in this section of the NPPF.			

8. Promoting healthy communities (paras 69-78)			
What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
<i>Policies should plan positively for the provision and use of shared space, community facilities and other local services (70).</i>	<i>Does the plan include a policy or policies addressing community facilities and local services?  To what extent do policies plan positively 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?</i>	Yes, Policy CF  Policy CF allows the provision of new and replacement community facilities. The policy also protects facilities. The Core Strategy aims to improve the self sufficiency of communities. Particular focus on towns and key service villages within each spatial area to serve surrounding rural areas.	No significant differences or affect on strategy
<i>Enable local communities, through local and neighbourhood plans, to identify special protection green areas of particular importance to them – 'Local Green Space' (76-78).</i>	<i>Do you have a policy which would enable the protection of Local Green Spaces and manage any development within it in a manner consistent with policy for Green Belts? (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).</i>	Policy GI allows the provision of new open space, replacement of existing open space with a new site and safeguards existing facilities.	No significant differences or affect on strategy

9. Protecting Green Belt land (paras 79-92)			
What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
<p>The general extent of Green Belts across the country is already established. New Green Belts should only be established in exceptional circumstances (82)</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>Boundaries should be set using 'physical features likely to be permanent' amongst other things (85)</p>	<p>If you are including Green Belt policies in your plan, do they accurately reflect the NPPF policy? For example:</p> <p>Lpas should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt. <i>Beneficial uses are listed in para 81.</i> PPG2 set out that 'Green Belts have a positive role to play in fulfilling objectives. Para 1.6 of PPG2 set out the objectives – some of these have been rephrased/ amended and 'to retain land in agricultural, forestry and related uses' has been omitted.</p> <p>Ensure consistency with the Local Plan strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development (85).</p> <p>Does it allow for the extension or alteration of a <i>building</i>, provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building? (89). <i>PPG2 previously referred to dwelling. Original building is defined in the Glossary.</i></p> <p>Does it allow for the replacement of a <i>building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces?</i> (89) <i>PPG2 did not have a separate bullet point – replacement related to dwellings rather than buildings.</i></p> <p><i>Does it allow for limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land) whether redundant or in</i></p>	<p>The Core Strategy does not include a specific Green Belt policy as it would be unnecessary repetition of the NPPF. Reference to the Green Belt in Policies NE and CEN refer to changes to the extent of Green Belt, but do not provide additional restrictions that would conflict with the NPPF.</p>	<p>No significant differences or affect on strategy</p>

	<p><i>continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development? (89)</i> (PPG2 referred to 'major existing developed sites')</p> <p>Change from 'Park and Ride' in PPG2 to <i>local transport infrastructure</i> and the inclusion of '<i>development brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order</i>' in relation to other forms of development that are not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in Green Belt. (90).</p>		
--	--	--	--

10. Meeting the challenge of climate change flooding and coastal change (paras 93-108)			
What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
<i>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).</i>	<p><i>Have you planned new development in locations and ways which reduce greenhouse gas emissions?</i></p> <p><i>Does your plan actively support energy efficiency improvements to existing buildings?</i></p> <p><i>When setting any local requirement for a building's sustainability, have you done so in a way that is consistent with the Government's zero carbon buildings policy and adopt nationally described standards? (95)</i></p>	<p>The spatial development strategy is aimed at improving the self sufficiency of settlements that provide services to the surrounding rural areas, reducing the need to travel. The transport strategy will provide improved public transport, reducing carbon emissions.</p> <p>Reference is not set out explicitly in the Core Strategy</p> <p>Policy D requires that new development should 'at least match' national targets. Industrial and commercial buildings should aim for a BREEAM very good or higher rating. These do not conflict with the NPPF</p>	<p>No significant differences or affect on strategy</p> <p>The Council has put forward a modification that supports energy efficiency improvements to existing buildings.</p> <p>No significant differences or affect on strategy</p>
Help increase the use and supply of renewable and low carbon energy (97).	<p><i>Do you have a positive strategy to promote energy from renewable and low carbon sources?</i></p> <p><i>Have you considered identifying 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)</i></p>	<p>Policy REN supports renewable energy production. Policy D requires a 10% target for renewable energy in developments of 10 dwellings or more.</p> <p>Map 18 in the Core Strategy sets out opportunities and potential for renewable energy. However, this is indicative and a local energy plan would need to be prepared and the findings incorporated into a subsequent plan.</p>	<p>No significant differences or affect on strategy</p>

11. Conserving and enhancing the natural environment (paras 109-125)			
What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
<p>Planning policies should minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity (para 117).</p> <p>Planning policies should plan for biodiversity at a landscape-scale across local authority boundaries (117).</p>	<p><i>If you have identified Nature Improvement Areas, have you considered specifying the types of development that may be appropriate in these areas (para 117)?</i></p>	<p>The whole of Purbeck District has recently been identified as a Nature Improvement Area (NIA). Policy BIO does not state what type of uses are suitable in the NIA.</p>	<p>Policy BIO should include criteria on what is or isn't allowed in the NIA. However, the 20 or so project areas within the NIA are already protected by various designations so additional policy may be redundant. The NIA is a new designation and the Council needs further consideration before introducing criteria based policy, possibly in a subsequent plan. Due to the existing protections, it is unlikely that this will affect the overall strategy.</p>

<b>12. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment (paras 126 – 141)</b>			
There are no new or significantly different requirements for the policy content of local plans in this section of the NPPF.			

13. Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals (paras 142-149)			
What NPPF expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Does your local plan address this issue and meet the NPPF's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
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).	<i>Does the plan have policies for the selection of sites for future peat extraction? (143) (NPPF removes the requirement to have a criteria based policy as peat extraction is not supported nationally over the longer term).</i>	Not applicable	Not applicable



### **Planning policy for traveller sites**

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

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

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

Government's aims in respect of traveller sites are:

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

In addition local planning authorities should:

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

Policy A: Using evidence to plan positively and manage development (para 6)			
What the policy for traveller sites expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what the policy expects	Does your local plan meet the policy's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
Early and effective community engagement with both settled and traveller communities.	Has your evidence been developed having undertaken early and effective engagement including discussing travellers accommodation needs with travellers themselves, their representative bodies and local support groups?	A GTAA was carried out in 2008 to assess needs to 2011. This is under review to look into the future.	There are significant differences, but these will be addressed in the Dorset Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations DPD so will not affect the overall strategy. Policy GT will need updating.
Co-operate with travellers, their representative bodies and local support groups, other local authorities and relevant interest groups to prepare and maintain an up-to-date understanding of likely permanent and transit accommodation needs of their areas.	<p>Can you demonstrate that you have a clear understanding of the needs of the traveller community over the lifespan of your development plan?</p> <p><b>Have you worked collaboratively with neighbouring local planning authorities?</b></p> <p>Have you used a robust evidence base to establish accommodation needs to inform the preparation of your local plan and make planning decisions?</p>	<p>The GTAA identified need to 2011 and therefore the review of the GTAA is essential.</p> <p>The target for Gypsy and Traveller sites and allocated sites will be agreed through the Dorset Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations DPD. This is being prepared jointly by all Dorset authorities as provision of sites (particularly transit sites) will need cross boundary co-operation</p> <p>The evidence base consists of the GTAA and history of illegal encampments. In addition the recent Issues and Options consultation has identified potential sites.</p>	There are significant differences, but these will be addressed in the Dorset Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations DPD so will not affect the overall strategy. Policy GT will need updating.

<b>Policy B: Planning for traveller sites (paras 7-11)</b>			
<b>What the policy for traveller sites expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives</b>	<b>Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what the policy expects</b>	<b>Does your local plan meet the policy's expectations?</b>	<b>How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?</b>
Set pitch targets for gypsies and travellers and plot targets for travelling showpeople which address the likely permanent and transit site accommodation needs of travellers in your area, working collaboratively with neighbouring lpas (8)	Have you identified, and do you update annually, a supply of specific, deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5 years worth of sites against locally set targets? Have you identified a supply of specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth for years 6-10, and, where possible, for years 11-15. (9)	This is not included in the Core Strategy. Instead the supply of sites will be established through the Dorset Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations DPD	There are significant differences, but these will be addressed in the Dorset Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations DPD so will not affect the overall strategy. Policy GT will need updating.
Consider the production of joint development plans that set targets on a cross-authority basis, to provide more flexibility in identifying sites.	Have you identified constraints within your local area which prevent you from allocating sufficient sites to meet likely future need? If so have you prepared a joint development plan or do you intend to do so? Is the reason for this clearly explained?	There are significant constraints in Purbeck that will make finding sites difficult. The Dorset Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations DPD will look to meet provision across Dorset.	There are significant differences, but these will be addressed in the Dorset Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations DPD so will not affect the overall strategy. Policy GT will need updating..
Relate the number of pitches and plots to the circumstances of the specific size and location of the site and the surrounding population size and density.			
Protect local amenity and environment.			
Set criteria to guide land supply allocations where there is identified need.	Has an up-to-date assessment of the need for traveller sites been carried out? If an unmet need has been demonstrated has a supply of specific, deliverable sites	The GTAA is being updated and will inform the Dorset Gypsy Traveller Site Allocations DPD. In the interim, the Core Strategy includes a criteria	There are significant differences, but these will be addressed in the Dorset Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations DPD so will not affect the overall

Planning Advisory Service  
Local Plans and National Planning Policy Framework: LPA Self Assessment

	been identified based on the criteria you have set? Where there is no identified need, have criteria been included in case applications nevertheless come forward?	based policy that will be used to determine planning applications for gypsy and traveller sites in the interim.	strategy. Policy GT will need updating.
Ensure that traveller sites are sustainable economically, socially and environmentally.	Have your policies been developed taking into account criteria a-h of para 11 of the policy	Officers have reviewed Policy GT against para 11. The objectives of the policies are the same, but there are some potential conflicts between the policies.	The differences are sufficient to warrant deleting the criteria in Policy GT. Planning applications will be determined against national policy instead, so this will not affect the overall strategy. Further detailed policy will be included in the Dorset Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations DPD

<b>Policy C: Sites in rural areas and the countryside (para 12)</b>			
<b>What the policy for traveller sites expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives</b>	<b>Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what the policy expects</b>	<b>Does your local plan meet the policy's expectations?</b>	<b>How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?</b>
When assessing the suitability of sites in rural or semi-rural settings lpas should ensure that the scale of such sites do not dominate the nearest settled community?			

<b>Policy D: Rural exception sites (para 13)</b>			
<b>What the policy for traveller sites expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives</b>	<b>Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what the policy expects</b>	<b>Does your local plan meet the policy's expectations?</b>	<b>How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?</b>
If there is a lack of affordable land to meet local traveller needs, lpas	If you have a lack of affordable land to meet local traveller needs in your rural	The Core Strategy includes criteria based policy for all	The differences are sufficient to warrant deleting the criteria in Policy GT. Planning applications

in rural areas, where viable and practical, should consider allocating and releasing sites solely for affordable travellers sites.	area have you used a rural exception site policy, and if so, does it make it clear that such sites shall be used for affordable traveller sites <b>in perpetuity?</b>	gypsy and traveler needs, not just affordable sites.  Dorset Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations DPD will provide sites for all needs including private ownership and affordable Council run sites.	will be determined against national policy instead, so this will not affect the overall strategy. Further detailed policy will be included in the Dorset Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations DPD
--	---	--	---

Policy E: Traveller sites in Green Belt (paras 14-15)			
What the policy for traveller sites expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what the policy expects	Does your local plan meet the policy's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
Traveller sites (both permanent and temporary) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.	Have you made an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site? Has this alteration been done through the plan-making process and is it specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only	The Green Belt in the Core Strategy has not been amended to make specific provision for gypsy and traveller sites. If the Dorset Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations DPD allocates sites in the Green Belt, the Green Belt will be amended accordingly.	There are significant differences, but these will be addressed in the Dorset Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations DPD. Policy GT will provide a suitable interim measure.

Policy F: Mixed planning use traveller sites (paras 16-18)			
What the policy for traveller sites expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what the policy expects	Does your local plan meet the policy's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
	Have you considered including travellers sites suitable for mixed residential and business use (having regard to safety and amenity of the	The Core Strategy housing allocations do not include a requirement to include gypsy and	There are significant differences, but these will be addressed in the Dorset Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations DPD. Policy GT will

	<p>occupants and neighbouring residents)?</p> <p>If mixed sites are not practicable have you considered the scope for identifying separate sites for residential and for business purposes in close proximity to one another?</p> <p>Have you had regard to the need that travelling showpeople have for mixed-use yards to allow residential accommodation and space for storage of equipment? <b>NB Mixed use should not be permitted on rural exception sites</b></p>	<p>traveller pitches.</p> <p>Dorset Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations DPD</p> <p>This will be looked at through the Dorset Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations DPD</p>	<p>provide a suitable interim measure.</p>
--	--	--	--

Policy G: Major development projects (para 19)			
What the policy for traveller sites expects local plans to include to deliver its objectives	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what the policy expects	Does your local plan meet the policy's expectations?	How significant are any differences? Do they affect your overall strategy?
	<p>Do you have a major development proposal which requires the permanent or temporary relocation of a traveller site?</p> <p>If so has a site or sites suitable for the relocation of the community been identified (if the original site is authorised)?</p>	<p>No</p> <p>Not applicable</p>	<p>No significant differences or affect on strategy</p>

Plan-making

Local Plans (paras 150-157)			
What NPPF identifies in relation to the development of local plans	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Which parts of your local plan address this issue (reference and brief summary of content, plus any other relevant evidence)	Does your local plan meet the NPPF's expectations? How significant are any differences?
Each local planning authority should produce a Local Plan for its area. Any additional DPDs should only be used where clearly justified. SPDs should be used where they help applicants make successful applications/aid infrastructure delivery/not be used to add unnecessarily to financial burdens on development (153)	<i>Are you able to clearly justify the use of additional DPDs if this is the approach that you are pursuing?</i>	As the Council has already submitted the Core Strategy (Local Plan) for examination, it is not possible at this late stage to include all of the additional requirements set out in the NPPF. To delay adoption to prepare a local plan containing all of the requirements of the NPPF would unduly delay economic development (e.g. house building). Therefore additional development plan documents are justifiable to support the Core Strategy. The Swanage AAP and Site Allocations DPD's will provide additional detail including the allocation of housing, retail and employment sites. The Heathland DPD will provide strategic mitigation to unlock housing development in South East Dorset. The Dorset Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations DPD will enable joint working of all Dorset Councils to make suitable provision.	Council's approach differs significantly from NPPF approach of preparing one local plan. However, pragmatic approach is to adopt Core Strategy in current format and then complete separate DPDs until such time as the review of the Local Plan provides the opportunity to prepare a single plan.
<b>Local Plans should:</b> □ Plan positively (para 157)	<i>Have you objectively assessed development needs and planned for them?</i>	The Core Strategy has objectively assessed needs. Targets for employment and retail growth are achievable, but it is not possible to meet Purbeck's housing needs due to insurmountable constraints.	No significant differences or affect on strategy

	<p><i>If you can't meet them in your area, have you co-operated with others on meeting them elsewhere? (para 182)</i></p>	<p>There are similar constraints across South East Dorset that makes meeting the needs of the housing market area difficult. The Council will work with West Dorset District Council on its proposals for Crossways, which could help meet housing needs in South West Purbeck. Poole, Bournemouth and Christchurch Councils have informed officers that they can meet their own housing and employment needs without requiring provision in Purbeck. In fact, there will be additional housing in the conurbation that could help meet Purbeck's housing needs in the plan period.</p>	
--	---	---	--



Using a proportionate evidence base (paras 158-177)			
What NPPF identifies in relation to the development of local plans	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Which parts of your local plan address this issue (reference and brief summary of content, plus any other relevant evidence)	Does your local plan meet the NPPF's expectations? How significant are any differences?
<b>Defence, national security, counter-terrorism and resilience</b>	See para 164		
<p><b>Ensuring viability and deliverability</b></p> <p>The sites and scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened (173)</p>	<p><i>To what extent has your plan been assessed to ensure viability, taking into account the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements? In so doing to what extent has it taken into account the normal cost of development and on-site mitigation and provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable (173)?</i></p> <p><i>To what extent have the likely cumulative impacts on development in your area of all existing and proposed local standards, supplementary planning documents and policies that support the development plan, when added to nationally required standards been assessed to ensure that the cumulative impact of these standards and policies do not put implementation of the development plan at serious risk, and facilitate development throughout the economic cycle (174)?</i></p>	<p>The three allocated sites have been assessed and can deliver 40-50% affordable housing plus other section 106 contributions and various hypothetical rates of CIL. No assessment has been made for employment or retail sites, but these are not allocated in the Core Strategy. This work will be looked at ahead of their allocation in subsequent plans.</p> <p>The Three Dragons analysis has used a standard approach to build costs, developer profit and contributions. The residual values for these sites is sufficient to make them attractive to landowners to bring forward for development.</p> <p>Emerging CIL work from Three Dragons confirms that The Council can deliver development in accordance with Core Strategy policy requirements and achieve CIL for housing and retail development. CIL may not be achievable for employment development. No analysis has been done on the viability of employment land to meet transport contributions and BREEAM requirements.</p>	<p>No significant differences or affect on strategy – employment viability will be looked at as part of CIL and Employment Land Review Part 3. In the meantime the Council will use open book appraisal to ensure economic development comes forward.</p>

Examining Local Plans (para 182)			
What NPPF identifies in relation to the development of local plans	Questions to help understand whether your local plan includes what NPPF expects	Which parts of your local plan address this issue (reference and brief summary of content, plus any other relevant evidence)	Does your local plan meet the NPPF's expectations? How significant are any differences?
Authorities should submit a plan for examination which it considers is sound, including being ....	<i>Positively prepared</i>	The Core Strategy has been positively prepared to meet objectively assessed needs. Where there is the potential for an adverse impact, mitigation will be required. The one concern is the shortfall in meeting Purbeck's housing needs although this need could be met by new housing in the conurbation. Further delays to find deliverable solutions would unduly delay housing in the short term which will help towards immediate needs. A partial review can be undertaken to assess higher housing growth options.	No significant differences or affect on strategy