



Report to Planning Committee 11 July 2024

Director Lead: Matt Lamb, Planning & Growth

Lead Officer: Lisa Hughes, Business Manager – Planning Development, Ext.5565

Report Summary	
Report Title	Planning Application Validation Checklist 2024
Purpose of Report	To update the Council’s Planning Application Validation Checklist in line with Government guidance and legislation.
Recommendations	<p>a) the Planning Application Validation Checklists is adopted as set out within the Appendix.</p> <p>b) the checklist is reviewed every 2 years in accordance with the Development Management Procedure Order.</p> <p>The planning application validation checklist will contribute towards assisting with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Delivering inclusive and sustainable economic growth; ▪ Creating more and better quality homes; ▪ Enhancing and protecting the district’s natural environment.

1.0 Background

- 1.1 Members will recollect agreement was sought from Planning Committee on 15th February 2024 to undertake an 8-week consultation on the Draft Planning Application Validation Checklist. This took place between 2nd April to 28th May 2024 with professional agents (who submitted applications within the past 12 months), applicants, consultees, Members, Town and Parish Councils and neighbours to planning proposals via the website. In addition, details of the consultation were placed on the Council’s website.
- 1.2 This checklist has been prepared to provide guidance to applicants on the information required to be submitted with a planning application in order to assist a timely decision. The previous checklist was adopted in 2021 and since this time there has been a significant number of changes to policy and legislation meaning it is appropriate to review this.
- 1.3 Information is required to determine a planning application. The Government introduced, on 6 April 2008, a national list of documents and information necessary in order to validate planning applications. These comprise, as set out in within the National Planning Practice Guidance (Paragraph: 016 Reference ID: 14-016-20140306 Revision date: 06 03 2014):
 - Completed application form

- Correct application fee
- Compliance with national requirements which includes;
 - Site Location Plan (showing the site in relation to the surrounding area)
 - Ownership Certificate and Agricultural Land Declaration
- Provision of local information requirements
- Information relating to biodiversity net gain – whether the applicant believes the development would or would not be subject to the statutory biodiversity condition

1.4 In addition, a Design & Access Statement Fire Statement are required for certain planning applications. There are also specific requirements set out for Outline planning applications which requires an indication of the area or areas where access points to the development will be provided to be shown, even if access is a reserved matter. Applications subject to Environmental Impact Assessment also require an Environmental Statement.

1.5 Other information required such as elevations or floor plans of the proposal, statements such as flood risk are not included within the national list and fall within a local list. The Council has a local list, which was last amended in 2023.

1.6 Councils are able to adopt a local list clarifying the information required to determine an application. The information required will be dependent upon the application type, scale and location. Information within the local list and required when validating the application must be:

- reasonable having regard, in particular, to the nature and scale of the proposed development; and
- require particulars of, or evidence about, a matter only if it is reasonable to think that the matter will be a material consideration in the determination of the application.

1.7 These statutory tests are set out in section 62 (4A) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (inserted by the Growth and Infrastructure Act) and article 11(3)(c) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (DMPO).

1.8 It is also possible for an applicant, if a Local Planning Authority determine that additional information is required in order to validate the application, to dispute this by issuing a notice under article 12 of the DMPO. There is then a process for both the Local Planning Authority and applicant to go through. Very few applications are disputed in terms of the information provided due to the criteria above (reasonableness) being complied with.

1.9 Legislation sets out that a local list is required to be published on a Council's website and, in order to be able to ask for information listed within the checklist, this has to be reviewed every 2 years.

2.0 Proposal/Options Considered and Reasons for Recommendation

2.1 12 responses have been received, which are set out within the table at the foot of this report, with officer response and whether or not the checklist has been amended. The checklist (attached as an Appendix) has been updated accordingly with the amendments shown in red for new and/or amended text and crossed through for text to be deleted.

2.2 The amendments should assist in meeting the legislative requirements as set out above as well as ensuring the correct information is submitted with applications. In anticipation of Planning Committee approving these amendments, it will ensure the Council is able to rely on the validation checklist in terms of local requirements in order to validate applications.

3.0 Implications

- 3.1 In writing this report and in putting forward recommendations, officers have considered the following implications; Data Protection, Digital and Cyber Security, Equality and Diversity, Financial, Human Resources, Human Rights, Legal, Safeguarding and Sustainability, and where appropriate they have made reference to these implications and added suitable expert comment where appropriate.

Background Papers and Published Documents

Planning Committee – 15th February 2024 – Planning Application Validation Checklist Consultation

Planning Committee – 20 April 2023 – Planning Application Validation Checklist

Planning Committee – 15 February 2007 – Best Practice Guidance on the Validation of Planning Applications

Respondent	Comment Made	Council's Response	Amendment to Checklist
Armstrong Ecology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I broadly understand and support the drive to have the additional detail with respect to how biodiversity net gain will be achieved up front/at the application stage and am of the opinion that this is also in the applicants best interests. • The requirement for the Biodiversity Net Gain strategy to be a separate document is overly onerous and makes for complication/a paper chase. There should be allowance for the potential for inclusion of this detail into a section or appendix within the relevant ecology report for the site - which would be much clearer and keep all the relevant detail in in [sic.] document. • The requirement for the BNG strategy/plan to be produced by a professional ecologist strays from the intent that the small sites metric could be capable of being used by other competent people: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In instances where the small sites metric has been completed by a competent person other than a professional ecologist it would only be reasonable for the same allowance to also be made for the BNG strategy/plan and other relevant documents such as the HMMP (where required). ○ Similarly where the BNG strategy/plan is simple/straight forward and does not deal with complex ecology provision it would be 	<p>1st bullet: Comment noted.</p> <p>2nd bullet: Noted, it is not considered that this is overly onerous given that the checklist makes it clear that duplication of information should be avoided and in many instances it will likely just be a case of referencing where the required information is elsewhere.</p> <p>3rd bullet (incorporating sub-bullets): Choice of words in the checklist has been carefully drafted and perhaps missed by the respondent; <i>"The Biodiversity Net Gain Strategy should be prepared by a suitably competent professional ecologist..."</i>. It is our view that in many situations where BNG assessments are undertaken by non-specialists that there are likely to be errors which ultimately could prove to be more expensive for applicants to address than would have been if they had employed an ecologist in the first instance. Hence our stance which we believe allows the flexibility that the respondent is seeking.</p>	<p>1st bullet: No changes to the checklist.</p> <p>2nd bullet: No changes to the checklist.</p> <p>3rd bullet (incorporating all sub-bullets): No changes to the checklist.</p>

	<p>reasonable for this to be prepared by competent people other than a professional ecologist, possibly drawing on information produced by a professional ecologist in some instances.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The requirement to give statements ref the mitigation/BNG hierarchy and adherence to BNG good practice requirements is likely to make this more complicated than it needs to be and have the unintended consequence of excluding other competent people. ○ To give some context to this - there are only so many consultant ecologists in circulation and not all of this workload for small sites can realistically be undertaken by a professional ecologist in every case/it would be unreasonable to anticipate that it could. Some flexibility for small sites would therefore seem reasonable in this context. ● The policy with respect to significant enhancement that is referenced looks to be set too low: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The triggering of the need for a HMMP for anything other than the habitats specified in the policy is likely to be unreasonably onerous in many cases/contexts particularly where simple measures such as tree planting and modified grassland feature within a sites landscape plan and information in the landscape plan/provided 	<p>In respect of the context of the resourcing issue regarding the number of available ecologists. This applies equally to local authorities, and having submitted ecological assessments completed by competent ecologists helps by reducing the time needed to get unacceptable submitted information corrected.</p> <p>4th bullet: 1st sub-bullet: The rationale for significant enhancement is set out in the policy. This has been driven by the fact that the Government has not published criteria defining what constitutes ‘significant on-site enhancement’, it has only provided examples. Invariably, this creates a situation where it is very difficult to apply a consistent and transparent approach to this matter across all applications required to provide mandatory BNG. Different applicants/agents will have different views as to what they consider to be ‘significant’ and this</p>	<p>4th bullet (incorporating all sub-bullets): No changes to the checklist.</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>by a landscape architect is likely to be sufficient.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The setting of the trigger with respect to significant enhancement/a HMMP at the low level set out is likely to have the unintended consequence of stymying the inclusion in landscape plans of features of slightly higher interest (that are none the less predictably and reliably achievable) into a sites landscape plan such as tree planting (in POS/outside of domestic gardens), modified grassland and small areas of wildflower seeding in order to avoid triggering the need for a HMMP. In such cases information in the landscape plan/provided by a landscape architect is likely to be sufficient rather than a HMMP being required. Equally in many instances a landscape architect is likely to be competent [sic] to produce [sic] an HMMP. • Justification should be given with respect to the need for GIS/CAD files to be provided and 	<p>would likely result in a considerable amount of time for the relevant LPA ecologist to resolve across multiple applications. We do not consider that this is onerous in respect of the Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) as the scope and depth of that plan can be relative to the complexity of the habitats and their subsequent management. It is our view that this policy provides clarity and direction for applicants.</p> <p>2nd sub-bullet: The example given by the respondent does not appear to make sense. Anything that is essentially green infrastructure outside of domestic gardens will be contributing to the BNG offsetting and will require a HMMP so the exclusion of the features mentioned would not have the effect of avoiding the need for a HMMP.</p> <p>5th bullet: The BNG calculation is based on accurate measurements of habitat areas. These are</p>	<p>5th bullet: Checklist amended.</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>the acceptability (or not) of other formats such as MapInfo.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be reasonable for the Strategic significance mapping to be made available in one or all of the following ways: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Downloadable in GIS/CAD format. ○ Searchable online such as via Insight Mapping or as part of a Local records search output 	<p>calculated via some form of digital mapping/drawing. It is not uncommon for overlap of habitat areas and for the habitat areas to not correspond with the application redline boundary, which then makes the calculation incorrect. Consequently, we are asking for these so that we can make the necessary checks, but asking for this information in the knowledge that this is data that applicants and their contracted ecologists will already have, so it places no, or minimal, additional burden on the applicant. Most applicants and their agents will be using QGIS software and .shp files. The intention was not to exclude other file formats so in response an amendment is recommended.</p> <p>6th bullet: 1st and 2nd bullets. As an initial response, we have had an informal discussion with the Local Records centre and will further this to investigate the feasibility of making the strategic significance mapping available in other formats. However, this will only relate to the Focal Areas, as Local Wildlife Sites information is currently available as part of a data search from Nottinghamshire Biological and Geological Records Centre and are on the Nottinghamshire Insight Mapping Portal. Addressing this issue does not require an amendment to the checklist.</p> <p>7th bullet:</p>	<p>6th bullet: No change to checklist.</p>
--	---	--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The requirement in Appendix A of the validation checklist triggers a number of thoughts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Is the approach based on the premise that bats are everywhere? rather than they can be anywhere but they are not everywhere? ○ The frequency of bats being found in large scale building maintenance/re-roofing projects in Sheffield and other case studies has been very low. ○ This is likely to give rise to a very high number of preliminary bat roost assessments being required. This is potentially a resourcing issue given the limited availability of suitably qualified ecologists to undertake these. ○ Where features such as integrated bat boxes are not present could a first assessment be made by another competent person such as an architect who would have the professional competence to provide a statement with respect to the state of the fabric of the building and for example if gaps are present in the fabric of the in the [sic] building of less than a set width etc. ○ Could habitat suitability modelling (such has been undertaken for South Yorkshire) be used to target the approach set out in Appendix A. The model developed for South Yorkshire could be applied for the Newark 	<p>1st sub-bullet: It is the latter scenario.</p> <p>2nd sub-bullet: Whilst information from other areas is useful, we are concerned with Newark and Sherwood District. The large number of preliminary bat roost assessments (PBRA) now being undertaken will enable us to analyse this data (which we intend to do during the last quarter of 2024) and review the current requirements.</p> <p>3rd sub-bullet: Whilst some applicants and agents have stated difficulties in sourcing ecologists to undertake this work there are now a reasonable number of ecologists that are now routinely undertaking PBRAs within the District. Whilst it would be unrealistic to consider that there are never resourcing issues, we currently consider that the situation is manageable.</p> <p>4th sub-bullet: This is an area where we have the strong opinion that any assessment required once we have made the decision that a PBRA is required must be undertaken by a suitably competent ecologist. Detection of roosting bats requires training and experience as does the identification of potential roosting features.</p> <p>5th sub-bullet: See 2nd sub-bullet comment.</p>	<p>7th bullet and all sub-bullets: No change to the checklist</p>
--	---	---	--

	and Sherwood area based on the relevant bat data for the area.		
Environmental Health Public Protection	<p>For number 4 air quality, there is a supplementary planning guidance document which gives a bit more detail on when an assessment would be required but I don't know if it has been approved for use yet. The principle of the text is fine.</p> <p>13 Contaminated land, looks good, the only points I would make are that you could refer to Land contamination risk management (LCRM) which is the most up to date DEFRA guidance for land contamination. If you do refer to LCRM, the desktop is now referred to as a preliminary risk assessment (PRA) and validation is now verification. The Notts guide is a bit old now although the principles are the same. For the phase III remediation, this seems to be linked in with the validation in the text however validation tends to be referred to as phase IV and sits separately from the remedial strategy. Probably nit picking and the principles are the same so providing that an assessment is submitted where required, the detail can be discussed and managed by the condition.</p> <p>12 CEMP, the one significant thing that is missing is proximity of receptors. For example a medium sized development with demolition and high dust risk next to a primary school or hours of</p>	<p>The document referred to is Guidance in relation to air quality and not supplementary planning guidance. Notwithstanding this, a link can be made to this document's location on our website.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The team have been asked whether the information requested is required for the application to be valid i.e. it is required in order to determine the application or whether it is</p>	<p>Checklist updated with link to document.</p> <p>Noted. An update will be provided as required.</p>

	delivery nin residential areas etc. should also trigger a CEMP, not just large or major developments.	possible for this to continue to be managed via a planning condition, as required. This will be updated to Members, as required, at Planning Committee.	
Newark Business Club	Para Proposed Floor Plans, sub-para d "for change of use applications (where internal alterations are proposed - must show proposed layout of rooms) " appears to require an edit, perhaps to move the closing bracket to follow the first word "proposed" Page 16, first line, "which are comprised of made ground" should read "which consist of made ground"	Noted	Amended
Rights of Way Manager Via East Midlands Ltd	Please see below my comments for improved information relating to the Rights of Way checklist. 31. Rights of Way Threshold/Trigger Required for: Inclusion of a Right of Way (RoW) within the application boundary or alongside the outside edge or where a RoW in the close vicinity is likely to receive increased use as a result of the development Details of what should be included <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A plan showing how the RoW is affected or being protected • A statement of how the RoW will be managed during the development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ability to keep the path open Requirement to apply for a temporary traffic regulations order (TTRO) to close 	Comments noted. '[w]ish' in the fourth bullet point has been amended to 'can'	Checklist updated.

	<p>the path for the duration due to public safety/provide alternative route</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Requirement to apply for a diversion or extinguishment of the path if the development cannot be built with the RoW in its current location• Whether improvement to the paths is anticipated as a result of increased and higher-level use and how that is to be managed. This can include the wish to upgrade to cycle paths and the legal implications, new links to the RoW network and additional routes for equestrians if appropriate and may involve a 106 agreement if outside of the development boundary.• Proposed future maintenance of the RoW if it is within public open space• Information as to the future ownership of the land over which the path runs on completion of the development, including boundary features such as hedges/trees <p>Other information: The developer should apply for an official search of the RoW to ensure that the correct legal alignment of the RoW is shown correctly on the plans. Contact row.landsearches@nottscc.gov.uk. Inaccuracies or misalignments of the routes on a development plan or a legal diversion may result in generating further inaccuracies and legal problems.</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>Early engagement with Rights of Way Team is encouraged to discuss future management, surface treatment, structures etc : Email: countryside.access@nottscc.gov.uk Phone: 0300 500 8080 Website: www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk.</p>		
<p>Joint Radio Company Limited</p>	<p>The Joint Radio Company (JRC) analyses the impact of proposed wind energy developments on the Critical National Infrastructure operated by the UK Energy Industry. We assess the potential of the turbines to interfere with the radio links operated by UK and Irish Energy Industry companies, in support of their regulatory operational requirements.</p> <p>In order to complete the assessment correctly, we need the following parameters for each turbine:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Turbine location in National Grid Reference (alpha numeric or eastings and northings) • Turbine Hub Height (in m) • Turbine Rotor Radius (in m) • Turbine Micro siting (in m) <p>In order for us to reduce the number of objections based on poor received information, <i>it would be extremely helpful if any planning application for a turbine or turbines contains this information in a simple table as part of the application form.</i></p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>New section for Wind Turbines (44) added to checklist.</p>

	<p>We receive many cases where the only location information is a pdf map, and that is not sufficient information for us to proceed, leading to delays in our response. We also sometimes are given a location which is not that of the turbine itself, which again leads to delays and an incorrect response.</p>		
<p>Nick Baseley</p>	<p>On a positive, I thought the tracked changes were really helpful in quickly working out what was being amended.</p> <p>The additional validation requirements regarding biodiversity net gain assessments and sections/finished floor levels are understood, and noted.</p> <p>The outstanding concern however is the requirement for seemingly all applications to require a bat building assessment as a minimum prior to validation – and more particularly permitted development schemes subject of prior notification/approval.</p> <p>The whole point of the extended permitted development rights was to help streamline the process and make such applications less burdensome than their conventional counterparts. And yet such prior approvals have become just as (and in some circumstances more) onerous than conventional applications.</p>	<p>We consider that great care has been taken to set out the legislative background and important court judgements that underpin the fact that Preliminary Bat Roost Assessments are required for certain proposals prior to validation of an application. This information is provided in Appendix A of the checklist. As prior approval is effectively a planning decision made by a local planning authority it falls within the remit of the need for the local planning authority to have sufficient information regarding the likely presence or absence of protected species before making a planning decision.</p>	<p>No change to the checklist.</p>

	<p>I see nowhere in the GPDO reference to the need for prior approval on protected species – and this is because such are already afforded protection under separate wildlife legislation.</p> <p>In such circumstances, my own view is that BBAs and other protected species surveys should not be required and/or included as part of the local validation checklist for PD schemes of prior notification/approval, but instead included as a note to the applicant reminding themselves of their responsibilities under the Wildlife Act.</p> <p>Clearly, if bats or other protected species are encountered, then an EPS licence will be required – necessitating surveys etc prior to obtaining the licence.</p> <p>If a licence cannot be obtained, then the development (permitted development or otherwise) cannot take place – thereby providing the necessary safeguards.</p> <p>In circumstances whereby both the private and public sectors are under massive pressure resource-wise as a consequence of the BNG requirements for all applications (where ecologists are struggling to cope with demand, leading to a significant backlog in the ability to submit applications), the requirement for BBAs and other protected species surveys for all applications including permitted development</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>prior notifications/approvals will only serve to unnecessarily add to this backlog.</p> <p>The above concerns equally apply to householder applications for dormer windows etc – which as currently drafted would similarly seemingly attract the need for a BBA as a minimum before being validated, which seems disproportionate to the scale of the development and places an unnecessary burden on such applications.</p> <p>This all being the case, in my view the requirement for a BBA and/or other protected species survey should not be an automatic validation requirement for all applications – and instead, the local authority could request the same if it deemed it appropriate on a case-by-case basis.</p>		
Natural England	<p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>Natural England has no comments to make on the Validation Checklist.</p>	No changes required.	No changes to checklist.
Sport England	<p>Sport England welcomes the inclusion of the information requirements for planning applications involving the loss of playing fields in Part 3 - Section 28. These reflect the information</p>	Comments noted.	No changes to checklist.

	<p>requirements set out in Annex B of our Playing Fields Policy and Guidance document.</p> <p>Sport England has no further comments to make.</p>		
Canal & River Trust	<p>We note the proposal to include Sections / Finished Floor Levels for all applications proposing engineering operations and/or on any development where there is a change in ground levels or where ground levels outside of the application site are noticeably different. Generally, we support this inclusion as it would enable the LPA and the Trust to better understand any earthworks that could impact on the structural integrity of the River Trent navigation, and the need for any measures to mitigate this.</p> <p>We have no other comments on the proposed revisions.</p>	Noted.	No changes to checklist.
The Coal Authority	<p>The Coal Authority is a non-departmental public body sponsored by the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero. As a statutory consultee, the Coal Authority has a duty to respond to planning applications and development plans in order to protect the public and the environment in mining areas.</p> <p>Our records indicate that within the Newark and Sherwood area there are recorded coal mining features present at surface and shallow depth including; mine entries and reported surface hazards. These features may pose a potential risk to surface stability and public safety.</p>	Noted	No changes to checklist.

	<p>The Coal Authority are pleased to see that the Local Validation List includes at Item 9 the requirement to provide a Coal Mining Risk Assessment to support relevant development proposals. We support this inclusion and the signposting provided for users of the list to further guidance in this regard.</p>		
Historic England	<p>We have limited comments to raise:</p> <p>Page 12, under the section for archaeological assessments. We support the need for these assessments and the detail included. We would request that the terminology is amended from 'historic parks and gardens' to 'registered parks and gardens', 'scheduled ancient monuments' to 'scheduled monuments' and 'historic battlefields' to 'registered battlefields'.</p> <p>Page 27, under the section for heritage impact assessment we would recommend that 'notably' is amended to 'including' on the second sentence of the third paragraph.</p> <p>We welcome the detail included within the checklist of the types of heritage assessment and when and how they may be required and consider this detail is likely to encourage the submission of appropriate heritage assessments, alongside planning applications.</p> <p>We welcome reference to the detail included for Listed Building Consent.</p>	Noted	<p>Checklist updated.</p> <p>Oli reference non-des... can you look at page 55 please?</p>

	<p>Page 55, under heritage impact assessment it would be worth including a reference to non-designated heritage assets within this bullet point list.</p>		
<p>Planning Policy Team, Nottinghamshire County Council</p>	<p>Highways Development Control On Page 65 Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC) would wish to see ‘vehicular and pedestrian access arrangements’ added to the list of particulars which must be included on the site plans associated with temporary recreational campsites. This applies to both notifications and prior approvals. This is to allow NCC to check the proposed access facilities are safe and suitable for the proposed use.</p> <p>Section 39 on Travel Plans (page 41) has transport.strategy@nottscc.gov.uk as the point of contact, but this now needs updating to Transport.Planning@nottscc.gov.uk</p> <p>Transport & Travel Services Section 38 ‘Transport Statement/Assessment’ refers to Public Transport and Details of what should be included includes...”data about existing public transport provision, including provision/ frequency of services and proposed public transport changes” and “measures to mitigate the residual impacts of development (such as improvements to the public transport network, introducing walking and cycling</p>	<p>Legislation sets out what can be asked for as part of prior approvals and notifications. Vehicular and pedestrian access arrangements are not included within legislation and therefore this request cannot be agreed. Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Most elements have been included within the Checklist. Reference to a planning condition has not as this might be subject to a planning obligation.</p> <p>These are specific development proposals. To include all feasible types of development would make the checklist unworkable. Added to section 38.</p>	<p>Checklist updated with the exception of prior approval and notification request.</p>

	<p>facilities, physical improvements to existing roads”</p> <p>Section 38 could be enhanced to also refer to bus stops and infrastructure with the following additional requirement: <i>An assessment of bus stop infrastructure, including locations of bus stops and walk distances including isochrone plans demonstrating whether they meet the County Council’s Highway Design Guide requirements. Where the site layout is likely to impact on the location of existing bus stops, the applicant should consider alternative site layout options. If bus stops/infrastructure is proposed to be relocated, then the applicant should submit proposals which will be subject to assessment as part of the application process. Where a bus stop relocation is required then this will be subject to a Planning Condition.</i></p> <p>Part 5 – Development Types Consideration should be given to including categories covering leisure and sustainable energy/ BESS i.e., battery storage and associated developments.</p> <p>Reference documents: Nottinghamshire County Council Highway Design Guide: https://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/media/290</p>	<p>Noted. Checklist updated with new section ‘Health Impact Assessment’</p>	
--	--	---	--

[2368/31-general-geometry-of-residential-streets.pdf](#)

Nottinghamshire County Council Developer Contributions Strategy

<https://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/planning-and-environment/general-planning/developer-contributions-strategy>

If you would like any further input on this, please contact ptdc@nottscc.gov.uk

Flood Risk Management

NCC would recommend adding a Construction Phase Management Plan onto the list.

If you would like any further input on this, please contact flood.team@nottscc.gov.uk .

Public Health

The Nottinghamshire Spatial Planning and Health Framework – Rapid Health Impact Assessment (RHIA) Checklist Matrix (attached) is recommended to be a requirement of the Newark and Sherwood Planning Application Validation Checklist for developers (typically of developments over a certain size threshold of over 50 dwellings and other major development likely to have a significant impact on health and well-being) to:

Complete and include RHIA Checklist:

- assessing the 12 RHIA criteria/ health related topics such as community inclusion, healthy neighbourhoods, active

	<p>lifestyles, environment protection, safety and wellbeing, and housing provision →</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• considering health in relation to the provision of health services, contamination surveys, noise assessments, air quality assessments etc• providing / paying for planning obligations for health• completing a 'Building for Healthy Life Assessment'; and / or• providing mitigation measures for potential health impacts of development. <p>The rationale for a threshold of 50 dwellings The first stage of the HIA is screening when a decision is made about whether to request HIA and this is where the statement to provide a number of dwellings is useful to provide as a benchmark¹. Evidence suggests` that planning policies needs to be clear as to when an Health Impact Assessment is required and a screening checklist/ process (such as the Nottinghamshire Health Impact Assessment Checklist) is used so that the decision is robust and also so that across an organisation a measure of consistency regarding Health Impact Assessment (HIA) can be achieved ¹ Therefore the statement to provide a number of dwellings, in this instance 50 dwellings, is deemed as the required `measure of consistency' to support Newark and Sherwood LDP.</p>		
--	---	--	--

Reference: ¹ Cave B, 'Assessing the Potential Health effects of Policies, Plans, Programmes and Projects' eds Barton H, Thompson S, Burgess S and Grant M in The Routledge Handbook of Planning for Health and Wellbeing. 2015, chap 26 pp374-378.



Nottinghamshire
HIA FINAL.docx