# PAS LOCAL PLAN ROUTE MAPPER TOOLKIT PART 4: LOCAL PLAN SOUNDNESS & QUALITY ASSESSMENT

**Why you should use this part of the toolkit**

The purpose of this assessment is to provide a ‘mock’ examination - as far as that is possible - of the drafts of your local plan policies update. It is intended to be particularly helpful for use as part of the development of your emerging local plan policies update and as a final check prior to publication of your Regulation 19 Submission Local Plan policies update. It will help you to identify areas for improvement and understand potential risks to the soundness of the plan or its usability.

**How to use this part of the toolkit**

There are 50 ‘key questions’ in the assessment matrix below which might seem a lot to get through. But thinking through these questions now could save time and expense further down the line. If you are undertaking a partial plan policies update not all of the content will be relevant to you.

If you are completing this assessment or peer reviewing it for a colleague within or from another authority, you should put yourself into the mind of a Planning Inspector assessing the soundness of the draft local plan policies update by keeping in mind the ‘tests’ as follows. Is the draft local plan update:

* **Positively prepared** – providing a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area’s objectively assessed needs; and is informed by agreements with other authorities, so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated where it is practical to do so and is consistent with achieving sustainable development;
* **Justified** – an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence;
* **Effective** – deliverable over the plan period, and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common ground; and
* **Consistent with national policy** – enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the [National Planning Policy Framework](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2).

For some elements, particularly those concerning clarity, you will also need to consider yourself as an end user of the Local Plan policies update.

Provide a brief answer to each question cross referring to evidence that has informed or supports the local plan policies update in order to justify your reasoning and the score you have attributed. Identify any likely implications of not changing your approach or ways in which you may potentially improve the score either through changes to the plan policies update, evidence or further engagement with developers or infrastructure providers recorded in your statement of common ground. But remember that the local plan policies update doesn’t need to be supported by reams of evidence. Evidence needs to be proportionate, clear and robust in line with [PAS advice on proportionate evidence](https://www.local.gov.uk/pas/).

If you find it helpful, you can score your local plan policies update on the degree to which you meet requirements underpinning the question. You can then add up the scores to calculate your confidence in the local plan policies update (on a scale from -100 to +100) and use this as a benchmark for future improvements. Where a particular question is not applicable to your circumstances, please score +2.

**How to use the results of this part of the toolkit**

You can use the results of this tool throughout the plan making process to assess the extent to which your plan addresses key soundness requirements. There is no requirement to publish or submit this table to the Planning Inspectorate as part of the independent examination, but you may find the assessment (or some elements) helpful to inform changes to your plan or supporting documents.

|  | ***KEY QUESTIONS*** | ***Assessment***  *Note: In answering the questions, you should be able to reference the document(s) in the plan evidence base (which may include any Statement(s) of Common Ground - both Examination focused and in relation to the Duty to Cooperate). Try to be as precise as possible when referencing evidence sources, including identifying specific sections/ paragraphs where appropriate.* | | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Growth Strategy** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **A** | **In no more than 100 words (excluding any referencing) summarise your strategy for delivering growth and development in your area** | The purpose of the Development Management in Birmingham Development Plan Document (DMB) is to provide detailed non-strategic development management policies to support the delivery of the strategic policies set out in the Birmingham Development Plan (BDP), adopted in January 2017. When adopted, the BDP replaced the  saved policies of the Birmingham Unitary Development Plan 2005, with the exception of those policies contained within chapter 8 and paragraphs 3.14 to 3.14D of that plan. The DMB once it is adopted, will replace these remaining Saved 2005Birmingham Unitary Development Plan policies and form part of Birmingham’s Local Plan. The strategy for delivering growth and development is set out in the adopted BDP. The strategy of the BDP aims to accommodate as much of the city’s housing and economic needs as possible within its boundary. This includes maximising brownfield land development and releasing green belt land for an urban extension of 6,000 homes and a 71-hectare employment site. Overall, the BDP will deliver 51,100 new homes; two Regional Investment Sites; a 71-hectare employment site at Peddimore; a minimum 5-year reservoir of 96 ha of land for employment use; 350,000 sq.m. of comparison retail development; and of 745,000 sq.m. of office space. | | | | | | | | | |
| **B** | **In no more than 100 words (excluding any referencing) identify the key factors which informed the distribution of development in the local plan policies update** | This question is not applicable to the DMB as the spatial distribution of growth is set out in the adopted BDP. The BDP focuses significant development on a number of locations which currently play an important role in providing homes, jobs and supporting facilities. These are the Key Growth Areas described in further detail below, in addition to the urban extensions at Langley and Peddimore. Equally the wider City will also see levels of growth reflecting the historic patterns of development and availability of land. The distribution of other growth opportunities is focussed on the City’s extensive network of local centres, the Core Employment Areas, key transport corridors and other opportunity sites. | | | | | | | | | |
| **C** | **List each of the main growth areas and strategic sites and the key infrastructure needed to support delivery** | This is not applicable to the DMB as the key growth areas are identified in the BDP. These are:  • The City Centre – a focus for major retail, leisure, office, leisure growth as well as new residential accommodation, and the arrival of HS2.  • Greater Icknield – a strategically significant site to the west of the City Centre which will be developed to provide a sustainable neighbourhood of 3,000 new homes.  • Aston, Newtown and Lozells - includes a 20 ha Regional Investment Site, including the growth of Perry Barr District Centre.  • Sutton Coldfield Town Centre – significant growth and diversification of the town centre to improve the current limited retail and leisure offer.  • Bordesley Park - an Area Action Plan has been recently adopted for the Bordesley Park area. The AAP will deliver 750 new homes, enhanced connectivity, an improved environment and new employment generating activity.  • Eastern Triangle – regeneration and growth of around 1,000 new homes and improvements to local centres at the Meadway, Stechford and Shard End.  • Selly Oak and South Edgbaston – major regeneration and investment opportunities including growth of Selly Oak District Centre, 700 new homes and a new life sciences campus.  • Longbridge - a Regional Investment Site, 1450 new homes, a new local centre and other employment sites.  • Langley Sustainable Urban Extension – 6,000 new homes, supported by a range of facilities and well-connected integrated transport links.  • Peddimore Employment Site - a 71ha high quality employment site creating c. 7,000 jobs to meet the critical shortage of high-quality employment land in the city. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Overall does the local plan policies update clearly articulate the strategy for where and how sustainable development will be delivered and that this is ‘an appropriate strategy’ within the context of paragraph 35 of the NPPF?** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | +2 | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement | |
| **Reason for score:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** The BDP which was adopted in January 2017 clearly sets out the strategy for sustainable growth. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Is it clear how the amount of development identified for any growth areas or major site allocations has been determined – and that the level proposed is deliverable and justified?** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | +2 | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement | |
| **Reason for score:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** The levels of growth were found to be justified and deliverable as evidenced by the BDP Inspector’s report (March 2016). | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Is it clear that the local plan policies update provides for the most appropriate level of housing growth using the standard methodology as a starting point? Can you clearly articulate why planned growth levels should not be higher or lower?**  **If you are proposing any material change away from the level of housing indicated by the standard method, can you clearly justify this through evidence?**  **Does the level of housing provide for an appropriate and justified buffer?** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | +2 | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement | |
| **Reason for score:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** The housing requirement is contained in the adopted BDP which pre-dates the standard methodology. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Is the distribution of development justified in respect of the need for, and approach to, Green Belt release and can you demonstrate that alternatives to Green Belt release have been fully considered? Can you demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist to justify green belt release?** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | +2 | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement | |
| **Reason for score:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** Exceptional circumstances to justify green belt release were demonstrated by the city council as evidenced by the BDP Inspector’s report (March 2016). | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Is it clear how sites have been selected and have site allocations been made on a consistent basis having regard to the evidence base, including housing and employment land availability assessments, the Sustainability Appraisal and viability assessment? If not, can you justify why?** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | +2 | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement | |
| **Reason for score:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** The site allocations and Key Growth Areas were found sound as evidenced by the BDP Inspector’s report (March 2016). | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Does the local plan policies update identify a housing requirement for designated neighbourhood areas?** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | +2 | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement | |
| **Reason for score:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** The BDP pre-dates the 2019 NPPF which requires local plans to identify a housing requirement for designated neighbourhood areas. The DMB provides detailed development management policies to support the delivery of the adopted BDP. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Do site allocations include sufficient detail on the mix and quantum of development, including, where appropriate any necessary supporting infrastructure?** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | +2 | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement | |
| **Reason for score:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** The DMB does not allocate sites. | | | | | | | | | |
| **D** | **What targets have you set for non-residential floorspace or employment land and, if relevant, the number of jobs to be created over the plan period?**  **List these targets and the evidence source for this ‘need’ target?** | The BDP sets targets for the development of two Regional Investment Sites of 20 and 25 hectares each; a 71-hectare employment site at Peddimore; a minimum 5-year reservoir of 96 ha of land for employment use; 350,000 sq.m. of comparison retail development; and of 745,000 sq.m. of office space.  The evidence source for these targets can be viewed at: <https://www.birmingham.gov.uk/directory_record/1361/economy_and_network_of_centres> | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Where and how are the targets referred to above to be delivered? Do the sites and indicative capacities that you have identified demonstrate that these targets are achievable? If you are not allocating sites to meet needs identified, can you justify and explain how those needs will be met?** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | +2 | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement | |
| **Reason for score:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** The DMB does not allocate sites. The adopted BDP sets out the measures to effectively meet the identified housing needs. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Does the local plan policies update: (i) identify infrastructure that is necessary to support planned growth; and (ii) enable provision of this infrastructure?** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | +2 | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement | |
| **Reason for score:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** The adopted BDP identifies and enables the infrastructure necessary to support planned growth. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Can you demonstrate that the transport and other infrastructure needed to support each growth area or strategic site identified in the local plan policies update: (i) can be funded and delivered; and (ii) is supported by the relevant providers/ delivery agents in terms of funding and timescales indicated?**  **Have you identified the extent of any funding gap? If so, are you able to explain why you are confident that any gap can be addressed?** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | +2 | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement | |
| **Reason for score:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** The BDP’s policies and proposals for the identified Growth Areas are justified and deliverable as evidenced by the BDP inspector’s report. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Process and Outcomes (*see also Toolkit Parts 2 and 3*)** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **E** | **What are the cross boundary strategic matters affecting your local plan policies update? List these.** | There are no cross boundary strategic matters as the DMB does not contain any strategic policies or site allocations. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Does your Duty to Cooperate Statement(s) of Common Ground: (i) identify these issues; (ii) identify the bodies you have engaged with or continue to engage with; and (iii) clearly set out not just the process, but the outcomes of this engagement highlighting areas of agreement and of difference?** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | +2 | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement | |
| **Reason for score:** There are no cross boundary strategic matters as the DMB does not contain any strategic policies or site allocations. However, a Duty to Co-operate Compliance Statement has been prepared demonstrates that the Council has complied with the duty. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** None | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** There are no cross boundary strategic matters as the DMB does not contain any strategic policies or site allocations. | | | | | | | | | |
| **F** | **Are there any aspects of the local plan policies update not in conformity with national policy? Please set these out and provide justification with reference to evidence for these. Are you satisfied you can robustly defend this on the basis of local evidence?**  ***For instance, are you seeking to require affordable housing on sites which are below the threshold of major development as defined by national planning policy?*** | No aspects of the DMB are considered to not be in conformity with national policy. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Are there any specific policies in the local plan policies update where there are differences to any policy approach set out in a relevant strategic planning framework (e.g. the London Plan, or a plan produced by a Combined Authority or through voluntary agreement).** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | +2 | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement | |
| **Reason for score:** There is no strategic planning framework for the West Midlands. The DMB policies do not conflict with any other policies in other plans within Birmingham or neighbouring local authorities. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** The DMB policies do not conflict with any other policies in other plans within Birmingham or neighbouring local authorities. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Is the local plan policies update:**   * **in conformity with any ‘higher level’ plans prepared by the Council; and** * **properly reflecting provisions of any made neighbourhood plan?** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | +2 | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement | |
| **Reason for score:** The policies are fully compliant with policies and proposals within the Birmingham Development Plan and other elements of the Birmingham Local Plan. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** The policies are fully compliant with policies and proposals within the Birmingham Development Plan and other elements of the Birmingham Local Plan. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Does your Consultation Statement demonstrate how you have complied with the specific requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Local Plan) (England) Regulations 2012 and the Council’s adopted Statement of Community Involvement to date [you should revisit and update this following the publication of your Regulation 19 local plan policies update]?** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | +2 | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement | |
| **Reason for score:** The Consultation Statement has been updated to reflect the publication of the DMB document and demonstrates that the City Council has complied with the specific requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Local Plan) (England) Regulations 2012 and the Council’s adopted Statement of Community Involvement to date. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** See Development Management in Birmingham Consultation Statement Regulation 22 (1) (c) | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Has the Sustainability Appraisal – incorporating the requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment legislation - evaluated all reasonable alternatives? Is it clear why alternatives have not been selected?** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | +2 | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement | |
| **Reason for score:** A Sustainability Appraisal has been carried out by independent consultants and has been updated at every stage of the development of the DMB document which has evaluated all reasonable alternatives and given clear reasoning why alternatives have not been selected. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action: We may be required to identify and assess detailed policy options.** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** See above. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Does the Sustainability Appraisal adequately assess the likely significant effects of policies and proposals?** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | +2 | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement | |
| **Reason for score:** The Sustainability Appraisal has been carried out by independent consultants who have significant experience in carrying out SAs. The SA has been updated at every stage of the development of the DMB document and has adequately assessed the likely significant effects of policies and proposals at each stage. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** See above. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Is it clear how the Sustainability Appraisal has influenced the local plan policies update including how any policies or site allocations have been amended as a result and does it show (and conclude) that the local plan policies update is an appropriate strategy?** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | +2 | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement | |
| **Reason for score:** The SA been updated at every stage in the formulation of the DMB and has informed the development of polices. It has concluded that the final DPD policies are appropriate. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** See above. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Is it clear how an Equalities Impact Assessment has influenced the local plan policies update?** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | +2 | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement | |
| **Reason for score:** An Equalities Impact Assessment has been carried out at each stage of the development of the DMB document. Each successive EIA carried out coupled with the relevant SA have influenced the formulation of local plan policies contained within each stage. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** See above. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Does the Habitats Regulations Assessment consider the local plan policies update in combination with other plans and projects?** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | +2 | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement | |
| **Reason for score:** The City Council has reviewed the DMB against the requirements of Regulation 105 of the Habitats Regulations; this review has drawn on the evidence gathered by the 2013 HRA undertaken for the Birmingham Development Plan and a technical review, taking into account the scope and content of the DMB. The technical review has determined that the significant effects considered in the 2013 HRA remain relevant, valid and can be relied upon, when considering the effects of the DPD. It is noted that the DMB will not introduce any new effect pathways. The review has concluded that the DMB will have no significant effects on any European sites as a result of its implementation as it is an expansion and clarification of the strategic policies of the BDP, which itself was determined not to have any likely significant effects on European sites, either alone, or in combination with other plans. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** See above. | | | | | | | | | |
|
|
|  | **If the Habitats Regulations Assessment has identified, through ‘Appropriate Assessment’ that mitigation measures are required, does the local plan policies update adequately identify the measures required and the mechanisms for delivering them?** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | +2 | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement | |
| **Reason for score:** N/A as the HRA identifies that there are unlikely to be any significant effects on any European sites. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** See above. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Is it clear how the outcomes and conclusions of the Habitats Regulations Assessment have influenced the local plan policies update?** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | **+2** | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | **Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement** | |
| **Reason for score:** N/A as the HRA identifies that there are unlikely to be any significant effects on any European sites. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** See above. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | ***Housing Strategy*** | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Can you demonstrate that the policies and proposed allocations in your local plan policies update meet your housing requirement in full and that this can be achieved as a minimum? If not [*for instance, because another local authority has agreed to plan for your unmet need*], can you explain and robustly justify why?** | -2 | | -1 | | 0 | +1 | | +2 | | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement | | |
| **Reason for score:** The DMB does not set housing requirements or numbers – this is set by the BDP which established that there was a housing shortfall to be met by other local authorities in the Greater Birmingham and Black Country Housing Market Area. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action for local plan soundness and/or effectiveness:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** The DMB does not set housing requirements or numbers. | | | | | | | | | |
| **G** | ***Is there any unmet need in neighbouring areas that you have been formally asked to accommodate? If yes, then list the amount by each local authority area.*** | The Black Country authorities (Sandwell, Dudley, Wolverhampton and Walsall) who are preparing a joint plan, formally asked other local authorities in the Greater Birmingham and Black Country Housing Market Area to consider whether they would be able and willing to accommodate any identified housing and employment development needs arising from the Black Country on 12 July 2018. Since then the Black Country has updated their Urban Capacity Study (December 2019). This shows that local housing need will outstrip housing supply in 2027/28 with the gap widening until there is a total shortfall of 29,288 homes in 2037/38. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Does your local plan policies update accommodate any of this unmet need where you can sustainably to do so?** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | +2 | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement | |
| **Reason for score:** N/A. The DMB only contains non-strategic development management policies to support the strategic policies set out in the adopted BDP. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** The DMB only contains non-strategic development management policies to support the strategic policies set out in the adopted BDP. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Is there a housing trajectory which illustrates the expected rate of housing delivery and ensures the maintenance of a 5-year supply during the plan period?**  **Is your strategy for delivery and implementation clearly articulated and justified to support the trajectory?** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | **+2** | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | **Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement** | |
| **Reason for score:** N/A The housing trajectory is set out in policy TP29 of the adopted BDP. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** The BDP has set out an appropriate strategy for meeting the housing trajectory. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Can you confirm: (i) that the local plan policies update will provide for a 5-year supply of specific deliverable sites on adoption; and (ii) that beyond this 5 year period sites are developable and (iii) if relevant, you have included a 5 or 20 percent buffer to deal with under-delivery.** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | +2 | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement | |
| **Reason for score:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** The adopted BDP provides for a five-year supply of housing land with an appropriate buffer. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Does the level of supply provide any ‘head room’ (that is additional supply above that required) to enable you to react quickly to any unforeseen changes in circumstances and to ensure that the full requirement will be met during the plan period?** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | +2 | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement | |
| **Reason for score:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** The five-year supply calculations assume a 5% buffer on the basis that there has not been a record of persistent under-delivery of housing in Birmingham. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Is the Council reliant on the delivery of any ‘windfall’ sites (sites not specifically identified in the development plan) during the plan period and if so, how many and when? Is there compelling evidence to confirm that such sites will continue to come forward?** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | +2 | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement | |
| **Reason for score:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** The windfall assumptions used are set out in the SHLAA. The BDP inspector was satisfied that the overall windfall allowance was based on sound evidence and is realistic and achievable. Furthermore, the SHLAA methodology and windfall assumptions were tested at a public inquiry for a planning appeal in 2018 and found sound. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Does the local plan policies update make it clear what size, type and tenure of housing is required?** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | +2 | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement | |
| **Reason for score:** N/A.The size, type and tenure of housing required are already set out in BDP policy TP27 Sustainable neighbourhoods, TP30 The type, size and density of new housing and TP31 Affordable housing. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** Policies setting out the size, type and tenure of housing required are contained in the adopted BDP. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Does the local plan policies update specifically address the needs of different groups in the community?** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | +2 | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement | |
| **Reason for score:** N/A. BDP policy TP27 Sustainable neighbourhoods, Policy TP30 The type, size and density of new housing, TP31 Affordable housing, TP33 student accommodation, Policy TP34 Provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show people specifically address the needs of different groups in the community. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** See above. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Can your affordable housing requirements, including any geographical variations, be justified?**  **Does the local plan policies update provide for the delivery of the full need for affordable housing? If not, can you explain and justify why?** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | **+2** | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | **Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement** | |
| **Reason for score:** N/A . The affordable housing requirement and policy were justified and is set out in the adopted BDP. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** See above. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Have the needs for travellers and travelling showpeople been adequately assessed in accordance with national policy and have they been based on robust evidence?**  **Does the local plan policies update make adequate provision for the identified needs?** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | | +1 | | | **+2** |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | **Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement** |
| **Reason for score:** N/A.A Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment was undertaken as part of the development of the BDP. Policy TP34 of the BDP makes adequate provision for the identified needs. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** Policy TP34 of the BDP makes adequate provision for the identified needs. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Will the local plan policies update provide for a 5-year supply of deliverable travellers and travelling showpeople pitches to meet identified needs?** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | | +1 | | | **+2** |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | **Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement** |
| **Reason for score:** Policy TP34 of the BDP provides for a 5 year supply of deliverable travellers and travelling showpeople pitches to meet identified needs. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** Policy TP34 of the BDP provides for a 5 year supply of deliverable travellers and travelling showpeople pitches to meet identified needs. | | | | | | | | | |
| **H** | ***List any* travellers and travelling showpeople *sites identified to meet need and the timescales for their delivery*** | The following sites are allocated in the BDP to provide accommodation for gypsies and travellers. Both sites have been implemented since the adoption of the BDP in 2017.   * Hubert Street/ Aston Brook Street East * Rupert Street/ Proctor Street | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Justified approaches to plan policy and content** | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Where thresholds are set in policies which trigger specific policy requirements, are these thresholds justified by evidence and is this clear in the supporting text?**  **[You may wish to check each policy setting a threshold]** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | | +1 | | | +2 |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |
| **Reason for score:** DM1 Air quality,DM10 Standards for Residential Development and DM11 Houses in multiple occupation (HMO) sets thresholds. These are justified in topic papers and clear in the supporting text. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** Thresholds are justified and clear in the supporting text. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Does the local plan policies update avoid deferring details on strategic matters to other documents? If it does, is it clear *why* matters will be covered in other Development Plan Documents or Supplementary Planning Documents and why this is appropriate?** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | | +1 | | | +2 |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |
| **Reason for score:** This issue has been raised in the consultation on the Publication version with regard to Policy DM15: Parking and Servicing. Certain representations have suggested that Parking Standards should be included directly within Policy DM15 and not within an accompanying Supplementary Planning Document as is proposed. However, a policy reference to deferring Parking Standards to an SPD already exists within the BDP. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** See above. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Where the local plan policies update defines a hierarchy do policies throughout the Plan consistently: (i) reflect this hierarchical approach; (ii) make clear the level of protection afforded to designations depending on their status within the hierarchy; and (iii) is the approach consistent with National Policy?**  **[For example, hierarchies could relate to nature conservation, heritage assets, town centres/retail, settlements.]** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | | +1 | | | +2 |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |
| **Reason for score:** N/A. The DMB contains no policies which define any hierarchies. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** N/A. The DMB contains no policies which define any hierarchies. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Where policies seek to limit certain uses, is this justified by evidence and is the rationale clear in the supporting text to the policy and in the evidence.**  **[For example, policies relating to town centres, employment or retail may seek to limit certain uses.]** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | | +1 | | | +2 |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement |
| **Reason for score:** Policies which seek to limit certain uses DM11 Houses in multiple occupation (HMO) and DM12 Residential Conversions and Specialist Accommodation are supported by evidence and the rationale is clear in the supporting text and evidence. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** Clear justification and rationale supports the policies. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Is it clear that any standards proposed for development are justified and deliverable, taking into account the scale of the development?**  **[For example, onsite provision of open space, optional technical standards, internal and external space standards.]** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | | +1 | | | **+2** |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | **Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement** |
| **Reason for score:** Justification for the residential standards proposed are set out in a Standards for Residential Development Topic paper and supported by an independent Financial Viability Assessment (FVA) of the DMB. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** The residential standards set out in Policy DM10 are justified and deliverable as evidenced by the DM10 Standards for Residential Development Topic paper and the FVA. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Deliverability** | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Has the viability of the local plan policies update been suitably tested and does this testing cover all requirements including in respect of any required standards, affordable housing provision and transport and other infrastructure needs and if relevant the implications of CIL?** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | +2 | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement | |
| **Reason for score:** A Financial Viability Assessment (FVA) of the DMB has been undertaken by independent specialist consultants. The FVA Report has been submitted as evidence to support the DMB. It covers all policy requirements including standards, affordable housing, other infrastructure needs and CIL. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** The viability of the DMB policies has been suitably tested. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Does the local plan policies update reflect the conclusions and recommendations of your viability evidence?**  **Is it clear the viability and delivery of development will not be put at risk by the requirements in the local plan policies update?** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | +2 | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement | |
| **Reason for score:** The DMB reflects the conclusions of the FVA and is clear that the viability and delivery of development will not be put at risk by the proposed policy requirements. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** The viability and delivery of development will not be put at risk by the DMB as evidenced by the FVA. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Does the monitoring framework clearly set out what matters will be monitored, and the indicators used? Are these measurable and can the data be readily secured/captured?** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | +2 | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement | |
| **Reason for score:** SeeAppendix 2 Monitoring Framework | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** The monitoring framework within the DMB sets out clear measurable indicators. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Does the local plan policies update and monitoring framework identify a clear framework for plan review?**  **Where triggers for plan review and/or update are identified are they justified and proportionate?** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | +2 | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement | |
| **Reason for score:** There are no specific triggers set out in the document for a review of the DMB. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** This DMB will be submitted without a framework for a plan review and the issue may be picked up by the Inspector at Examination. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** The Proposed Minor Changes suggest inclusion of an additional paragraph in Chapter 6 to indicate when the document will be reviewed. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** The DMB does not identify a clear framework for review. The Proposed Minor Changes suggest inclusion of an additional paragraph in Chapter 6 to indicate when the document will be reviewed. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Plan effectiveness (and associated policy clarity)** | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Does the local plan policies update clearly set out the timeframe that it covers? Is it clear which policies are strategic? Will the strategic policies provide for a minimum of 15 years from adoption? Does the evidence relied on to support those policies correspond/cover this whole period?** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | +2 | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement | |
| **Reason for score:** Para 1.4 sets out the DMB’s relationship with the Birmingham Development Plan. The period covered is therefore until 2031. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** The DMB does not contain strategic policies. The purpose of the DMB is to provide detailed development management policies to support the BDP which has a time frame of 2011-2031. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Does the local plan policies update clearly set out which adopted Development Plan policies it supersedes?** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | +2 | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement | |
| **Reason for score:** This is set out in para. 1.2 and Appendix 3 of the DMB Publication Document. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** This is set out in para. 1.2 and Appendix 3 of the DMB Publication Document. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Are the objectives the policies are trying to achieve clear, and can the policies be easily used and understood for decision making?** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | +2 | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement | |
| **Reason for score:** The introductory text for each policy provides a clear statement of the policy objective. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** The supporting text for each policy provides a clear statement of the policy objective. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **For each policy area you have designated or defined in the Plan: (i) are these clearly referenced and explained in the Plan; and (ii) clearly defined on the Policies Map?**  **Where you have included maps or graphics within the local plan policies update are these legible and is it clear if and how they are to be used in decision making?** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | +2 | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement | |
| **Reason for score:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** The DMB policies are to be applied city-wide as stated in para. 1.4 of the Publication version. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Does each local plan policies update policy: (i) make clear the type of development it will promote; (ii) use positive rather than negative wording?** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | +2 | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | **Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement** | |
| **Reason for score:** Each policy makes clear the type of development required and uses positive wording. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** Each policy makes clear the type of development encouraged and uses positive wording. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Do policies make clear where they are intended to be applied differently for the purposes of decision-making dependent on (i) scale; (ii) use; or (iii) location of development proposed.**  **[Note: If you have said ‘all development’ this implies equal application irrespective of the development scale/use/location and this may not be either justified or deliverable]** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | +2 | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement | |
| **Reason for score:** All the policies are clear in terms of how they are to be applied. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** | | | | | | | | | |
| **I** | ***State how many policies are in your local plan update?***  ***Can you list any policies within the local plan update that: (i) repeat parts of other policies within the plan; (ii) replicate or repeat paragraphs in the NPPF (iii) cross reference other policies.*** | There are 16 policies in total.  None of the policies repeat parts of other policies within the plan or replicate or repeat paragraphs in the NPPF. Each policy contains a section called “Policy Links” which provides a cross-reference to BDP policies and supporting guidance. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Based on the above, have you tried to avoid unnecessary repetition (of the NPPF or other policies within the local plan policies update) and cross referencing in policies?**  **If you find duplication or repetition you may want to take minute to consider whether this is appropriate.** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | **+2** | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | **Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement** | |
| **Reason for score:** Repetition of NPPF and BDP policies has sought to be avoided. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** Repetition of NPPF and BDP policies has sought to be avoided. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Do policies avoid duplicating other regulatory requirements (for example, building regulations)?** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | +2 | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement | |
| **Reason for score:** Thepolicies do not duplicate other regulatory requirements. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** N/A | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** The policies do not duplicate other regulatory requirements. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Does the wording of plan policies avoid ambiguity? Are requirements clear to the decision-maker?**  **[For instance, policies should avoid using overly subjective terms such as “to the Council’s satisfaction”, “considered necessary by the Council” or “appropriate” without associated clarification.]** | -2 | -1 | | 0 | | +1 | | | +2 | |
| No, we do not meet this requirement | No, we may not fully meet this requirement | | Unclear whether our plan meets this requirement or not | | Yes, we are likely to meet this requirement | | | Yes, we are confident our plan will meet this requirement | |
| **Reason for score:** The policy wording has evolved through each stage of the DMB document to reduce ambiguities in the wording of policies. The Proposed Minor Changes to the Publication DMB document suggests a number of minor changes to provide further clarification as a result of representations made regarding unclear policy wording. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Implications of taking no further action:** This could result in unclear policy and inconsistent decision making. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mitigation / Action required (if necessary) to move scale to right:** Agree proposed changes to provide clarification. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reviewer Comments:** The Proposed Minor Changes to the Publication DMB should address the ambiguities in the policy wording. | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date of assessment:** | 29th May 2020 |
| **Assessed by:** | Martin Dando |
| **Checked by:** | Uyen-Phan Han |
| **Overall Score:** | +47 |
| **Comments:** | * The Development Management in Birmingham DPD (DMB) provides detailed non-strategic development management policies to support the delivery of the strategic policies set out in the Birmingham Development Plan (BDP), adopted in January 2017. Due to its non-strategic nature, there are no policies or issues within the DMB which would have implications for neighbouring local planning authorities which would necessitate specific Duty to Co-operate agreements or statements of common ground. All the policies are deemed to be in conformity with national policy and higher-level plans. * A full sustainability appraisal has been carried out and updated at all stages of the document and has been consulted on at all stages as well alongside the DMB itself. * The policies themselves have been tested with regard to their soundness, clarity and ambiguity and are backed by an evidence base which justifies when thresholds have been set or where policies limit particular uses. Where policies have been questioned during consultation is with regard to deferring detail onto Supplementary Planning Documents. The Council believes this has been addressed and justified within the document through wording changes and clarification. * The policies have also been subject to viability assessment which has tested their deliverability and a monitoring framework has also been set out within the document. * This soundness toolkit has helped to highlight the need to ensure that the DMB contains timeframes for the period covered by the document and any triggers for its review. * Overall, the PAS Soundness Toolkit has confirmed to Council officers that the document and its policies are generally sound and compliant. |