Appendix 1: Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan Statement of Consultation Regulation 22(1)(c), November 2025

Contents

1. Introduction 3
2. Which bodies and persons were invited by the Councils to make representations and how were they invited to make the representations 4
3. Plan Production Timeline 8
Growth Options (July 2020 and February 2021) 8
Preferred Approach (January 2023) 12
Distribution and Logistics Preferred Approach (September 2023) 14
Summary of key changes made to the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan based on Regulation 18 responses 15
Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan Publication Draft (2024) 16
Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan Publication Draft (March 2025) 16
4. Summary of Main Issues Raised Pursuant to Regulation 19 Publication Version Plans: 19
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk 19
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy 21
Policy 3: Housing Target 22
Policy 4: The Green Belt 23
Policy 5: Employment Provision and Economic Development 24
Policy 6: Nottingham City Centre 25
Policy 7: Role of Town and Other Centres 26
Policy 8: Housing Size, Mix and Choice 27
Policy 9: Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople 28
Policy 10: Design and Enhancing Local Identity 29
Policy 11: The Historic Environment 30
Policy 12: Local Services and Healthy Lifestyles 31
Policy 13: Culture, Tourism and Sport 32
Policy 14: Managing Travel Demand 33
Policy 15: Transport Infrastructure Priorities 34
Policy 16: Blue and Green Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space 35
Policy 17: Biodiversity 36
Policy 18: Developer Contributions for Infrastructure 37
Policy 19: Strategic Allocation at Boots 38
Policy 20: Strategic Allocation Field Farm (Broxtowe) 39
Policy 21: Strategic Allocation Toton and Chetwynd Barracks (Broxtowe) 40

Policy 22: Strategic Allocation Former Bennerley Coal Disposal Point (Broxtowe) 42
Policy 23: Strategic Allocation Top Wighay Farm (Gedling) 43
Policy 24: Strategic Allocation Former Stanton Tip (Nottingham City) 44
Policy 25: Strategic Allocation Broad Marsh (Nottingham City) 45
Policy 26: Strategic Allocation Melton Road, Edwalton (Rushcliffe) 46
Policy 27: Strategic Allocation Land North of Bingham (Rushcliffe) 47
Policy 28: Strategic Allocation Former RAF Newton (Rushcliffe) 48
Policy 29: Strategic Allocation Former Cotgrave Colliery (Rushcliffe) 49
Policy 30: Strategic Allocation South of Clifton (Rushcliffe) 50
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe) . 51
Policy 32: Strategic Allocation Former Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station (Rushcliffe) 52
Other Sections of the Document and Supporting Documents: 53
General Comments 53
Key Settlements Review 54
Strategic Transport Modelling 55
Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) 55
Policies Map 56
Employment Land Needs Study 56
Green Belt Review and Background Paper 57
Heritage Assets Assessment 58
Sustainability Appraisal (SA) 58
Viability Study 59
Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) 59
Housing Background Paper 60
Omission Sites (Broxtowe and Rushcliffe) 61

1. Introduction

1.1. This Statement of Consultation sets out the details of publicity and consultation undertaken to prepare and inform the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan. This Statement is to fulfil the requirements of Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, as amended, which requires a statement setting out the following:

a) Which bodies and persons were invited by the Council to make representations,
b) How those bodies and persons were invited to make representations,
c) A summary of the main issues raised by the representations; and
d) How any representations have been taken into account.

1.2. The consultations which have been undertaken the Strategic Plan are listed below:

- Growth Options (July 2020 and February 2021)
- Preferred Approach (January 2023)
- Distribution and Logistics Preferred Approach (September 2023)
- Publication Draft (Regulation 19 – 2024)
- Publication Draft (Regulation 19 – March 2025)

1.3. Section three of this statement provides further detail of these consultations.

2. Which bodies and persons were invited by the Councils to make representations and how were they invited to make the representations

2.1. The Councils consulted a variety of organisations and individuals. The Councils hold a joint database, hosted by 'Inovem' which currently has over 2,500 members. The database can be viewed: https://gnplan.inconsult.uk/

2.2. The Councils sent emails to everyone on the joint database notifying them of each consultation and inviting them to make comments.

- Growth Options Consultation (July 2020): 1,626 emails.
- Growth Options Consultation (February 2021): 2,116 emails.
- Preferred Approach (January 2023): 2,425 emails.
- Strategic Plan: Distribution and Logistics Preferred Approach (September 2023): 3,041 emails.
- Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan Publication Draft (2024): 2,561 emails and 113 letters.
- Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan Publication Draft (March 2025): 2,869 emails and 135 letters.

2.3. The joint database includes individuals and organisations who have registered an interest in the Strategic Plan or who have responded to a previous consultation and have given permission for the Councils to contact them in respect of future consultations. It also includes statutory consultees, key organisations, infrastructure providers and duty-to-cooperate partners:

- Active Travel England
- All Parish Councils, Town Councils and Neighbourhood Forums in the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan area
- Amber Valley Borough Council
- Ashfield District Council
- Bassetlaw District Council
- British Waterways
- BT
- Cadent Gas
- Canal & River Trust
- Central Networks
- Charnwood Borough Council
- Civil Aviation Authority
- Coal Authority
- D2N2
- Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO)
- Derby City Council
- Derbyshire County Council

- East Midlands Combined County Authority
- Environment Agency
- Erewash Borough Council
- Forestry Commission
- HS2 Limited
- Historic England
- Homes England
- Leicester City Council
- Leicestershire County Council
- Mansfield District Council
- Melton Borough Council
- Ministry of Defence
- National Grid
- National Highways
- Natural England
- NET (Tram)
- Network Rail
- Newark and Sherwood District Council
- NHS and Integrated Care Boards
- North West Leicestershire Council
- Nottinghamshire County Council
- Office of Rail and Road
- Severn Trent Water
- South Derbyshire District Council
- Sport England
- The Gardens Trust
- The Theatres Trust

2.4. Letters were sent to individuals or organisations who were held on the database but did not provide an email address.

2.5. Consultation documents are held on the Greater Nottingham Planning Partnership website: www.gnplan.org.uk Each Council also had a page on their own website with details of the consultations.

2.6. The majority of comments were submitted via the online consultation portal. This allows individuals or organisations to make multiple comments against the relevant part of the consultation document. This results in a significantly higher number of responses compared to individual respondents.

2.7. The Councils publicised the consultations through press releases and using social media. A YouTube video was also prepared for the Growth Options consultation and an accessible 'story map' consultation summary was provided for the Preferred Approach and the Publication Draft.

2.8. Individual Councils also publicised the consultations through their own newsletters or email circulations.

2.9. Due to the new allocation proposed at the former Bennerley Coal Disposal Point and the extension of the allocation at Toton and Chetwynd Barracks, site notices were also displayed around these locations.

2.10. Copies of the consultations were held on the Greater Nottingham Partnership's website, on the online consultation portal and paper copies were provided in libraries and/or council offices within each local authority area. Details of how people could access the documents were provided within the emails and letters sent out as part of the consultation.

2.11. Parish Councils, Town Councils and Neighbourhood Forums also publicised details of the consultations, particularly those located in close proximity to allocated sites.

2.12. The consultations were undertaken in accordance with each Council's Statement of Community Involvement:

- Broxtowe Borough Council: https://www.broxtowe.gov.uk/for-you/planning/planning-policy/statement-of-community-involvement/
- Nottingham City Council: https://www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/media/3d1a44wt/statement-of-community-involvement-june-2023.pdf
- Rushcliffe Borough Council: https://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/planning-growth/planning-policy/local-plan/community-involvement/

2.13. Prior the Gedling's withdrawal from the Strategic Plan, consultations were also undertaken in accordance with their Statement of Community Involvement:

- Gedling Borough Council: https://www.gedling.gov.uk/media/gedlingboroughcouncil/documents/planningpolicy/documents/GBC%20SCI%20FINAL%202019.pdf

Summary of Consultation Requirements based on Statements of Community Involvement:

	Broxtowe	**Gedling**	**Nottingham City**	**Rushcliffe**
Details on Website	✓	✓	✓	✓
Publicity via press releases, social media posts, posters, websites etc.	✓	✓	✓	✓

	Broxtowe	**Gedling**	**Nottingham City**	**Rushcliffe**
Contact consultees by email or letter	✓	✓	✓	✓
Hard copies of documents at council offices	✓	✓	✓	✓ (at Contact Centre)
Hard copies at libraries	Not required but were provided in all libraries for Regulation 19.	✓	✓	✓
Presentations, workshops	Only where considered appropriate	Only where considered appropriate	Optional	Only where considered appropriate
Site Notices close to sites	Not required but were provided at Toton/ Chetwynd and Bennerley at Regulation 19	✓	Optional	Not required.

3. Plan Production Timeline

Growth Options (July 2020 and February 2021)

3.1. The Growth Options consultation asked questions on housing growth, employment growth and economic development, climate change and carbon neutrality, Green Belt, city and town centres, the natural environment, urban design, the historic environment, safe and healthy communities and infrastructure provision.

3.2. This consultation also invited views on potential broad areas for growth and sites. The first consultation was undertaken for 10 weeks between 6th July and 14th September 2020. 4,228 individual comments were submitted from 627 respondents.

3.3. From 10th February 2021 to 24th March 2021 an extended consultation period was carried out after the Councils were made aware that some comments submitted by email had been blocked by security software and had not been received. 893 individual comments were submitted from 272 respondents.

Chapter	**Question**	**Number of Comments**
Chapter One Introduction and Vision	INT1: Vision and Spatial Objectives INT2: Evidence Base INT3: Strategic Issues	593
Chapter Two Overall Strategy	OS1: Urban Intensification Growth Strategy OS2: More-Dispersed Growth Strategy Option OS3: Green and Blue Infrastructure-Led Growth Strategy Option OS4: Transport-Led Growth Strategy Option OS5: Climate change OS6: Amount of New Housing OS7: Growth Options OS8: Other Growth Strategy Options OS9: Site Assessments OS10: Safeguarded Land	2,352
Chapter Three Green and Blue Infrastructure and the Natural Environment	GBI1: Strategic Green and Blue Infrastructure Assets GBI2: Strategic Allocations and Policies GBI3: Biodiversity Net Gains	294
Chapter Four Green Belt	GB1: Principle of the Nottingham-Derby Green Belt GB2: Approach to the Green Belt	402

Chapter	Question	Number of Comments
	GB3: Offsetting Losses to the Green Belt	
Chapter Five Working in Greater Nottingham	EMP1: Employment Land and Office Space EMP2: Office Development EMP3: Driving Innovation and Supporting Business Growth EMP4: Regeneration Priorities EMP5: Climate Change EMP6: Safeguarding Employment Land EMP7: Rural Area	437
Chapter Six Living in Greater Nottingham	H1: Affordable Housing H2: Housing Size, Types and Tenure H3: Meeting the Needs of Different Groups H4: Gypsies and Travellers	337
Chapter Seven The City and Town Centres	CTC1: The Network and Hierarchy of Centres CTC2: Nottingham City Centre and the Town and District Centres CTC3: Acceptable Uses on the Edge or Outside of Centres	183
Chapter Eight Designing Good Places	D1: Achieving Well Designed Places D2: Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment	169
Chapter Nine Infrastructure to Support Growth	IN1: Infrastructure to Support Growth IN2: Priorities for Development-Funded Infrastructure IN3: Timely Provision of Infrastructure	241
Chapter Ten Any Other Issues	OI1: Any Other Issues	113
Total		**5,121**

3.4. The Report of Consultation Responses was published in February 2022 and provided a summary of the comments received as part of the consultations.

Report of Consultation Responses (February 2022):
https://www.gnplan.org.uk/media/mnco0kmt/report-of-consultation-responses-growth-options.pdf

3.5. A response to the Growth Options consultation responses was published as part of the "Preferred Approach: Response to the Growth Options Consultation" in September 2022.

Preferred Approach: Response to the Growth Options Consultation: https://www.gnplan.org.uk/media/w25l02xx/preferred-approach-response-to-the-growth-options-consultation.pdf

Summary of Key Issues Raised in Consultation

Issue	Summary	Response
Heritage	Lack of reference to historic environment; requested inclusion in Vision and policies.	Historic environment will be included in the Vision and Publication Version.
Green Belt Protection	Strong opposition to development in Green Belt; calls for preservation.	Green Belt will only be amended in exceptional circumstances; supported by targeted review.
Carbon Neutrality Targets	Support for Nottingham's 2028 goal; calls for measurable targets.	Climate emergency acknowledged; policies will steer development toward carbon neutrality.
Flood Risk and Water Management	Concerns about floodplain development; EA requested stronger flood policies.	Flood risk now a separate Sustainability Appraisal criterion; EA advice incorporated.
Urban Intensification Strategy	Most supported option; seen as sustainable and infrastructure-efficient.	Adopted as a core strategy; qualified to avoid "town cramming"; supports 20-minute (compact and connected) neighbourhoods.
Blue and Green Infrastructure (BGI)	Support for enhancing BGI; concern about development harming sensitive areas.	BGI Strategy adopted; development must enhance existing networks and create new ones.
Transport-Led Growth Strategy	Support for development near transport hubs (HS2, NET); active travel promoted.	Transport-led growth included; strategic sites near HS2 and East Midlands Parkway prioritised.
20-Minute Neighbourhood Concept	Supported by consultees to reduce car use and improve access.	Adopted as a key component of the Preferred Approach, referred to as "compact and connected communities".

Issue	Summary	Response
Housing Delivery and Affordability	Concern over undelivered permissions; calls for more land to address affordability.	SHLAAs reviewed; housing supply and affordability addressed in Vision and housing strategy.
Nottingham City Housing Shortfall	Concern over City's capacity; debate over redistribution.	Evidence updated in respect of City's housing supply against updated standard method.
Evidence Base Strengthened	Requests for updated studies on climate, biodiversity, heritage, etc.	Additional studies completed (e.g. Employment, Logistics, Heritage); strategic transport assessment underway.
Biodiversity Net Gain	Strong support for net gain; calls for clear targets.	Net gain principles adopted; will be detailed in Publication Version.
Design and Place-Making	Support for high-quality, locally distinctive design.	Design policy will be included; good design central to Vision.
Affordable and Diverse Housing	Demand for affordable, elderly-friendly, and tenure-blind housing.	Housing mix guided by Housing Needs Study; First Homes and specialist housing considered.
Employment Growth Focus	Support for co-location of jobs and homes; Toton and Ratcliffe highlighted.	Strategic employment growth at Toton and Ratcliffe confirmed; supports East Midlands Freeport.
Reuse of Employment Sites	Support for releasing low-quality sites for housing.	Policy will safeguard high-quality sites; low-demand sites may be released for other uses.
Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)	Calls for coordinated infrastructure planning and funding.	IDP will coordinate infrastructure needs, timing, and funding; viability assessments planned.
Waste and Recycling	Support for comprehensive waste strategy.	Waste policy to be developed through Joint Waste Local Plan.
Gypsies and Travellers	Requests for dedicated policy and assessment.	Accommodation Assessment completed; will inform future policy.

Issue	Summary	Response
Site Selection Process	Calls for robust criteria including flood risk, heritage, biodiversity, viability.	Site selection informed by Sustainability Appraisal, flood risk tests, heritage assessments, and viability.
Site-Specific Objections	Strong opposition to sites like R05 (Orston), R07.1 (Regatta Way), and R17 (Normanton on Soar) due to flooding, biodiversity loss, and infrastructure concerns.	Site selection document has justified the final selection of sites. A number of sites which received significant levels of objections have not been selected.

Preferred Approach (January 2023)

3.6. The Preferred Approach consultation focused on the distribution of housing and employment provision and identified strategic sites. The document included a proposed vision, objectives relating to housing and employment and a planning strategy. It also included details of the housing and employment supply and identified strategic site allocations to meet any remaining need.

3.7. The consultation ran from 4th January 2023 to 14th February 2023. 830 individual comments were received from 184 respondents.

Chapter/Document	Number of Comments
1. Introduction	39
2. Background	27
3. Vision and Objectives	82
4. Proposed Planning Strategy	106
5. Approach to Housing Need	120
6. Approach to Employment Need	47
Appendix A: Preferred Sites	190
Appendix A: Additional or Alternative Sites	89
Appendix B: Housing Trajectory	27
Supporting Evidence Documents	103

3.8. The Statement of Consultation supporting the Regulation 19 Publication Draft contained a full summary and response to the comments received.

https://www.gnplan.org.uk/media/jmzcwx1m/gnsp-statement-of-consultation-regulation-19-sept-2024.pdf

3.9. A summary of the key points raised and the Councils' response is provided below:

Summary	Response
Housing targets too low, especially Nottingham City's unmet 35% uplift	City will meet as much of its need as possible; uplift not redistributed due to Green Belt constraints
Insufficient housing allocations in Broxtowe, Gedling, and Rushcliffe	Existing allocations retained; no new strategic sites added; future plans may address smaller sites
Over-reliance on large strategic sites (e.g. Toton, Gamston)	Delivery timelines revised; SHLAA used to update trajectories; smaller sites included in future plans if required.
Affordable housing need exceeds viable delivery	Plan contributes significantly; viability and equality assessments guide delivery
Lack of buffer in housing supply	Non-implementation allowance used instead of buffer; reserve sites not deemed necessary
Windfall assumptions questioned, especially in Nottingham City	Windfall rates updated with more years of data; student housing and office conversions monitored
Strong support for Green Belt protection	Green Belt only altered in exceptional cases; most proposed sites rejected due to lack of justification
Infrastructure concerns, especially transport and education	Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) produced; site-specific policies include infrastructure requirements
Support for 20-minute neighbourhoods, but concerns about feasibility	Concept adopted; clarified as "compact and connected communities"; not a strict time-based rule
Economic growth underestimated (Freeport, HS2)	Regeneration scenario adopted; HS2 cancelled; Freeport growth considered aspirational
Uneven distribution of employment land	Strategic allocations retained; Ratcliffe and Toton prioritised; City's constraints acknowledged
Ratcliffe on Soar redevelopment concerns (Green Belt, infrastructure)	Site allocated post-LDO approval; employment/logistics mix supported; no further land needed
Lack of strategic logistics strategy	Separate consultation held; two sites allocated (Bennerley & Ratcliffe); others rejected
Student housing pressures not addressed	City has Student Living Strategy; monitoring and planning policies in place
Need for places of worship and burial spaces	Recognised; addressed in Policy 12 and future local plans

Summary	Response
Climate change and biodiversity need stronger emphasis	Policies updated; Natural England's GI Framework adopted; BNG and flood risk addressed
Concerns about "town cramming" and urban intensification	Strategy qualified to protect quality of life; compact growth balanced with infrastructure
Call for more employment land in Broxtowe and Rushcliffe	Existing allocations retained; strategic sites deemed sufficient
Site-specific objections and promotions (e.g. East Leake, Ruddington)	Most rejected as not required to meet housing targets.
Sustainability Appraisal methodology questioned	SA updated to emphasize chosen strategy's sustainability; alternatives assessed where valid

Distribution and Logistics Preferred Approach (September 2023)

3.10. This consultation focused on the approach to strategic distribution and logistics. The consultation provided detail regarding the need for distribution and logistics development, identified existing and future supply and also identified two new allocations which would help to meet the unmet need.

3.11. The consultation ran between 26th September and 7th November 2023. 134 individual comments were received from 53 respondents.

Chapter/Document	Number of Comments
1. Introduction	11
2. Background	7
3. The Need for Strategic Distribution and Logistics and Site Criteria	23
4. Preferred Sites for Distribution and Logistics	47
5. Appendix A: Preferred Sites	22
6. Appendix B: Glossary	2
Supporting Evidence Documents	22

3.12. The Statement of Consultation supporting the Regulation 19 Publication Draft contained a full summary and response to the comments received.

https://www.gnplan.org.uk/media/jmzcwx1m/gnsp-statement-of-consultation-regulation-19-sept-2024.pdf

3.13. A summary of the key points raised and the Councils' response is provided below:

Summary	Response
Lack of a clear strategy for strategic logistics needs; omission seen as unsound	Councils conducted a separate consultation and allocated two strategic sites following a detailed site selection process (Bennerley & Ratcliffe on Soar)
Evidence of strong demand for B8 logistics (Iceni Study, low vacancy rates)	Iceni Study used to inform site selection; strategic logistics needs addressed separately from general employment
Calls for Green Belt review to enable logistics development in key corridors (e.g. M1 J26)	Green Belt release only permitted in exceptional circumstances; most proposed sites not justified for release
Concerns about viability and deliverability of Bennerley site (flooding, access, contamination)	Site assessed; have been subject to viability testing, delivery phased and infrastructure requirements clarified
Ratcliffe on Soar site concerns (impact on strategic road network, heritage, flooding)	Site allocated post-LDO approval; transport modelling undertaken; policy aligned with LDO boundaries
Need for wider range of logistics sites, including non-Green Belt options	Councils assessed sites which met minimum criteria; only sites meeting strategic criteria and sustainability were allocated
Requests for alignment with housing growth to support employment development	This has been considered as part of the wider employment scenarios and within the Housing Background Paper.
Environmental and biodiversity concerns (impact on regenerated brownfield sites)	Blue and green infrastructure requirements included in site policies; biodiversity impacts considered in assessments
Infrastructure concerns (sewage, highways, water treatment, cumulative impacts)	Infrastructure Delivery Plan developed; consultation key stakeholders undertaken

Summary of key changes made to the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan based on Regulation 18 responses

3.14. Based on the comments received in respect of the Regulation 18 consultations, the following key changes were incorporated into the Publication Draft of the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan:

- Plan period extended from 2038 to 2041.
- Housing targets updated due to changes to the standard method figure.
- Vision and Objectives updated through the production of the plan and to update references to proposed allocated sites.
- Further clarification provided regarding how the compact and connected communities principles have been applied.

- Settlement hierarchy amended to reflect the planning strategy.
- Places of worship included within the definition of Community Facilities in the justification text of Policy 12.
- List of transport schemes updated.
- Reference included to Natural England's Green Infrastructure Framework within Policy 16.
- Additional justification provided in respect of windfall.
- Sites allocated in respect of logistics.
- Housing trajectories updated based on latest evidence.
- Additional land allocated at Toton to support delivery of the link road.
- Sustainability Appraisal updated to consider alternative growth strategies and housing distribution.
- Additional mitigation text added for flood risk, biodiversity, and active travel.

Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan Publication Draft (2024)

3.15. Broxtowe Borough Council, Gedling Borough Council, Nottingham City Council and Rushcliffe Borough Council published the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan Publication Draft and supporting documents for consultation in November 2024.

3.16. The consultation period was from Monday 4th November 2024 to Monday 16th December 2024.

3.17. 893 comments were received from 378 respondents. Further details are provided in the table below, combined with the further consultation undertaken in March 2025.

Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan Publication Draft (March 2025)

3.18. A further Regulation 19 Publication Draft was published due to Gedling Borough Council withdrawing from the Strategic Plan. The key changes from the consultation undertaken on the Publication Draft (2024) were:

- Policy specific content related to Gedling Borough Council were removed.
- Housing targets for Broxtowe and Rushcliffe Borough Councils were updated to meet the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) transitional arrangements.
- Additional text was added to Policy 31 (East of Gamston / North of Tollerton).

3.19. The consultation period was from Wednesday 12th March 2025 to 17:00 on Friday 25th April 2025. Respondents who submitted comments in relation to the 2024 consultation were invited to 'carry forward' their previous comments

or to either add to their comments or submit new comments. The consultation database questionnaire included an option to carry forward previous comments.

3.20. All responses received have been summarised within the consultation summary table. Where respondents 'carried forward' their comments without making any changes, only the 2025 response has been included in the table to avoid repetition.

3.21. A total of 858 responses were received from 252 respondents. A list of responses against each policy or section of the Strategic Plan, alongside the number of comments made against the 2024 consultation, is contained in the table below:

Section	Number of Responses (2024)	Number of Responses (March 2025)
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	41	35
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	63	56
Policy 3: Housing Target	111	95
Policy 4: The Green Belt	77	48
Policy 5: Employment Provision and Economic Development	40	25
Policy 6: Nottingham City Centre	7	4
Policy 7: Role of Town and Other Centres	7	8
Policy 8: Housing Size, Mix and Choice	30	24
Policy 9: Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	1	0
Policy 10: Design and Enhancing Local Identity	11	11
Policy 11: The Historic Environment	6	4
Policy 12: Local Services and Healthy Lifestyles	7	7
Policy 13: Culture, Tourism and Sport	7	7
Policy 14: Managing Travel Demand	16	15
Policy 15: Transport Infrastructure Priorities	25	20
Policy 16: Blue and Green Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space	29	19
Policy 17: Biodiversity	33	27
Policy 18: Developer Contributions for Infrastructure	20	16
Policy 19: Strategic Allocation at Boots	5	7
Policy 20: Strategic Allocation Field Farm (Broxtowe)	3	4
Policy 21: Strategic Allocation Toton and Chetwynd Barracks (Broxtowe)	28	36

Section	Number of Responses (2024)	Number of Responses (March 2025)
Policy 22: Strategic Allocation Former Bennerley Coal Disposal Point (Broxtowe)	12	16
Policy 23: Top Wighay Farm	20	0
Policy 24: Strategic Allocation Former Stanton Tip (Nottingham City)	8	9
Policy 25: Strategic Allocation Broad Marsh (Nottingham City)	11	13
Policy 26: Strategic Allocation Melton Road, Edwalton (Rushcliffe)	6	5
Policy 27: Strategic Allocation Land North of Bingham (Rushcliffe)	8	6
Policy 28: Strategic Allocation Former RAF Newton (Rushcliffe)	6	5
Policy 29: Strategic Allocation Former Cotgrave Colliery (Rushcliffe)	7	5
Policy 30: Strategic Allocation South of Clifton (Rushcliffe)	5	7
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	197	155
Policy 32: Strategic Allocation Former Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station (Rushcliffe)	19	16
Supporting documents	40	30
Other section of document	117	123
Total	**893**	**858**

3.22. A summary of the main issues raised and the response to these issues is provided in Section 4. Full summaries and responses are provided in a separate appendix.

4. Summary of Main Issues Raised Pursuant to Regulation 19 Publication Version Plans:

Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk

Representations received: 35 (March 2025); 41 (2024)

Main Issues Raised:

- **Concern** that requiring new buildings to achieve net zero regulated operational emissions is unrealistic under current economic conditions and could undermine growth delivery (raised by multiple developers and industry groups).
- **Objection to higher local standards** than national Building Regulations, with many respondents arguing the evidence base is insufficient to justify this and that local plans should not exceed national requirements.
- **Viability concerns**: Many developers argue that the policy's requirements (e.g., 63% improvement on Part L 2021) are not viable, especially for certain types of development (e.g., older persons' housing).
- **Calls for flexibility**: Several respondents request more explicit viability caveats and flexibility in the policy wording, especially regarding technical or financial feasibility.
- **Site-by-site energy generation**: Some argue this approach undermines economies of scale and efficient land use.
- **Parts of the policy considered non-strategic**: Some developers argue that sections 2–7 duplicate national legislation and should be deleted.
- **Support for the policy's aims**: A number of respondents, including local authorities and public bodies, support the general direction of the policy.
- **Detailed technical suggestions**: The Environment Agency and Historic England suggest amendments to strengthen references to resilience, permeable surfaces, water quality, heritage, and nature-based solutions.
- **Concerns about loopholes**: Some fear that lack of clear criteria for "unviable or unfeasible" could be exploited by developers.
- **Other issues**: Comments on the need for policies on solar panels, EV charging, and public open space integration; some support for carbon offsetting and lifestyle change encouragement.

Councils' Response:

- Higher local standards are justified by local evidence and plan-wide viability testing.
- Flexibility is provided for viability and technical feasibility; case-by-case consideration is built in.
- Local plans can set higher standards than Building Regulations, subject to national policy.

- Some technical suggestions (e.g., wording on resilience, permeable surfaces) are accepted and main modifications are suggested, including for clarity.
- Strengthen language around climate resilience, blue-green infrastructure, permeable surfaces, and SuDS.
- Justification text updated to reflect multifunctional benefits of SuDS.

Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy

Representations received: 56 (March 2025); 63 (2024)

Main Issues Raised:

- **Over-reliance on brownfield sites**: Respondents argue that brownfield sites are complex, costly, and slow to deliver, and that growth should be more evenly distributed, including more greenfield and rural sites.
- **Housing delivery concerns**: Multiple developers and land promoters argue that the plan under-delivers on housing, fails to meet minimum needs, and is overly reliant on windfall and existing allocations.
- **Settlement hierarchy disputes**: Objections to downgrading certain settlements (e.g., Brinsley), and calls for more growth in Key Settlements and sustainable rural villages.
- **Gedling's withdrawal**: Several respondents question the soundness and legal compliance of the plan following Gedling's departure, raising concerns about cross-boundary cooperation.
- **Affordable housing and distribution**: Concerns that the spatial strategy does not adequately address affordable housing needs, especially in Nottingham City and rural areas.
- **Active travel and infrastructure**: Request greater emphasis on cycling and walking infrastructure, and for active travel to have "parity of esteem" with public transport.
- **Windfall assumptions challenged**: Argue windfall supply is overstated and not robustly evidenced.
- **Green Belt review**: Request a full Green Belt review to identify more sustainable sites for housing and employment.
- **Support for prioritising urban areas**: Some support for focusing growth within and adjoining Nottingham, but with caveats about infrastructure and delivery risks.
- **Employment land and logistics**: Some argue the spatial strategy is too housing-focused and does not sufficiently plan for employment and logistics needs.

Councils' Response:

- The spatial strategy is justified, sustainable, and supported by evidence.
- Brownfield focus and settlement hierarchy are considered appropriate; no need for further allocations.
- Windfall assumptions and housing supply are robust; no additional Green Belt review required.
- Gedling's withdrawal does not undermine the plan's soundness.
- No main modifications proposed, but updates to justification text clarify infrastructure priorities and reflect the transition from the East Midlands Development Corporation to the Combined County Authority.

Policy 3: Housing Target

Representations received: 95 (March 2025); 111 (2024)

Main Issues Raised:

- **Insufficient housing provision**: Developers and land promoters argue the plan's housing target is below the minimum need, does not meet the Standard Method, and is not justified.
- **Objection to deviation from Standard Method**: Respondents question the lack of exceptional circumstances for not meeting the full Standard Method requirement.
- **Over-reliance on windfall and existing allocations**: Concerns that the plan is too dependent on windfall sites and existing allocations, risking under-delivery.
- **Calls for a buffer**: Request a 10–20% buffer to ensure flexibility and resilience in housing supply.
- **Green Belt review**: Request a comprehensive Green Belt review to identify more housing land.
- **Affordable housing needs**: Request to increase the housing requirement to better address affordable housing needs.
- **Strategic site deliverability**: Concerns about the deliverability and timing of large strategic sites (e.g., Toton, Chetwynd, Broad Marsh).
- **Support for transitional arrangements**: Some support for using transitional NPPF arrangements, but others argue this is a short-sighted approach.
- **Local authority targets**: Mixed views on whether Rushcliffe and Broxtowe targets are too high or too low; some argue for more allocations, others for fewer.
- **Other issues**: Requests for more clarity on plan period, site allocations, and the treatment of "grey belt" land.

Councils' Response:

- The housing target is justified by transitional arrangements and the Standard Method.
- Windfall and delivery rates are robust; no need for a buffer or further allocations.
- Affordable housing and specialist needs are addressed through policy and evidence.
- The plan period and trajectory are considered realistic.
- Reduction of overall housing target from 47,600 to 47,100 proposed to reflect Stanton Tip being removed from strategic housing sites.
- Clarification added on how targets apply to individual councils.

Policy 4: The Green Belt

Representations received: 48 (March 2025); 77 (2024)

Main Issues Raised:

- **Requests for Green Belt release**: Numerous site-specific requests to remove land from the Green Belt for housing or employment, especially from developers and landowners.
- **Demand for a full Green Belt review**: A comprehensive review is needed to meet housing and employment needs.
- **Objection to lack of new allocations**: Not enough land is being released from the Green Belt, risking under-delivery.
- **Support for maintaining Green Belt**: Some respondents, including Derbyshire County Council, support the principle of maintaining and enhancing the Green Belt.
- **Justification for changes**: Requests for clearer justification for specific Green Belt boundary changes (e.g., Ratcliffe power station, Bennerley).
- **Cross-boundary engagement**: Concerns about insufficient engagement with neighbouring authorities on Green Belt matters.
- **Grey Belt policy**: The plan should consider “grey belt” land in light of emerging national policy.
- **Employment land**: Request more employment land to be released from the Green Belt, especially for logistics.
- **Safeguarded land**: Requests to allocate safeguarded land for housing at the earliest opportunity.
- **Monitoring and triggers**: Suggestions to include triggers for future Green Belt review based on land supply and affordability.

Councils’ Response:

- Exceptional circumstances for Green Belt release are justified and clearly set out.
- Sufficient sites are allocated; no further Green Belt review or safeguarded land release is needed.
- Cross-boundary engagement and consistency are evidenced.
- No modifications proposed.

Policy 5: Employment Provision and Economic Development

Representations received: 25 (March 2025); 40 (2024)

Main Issues Raised:

- **Shortfall in logistics land**: The plan under-provides for strategic logistics/distribution land, with a significant shortfall identified compared to evidence base studies.
- **Need for more sites**: Request for additional employment and logistics sites, including smaller and more geographically diverse allocations.
- **Concerns about deliverability**: Some doubt the deliverability and timing of the two main logistics allocations (Bennerley and Ratcliffe on Soar).
- **Methodology disputes**: Disagreement over the employment land needs assessment, plot ratios, and inclusion of certain sites in supply figures.
- **Alignment with housing growth**: Request closer alignment between job growth and housing provision, especially in relation to the Freeport and major employment sites.
- **Cross-boundary cooperation**: Concerns about lack of engagement with neighbouring authorities and the wider functional economic market area.
- **Support for key allocations**: Some support for the Bennerley and Ratcliffe allocations, but with caveats about design, delivery, and compensatory measures.
- **Policy flexibility**: Requests for criteria-based policies to allow additional employment sites to come forward if needed.
- **Monitoring and future provision**: Requests for clearer mechanisms to address residual unmet needs and to monitor employment land delivery.
- **Other issues**: Comments on the need for up-to-date evidence, the role of office and general industrial land, and the impact on local labour markets.

Councils' Response:

- Employment land allocations are justified by robust evidence and the Employment Land Needs Study.
- Logistics and strategic distribution needs are addressed insofar as policy constraints allow; flexibility is provided for future needs.
- No additional sites are required; plan includes criteria for assessing further proposals.
- Reduction of employment land provision from 155.5 ha to 148 ha due to Stanton Tip removal.
- Stanton Tip removed from strategic employment sites.

Policy 6: Nottingham City Centre

Representations received: 4 (March 2025); 7 (2024)

Main Issues Raised:

- **Mixed-use approach at Broadmarsh**: Some question whether a mixed-use redevelopment is best, suggesting a greater focus on housing due to high vacancy rates in retail, leisure, and office uses.
- **Tall buildings**: Concerns about the impact of tall buildings on the historic environment and heritage assets; requests for clearer definitions and assessment criteria.
- **Support for heritage protection**: Support for protecting heritage tourism assets and the city's historic character.
- **City Centre's regional role**: Calls for more explicit reference to the interdependency between Nottingham City Centre and surrounding districts for employment and services.
- **Retail focus**: Requests for the policy to emphasize the Primary Shopping Area and the Victoria Centre's role in the city's retail offer.
- **Tram extensions**: Suggestions to reference feasibility studies for tram extensions to new developments.
- **Car parking and accessibility**: Support for balanced car parking provision to maintain city centre vitality, while encouraging sustainable transport.
- **General support**: Broad support for the overall approach of strengthening the city centre as the main location for town centre uses.

Councils' Response:

- Support a mixed-use approach and strong emphasis on housing at Broadmarsh.
- Heritage and retail concerns are addressed through masterplanning and local plan policies.
- Additional justification text will reference the Victoria Centre.
- No main modifications proposed, but several other modifications to improve clarity on city centre quarters, retail role, and transport access.

Policy 7: Role of Town and Other Centres

Representations received: 8 (March 2025); 7 (2024)

Main Issues Raised:

- **Accuracy of centre hierarchy**: Objection to the omission of certain local centres (e.g., Toton & Chetwynd Barracks) from the policy's list; requests for updates as new centres are developed.
- **Support for health facilities**: Agreement that healthcare facilities should be within walking distance of villages.
- **Recognition of local centres**: Request recognition of centres like Fairham and Cropwell Bishop, which serve wider rural areas.
- **Parking and congestion**: Concerns about parking and congestion in village centres, especially where they serve a wider catchment.
- **Community wealth and advice services**: Suggestions to reference community wealth building and the role of advice services, though these are not considered strategic planning matters.
- **Support for retail hierarchy**: Support for the city centre's primacy in the retail hierarchy and its positive impact on other centres.
- **General support**: Broad support for the network and hierarchy of centres as set out in the policy.

Councils' Response:

- The list of centres will be updated in future plans as new centres are developed.
- Health and community facilities are supported in policy.

Policy 8: Housing Size, Mix and Choice

Representations received: 24 (March 2025); 30 (2024)

Main Issues Raised:

- **Space standards and accessibility**: Objections to mandatory Nationally Described Space Standards and 100% M4(2) accessibility requirements; calls for more flexibility and site-by-site viability consideration.
- **Affordable housing mix**: Concerns about the achievability of affordable housing targets and mix; requests for more flexibility and updated evidence.
- **Older persons' housing**: Request more explicit provision for elderly and disabled housing, including bungalows and exemptions from affordable housing requirements for such schemes.
- **Viability and contingency**: Requests for contingency allowances in viability assessments and higher benchmark land values for small sites.
- **Student housing**: Suggestions for clearer policies on student accommodation and recognition of its role in the housing mix.
- **Wheelchair accessible homes**: Calls for a specific percentage of M4(3) wheelchair user dwellings.
- **Rural exception sites**: Support for rural exception sites and cascade mechanisms for local connection; requests for more positive wording on market housing on such sites.
- **Policy complexity**: Some find the policy overly lengthy and complex, suggesting it be split into separate policies for clarity.
- **NHS staff housing**: Recommendations to consider affordable housing needs for NHS staff near major healthcare employers.
- **General support**: Support for the policy's general approach and for providing a mix of homes responsive to local need.

Councils' Response:

- Space standards, accessibility, and affordable housing requirements are supported with evidence and viability testing.
- Flexibility is provided for site-specific viability; some clarifications will be added.
- Main modifications suggested for clarity on implementation including claritfiny application of Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS), including transition periods and exceptions for student accommodation.
- Proposed to update affordable housing element of policy to include viability considerations.

Policy 9: Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Representations received: 1 (2024)

1 response received stating support for the policy but no comments were included in the representation.

Policy 10: Design and Enhancing Local Identity

Representations received: 11 (March 2025); 11 (2024)

Main Issues Raised:

- **Flexibility and clarity**: Calls for more flexibility in policy wording (e.g., “where feasible and viable”) and clearer definitions of terms like “valued local characteristics” and “perform highly.”
- **Density and design standards**: Requests for more detail on acceptable densities and references to specific design standards (e.g., DfT LTN 1/20, Active Design).
- **Heritage and local distinctiveness**: Concerns about limited reference to heritage and local character; requests for more certainty for developers.
- **Key views and vistas**: Questions about how key views and vistas are identified and protected.
- **Active travel and parking**: Suggestions to address the negative impacts of excessive car parking and to promote active travel.
- **Land instability**: Support for inclusion of land instability and mitigation measures due to coal mining legacy.
- **General support**: Some support for the policy’s approach to design and character.

Councils’ Response:

- The policy is sufficiently detailed and flexible.
- Heritage and local character are addressed through other policies, supporting documents and local plans.
- Some technical clarifications (e.g., on heritage significance) are proposed.
- New element of policy on riparian buffer zones suggested, as response to representations from the Environment Agency (responding to Policy 17: Biodiversity.

Policy 11: The Historic Environment

Representations received: 4 (March 2025); 6 (2024)

Main Issues Raised:

- **Alignment with NPPF**: Requests from Historic England for amendments to ensure the policy aligns with Section 16 of the NPPF, especially regarding harm to heritage assets.
- **Comprehensiveness**: Requests from Historic England for the policy to cover all heritage asset types and to clarify the approach to harm, reuse, and public realm improvements.
- **Archaeological evidence**: Suggestions to require appropriate archaeological assessments with planning applications.
- **Monitoring**: Proposals for improved monitoring indicators (e.g., % of applications approved contrary to heritage advice).
- **Local examples**: Requests to include specific local heritage assets, though not considered appropriate for a strategic plan.
- **Historic environment in key settlements**: Request for more attention to the historic environment in key settlements and cross-boundary impacts.
- **General support**: Some support for the policy's flexibility and ambition.

Councils' Response:

- Welcome feedback from Historic England and propose to strengthen policy wording for compliance with national policy.
- Further detail on harm, reuse, and public realm improvements will be added.
- Main modifications suggested to strengthen policy and justification text.

Policy 12: Local Services and Healthy Lifestyles

Representations received: 7 (March 2025); 7 (2024)

Main Issues Raised:

- **Support for healthy lifestyles**: Broad support for policies promoting healthy lifestyles and compact, connected neighbourhoods.
- **Health Impact Assessments**: Recommendations to require Health Impact Assessments for significant residential developments.
- **NHS land disposals**: Concerns that requirements for alternative community uses on NHS disposal sites could delay reinvestment; calls for streamlined processes.
- **Community facilities location**: Support for locating community facilities in town and village centres.
- **Sports facilities**: Requests from Sport England for a separate criterion addressing loss of sports facilities, though this is covered under Policy 13.
- **General support**: Support for the city centre as a location for community facilities.

Councils' Response:

- The policy supports healthy lifestyles and compact neighbourhoods.
- NHS land disposal requirements are considered appropriate.
- Sports facilities are addressed in Policy 13.

Policy 13: Culture, Tourism and Sport

Representations received: 7 (March 2025); 7 (2024)

Main Issues Raised:

- **Heritage tourism**: Suggestions to reference heritage tourism, though considered too specific for this policy.
- **Protection of leisure sites**: Requests to save Nottingham Airfield for community and educational use.
- **Evidence base**: Concerns about out-of-date or missing evidence on playing pitches and sports facilities.
- **Consistency with NPPF**: Sport England request alignment with NPPF paragraph 104 regarding loss of sports facilities.
- **Parking around sports venues**: Requests to address on-street parking issues around sporting events.
- **General support**: Support for improving cultural, sporting, and tourism facilities, and for the city centre as a preferred location.

Councils' Response:

- Heritage tourism too specific for this policy; heritage is covered elsewhere.
- Main modifications suggested for sport facility policy wording to reflect the NPPF.
- Evidence on sports facilities will be updated in future plan work.

Policy 14: Managing Travel Demand

Representations received: 15 (March 2025); 16 (2024)

Main Issues Raised:

- **Alignment with spatial strategy**: Concerns about disconnects between spatial strategy, site selection, and travel demand management.
- **Active travel and monitoring**: Requests for better performance indicators and outcome measures for active travel, and for consulting Active Travel England.
- **Parking provision**: Concerns about over-provision of off-road parking undermining sustainable travel.
- **Limited Traffic Neighbourhoods**: Suggestions to promote this concept in new and existing areas.
- **Co-location of jobs and homes**: Requests for more housing near major employment sites (e.g., Ratcliffe on Soar) to support sustainable travel.
- **Support for hierarchy**: Support for the hierarchical approach to managing travel demand.
- **Strategic site accessibility**: Concerns about the accessibility of major employment allocations by sustainable modes.
- **General support**: Support for the policy's aims and for prioritising sustainable transport.

Councils' Response:

- The hierarchical approach is appropriate and aligns with the Local Transport Plan. There is a strong focus on sustainable travel methods, particularly in respect of site allocations.
- Monitoring indicators are considered sufficient; active travel is prioritised.

Policy 15: Transport Infrastructure Priorities

Representations received: 20 (March 2025); 25 (2024)

Main Issues Raised:

- **Funding and deliverability**: Concerns that many transport schemes are unfunded and may not be delivered; calls for clearer links between development and infrastructure funding.
- **Clarity of priorities**: Requests to distinguish between schemes needed for strategic allocations (eligible for S106) and those that are desirable but not essential.
- **Active travel infrastructure**: Request more detail on required active travel infrastructure and for prioritising cycling and walking projects.
- **Major road schemes**: Mixed views on the need for new roads (e.g., Toton Link Road), with some seeing them as increasing congestion.
- **Public transport improvements**: Support for tram extensions and rail upgrades, but requests for more specificity.
- **Historic environment**: Questions about how transport schemes will impact heritage assets.
- **Accessibility of employment sites**: Concerns about the accessibility of Ratcliffe on Soar and other major employment sites by sustainable modes.
- **Cross-boundary coordination**: Emphasis on the need for joint working with neighbouring authorities and agencies.
- **Monitoring and modelling**: Calls for further transport modelling and outcome-based monitoring.
- **General support**: Support for the policy's aims to improve sustainable transport and accessibility.

Councils' Response:

- Infrastructure priorities are justified by modelling and engagement with stakeholders.
- Some technical clarifications and updates to project lists will be made.
- Main modifications suggested for clarity and to update transport schemes, reflect completed projects, and revise mitigation measures based on modelling.
- A52 Bramcote Island signalisation removed due to congestion concerns.

Policy 16: Blue and Green Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space

Representations received: 19 (March 2025); 29 (2024)

Main Issues Raised:

- **Definitions and clarity**: Requests for clearer definitions of “green routes,” “locally valued landscapes,” and “mitigation hierarchy.”
- **Integration of blue and green infrastructure**: Stakeholders want a catchment-scale, multi-functional approach, not treating blue and green infrastructure separately.
- **Urban Greening Factor (UGF)**: Requests to consider UGF and alignment with Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) and Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG).
- **Protection of open space**: Request explicit protection of open space and sports facilities, referencing NPPF para 104.
- **Community forests and tree cover**: Support for increasing tree cover and community forests.
- **Active travel**: Support for prioritising walking, cycling, and informal recreation in BGI planning.
- **Private gardens**: Debate over including private gardens as green infrastructure.
- **Neighbourhood Plans**: Requests to add Neighbourhood Plans to monitoring and delivery mechanisms.
- **General support**: Broad support for a strategic, landscape-scale approach to BGI.

Councils’ Response:

- Support a strategic, landscape-scale approach and will clarify monitoring and delivery mechanisms.
- Neighbourhood Plans will be referenced in monitoring table.
- Main modifications suggested for clarity and to emphasise the protection of BGI, access to nature, and alignment with Sport England and Environment Agency recommendations..

Policy 17: Biodiversity

Representations received: 27 (March 2025); 33 (2024)

Main Issues Raised:

- **BNG targets**: Questions regarding 20% BNG in Rushcliffe compared to 10% elsewhere; some want 20% area-wide whilst others consider there should only be 10% BNG in Rushcliffe.
- **Viability and justification**: Concerns about the viability of higher BNG targets; council cites background paper and viability testing.
- **Mitigation hierarchy**: Calls for clarity on BNG hierarchy, off-site/credit options, and ecological buffer zones.
- **Monitoring**: Requests for robust monitoring and use of the Statutory Biodiversity Metric.
- **Alignment with LNRS**: Request for alignment with Local Nature Recovery Strategy and Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping.
- **Implementation details**: Suggestions for swift bricks, stewardship, and buffer zones.
- **Neighbourhood Plans**: Requests to add Neighbourhood Plans to monitoring.
- **Riparian zones**: Request for policy guidance for development close to watercourses.
- **General support**: Support for BNG policy, with requests for clarity and flexibility.

Councils' Response:

- The BNG targets are justified with evidence and viability testing.
- Monitoring and metric references will be clarified.
- Modifications suggested to include guidance on riparian zones within Policy 10: Design and Enhancing Local Identity
- Modifications suggested for monitoring and technical clarity.

Policy 18: Developer Contributions for Infrastructure

Representations received: 16 (March 2025); 20 (2024)

Main Issues Raised:

- **Long-term stewardship**: Emphasis on securing long-term management for infrastructure.
- **Viability and flexibility**: Support for allowing viability assessments and review of contributions if not viable.
- **CIL vs. S106 clarity**: Calls for clearer differentiation between Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and S106, and reference to the national infrastructure levy.
- **Primary healthcare and sports**: Requests to explicitly include primary healthcare and sports facilities in contributions.
- **Fairness and double-charging**: Concerns about fair and reasonable contributions and avoiding double-charging.
- **Up-to-date evidence**: Calls for updated evidence for sports and community needs.
- **Maintenance**: Clarification that maintenance contributions exclude highways.
- **General support**: Broad support for the policy's alignment with the plan's vision.

Councils' Response:

- Long-term stewardship and viability review mechanisms are included.
- Maintenance and funding sources are considered clear.

Policy 19: Strategic Allocation at Boots

Representations received: 7 (March 2025); 5 (2024)

Main Issues Raised:

- **Housing density**: Request to increase housing density (up to 2,000 units) and support adaptive reuse of heritage buildings.
- **Retail and transport**: Requests for more detail on retail provision and sustainable transport links.
- **Heritage and infrastructure**: Concerns about heritage impacts and need for ongoing dialogue with Historic England.
- **Delivery trajectory**: Questions about the delivery rate and split between Broxtowe and Nottingham City.
- **Active travel**: Support for improved bus, cycle, and pedestrian linkages

Councils' Response:

- The Councils maintain utilising a minimum housing figure is appropriate to allow for further housing development and the policy supports adaptive reuse of heritage buildings, subject to detailed work to understand the heritage impacts.
- The site is already under development. Where heritage issues arise, there will be dialogue with Historic England as appropriate.
- Masterplanning will address detailed issues.

Policy 20: Strategic Allocation Field Farm (Broxtowe)

Representations received: 4 (March 2025); 3 (2024)

Main Issues Raised:

- **Active travel**: Calls for completion of cycling routes and alignment with national policy.
- **General support**: Agreement on enhanced cycle/pedestrian infrastructure.
- **Housing trajectory**: Delivery rate considered reasonable

Councils' Response:

- Support enhanced active travel and considers delivery rates reasonable.

Policy 21: Strategic Allocation Toton and Chetwynd Barracks (Broxtowe)

Representations received: 36 (March 2025); 28 (2024)

Main Issues Raised:

- **Widespread support for continued allocation**: Multiple respondents support the continued strategic allocation at Toton and Chetwynd Barracks, with a number supporting the amalgamation of the two sites into a single strategic site.
- **Link road and infrastructure**: There is strong support for the delivery of the link road as a strategic transport requirement, with its role in unlocking land for development emphasised by several respondents.
- **Green Belt release**: Some respondents request that additional land be released from the Green Belt to increase housing capacity.
- **Impact of HS2 cancellation**: Several respondents state that the cancellation of HS2 requires a review of policy requirements, infrastructure needs, and delivery assumptions for the site.
- **Site area and capacity**: Concerns are raised about the accuracy of the stated site area (266 hectares) and whether all of it is available or deliverable, especially in light of infrastructure and land ownership constraints.
- **Education and community facilities**: Requests are made for the policy to explicitly reference the need for expanded secondary education provision and improved community and leisure facilities.
- **Heritage and utilities**: Some call for more explicit protection of heritage assets within Chetwynd Barracks and for policy wording to address the relocation or undergrounding of utility infrastructure.
- **Developer contributions and delivery triggers**: There are concerns about the clarity of policy wording on developer contributions, maintenance responsibilities, and the triggers or thresholds for infrastructure delivery.
- **Open space and green infrastructure**: Some respondents (e.g., Nottingham Open Space Forum) raise concerns about the adequacy of open space provision and the need for more detail in the policy.
- **Viability and deliverability**: A number of respondents question whether all aspects of the policy are viable and deliverable, especially given the complexity of the site and the loss of HS2 as a catalyst.

Councils' Response:

- Welcomes support for the continued allocation and the amalgamation of Toton and Chetwynd Barracks into a single strategic site. Agree that, following the cancellation of HS2, some policy requirements have been reviewed and further amendments are proposed, including references to infrastructure including school provision, access to the western parts of the Toton site and the extension of the tram to the west.
- Do not consider there are exceptional circumstances to release additional land from the Green Belt as proposed by some respondents. The policy's site area and capacity are based on available evidence and land assessments.

- Amendments to the policy format are proposed to improve clarity which includes references to the adopted Neighbourhood Plan.
- Updates to reflect housing delivery within the plan period, infrastructure requirements, blue-green infrastructure, education, and design principles.
- Neighbourhood Plan formally referenced.
- Supporting text and delivery mechanisms updated.

Policy 22: Strategic Allocation Former Bennerley Coal Disposal Point (Broxtowe)

Representations received: 16 (March 2025); 12 (2024)

Main Issues Raised:

- **Strategic allocation and Green Belt**: Some support for allocation and Green Belt removal.
- **Awsworth impacts**: Concerns about character, in particular the impact on heritage assets which is raised by Historic England, infrastructure, biodiversity, and traffic.
- **Country Park**: Support for realisation of Country Park.
- **Rail connection**: Questions about practicality of rail connection and impact on Country Park.
- **Habitat and flood risk**: Calls for policy amendments to protect river health and support BNG.
- **Active travel**: Questions about travel demand management.
- **Viability and feasibility**: Some challenges to deliverability timescales for the site and rail capacity.

Councils' Response:

- Site is considered to be deliverable based on evidence from the site promoters.
- Amendments to the policy to clarify how heritage should be considered as part of future development and to ensure river health is protected through enhancing blue-green infrastructure.
- Amendments to the policy to clarify the rail freight terminal requirements.

Policy 23: Strategic Allocation Top Wighay Farm (Gedling)

Representations received: 20 (2024)

- Responses received in relation to the proposed extension of the allocation.

Councils' Response:

- The site no longer forms part of the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan following the withdrawal of Gedling Borough Council.

Policy 24: Strategic Allocation Former Stanton Tip (Nottingham City)

Representations received: 9 (March 2025); 8 (2024).

Main Issues Raised:

- **Reduced Housing Capacity**: Site promoters confirmed a reduction from the previously anticipated 500 homes.
- **Housing Trajectory**: considered overambitious.
- **Cycling & Walking Connectivity**: Strong support for new links to Kimberley, Bennerley Viaduct, and National Cycle Network Route 6.
- **Green Infrastructure Enhancement**: Calls for improved biodiversity and green buffers, especially near Grantham Canal.
- **Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)**: Support for integrating BNG measures through future planning applications.
- **Open Space Provision**: Comments on the need for meaningful open space, to be addressed at application stage.
- **Environmental Value**: Recognition of the site's potential for ecological improvement, especially where land was previously used for crops.
- **Strategic Connectivity**: Suggestions to link the site with wider green and active travel networks across Nottingham.

Councils' Response:

- Proposed main modification to remove the site allocation from the Strategic Plan due to the reduced amount of development now proposed to come forward. Site will remain allocated through Notitngham City's Local Plan Part 2.

Policy 25: Strategic Allocation Broad Marsh (Nottingham City)

Representations received: 13 (March 2025); 11 (2024)

Main Issues Raised:

- **Heritage impacts**: Historic England highlights potential harm to multiple heritage assets but also opportunities for enhancement; requests further dialogue and possible policy amendments.
- **Open space**: Nottingham Open Space Forum raises concerns about minimal open space benefits; council notes open space will be considered at planning application stage.
- **Regeneration support**: Some support for the positive regeneration impact of the Broad Marsh site on the city centre's vitality and economy.
- **Policy clarity**: Calls for clearer policy wording on heritage and open space requirements.
- **Infrastructure**: Some comments on the need for robust infrastructure to support the scale of development.
- **Consultation process**: Requests for ongoing engagement with heritage and community stakeholders.
- **Housing and employment**: Some concerns about the balance of uses and delivery trajectory.
- **General support**: Broad support for the principle of redeveloping Broad Marsh.

Councils' Response:

- First phase of development of shopping centre has been open space – the "Green Heart").
- Clarify restrictions on student accommodation and support for diverse housing types.
- Heritage and open space concerns will be addressed through masterplanning and planning application processes, with ongoing dialogue with Historic England as appropriate.
- Given Homes England's ownership of the site, the delivery trajectory is considered to be realistic and the mix of uses appropriate.

Policy 26: Strategic Allocation Melton Road, Edwalton (Rushcliffe)

Representations received: 5 (March 2025); 6 (2024)

Main Issues Raised:

- **Heritage assets**: Historic England queries the need for heritage protection wording, as the site has no heritage assets nearby; council confirms no harm is expected.
- **Mixed-use area**: Calls for the policy and plan to better reflect the vibrant mix of uses (employment, retail, etc.) in the southern part of the allocation.
- **Plan representation**: Suggestion to amend Figure 26.1 to show the area as 'mixed use' rather than just employment.
- **Policy clarity**: Some requests for clearer policy wording on land use.
- **General support**: Broad support for the allocation and its delivery.

Councils' Response:

- The plan and map accurately reflect permissions and uses.

Policy 27: Strategic Allocation Land North of Bingham (Rushcliffe)

Representations received: 6 (March 2025); 8 (2024)

Main Issues Raised:

- **Active travel**: Calls for improved cycle and footpath connections to Bingham town centre and surrounding areas.
- **Connectivity**: Requests for better integration with existing and planned developments.
- **Housing numbers**: Some flexibility requested in the number of homes to be delivered.
- **Open space**: Support for provision of open space and green infrastructure.
- **General support**: Broad support for the allocation.
- **Policy clarity**: Some requests for clearer policy wording on delivery and phasing.

Councils' Response:

- The policy supports improved connectivity and open space provision.
- Consider the policy text is sound as drafted.

Policy 28: Strategic Allocation Former RAF Newton (Rushcliffe)

Representations received: 5 (March 2025); 6 (2024)

Main Issues Raised:

- **Active travel**: Calls for improved walking and cycling routes to nearby settlements.
- **Green Belt**: Some concerns about Green Belt loss, but generally accepted due to previous allocation.
- **Housing density**: Requests for flexibility in housing numbers and density.
- **Infrastructure**: Need for robust infrastructure to support new development.
- **Transport**: Calls for improved public transport links to Bingham town centre and improved crossing facilities over the A46
- **Open space**: Support for provision of green infrastructure and open space.
- **Policy clarity**: Some requests for clearer policy wording on phasing and delivery.

Councils' Response:

- The policy support active travel and infrastructure provision.
- The site is considered deliverable.

Policy 29: Strategic Allocation Former Cotgrave Colliery (Rushcliffe)

Representations received: 5 (March 2025); 7 (2024)

Main Issues Raised:

- **Housing references**: Requests to remove references to housing and focus on employment and green infrastructure.
- **Connectivity**: Requests for improved links to Cotgrave and surrounding areas.
- **Wildlife corridors**: Support for protecting and enhancing wildlife corridors.
- **Open space**: Support for provision of green infrastructure and open space.
- **General support**: Broad support for the allocation as employment-led.
- **Policy clarity**: Some requests for clearer policy wording on land use.

Councils' Response:

- The policy supports employment-led development and green infrastructure.
- Policy wording is considered to be clear.

Policy 30: Strategic Allocation South of Clifton (Rushcliffe)

Representations received: 7 (March 2025); 5 (2024)

Main Issues Raised:

- **Active travel**: Support for improved walking and cycling routes, including links to the tram extension.
- **Tram extension**: Support for the planned tram extension to serve the site.
- **Connectivity**: Requests for better integration with existing and planned developments.
- **Open space**: Support for provision of green infrastructure and open space.
- **General support**: Broad support for the allocation.
- **Policy clarity**: Some requests for clearer policy wording on delivery and phasing.

Councils' Response:

- The policy supports a comprehensive masterplanning approach.
- The policy is considered to be sound as drafted.

Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)

Representations received: 155 (March 2025); 197 (2024)

Main Issues Raised:

- **Principle:** Objection to the loss of the airfield and loss of agricultural land.
- **Environmental concerns**: Objections on grounds of flood risk, contamination, biodiversity, and landscape impact.
- **Contamination**: Concern over the potential for radioactive contamination on the site and the safety of any remediation activity
- **Emergency Services**: Concerns over the relocation of air ambulance handovers from the site
- **Heritage**: Some concerns about potential impacts on heritage assets.
- **Infrastructure**: Calls for robust infrastructure provision, including schools, healthcare, and transport.
- **Masterplanning**: Emphasis on the need for comprehensive masterplanning and community engagement.
- **Integration**: Requests for better integration with existing settlements and transport networks.
- **Housing numbers**: Some flexibility requested in the number of homes to be delivered.
- **Open space**: Support for provision of green infrastructure and open space.
- **Transport**: Calls for improved public transport and active travel links.

Councils' Response:

- Detailed planning policy documents such as masterplans and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) are material considerations and will be used to determine applications for the site's development. The policy reflects the current position.
- The Council is aware of contamination that may be present on the site and believes this can be dealt with at the application stage.
- An alternative location for the Air Ambulance's operation will need to be found as part of the development.
- Policy 31 is aligned with Policy 8 regarding affordable housing, seeking a proportion of 30% affordable dwellings on all developments of 10 or more homes.
- The policy and supporting evidence provide a realistic approach, with further detail to be addressed through planning applications and site-specific policies.
- No main modifications are proposed, as it is considered the policy and supporting documents provide sufficient clarity and flexibility.

Policy 32: Strategic Allocation Former Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station (Rushcliffe)

Representations received: 16 (March 2025); 19 (2024)

Main Issues Raised:

- **Employment/logistics use**: Support for allocation as a major employment and logistics site.
- **Green Belt**: Support for removal from the Green Belt to enable redevelopment.
- **Active travel**: Support for improved walking and cycling links to surrounding areas.
- **Deliverability**: Some concerns about the deliverability and timing of the site.
- **Transport impacts**: Calls for robust transport assessment and mitigation, especially regarding highway capacity.
- **Open space**: Support for provision of green infrastructure and open space.
- **Policy clarity**: Some requests for clearer policy wording on land use and phasing.

Councils' Response:

- The developer requirements mirror the Local Development Order (LDO).
- The policy criteria outline what is required for transport and mitigation, both site-wide and scheme-specific. The LDO contains conditions for transport mitigation.
- The Green Belt Background Paper outlines the exceptional circumstances for the site's release from the Green Belt. The proposed Green Belt inset follows defensible boundaries.
- Open space provision will be considered as part of planning applications, with requirements set out in policies.
- Additional text proposed in relation to protecting electricity infrastructure and to justify Green Belt release.

Other Sections of the Document and Supporting Documents:

Representations received: 153 (March 2025); 157 (2024)

Vision and Objectives

- **Plan Area and Housing Need:** Some respondents criticise the exclusion of Erewash and Ashfield, and the lack of a 'plan B' if the local plan fails. There are requests for the plan to meet the Standard Method housing targets (minimum 47,500 homes by 2041).
- **Green Belt Review:** Calls for a further Green Belt review and additional allocations.
- **Urban Living Focus:** Multiple respondents challenge the evidence for focusing on urban living, overreliance on brownfield land, and lack of rural growth; the council maintains compliance with national policy.
- **Housing Crisis and Affordability:** Concerns over the lack of explicit mention of the housing crisis, affordable housing, and the link between homes and jobs; the council maintains the vision/objectives are balanced and supported by evidence.
- **Strategic Logistics:** Request logistics growth as an explicit objective.
- **Brownfield vs. Greenfield:** Concerns over the deliverability and affordability of brownfield sites; the council asserts evidence of deliverability.
- **Settlement Hierarchy:** Some support the hierarchy but call for a higher housing requirement (51,084 homes).
- **Plan Period:** Calls to extend the plan period to 2043 for a full 15-year horizon from adoption.
- **General Support:** Some support for the vision and objectives as drafted.
- **Policy Clarity:** Requests for clearer links between objectives and delivery mechanisms.

Councils' Response:

- The vision and objectives are considered to be balanced, evidence-based, and compliant with national policy.
- Housing and economic objectives are considered sufficiently covered.
- The settlement hierarchy and urban focus are justified by sustainability and infrastructure evidence.

General Comments

- **Consultation Process:** Concerns about the adequacy and transparency of the consultation process, especially after Gedling's withdrawal.
- **Legal Compliance:** Some question whether the plan meets legal requirements, including the Duty to Cooperate.
- **Cross-Boundary Cooperation:** Calls for more robust engagement with neighbouring authorities and combined authorities.

- **Monitoring and Review**: Requests for clearer monitoring indicators and triggers for plan review if delivery falls short.
- **Plan Flexibility**: Calls for more flexibility to respond to changing circumstances, including housing need and economic shifts.
- **Evidence Base:** Concerns about the timeliness and robustness of the evidence base, especially for housing, employment, and transport.
- **Sustainability:** Calls for stronger emphasis on climate change, biodiversity, and sustainable transport.
- **Community Engagement:** Requests for more meaningful engagement with local communities and neighbourhood planning groups.
- **Policy Integration:** Suggestions to better integrate policies across housing, employment, transport, and environment.
- **General Support:** Some support for the plan's overall direction, subject to addressing specific concerns.

Councils' Comments:

- The consultation process is legally compliant and transparent, including after Gedling's withdrawal.
- Duty to Cooperate and cross-boundary engagement are evidenced through Statements of Common Ground.
- Monitoring and review mechanisms are included in the plan; flexibility is provided through future plan reviews.
- The evidence base is considered robust and up-to-date.

Key Settlements Review

- **Purpose and Role**: The review is used to confirm the status of settlements (e.g., Cotgrave, East Leake, Brinsley) and justify the settlement hierarchy that underpins the spatial strategy.
- **Support for Settlement Status**: Some respondents (e.g., IM Land) support the designation of Cotgrave and other settlements as 'key settlements' due to their range of services, facilities, and public transport links.
- **Downgrading Concerns**: Objections are raised to the downgrading of certain settlements (e.g., Brinsley) from 'key settlement' to 'other settlement', with arguments that these places have sufficient facilities and sustainability credentials.
- **Gedling References**: Some request the removal of references to Gedling (which withdrew from the plan area), but the council retains them for consistency and transparency in the evidence base.
- **Methodology and Consistency**: Respondents seek assurance that the review's methodology is robust, transparent, and consistently applied across the plan area.

Councils' Response:

- The review is considered to be robust, up-to-date, and supports the settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy.

- Methodology is consistently applied; references to Gedling are retained for transparency.
- The review justifies allocations and non-allocations for settlements.

Strategic Transport Modelling

- **Assessment of Deliverability**: Respondents emphasize that robust transport modelling is essential to demonstrate that the spatial strategy and site allocations are deliverable without causing unacceptable congestion or infrastructure overload.
- **Inclusion of Gedling**: Some concerns are raised about the inclusion of Gedling in the modelling, given its withdrawal from the plan area, and whether this affects the validity and applicability of the results.
- **Timing and Transparency**: Several comments note that the modelling was not available during the consultation period, with requests for it to be published and scrutinized before plan adoption.
- **Cross-Boundary Impacts**: There are calls for the modelling to fully consider cross-boundary transport impacts, especially where growth may affect neighbouring authorities' networks.
- **Infrastructure Prioritization**: The modelling is seen as critical for informing the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and prioritizing which transport schemes are essential to support growth.
- **Active Travel and Public Transport**: Respondents want assurance that the modelling gives sufficient weight to active travel (walking/cycling) and public transport, not just road capacity.
- **Mitigation Measures**: There are requests for the modelling to clearly identify what mitigation measures (e.g., junction improvements, new links, sustainable transport) are needed and how they will be funded and delivered.
- **Plan Soundness**: The modelling is viewed as essential evidence for demonstrating the plan is sound, particularly in relation to the NPPF requirements for sustainable transport and infrastructure delivery.
- **Ongoing Review**: Some call for the modelling to be updated as the plan evolves, especially if significant changes are made to allocations or infrastructure priorities.

Councils' Response:

- The modelling is complete, robust, and will be published at submission.
- Cross-boundary impacts and all modes of transport are considered.
- The modelling informs the IDP and infrastructure priorities.

Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)

- **Natural England Review**: Natural England confirms the HRA follows accepted methodology and legislation.

Councils' Response:

- Support for the HRA is noted.

Policies Map

- **Clarity and Accuracy**: Respondents emphasize the need for the Policies Map to clearly and accurately represent all allocations, designations, and policy boundaries, including new housing and employment sites, Green Belt changes, and infrastructure.
- **Green Belt and Country Park**: Some welcome the retention and clear depiction of Green Belt boundaries and Country Park areas, while others request updates to reflect the latest allocations and designations.
- **Omission Sites**: Multiple objections are raised regarding the omission of specific sites from the map, with promoters arguing their sites are sustainable and should be included.
- **Mixed-Use and Employment Areas**: Requests for clearer mapping of mixed-use areas, employment zones, and infrastructure corridors, especially where permissions or uses have changed since previous plans.
- **Consistency with Plan**: Calls for the map to be fully consistent with the written policies and site allocations in the plan, avoiding any discrepancies.
- **Updates and Amendments**: Some respondents note inconsistencies or outdated elements and request that the map be updated as the plan progresses toward adoption.
- **Infrastructure Representation**: Suggestions to improve the depiction of key infrastructure (e.g., transport routes, schools, healthcare facilities) to support understanding of how growth will be served.
- **Neighbourhood Plan Boundaries**: Some call for clearer depiction of neighbourhood plan boundaries and local designations.

Councils' Response:

- The map accurately reflects the plan and will be updated as needed for adoption.

Employment Land Needs Study

- **Assessment Period and Updates**: Some respondents call for the study to be refreshed or extended to cover the full plan period, ensuring it reflects the latest economic trends and employment forecasts.
- **Alignment with Policy**: The study underpins the employment land allocations and informs the spatial strategy, especially for logistics and strategic employment sites.
- **Logistics and Strategic Distribution**: There are concerns that the plan under-provides for logistics and strategic distribution land compared to the needs identified in the study, with calls for more allocations and a buffer for flexibility.

- **Cross-Boundary Issues**: Respondents emphasize the need to consider employment land needs across the wider functional economic market area, not just within the plan boundary.
- **Qualitative and Quantitative Needs**: Some argue that the study should better address qualitative needs (e.g., site size, location, market attractiveness) as well as quantitative requirements.
- **Viability and Deliverability**: The study is referenced in discussions about the viability and deliverability of employment sites, with some questioning whether all allocated sites are realistic.
- **Alignment with Housing Growth**: Calls for closer alignment between job growth and housing provision, ensuring that employment land supply supports the plan's economic and housing objectives.
- **Evidence for Allocations**: The study is used to justify the selection of employment sites and the rejection of omission sites, with some promoters arguing their sites were unfairly excluded.
- **Policy Flexibility**: Some respondents request that the plan include criteria-based policies to allow additional employment sites to come forward if needs change.

Councils' Response:

- The study, together with the Employment Background Paper, provides robust and up-to-date evidence.
- Employment land allocations and spatial strategy are justified by the evidence.
- The plan includes flexibility for future employment needs.

Green Belt Review and Background Paper

- **Justification for Green Belt Changes**: Respondents seek clear and robust justification for any changes to Green Belt boundaries, especially where land is being released for development.
- **Exceptional Circumstances**: There is a strong emphasis on the need to demonstrate 'exceptional circumstances' for Green Belt release, in line with national policy.
- **Long-Term Strategy and Permanence**: Some call for a long-term Green Belt strategy, ensuring boundaries are set for permanence and not subject to frequent review.
- **Consistency and Methodology**: Respondents want assurance that the review methodology is consistent across the plan area and aligns with national guidance.
- **Cross-Boundary Engagement**: There are calls for more robust engagement with neighbouring authorities on Green Belt matters, especially where changes may have cross-boundary impacts.
- **Grey Belt and Future Policy**: Some suggest the review should consider the potential for 'grey belt' (previously developed land in the Green Belt) in anticipation of future national policy changes.

- **Safeguarded Land**: Requests for clarity on the status and future use of safeguarded land, with some arguing it should be allocated for development at the earliest opportunity.
- **Evidence for Allocations**: The review is used to justify the selection of strategic sites and the rejection of omission sites, with some promoters arguing their sites were unfairly excluded.
- **Alignment with NPPF**: Respondents stress the importance of aligning the review with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), particularly regarding the sequential approach to site selection.

Councils' Response:

- The review is considered to be robust, justified, and aligns with national policy.
- Exceptional circumstances for Green Belt release are clearly set out.
- Boundaries are intended to be permanent; safeguarded land status is clarified.

Heritage Assets Assessment

- Historic England welcomes the existence of the evidence base but notes that in some areas the level of detail is limited and could be improved for certain sites or settlements.

Councils' Response:

- The council welcomes Historic England's feedback and considers the assessment proportionate for a strategic plan.

Sustainability Appraisal (SA)

- **Assessment of Spatial Options**: Some respondents challenge the robustness of the appraisal of spatial options, arguing that alternatives (such as more dispersed growth or additional Green Belt release) were not adequately tested.
- **Inclusion of Gedling**: Concerns are raised about the inclusion of Gedling in the SA, given its withdrawal from the plan area, and whether this affects the validity of the assessment.
- **Justification of Preferred Strategy**: The SA is used to justify the selection of the preferred spatial strategy, but some argue that the appraisal does not provide a clear rationale for rejecting reasonable alternatives.
- **Assessment of Site Allocations**: Some developers and land promoters argue that the SA does not fairly assess the sustainability of omission sites or alternative allocations.
- **Environmental Impacts**: Calls for more detailed assessment of environmental impacts, especially in relation to biodiversity, climate change, and Green Belt.

- **Social and Economic Factors**: Some respondents question whether the SA gives sufficient weight to social and economic objectives, such as affordable housing and employment.
- **Alternatives and Mitigation**: Requests for clearer presentation of alternatives considered and mitigation measures proposed for negative impacts.
- **Ongoing Review**: Some call for the SA to be updated as the plan evolves, especially if significant changes are made to allocations or policies.

Councils' Response:

- The SA is robust, legally compliant, and supports the preferred strategy and allocations. All reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures have been considered. The SA will be updated as needed if significant changes are made to the plan. A screening has been undertaken in relation to the proposed main modifications.

Viability Study

- **Plan-wide Testing**: The study tests the deliverability of all key policy requirements (affordable housing, BNG, space standards, accessibility, etc.) across a range of site types and economic scenarios.
- **Affordable Housing**: Some respondents questioning whether the targets are achievable, especially on brownfield or small sites.
- **Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) and Space Standards**: Some developers arguing these requirements could threaten viability.
- **Older Persons' Housing**: Some respondents argue that affordable housing requirements are not viable for specialist older persons' accommodation and seek explicit exemptions, referencing the Viability Study's findings.
- **Contingency Allowance**: There are calls for a contingency (e.g., 5%) to be included in cost assumptions to reflect market uncertainty and risk.
- **Small Sites and Benchmark Land Values**: Some developers request higher benchmark land values for small sites, arguing the current assumptions may underestimate costs and overstate viability.

Councils' Response:

- The Viability Study is considered to be robust and includes sensitivity testing and supports all major policy requirements. Affordable housing, BNG, and space standards are considered deliverable; flexibility is provided for site-specific viability review.

Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)

- **Comprehensive Infrastructure Needs**: Respondents emphasise the importance of identifying all necessary infrastructure (transport, schools,

healthcare, utilities) to support planned growth and ensure sustainable communities.

- **Transport Priorities**: There is strong focus on the need for clear, deliverable transport improvements—including road, rail, tram, and active travel (walking/cycling) infrastructure—to support new development and reduce congestion.
- **Education and Health Provision**: Multiple comments stress the need for timely delivery of new schools and healthcare facilities, with concerns that infrastructure must keep pace with housing growth.
- **Phasing and Funding**: Respondents highlight the importance of phasing infrastructure delivery in line with development and securing funding (via S106, CIL, government grants), with some concerns about the risk of unfunded or delayed projects.
- **Alignment with Site Allocations**: The IDP is seen as critical for justifying the deliverability of strategic site allocations and ensuring infrastructure is in place before or alongside new homes and jobs.
- **Stakeholder Engagement**: There are calls for ongoing engagement with infrastructure providers, statutory consultees, and local communities to ensure the IDP remains up-to-date and responsive to changing needs.
- **Monitoring and Review**: Respondents request robust monitoring of infrastructure delivery, with clear triggers for review or intervention if delivery falls behind.
- **Plan Soundness and Legal Compliance**: The IDP is viewed as essential for demonstrating the plan is deliverable and legally compliant, particularly in relation to the Duty to Cooperate and soundness tests.
- **Detail and Transparency**: Some comments seek greater detail and transparency in the IDP, especially regarding funding sources, delivery timescales, and responsibilities for delivery.

Councils' Response:

- The IDP identifies all necessary infrastructure and is aligned with site allocations and phasing. An addendum has been produced to update the infrastructure requirements and identify funding sources and delivery mechanisms.

<u>Housing Background Paper</u>

- **Housing Need and Supply**: Respondents challenge whether the plan meets the full housing need, with some arguing that the Standard Method target should be treated as a minimum and that the plan under-delivers.
- **Windfall Allowance**: There are concerns about the robustness of the windfall supply assumptions, with some arguing that windfall is overstated and does not provide certainty about where housing will be delivered.
- **Affordable Housing**: Multiple comments highlight that focusing housing delivery in Nottingham City fails to address affordable housing needs effectively, and that more sites (including adjacent to Nottingham) should be considered.

- **Green Belt Review**: Calls for a full Green Belt review to identify further sustainable sites for housing, especially to address affordability and delivery issues.
- **Strategic Scale Growth**: Some argue there is an overreliance on large, strategic sites that require significant infrastructure and are vulnerable to delivery delays; a more balanced approach including smaller, less infrastructure-dependent sites is suggested.
- **Alignment with Employment Need**: The Housing Background Paper is referenced as providing analysis comparing employment need and housing need, supporting the plan's approach to aligning homes and jobs.
- **Plan Period and Delivery Rates**: The paper is used to justify the plan period and the delivery trajectory for strategic sites, but some respondents question whether delivery rates are realistic.
- **Student and Specialist Housing**: The role of student and older persons' housing is considered in the evidence base, with some calls for more explicit policy links.
- **Monitoring and Flexibility**: Respondents request robust monitoring of housing delivery and flexibility to respond to under-delivery or changing needs.

Councils' Response:

- The housing target is justified by the Standard Method and transitional arrangements.
- Windfall assumptions are based on robust evidence and historic delivery rates.
- Affordable housing and specialist housing needs are addressed through policy and supporting evidence.
- The plan period and delivery trajectory are considered realistic and justified.

<u>Omission Sites (Broxtowe and Rushcliffe)</u>

- **Housing Need**: Promoters argue their sites are needed to meet housing targets or provide flexibility.
- **Employment Land**: Some omission sites are promoted for employment or mixed-use.
- **Sustainability**: Promoters argue their sites are well-located for sustainable transport and infrastructure.
- **Viability and Deliverability**: Claims that omission sites are more viable or deliverable than some allocated sites.
- **Local Support**: Some omission sites claim local support or alignment with neighbourhood plans.

Councils' Response:

- Sufficient sites are allocated to meet housing targets, and omission sites are not required.

- The evidence base is considered robust in assessing omission sites.

Regulation 22 Statement of Consultation

Appendix 1: Consultation Summaries Regulation 19 (2024 and 2025)

Consultation responses in relation to the Regulation 19 consultation undertaken in March 2025 are summarised below.

Responses made in relation to the Regulation 19 consultation undertaken in November 2024 have been added in red.

Where the comments repeat points already summarised, the 2024 response ID has been added or it is shown in a table in Appendix 2, alongside a full list of respondents.

Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan Regulation 19 (2024 and 2025) Consultation Summaries

Introductory Sections of the Strategic Plan 5
Vision and Objectives 13
Policy 1 37
Policy 2 71
Policy 3 108
Policy 4 151
Policy 5 180
Policy 6 245
Policy 7 257
Policy 8 267
Policy 9 292
Policy 10 293
Policy 11 302
Policy 12 310
Policy 13 316
Policy 14 320
Policy 15 331
Policy 16 375
Policy 17 411
Policy 18 443
Policy 19 476

Policy 20 480
Policy 21 483
Policy 22 555
Policy 23 569
Policy 24 572
Policy 25 581
Policy 26 593
Policy 27 598
Policy 28 604
Policy 29 614
Policy 30 619
Policy 31 625
Policy 32 693
General Comments 708
Housing Background Paper 773
Infrastructure Delivery Plan 774
Viability Study 791
Key Settlements Review 794
Transport Modelling 797
Habitats Regulations Assessment 798
Policies Map 800
Employment Land Needs Study 802

Green Belt Review and Background Paper 803
Heritage Assets Assessment 808
Transport Evidence Base 809
Sustainability Appraisal 811
SHLAA 824
Site Selection Report 826
Omission Sites (Broxtowe) 828
Omission Sites (Rushcliffe) 839
Omission Sites (Gedling) 856

Introductory Sections of the Strategic Plan

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Section 1	Section 1.1 Working in Partnership to Plan for Greater Nottingham: it is disappointing that all Districts in the partnership are not "signed up " to the document. This is to be expected bearing in mind the current two-tier nature of Local Government in the Area and the previous Government approach to strategic planning. We are in favour of unitary councils in particular one covering the Greater Nottingham area.	Noted but local planning authorities are not obliged to participate in the GNSP.	None.	1258352 1235394	The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Section 1	Section 1.2 Why the Councils work together: we fully support the NPPF statement in Para 1.2.3 regarding the advantages of joint working (where it is two-tier).	Noted	None.	1258352 1235394	The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council
Section 1	Section 1.3 The Local Plan: we strongly support the Neighbourhood Plan process but are alarmed by the lack of a Town Council for West Bridgford, which is the only part of Rushcliffe Borough without Parish/Town Council status. West Bridgford has a population of around 40,000 and pre-1974, had an Urban District Council.	The creation of new town or parish council areas is not a matter for the Local Plan process.	None.	1258352 1235394	The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Section 1	It is regrettable that Erewash Borough Council, Ashfield District Council and Gedling Borough Council are not willing to be part of the emerging GNSP. Clarification is requested as to the status of part two local plans upon adoption of the GNSP? There is uncertainty over the intended status of local plan part two because, for the time being, the GNSP is not proposed to replace such plans 'in their entirety'. However, some specific policies may be superseded	Appendix D clearly sets out the status of plans and policies following adoption of the GNSP.	None.	1261255 1261270	Taylor Wimpey (Land West of Ruddington) Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land (Land East of Gamston)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	by policies within the Strategic Plan. The exact intention here needs to be explained.				
Paragraph 1.1.3	The Plan period should be from 2025, 'at the earliest', to 2043.	Adoption is anticipated to be December 2026, providing a 15 year plan period.	None.	1260110 1245734 1246701 1246716	Strawson Group Investments Stagfield Group
Paragraph 1.1.8	The district council do not consider that any further changes are required to demonstrate that the Strategic Plan is legally compliant.	Comments noted.		1245970	Mansfield District Council (Andrew Norton)
Paragraph 2.2.8	Support the inclusion of this paragraph.	Comments noted.	None.	1262391 1246146	Historic England Historic England
Paragraph 2.3.2	Support the references to heritage within the Spatial Vision.	Comments noted.	None.	1262391 1246149	Historic England Historic England

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Paragraph 2.3.3	Support - As per para 2.2.21 economic development over the City should be used to tackle deprivation issues and encourage urban living.	Comments noted	None	1249412	Consortium of Parish Councils
Paragraph 2.3.3	'It is not clear where the assumption for the demand for urban living stems from, nor where the evidence is to support this assumption' - growth should be supported 'across the Greater Nottingham area'.	It is considered that focusing growth in the main built up area is sound and complies with national planning policy. This has also been considered as part of the SA. A Housing Needs Assessment has also been produced which considers housing need of various groups and the need for affordable housing. Focusing development within the main built up area is	None.	1260110 1245734	Strawson Group Investments

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		important for addressing these needs.			
Sections 2.3 and 2.4	The Spatial Vision and Spatial Objectives should mention the need for housing, including affordable housing, 'in response to the national housing crisis'.	It is considered that the vision and objectives appropriately covers the importance of housing for all groups.	None.	1260110 1245734	Strawson Group Investments
Sections 2.3 and 2.4	Support the vision, particularly paragraphs 2.3.2 and 2.3.4 regarding economic growth, and the objectives, particularly objectives 3 and 12.	Noted.	None.	1261596	Wilson Bowden Developments
Sections 2.3 and 2.4	The Plan will not deliver its Spatial Vision or its housing	It is considered that focusing growth in the main built up area is	None.	1261818	MyPad

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	objective. The Vision will not deliver sufficient housing, it concentrates too much on the built-up area of Nottingham, it is overly reliant on previously developed land and there is 'no recognition' of the link between homes and jobs.	sound and complies with national planning policy. This has also been considered as part of the SA. There is a mixture of greenfield and brownfield site allocations. The Employment Background Paper and Housing Background Paper consider the links between homes and jobs.			
Paragraph 2.3.2	Concerned to ensure that all the aspirations contained in the Spatial Vision are realised across the whole of Awsworth Parish.	Comments noted.	None.	1262382 1243681	Awsworth Parish Council
Paragraph 2.4.1	Support the inclusion of Spatial Objective 6).	Comments noted	None	1262391 1246150	Historic England Historic England

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Sections 2.6, 2.7, 2.8.	Support the heritage sections of the Area Spatial Portraits.	Comments noted.	None	1262391 1246152	Historic England Historic England
Paragraph 2.6.6	Neither Wollaton Park nor the University Campus 'are within walking distance of the most populated areas of South Broxtowe' and the 'unsubstantiated and misleading' reference to them should be deleted.	Both of these areas are within walking distance of parts of South Broxtowe.	None.	1260114	Mr Michael Lyons
Paragraph 2.6.8	Welcome the inclusion of this paragraph, however query whether there is 'a positive strategy to overcome the identified heritage at risk within the Plan'.	Protecting and enhancing heritage forms a key objective within the GNSP.	None.	1262391 1246151	Historic England Historic England

Vision and Objectives

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Vision and objectives	Erewash Borough and Ashfield District are not part of the GNSP, which is a missed opportunity, something that may cut to the heart of the tests of soundness and there is no obvious 'plan B' should one or both of these separate local plans fail at examination. The proposed spatial vision for the GNSP area does not explain how this fits in with relevant areas in Erewash, Ashfield and Gedling. Part of the spatial vision is to see a minimum of 47,500 new homes delivered,	The GNSP Councils have worked closely with adjoining authorities, as evidenced through statements of common ground, to address any cross boundary issues. It considered that the vision is appropriate as drafted and sets out a clear aspiration for the plan area up to 2041. It is considered that the housing requirement set out in the GNSP is sound and it is appropriately referred to within the vision and objectives.	None	1261280 1261271 1292265 1292271	Taylor Wimpey (Land West of Ruddington) Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land (Land East of Gamston) Taylor Wimpey (Land West of Ruddington) Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land (Land East of Gamston)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	incorporating different types of homes for different life stages, in the period to 2041. The annual requirement is unsound not being based on the consultation draft of the Standard Method, devised to deliver the Government's aim of delivery of 1.5m new homes. There should be explicit mention of the quantum of new housing being at least the minimum required under local housing need under the Standard Method. In the second spatial objective				
Vision and objectives	The Rushcliffe Spatial Portrait / Local Distinctiveness	It is considered that sufficient sites for housing have been	None	1261280	Taylor Wimpey (Land West of Ruddington)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	(paragraph 2.8.1) rightly identifies Ruddington as one of the six largest settlements in the Borough. And that the six towns and larger villages provide a range of facilities and services. It is unfortunate that the proposed spatial strategy does not recognise these matters as it fails to propose a review of the Green Belt and identification of new land for housing development. This exercise should be undertaken and it will find Taylor Wimpey's proposal on land adjacent to Pasture Lane, Ruddington to be	identified as part of the GNSP and therefore there is no requirement to identify further land for housing development. The Councils have received funding to undertake a Green Belt Review as part of future plan preparation.		1292265	Taylor Wimpey (Land West of Ruddington)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	suitable and deliverable for housing development With reference to government grant funding (announced December 2024) to support authorities with local plan delivery and Green Belt reviews, the Greater Nottingham Planning Partnership should consider applying for such funding to undertake reviews of the proposed housing targets and a review of the Green Belt in Greater Nottingham.				
Vision and objectives	The area of land controlled by Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land should be reconsidered in the GNSP Rushcliffe	It is considered that sufficient sites for housing have been identified as part of the GNSP and therefore there is no requirement	None	1261271 1292271	Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land (Land East of Gamston) Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land (Land East of Gamston)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Spatial Portrait / Local Distinctiveness. The spatial strategy does not recognise these matters as it fails to propose a review of the Green Belt and identification of new land for housing development. This should be undertaken which will find proposal on land east of Gamston to be suitable and deliverable for housing development.	to identify further land for housing development.			
Vision and objectives	It is not clear where the assumption for urban living originates, nor where the evidence is to support this assumption. There are many settlements outside of Nottingham City which play a	It is considered that focusing growth in the main built up area is sound and complies with national planning policy. This has also been considered as part of the SA.	None	1261234 1246611	William Davis Homes

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	fundamental role in providing housing, employment and sustaining local services, of which, there is demand to live and work in these areas. Focusing growth within the city and the built-up areas immediately surrounding Nottingham will not meet the wider needs of the wider Greater Nottingham area in terms of housing need, will fall woefully short in tackling affordability issues in more rural areas, and will inhibit economic growth. The Strategic Vision should be reconsidered to include supporting growth not only in the urban locations, but	There are a range of sites identified within the Strategic Plan which are outside of the city and built up areas immediately surrounding Nottingham.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	across the Greater Nottingham area.				
Vision	Emphasis on seeking sites in main built-up-area of Nottingham: as per para 2.2.21 economic development over the City should be used to tackle deprivation issues and encourage urban living.	Comments noted.	None	1260883	Gotham Ward Parishes and Borough Councillors
Vision and objectives	For vision to support a strong and stable economy, greater emphasis needs to be placed on the important link between homes and jobs. The spatial strategy is unjustified and not effective, as there is an overreliance on brownfield land to deliver large quantities	It considered that the vision and objectives are appropriate as drafted and set out a clear aspiration for the plan area up to 2041 including balancing housing and employment requirements for the area. Evidence has been provided to show that sites, including	None	1261386 1246753 1261373 1246786	Barratt David Wilson Homes (North Midlands) and Averill Land Limited Barratt David Wilson (North Midlands)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	of the GNPP's housing requirement is overambitious and unlikely to be delivered as envisaged. Brownfield sites are often complex and costly to deliver – therefore there is concern over delivery of housing needs (market and affordable) when compared with housing which can be delivered on greenfield development sites. Spatial strategy should be amended to deliver a range of homes to address affordability issues locally and in sustainable locations. The objectives do not appropriately respond	those on brownfield land, are deliverable.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	to the needs and issues in relation to housing across the Plan area. The decision of the GNPP to combine the existing housing objectives, to only provide one broad objective is a concern. The vision and subsequent objectives do not mention the housing crisis or rising affordable housing need across the Plan area. The vision and objectives need to recognise this shortfall and strategically aim to tackle affordable housing need over the course of the plan period.				
Vision and Objectives	There is no clear evidence of popular demand for urban	It is considered that focusing growth in the main built up area is	None	1260556 1259885	Harworth Group Mr Richards and Mrs

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	living. Demand to live within towns and villages outside of Nottingham City plays a crucial role in the provision of employment, services, character and communities. Therefore there is a failure to meet wider housing needs. The Vision should acknowledge that the delivery of homes plays an important role in supporting the growth and prosperity of the economy. The Spatial Vision should support growth across the entire Greater Nottingham area to enable the housing needs and demands of all	sound and complies with national planning policy. This has also been considered as part of the SA. A Housing Needs Assessment has also been produced which considers housing need of various groups and the need for affordable housing. Focusing development within the main built up area is important for addressing these needs. It considered that the vision and objectives are appropriate as drafted and set out a clear aspiration for the plan area up to 2041		1246973	Hurst Mr Richards and Mrs Hurst

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	authorities are met, whilst also delivering economic growth. The objectives do not appropriately respond to the needs and issues in relation to housing across the Plan area. The decision of the GNPP to combine the existing housing objectives, to only provide one broad objective is a concern. The vision and subsequent objectives do not mention the housing crisis or rising affordable housing need across the Plan area. The vision and objectives need to recognise this shortfall and strategically aim to tackle affordable				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	housing need over the course of the plan period.				
Vision and objectives	The vision and objectives recognise the key growth areas and what is required in order for the plan area to develop sustainably. However, the GNPP do not support the vision and objectives proposed. There is a need for strategic logistics growth and provision to be incorporated as an objective as part of the vision to maximise opportunities for economic development over the plan period.	It considered that the vision and objectives are appropriate as drafted and set out a clear aspiration for the plan area up to 2041	None	1261367 1246951	Knightwood Developments
Vision and objectives	The GNSP fails to respond to the overall spatial vision and objectives set out in	It considered that the vision and objectives are appropriate as drafted and set out a	None	1262484	Gladman Developments Ltd

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	sections 2.3 and 2.4 of the Plan. The GNSP as drafted does not provide for the minimum amount of housing required by the standard method and therefore it fails against this key objective in respect of housing. There is no recognition within the Vision of the critical link between homes and jobs and the general role housing delivery plays in underpinning economic growth and prosperity.	clear aspiration for the plan area up to 2041 including balancing housing and employment requirements for the area.			
Vision and Objectives	GNSP does not deliver on its overall strategy or the vision and strategic objectives it defines, especially for housing delivery and meeting the housing needs of	It considered that the vision and objectives are appropriate as drafted and set out a clear aspiration for the plan area up to 2041 including balancing	None	1262109	Marrons (Ben Ward)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	different sections of the community. It fails to acknowledge or address the significant housing affordability crisis, and doesn't set out a vision or strategy for growth outside of Nottingham and its fringes.	housing and employment requirements for the area.			
Vision and Objectives	Spatial Vision & Objectives, GNSP not delivering its standard method, so not delivering on housing objective. No mention of housing crisis or affordability. Vision overconcentrated on Nottingham, no detail on how the other settlements will develop. Equally over-reliance on brownfield land unlikely to yield	It considered that the vision and objectives are appropriate as drafted and set out a clear aspiration for the plan area up to 2041 including balancing housing and employment requirements for the area. It is considered that focusing growth in the main built up area is sound and complies with national planning policy. This has also	None	1262111	Marrons (Ben Ward)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	sufficient housing and will secure fewer affordable homes. No recognition in vision of link between jobs and homes.	been considered as part of the SA. A Housing Needs Assessment has also been produced which considers housing need of various groups and the need for affordable housing. Focusing development within the main built up area is important for addressing these needs.			
Vision and Objectives	EMCCA is broadly supportive of the Spatial Vision set by the Plan. Welcome para 3.2.6.	Noted.	None	1246018	East Midlands Combined County Authority
Vision and Objectives	Encourage the joint authorities to reconsider their Strategic Vision, to include supporting of growth not only in the	The Vision and Objectives are considered appropriate. Focussing significant development on the Nottingham Built Up	None	246812 1246836 1246837	Harworth Group Strawson Group Investments Ltd Stagfield Group

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	urban locations, but across the Greater Nottingham area to ensure that housing needs of all authorities are met in a range of locations to meet demand, whilst also delivering economic growth. "There is not the strategy in place to meet the objectives of the Plan." "It is concerning that neither the Strategic Vision, or the Objectives fail to mention the need for housing in response to the national housing crisis. Nor is there reference towards the need for affordable housing, which the accompanying evidence base	Area is considered to be sustainable, and the GNSP does not ignore the needs of the rest of the plan area. Spatial Objective 2 refers to affordable housing and sustainable development.		1245701 1246716	

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	demonstrates that there is a high level of need for affordable housing, but a shortfall in previous delivery." Further housing objectives are needed to provide greater detail for how the Plan will meet the housing needs and demands in a sustainable manner.				
Spatial Vision and Objectives	Gladman considers that the GNSP falls short in delivering the overall strategy of the plan as set out in its vision and objectives. In particular, the plan does not adequately deliver the housing needed across the four local authorities, both in terms of quantity and the type of housing to	The Vision and Objectives are considered appropriate. Focussing significant development on the Nottingham Built Up Area is considered to be sustainable, and the GNSP does not ignore the needs of the rest of the plan area.	None	1246791	Gladman Developments Ltd (Mr Richard Naylor)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	meet the needs of local communities. There is a significant affordability issue across the plan area and this is not addressed within the draft plan. In coming together to produce a joint spatial plan, an opportunity is provided to meet needs which would otherwise not be possible – the plan completely overlooks this and does not seek to meet even minimum housing needs across the area. The GNSP does not deliver upon its overall strategy the vision and strategic objectives it defines, most notably in respect of housing delivery and meeting the housing needs of				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	different sections of the community. It furthermore fails to acknowledge or address the significant housing affordability crisis within the Plan area and does not set out a clear vision or strategy for growth within the parts of the Plan area outside of Nottingham and its fringes.				
Spatial Vision and Objectives	The Vision and Objectives is not considered to be sound as they are not justified or effective or in line with national policy. HBF would have expected the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan (GNSP) to include a clear vision for the	The Vision and Objectives are considered appropriate. Focussing significant development on the Nottingham Built Up Area is considered to be sustainable, and the GNSP does not ignore the needs of the rest of the plan area.	None	1246219 1246229 1246218	Home Builders Federation (Ms Rachel Danemann)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	GNSP, presented along the same as the policies. Although HBF supports an objective for the Plan to deliver "High quality new housing", HBF are concerned that the spatial vision seeks "a minimum of 52,600 new homes will be delivered". This is not enough, as detailed further in comments on Policy 3. HBF would also suggest that both the Vision and Objective Two should be more explicit about the need to plan for both open market and affordable housing to meet housing needs in full, and to support the	Spatial Objective 2 refers to affordable housing.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Council's growth aspirations. HBF also considers that it is appropriate for the Council to identify the maintenance of the five-year supply across the GNSP area as an objective for the Plan.	The requirement for a 5 year housing land supply is required outside of the plan-making process, and it is not necessary to repeat that requirement in the GNSP			
Vision and Objectives	It is very important that the Strategic Plan is consistent with and working towards the targets in the "Greener, Healthier, Happier Nottingham" open space strategy. The Spatial Vision described in section 2.3 is generally welcomed – particularly the statement in paragraph 2.3.3 that people from all sections of society will be provided with	Comments noted. Policies are included to ensure development is supported by good quality open space.	None	1243632	Nottingham Open Space Forum (Mr Ben Hunt)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	better access to open space. At the same time, priority is given to finding sites for development within the main built-up area of Nottingham. Although paragraph 2.3.6 makes reference to well-designed spaces and net environmental gains, there is a risk that there will be significant pressure to deliver developments – particularly residential schemes – with minimal open space benefits. This is especially so where redevelopment takes place and there is no statutory requirement to provide biodiversity net gain.				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	That said, NOSF welcomes Spatial Objective 11 on page 12, which in broad terms recognises the range of important functions of open space, both to people and wildlife. Therefore NOSF does not object to the vision and objectives for the plan, but draws the attention of the authors to its comments in relation the Broadmarsh strategic site, Policy 25.				
Spatial Vision and Spatial Objectives	Support the vision and objectives as set out in the Publication plan.	Comments noted.	None	1242832	Wilson Bowden Developments (Land at New Farm, Nuthall)

Policy 1

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	The aims of the policy are supported in general terms.	Comments noted and welcomed.	None	1261291 1262334 1260091 1262496 1258401 1259524 1261257 1260955 1261272 1258432 1259110 1243744	Arc Partnership (on behalf of Nottinghamshire County Council) Churchill Living and McCarthy Stone Harworth Group Home Builders Federation Langridge Homes Rula Developments Taylor Wimpey Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land Trustees of Hammond Farm William Davis Homes William Davis Homes (Hannah Price)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	The expectation that new buildings will achieve net zero regulated operational emissions is not realistic or achievable 'in the current economic conditions' and could undermine delivery of growth.	The policy requirements have been tested through the plan wide viability study. This included testing current economic conditions and a five year sensitivity test.	None	1261291 1260091	Arc Partnership (on behalf of Nottinghamshire County Council) Harworth Group
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	The Carbon Policy Support Evidence Base (2024) does not provide sufficiently robust local evidence, including regarding viability and delivery, to justify higher standards to those set at a national level by Building Regulations.	The policy requirements have been tested through the plan wide viability study. Local specific analysis was included within the Carbon Policy Support Evidence Base. Applications are considered on a case-by-case basis.	None	1261291 1261315 1261456 1261434 1261440 1261043 1262220 1262345 1260091 1262496	Arc Partnership (on behalf of Nottinghamshire County Council) Bloor Homes David Wilson Homes East Midlands Gladman Developments Harworth Group Home Builders Federation

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
				1258661 1261257 1260955 1261272 1259110 1261600 1261631 1260100 1260099 1246719 1242834 1243744	Oxalis Planning Taylor Wimpey Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land William Davis Homes Wilson Bowden Developments Barratt David Wilson (North Midlands) Bloor Homes (Ms Sally Smith) Wilson Bowden Developments (Land at New Farm, Nuthall) William Davis Homes (Hannah Price)
Policy 1: Climate Change,	A 'site by site approach' to energy generation may undermine economies of scale	The policy provides flexibility for sites which are not able to	None	1261291 1260091	Arc Partnership (on behalf of

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	in the provision of sustainable sources of energy and conflict with the efficient use of land.	meet on-site requirements.		1243478 1245883	Nottinghamshire County Council) Harworth Group Harworth Group Plc (Mr Stuart Ashton) Bloor Homes Limited (Sarah Milward)
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	With regard to the Climate Change policy, the County Council considers that 'in relation to employment matters, the importance of a growth in green/ low carbon skills, training and employment should be a stronger focus within the document'.	This would not be a matter for this policy as this does not cover training and employment matters.	None	1259648	Derbyshire County Council
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable	Part 1 of the policy should be amended to include reference to resilience.	The proposed amendment would provide some additional clarity.	See Suggested Main Modification Document for	1262353	Environment Agency

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk			suggested wording.		
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	Part 5 of the policy should have an extra bullet point added regarding the area of permeable surfaces.	The proposed amendment in relation to permeable surfaces would provide some additional clarity but should be added to part 13 of the policy and to the justification text.	See Suggested Main Modification Document for suggested wording.	1262353	Environment Agency
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	Part 7 of the policy should be amended to include references to resilience and the building's surroundings. References should also be added in Part 7 to de-culverting, water quality, buffers to watercourses and restoration of watercourses.	These amendments are not required to make the policy sound. De-culverting would be a matter for Blue and Green Infrastructure (Policy 16).	None	1262353 1246138	Environment Agency Environment Agency

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	Part 8 of the policy should be amended to include references to new BGI, nature-based solutions, 'adaptive capacity solutions', water quality and the 'retrofitting' of SuDS.	A number of proposed amendments would provide some additional clarity.	See Suggested Main Modification Document for suggested wording.	1262353 1246138	Environment Agency Environment Agency (Joshua Milsom)
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	Part 13 of the policy should be amended to include references to multifunctional SuDS, water quality, water efficiency, biodiversity, place shaping and amenity.	This can be added to 3.1.50 which provides further detail in relation to SuDS.	See Suggested Main Modification Document for suggested wording.	1262353 1246138	Environment Agency Environment Agency (Joshua Milsom)
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable	Supports part 4(c) of the policy.	Comment noted.	None	1262392 1246153	Historic England Historic England

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk					
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	Within part 9 of the policy there should be consideration of renewable energy and the historic environment.	The plan should be read as a whole. There is a specific policy in relation to the historic environment (Policy 11).	None	1262392 1246153	Historic England Historic England
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	Welcomes the reference to heritage within part 13 of the policy.	Comments noted.	None	1262392 1246153	Historic England Historic England

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	At paragraph 3.1.33, embodied carbon within heritage assets should also be considered.	Consideration of the impact on heritage assets would be considered as part of Policy 11.	None	1262392 1246154	Historic England Historic England
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	At paragraph 3.1.35 a bullet point should be added: 'protecting heritage assets'.	Consideration of the impact on heritage assets would be considered as part of Policy 11.	None	1262392 1246155	Historic England Historic England
Policy 1: Climate	Fully support 'policies that promote carbon neutral	Comments noted.	None	1260085	NHS Property Services

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	development' and highlight that NHS property could benefit from carbon offset funds collected where on-site carbon mitigation requirements cannot be met.			1245977	NHS Property Services (Daniel Fleet)
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	The policy and supporting text should be amended to say that developers will be expected to integrate public open space into their designs.	Public open space requirements are included in separate policies (Policy 16).	None	1262214	Nottingham Open Space Forum
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and	At part 2 of the policy and paragraph 3.1.23, there are no criteria for 'unviable or unfeasible': 'This is a seriously large loophole which will be exploited by builders'.	Clear and robust evidence would be required to demonstrate it would be unviable or unfeasible which would	None	1257948	Mrs June Ellerby

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Managing Flood Risk		be considered on a case-by-case basis.			
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	The building of an energy from waste incinerator ('the dirtiest form of energy generation') at Ratcliffe 'does not comply with any sustainability and climate target'.	The energy from waste incinerator already has planning permission and is beyond the remit of this plan.	None	1258791	Ms Susan Edwards
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	Any housing built should be at the highest specification for insulation, climate and sustainability.	Comments noted. The policy balances sustainability requirements and is in conformity with the ministerial statement.	None	1258791	Ms Susan Edwards

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	There should be policies about: solar panels on the roofs of all new buildings; the locations of solar farms; EV charging and 'systems upgrades'.	The policy includes requirements related to solar panels and solar farms. EV charging is covered by building regulations. Electricity grid infrastructure has been considered as part of the IDP, with input from National Grid.	None	1258353 1235801	The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	At paragraph 3.1.2, Rushcliffe BC should set in-house and area-wide carbon neutral targets before the examination.	This is not a matter for the GNSP.	None	1258353 1235801	The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable	Strongly support the encouragement of lifestyle and behavioural change at paragraph 3.1.44: however,	Parking standards are not a matter for the Strategic Plan.	None	1258353	The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	have concerns about 'the current relaxed car parking standards applied to new development in Nottinghamshire'.			1235801	The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	The requirement for energy efficiency should be deleted from the policy, as the estimated cost uplift of 3% to achieve a 63% improvement on Part L is 'a gross underestimate' and this could affect site viability and deliverability.	The requirement is based on a robust evidence base and has been viability tested.	None	1261315 1261456 1261434 1261440 1245883	Bloor Homes Bloor Homes Limited (Sarah Milward)
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and	To expect developers who specialise in older persons' housing to comply with a 63% improvement standard is 'completely unnecessary and unjustified': part 2(a) of the policy should exclude this kind of development and a further	There is no justification for treating this type of development differently.	None	1262334	Churchill Living and McCarthy Stone

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Managing Flood Risk	reference to financial viability should be added.				
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	In part 3(d) of the policy the requirement for s106 contributions is contrary to the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations.	The requirement for off-set payments is established through a number of adopted local plans and would comply with CIL Regulations.	None	1261043 1261600 1261631	David Wilson Homes East Midlands Wilson Bowden Developments Barratt David Wilson (North Midlands)
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	Part 5 of the policy should be amended to include a reference to viability.	It is considered that this amendment would be unnecessary. Water efficiency was tested as part of plan wide viability.	None	1261043 1261631	David Wilson Homes East Midlands Barratt David Wilson (North Midlands)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	The policy should be amended to require new developments to achieve energy efficiency solely in line with the latest standards set by the Government.	Local plans are able to set higher standards compared to building regulations, subject to complying with the written ministerial statement (December 2023).	None	1262220 1261257 1260955 1261272	Bloor Homes Taylor Wimpey Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	Any references to standards that differ from Building Regulations should be deleted.	Local plans are able to set higher standards compared to building regulations, subject to complying with the written ministerial statement (December 2023).	None	1262345	Gladman Developments
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and	Parts 2 and 3 of the policy 'undermine economies of scale for product manufacturers, suppliers and developers' by diverging from national standards, add to complexity and could 'undermine the	Local plans are able to set higher standards compared to building regulations, subject to complying with the written ministerial statement (December	None	1262496 1259110 1246220	Home Builders Federation William Davis Homes Home Builders Federation (Ms Rachel Danemann)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Managing Flood Risk	environmental objectives the Councils are seeking to secure'.	2023). The GNSP will also require a consistent approach across three council areas.		1247147 1243744	William Davis Homes (Mrs Hannah Price) William Davis Homes (Hannah Price)
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	Parts 2-6 of the policy should be deleted as they are 'non-strategic' and 'covered by legislation'.	Local plans are able to set higher standards compared to building regulations, subject to complying with the written ministerial statement (December 2023).	None	1258401 1258432	Langridge Homes Trustees of Hammond Farm
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	Part 7 of the policy should be deleted as it is 'non-strategic'.	Allowing for adaption for future changes in climate is a strategic matter.	None	1258401 1258432	Langridge Homes Trustees of Hammond Farm

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	'Broadly supports' part 8 of the policy, however cross-refences should be added to policies 4 and 16.	Comment noted. The plan should be read as a whole and therefore there is no need to cross reference these policies.	None	1258401 1258432	Langridge Homes Trustees of Hammond Farm
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	'Further clarity' is needed on the delivery of part 9 of the policy, in relation to Green Belt policy, perhaps identifying locations for solar/wind farms.	Policy 4 and the NPPF provide sufficient guidance in respect of the appropriateness of sites in the Green Belt.	None	1258401 1258432	Langridge Homes Trustees of Hammond Farm
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and	Part 10 of the policy is unnecessary as it repeats what is in the NPPF and PPG.	It is considered that this part of the policy is necessary to provide clear policy guidance.	None	1258401 1258432	Langridge Homes Trustees of Hammond Farm

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Managing Flood Risk					
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	At paragraphs 3.1.10 and 3.1.52, separate energy statements and sustainability statements should not be required: they could perhaps be incorporated in Design and Access Statements.	These statements are considered necessary to demonstrate compliance with the policy. Each Council has individual validation lists which will set out specific requirements.	None	1258401 1258432	Langridge Homes Trustees of Hammond Farm
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	The policy, and paragraph 3.1.6 of the justification text, should be amended so that they are 'in line with Future Homes Standards and Building Regulations'.	Local plans are able to set higher standards compared to building regulations, subject to complying with the written ministerial statement (December 2023).	None	1260189 1260198 1261283	Parker Strategic Land
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable	Parts 2(b) and 3(b) of the policy should have text added at the end saying: 'unless it can	It is considered that this amendment would be unnecessary. There is existing reference to	None	1259524	Rula Developments

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	be demonstrated that this is not technically or financially viable'.	"unless it can be demonstrated that compliance is unviable or unfeasible" which applies to parts 2 and 3 of the policy.			
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	Parts 3(c) and 3(d) of the policy should have text added saying: 'unless viability and other considerations indicate otherwise'.	It is considered that this amendment would be unnecessary. There is existing reference to "unless it can be demonstrated that compliance is unviable or unfeasible" which applies to parts 2 and 3 of the policy.	None	1259524	Rula Developments
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	The policy should be made shorter and less 'unwieldy', with more precision and clarity.	The policy wording is considered appropriate.	None	1261257 1260955 1261272	Taylor Wimpey Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	Part 2(a) of the policy should refer to 31% rather than 63% and to the 2013 rather than 2021 Building Regulations.	Local plans are able to set higher standards compared to building regulations, subject to complying with the written ministerial statement (December 2023).	None	1259110 1247147 1243744	William Davis Homes William Davis Homes (Mrs Hannah Price) William Davis Homes (Hannah Price)
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	Part 2(a), and/or 3(b)/(d), of the policy should be re-worded to allow for potential change in Government policy and to include flexibility and viability considerations.	It is considered that this amendment would be unnecessary. Potential change to Government policy may supersede the policy in due course. There is existing reference to "unless it can be demonstrated that compliance is unviable or unfeasible" which applies to parts 2 and 3 of the policy.	None	1259110 1247147	William Davis Homes William Davis Homes (Mrs Hannah Price)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	Part 3(b) of the policy should say that capacity is required 'where appropriate and feasible'.	Where it is not feasible, part 3(d) of the policy applies.	None	1259110	William Davis Homes
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	Part 11 of the policy should be deleted as it is 'unclear and imprecise'.	This part of the policy sets out a clear sequential approach to future allocations, should they be required.	None	1259110	William Davis Homes
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and	Parts 2(b), 3(a) and 3(b) of the policy would discourage large-scale industrial and logistics operators from locating in the area.	The targets have been subject to plan wide viability testing, and on this basis are believed to be achievable.	None	1261600	Wilson Bowden Developments

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Managing Flood Risk					
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	Pleased that the supporting text at 3.1.11 is clear that the approach to such matters at the outline planning application stage is necessarily different to that with applications for full planning permission or applications for reserved matters approvals. Would find it helpful if that were to be set out in the policy itself, or if the 'decision-taking' parts of Policy 1 were to refer to applications for full planning permission or reserved matters approval. Specifically in relation to Policy 1. a), DIO is unsure of the need to refer to the requirements of the Building Regulations given that the Regulations do not depend on the planning system for implementation. If that is	Consider that the clarification regarding how the policy is applied to different types of applications is appropriate within the justification text rather than the policy text. Consider that the reference is Building	None	1263726 1245857	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mr Paul Hinton)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	considered necessary, DIO proposes that the policy refer to the version of the Building Regulations that is current at the point at which an energy statement is submitted, or to the Future Homes Standard once that is implemented/mandated by government.	Regulations is required to provide a benchmark for the level of improvement required for different types of development.			
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	States that the GNSP is inconsistent and points to Policy 4 vs Policy 21as an example of this (release of Green Belt). States that a link road on to the A52 is not sustainable, will add congestion and adversely impact air quality as well as disincentivise use of the Tram. Notes that no other alternative plans have been considered.	The Plan should be read as a whole, taking individual policies does not provide a rounded policy view. The link road is considered to be necessary to access the site, and is accompanied by a range of other transport measures, including active travel and public transport.	None	1243716	Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum (Dr Paul NATHANAIL)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	There should be focus on a Plan that will deliver truly sustainable development.				
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	Broadly supports measures in Sections 2 to 6 but it is inappropriate to include policies on design and construction in the GNSP, as they are non-strategic and are covered by legislation. Holds that it is not necessary to include Section 7 as it is non-strategic. Broadly supports Section 8 but says it should be cross-referenced with Policy 4. States that further clarity is needed on the delivery of Section 9. Suggests a spatial assessment.	Local plans are able to set higher standards compared to building regulations, subject to complying with the written ministerial statement (December 2023). Section 7 (adaptation to climate change) is considered to be a strategic matter. The Plan should be read as a whole, a cross ref to Policy 4 is not required. A spatial assessment for part 9 will form part of future plan-making, if appropriate.	None	1243420 1250323 1250365 1243305	Langridge Homes Ltd (Mr David Fletcher) Langridge Homes Ltd (Mr David Fletcher) Trustees of Hammond Farm Hammond Farms (Mr Robert Hammond)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Regards that Section 10 is unnecessary as it repeats national legislation. Feels it is not necessary have to submit a separate energy statement with planning applications for large schemes.	Section 10 is considered necessary to set out an approach to flood risk. An energy statement is required to demonstrate how the provisions of the policy have been addressed.			
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	Object to the content of Policy 1, which sets out ambitious requirements for new development to comply with standards which go beyond adopted Building Regulations. Questions whether Part 3(d) meets the tests set out in CIL regulation 122. States that Part 5 of the policy is not in accordance with NPPF Paragraph 16 (b).	Local plans are able to set higher standards compared to building regulations, subject to complying with the written ministerial statement (December 2023). Part 3(d) meets Cil requirements, as demonstrated by a number of adopted local plans. Part 5 is considered entirely consistent with		27195809 1247014 1247147	David Wilson Homes East Midlands (Ms Helen Bareford) David Wilson Homes East Midlands (C/O Agent) William Davis Homes (Mrs Hannah Price)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		NPPF par 16b, as it is aspirational but deliverable.			
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	Holds that the following is unjustified and would undermine the Council's aims: "all new residential development (Use Classes C3 and C4, except householder development) and purpose-built student accommodation should demonstrate a minimum 63% improvement on Part L 2021 Building Regulations Target Emissions Rate (or equivalent reduction on future Building Regulations) through energy efficiency measures (including heat pumps)." Concerned that the Council is still seeking to move away from the carbon reduction methods set out in Part L of the Building Regulations.	Local plans are able to set higher standards compared to building regulations, subject to complying with the written ministerial statement (December 2023).	None	1246220	Home Builders Federation (Ms Rachel Danemann)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Concerned that the Council is adding to the complexity of policy, regulations and standards that housebuilders are already expected to comply with. considers it would be appropriate to make reference to the Future Homes Standard and the Building Regulations as the appropriate standards for development.				
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	States that the requirement to achieve NCZ as proposed in this policy is clearly in conflict with the NPPF and "*other statements of national planning policy"* such as the WMS(2023 NPPF paragraph 35d). States that for the policy to be sound, it should be revised to require new developments to "*achieve an energy efficiency in line with the latest standards set by the Government,*	Local plans are able to set higher standards compared to building regulations, subject to complying with the written ministerial statement (December 2023).	None	1243530	Define Planning and Design on behalf of Bloor Homes Limited (Mr Sam Perkins)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	whether that be Building Regulations or the Future Homes Standard (including any transitional arrangements)."				
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	States that a Material Recovery and Biological Treatment (MRBT) facility or something similar should be built at Ratcliffe on Soar as opposed to an EfW incinerator. States that development should not be built around car use.	The EfW plant has planning permission. Policy 14 sets out a hierarchy for sustainable transport networks.	None	1242535	Ms Susan Edwards
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	States that the Plan should be amended to remove the additional requirements for developments to exceed Buildings regulations.	Local plans are able to set higher standards compared to building regulations, subject to complying with the written ministerial statement (December 2023).	None	57003009	Oxalis Planning (Mr Ben Holmes)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	Recommends that: a) Policy 1 text is amended to make explicit reference to public open space in all its forms in this part of the policy so that it is clear developers will be expected to integrate this element into their design, and to increase consistency with national policy; and b) the supporting text is reviewed to clearly link references to open space, green infrastructure and recreation to the correct part of Policy 1.	Open space is covered by other policies of the Plan.		1243637	Nottingham Open Space Forum (Mr Ben Hunt)
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and	Supports the policy	Noted	None	1241097 1241098 1241099 1241101	Mr Christopher Smith Mr Christopher Smith Mr Christopher Smith Mr Christopher Smith

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Managing Flood Risk					
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	No written response or attachment submitted.	N/A	N/A	1243743	tor&co (Miss Zarina Ali)
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	States that Ravenshead cannot cope with an increase of that size without better infrastructure.	Gedling have withdrawn form the GNSP and are preparing a standalone Local Development Plan	None.	1235312	Mr Robert Hurst
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable	States that that the Councils are not utilising the current technologies available to assist in mitigating some of the	The policy will support developers to utilise current technologies in their developments.	None.	1240820	Mrs Pam Hill

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	challenges of climate change when permitting buildings to be erected within their areas. Feels it would be beneficial to have local groups to include residents to direct and discuss changes in a co-productive manner.				
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	The following text should be added to 2a) of Policy 1: All new residential development (Use Classes C3 and C4, except householder development) and purpose-built student accommodation should demonstrate a minimum 63% improvement on Part L 2021 Building Regulations Target Emissions Rate (or equivalent reduction on future Building Regulations) through energy efficiency measures (including heat pumps). ***The***	The Policy already includes provisions for viability and feasibility.	None.	1246341 1246337	McCarthy Stone (Lauren Bishop) Churchill Living (Lauren Bishop)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	requirement will be applied subject to financial viability.				
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	The policy should be amended so that it is in line with Future Homes Standards and Building Regulations.	Local plans are able to set higher standards compared to building regulations, subject to complying with the written ministerial statement (December 2023).	None	1246634	Parker Strategic Land Limited (site at Cotgrave) (Mr Andrew Bamber)
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	Question whether wording in Part 3(d) would be complaint with Regulation 122 (CIL)	Part 3(d) is considered CIL compliant, as demonstrated by several adopted Local Plans which include this provision.	None	1242834	Wilson Bowden Developments (Land at New Farm, Nuthall)
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable	Policy 1:1. The policy could be strengthened if Carbon Neutrality was defined.	Net Zero is defined in the Policy as Net Zero Operational Emissions.	None	1243747	Mr Will James

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	Policy 1:2. a) This policy could be strengthened if a reduction in energy is prescribed, in addition to renewables (such as PV). Policy 1:2. b) To support the delivery of this policy and consistency against the different applications, % reduction should be evidenced. Policy 1:4. The plan should be ambitious in also prescribing energy performance target reductions for existing buildings, similar to new builds listed in Policy 1:2. Policy 1: 5. a) To meet the Carbon Neutrality targets set out by each borough (2027, 2028, 2030 and 20230), a Whole Life Carbon Assessment should be required to count Embodied Carbon.	Government guidance specifies policies should use a Target Emissions Rate. The policy requires evidence in the form of an energy statement. Existing buildings cannot be covered by a policy for new development, unless planning permission is required, in which case Part 4 applies. An energy statement is considered appropriate for the implementation of this policy. The energy hierarchy is set out at para			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Policy 1:6. An energy hierarchy and waste hierarchy should be described so that there is no unfavourable interpretation of hierarchy. Policy 1:7. The policy could be strengthened here if a level of resilience or climate adaption was specified.	3.1.10, the waste hierarchy is set out in the Nottinghamshire and Nottingham waste Local Plan, 2025. Resilience and adaptation are considered on a case by case basis.			
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	Criteria a) of Policy 1 goes beyond Building Regulation requirements. This should be deleted from the policy. Object to having to provide a financial contribution for solar energy off-site if proposals do not propose their own renewable energy source on site, as set out in points b) and c) of policy sub-point 3. Point 3 b) and c) should be removed, or re-worded to states that renewable energy provision on site will be	Local plans are able to set higher standards compared to building regulations, subject to complying with the written ministerial statement (December 2023). Offset payments are an established mechanism to achieve net zero. Points 3b) and C) are necessary to the	None	1245988	The Victoria Centre Partnership (Holly Ganderton)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	supported and be considered significant public benefit by Local Planning Authorities when assessing proposals. As it stands, this Policy 1 as a whole is not sound as drafted.	operation of a net zero policy.			
Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk	The policy should be amended so that it is in line with Future Homes Standards and Building Regulations.	Local plans are able to set higher standards compared to building regulations, subject to complying with the written ministerial statement (December 2023).	None	1245804	Parker Strategic Land Limited (Mr Andrew Bamber)

Policy 2

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	Support removal of references to Hucknall as a Sub-Regional Centre. Request similar change to paragraph 2.2.5 for consistency. Consider the GNSP complies with the Duty to Cooperate.	Paragraph 2.2.5 is a factual description of the area with no policy content, and so retention of the reference to Hucknall is considered appropriate.	None	1260064	Ashfield District Council (Christine Sarris)
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	Welcome and support the 6 broad principles behind the plan. ('Fully support' criteria a), c), d) and e); 'support' criterion b); 'generally support' criterion f).) Criterion c) "ensuring that new development……in or adjoining Key Settlements, is of a scale and character that supports these as sustainable locations for growth" is supported, but concern that development should be supported by associated infrastructure.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Policy 18 Developer Contributions for Infrastructure seek to ensure appropriate infrastructure for new development. See comments against Policy 22 and the Policies Map Changes document.	None	1262384 1262381	Awsworth Parish Council (Mrs Hayley Holt)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	With reference to criterion f) "maximising the economic development potential of key sites including…. the former Bennerley Coal Disposal Point", concern over the boundary of the site, the extent of the proposed Country Park, and areas of land removed from the Green Belt.				
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	Spatial Strategy places over-reliance on brownfield sites, as these are complex and costly to deliver. Brownfield sites at Broad Marsh, Stanton Tip and Chetwynd have challenging issues. Brownfield sites also have slower delivery than greenfield ones. Growth should be more evenly distributed across the GNSP area.	The NPPF encourages brownfield development. The Councils have prepared trajectories that are considered realistic. Most brownfield sites are within the urban area, and therefore sustainably located with regards to accessibility and transport. The GNSP does make significant provision for	None	1261374 1261387 1260062 1260119 1260564	Barratt David Wilson (North Midlands) Barratt David Wilson Homes (North Midlands) and Averill Land Limited (Simon Atha) Stagfield Group Strawson Group Investments Ltd (c/o agent)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Cotgrave is a Key Settlement and more housing could be accommodated here. Over-reliance on brownfield sites impacts on affordable housing delivery. Nottingham City has a low level of affordable housing delivery, and a large proportion of student homes. Over the last 12 years, Nottingham City has delivered an average of 1,032 dwellings per year, below the 2023 Standard Method figure by 741 dwellings. This is a failure of the strategy, requiring a redistribution of housing to Key Settlements, which would also provide wider choice. Trowell is also promoted for further growth as it is considered a sustainable location.	growth outside of the urban area. The Standard Method includes an affordability uplift and so targets already take account of affordability to a degree. Greenfield sites can also be challenging in viability terms, as they have higher infrastructure requirements. Student Accommodation is subject to affordable housing provision via SPD. NCC average delivery over the past 10 years has been 1,520 per annum (2014/15 to 2023/24). NCC has exceeded the Standard Method applicable at the time in every year		1246702	Harworth Group (c/o agent) Stagfield Group (Sir/ Madam)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Tollerton is also promoted for further growth as it is considered a sustainable location.	that the Standard Method has been relevant. There is no requirement to allocate additional sites.			
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	Object to Brinsley being downgraded. It is defined as a Key Settlement in the current Aligned Core Strategies but is defined as an Other Settlement in the GNSP. Insufficient evidence has been provided to justify this downgrading. Brinsley has a range of facilities accessible to it and is considered to be as	The Key Settlements Review 2024 justifies Brinsley's current position in the hierarchy.	None	1261633 1243588	Barratt David Wilson (North Midlands) (c/o agent) Barratt David Wilson Homes (Mr Robert Galij)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	sustainable as Awsworth and Kimberley.				
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	GNSP gives insufficient weight to the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan compared to the Local Transport Plan. "Cycling & walking" should be given at least "parity of esteem" relative to "public transport".	GNSP policy 14: Managing Travel Demand includes active travel at the top of the hierarchy in terms of delivering sustainable transport networks.	None	1258381	David Rhead
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	Section 2.6 doesn't give active travel "parity of esteem" with public transport. After Para 2.6.4, make reference to NCN 6 and the Erewash Canal towpath. These have adequate capacity for current leisure use, but their quality/capacity is inadequate for the increased utility generated by other policies in the GNSP.	GNSP policy 14: Managing Travel Demand (parts 2 and 3) gives "parity of esteem" to active travel (walking and cycling) and public transport.	None	1258395	David Rhead

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	Supportive of the proposed settlement hierarchy. East Leake is classified as a Key Settlement. However, the stipulation that further land is not to be allocated is at odds with this. Growth should be dispersed across the Key Settlements to ensure housing needs are met in full. East Leake is one of only two Key Settlements unconstrained by Green Belt, and this justifies more growth here. Sutton Bonington is defined as an "other settlement". There should be a distinction between "other settlements" which are sustainable in terms of facilities etc and those that are not (Bunny, West Leake). It is also not constrained by Green Belt. Policy should acknowledge there are other locations which	There is sufficient housing supply already provided in the GNSP, further allocations at Key Settlements are not required. The hierarchy at Policy 2 sets the development priorities for the GNSP, which is a strategic document. Any allocations at a lower level in the hierarchy will be a matter for subsequent Plan making.	None	1261049 1247017	David Wilson Homes East Midlands (Ms Helen Bareford) David Wilson Homes East Midlands (C/O Agent)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	could deliver housing without release of Green Belt.				
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	The GNSP relies largely on SUE sites carried over from previous plans supplemented by a modest contribution from Key Settlements, also carried over from previous plans. Concern that the housing allocations proposed in the Plan do not go far enough to ensure reliable delivery within the Plan Period. For example East of Gamston/North of Tollerton does not yet have planning permission. Trajectory delivers up to the end of the GNSP period, so any delay will result in a reduction in the number of homes provided. Toton and Chetwynd have not delivered as anticipated in the Broxtowe Local Plan Part 2. In	GNSP has adequate supply to meet housing targets. Realistic trajectories are provided for all sites. The nature of the GNSP is that it focusses solely on strategic sites. Any further allocations a matter for future Plan making. Trajectories have been provided for the GNSP, which are considered to be robust. The allocation of small sites, if required, is a matter for future Plan making.	None	1261337 1261339 1261343 1261347 1261354 1261357 1261298 1245779 1247041 1247049 1247131	Davidsons Developments (c/o agent) Northern Trust Land Ltd (c/o agent) MyPad 2020 Limited (John Turner) Davidsons Developments Ltd (C/O Agent)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	fact cancellation of HS2, the MoD delaying closure of the barracks until 2026 and lack of funding to for a link road cast doubt on early delivery. It will not deliver as anticipated in the GNSP. There is a need to increase allocations at Key Settlements to compensate. Small sites reduce the risk of non delivery, and are not so reliant on provision of new infrastructure. They also provide for consumer choice. Smaller sites in more rural settlements can support local infrastructure, such as schools. Also more likely to be viable, and therefore deliver affordable housing. Other sites will need to be found due to GNSP under provision and these should be spread across the Key				Davidsons Developments Ltd (C/O Agent) Davidsons Developments Ltd (C/O Agent)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Settlements and Other Settlements. Allocation at Hillside Farm, Keyworth has been refused, and dismissed on appeal, so unlikely to ever come forward. This casts doubt on the Rushcliffe allocations to be sufficient to meet need without further allocations. Other sites promoted: Cropwell Bishop is accessible and offers a range of services, and should be considered suitable for development. Gotham is accessible and offers a wide range of services accessible within the village. Its designation as Other Settlement does not reflect this and it should be considered suitable for development.				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	East Leake is carried over as a Key Settlement from the previous Local Plan, it is a suitable and appropriate location for development and is capable of accommodating more than has previously been allocated. It is also not constrained by Green Belt. A further site adjacent to the allocation at Tollerton is promoted to redress the insufficient housing provision. Bunny has a range of services and is accessible by public transport. It would be an appropriate location for growth. Land at Coventry Lane, Bramcote is promoted as it adjoins the built up area of Nottingham.				
	GNSP (i) does not set an appropriate housing requirement or identify a	The strategy is considered appropriate. The GNSP allocates	None	1262221	Define Planning and Design on behalf of

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	sufficient range of allocation sites to meet that requirement and (ii) it does not focus sufficient development to some settlements despite their sustainable credentials. Eastwood is recognised as a Key Settlement and a sustainable location for growth, the GNSP does not allocate further growth to support its development. As there is insufficient housing identified in the GNSP, growth at Key Settlements should not be unduly limited.	sufficient land to meet its housing targets. Development at Eastwood is provided for through existing allocation, infill etc. Further allocations are not required.			Bloor Homes Limited (Mr Sam Perkins)
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	Spatial strategy is too Nottingham-centric, may not deliver sufficient market and affordable housing across the area as a whole, particularly in Key Settlements and other rural areas. Existing	The built up area of Nottingham is the most sustainable location for new development, as there is existing infrastructure available and high levels of accessibility by a range of modes. Housing	None	1262354 1262379 1246868	Gladman Developments Ltd (Mr Richard Naylor) Hallam Land (c/o agent)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	allocations in current Local Plan only provide to 2028. There are a number of considerations that inform the need and demand for housing, including the range of housing required, environmental and social considerations, and accessibility which need to be taken into account. There is no more detailed housing need assessment, and no assessment of how the housing distribution will support local service provision.	delivery in Nottingham City is currently buoyant. The Key Settlements Review 2024 provides evidence of the sustainability of settlements. Where services exist, further growth has been provided for through existing allocations, infill etc.			
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	Support Part 2 of Policy 2. (Settlement Hierarchy)	Noted.	None	1260885 1238971 1249413	Gotham Ward Parishes and Borough Councillors Kinoulton Parish Council (Neil Oxby)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
					Consortium of Parish Councils
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	Strongly objects to designation of Calverton as a Key Settlement	Gedling have withdrawn from the GNSP and are preparing a separate Local Development Plan.	None	1242786	Calverton Parish Council (Jane Walker)
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	The Spatial Strategy is flawed, as it has not been revisited with the departure of Gedling from the GNSP, with no evidence of ongoing cooperation. The withdrawal of Gedling is a fundamental matter, and the GNSP should be subject to a Regulation 18 consultation. This is a failure to prepare the GNSP in accordance with legal due process. Without Erewash and Gedling the GNSP cannot be considered a sound strategic plan for the area. It no longer	When a partner withdraws from a joint Local Plan the test applied is that the Plan has "substantially the same effect" on the remaining authorities. BBC, NCC and RBC consider the March Regulation 19 GNSP has substantially the same effect on their areas, as evidenced through the track changes version of the GNSP.	None	1259656	Hallam Land and Davidsons Developments

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	includes the only meaningful cross-boundary strategic issue, the expansion of Hucknall into Gedling. What remains is a development management strategy over a non functional geography.	The withdrawal of Gedling does not change the GNSP strategy or proposals for the remaining Councils.			
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	There is little to no evidence in the draft Plan or supporting documents of cooperation with the adjacent LPAs in Leicestershire (including North West Leicestershire and Charnwood) or any of the Derbyshire districts, the latter importantly part of 3438 . Each individual LPA within the plan area is required to cooperate with all LPAs surrounding it, whether inside the plan area or not. Doubt as to whether Nottingham City can	Statements of Common Ground have been prepared with all surrounding LPAs. Whilst EMCCA is not a prescribed body, ongoing dialogue on planning and transport matters has taken place and continues. Nottingham City has a record of strong housing delivery, and has exceeded the Standard Method housing need for as	None	1259951 1259940 1243775 1243768	Hallam Land and Davidsons Developments David Lock Associates (Mr David Akam) Hallam Land (Will Martin)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	accommodate the amount of housing proposed here, there are only two allocations, remaining supply is from windfall and part 2 Local Plan allocations. The second level of settlement hierarchy, sites adjoining the urban area, is not effective, justified or consistent with NPPF, particularly Green Belt purposes. There are readily available and realistic alternative sites located either outside of the Green Belt or in areas where its function performs less well. The option of new settlements has been dismissed by the GNSP out of principle, without adequate reasoning or assessment. The result is unsustainable sprawl in	long as it has been relevant. Site Assessment document shows how the allocations have been fully justified. Sites adjacent to the urban area can benefit from existing infrastructure and are or can be made accessible by a range of transport modes. A new settlement is not needed, and the settlement hierarchy ensures existing infrastructure and accessibility measures are maximised. New settlements will take some time to deliver houses and would have to provide necessary			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Nottingham, and overloading Key Settlements and villages. Collocating jobs and homes is an important sustainable development principle, Ratcliffe on Soar will be a major employer, and failure to align this with homes and infrastructure is a major failing.	infrastructure from scratch. The Ratcliffe site is accessible by rail, and will be made accessible by a range of other transport modes as it develops.			
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	Maximising the economic benefit of Bennerley Coal Disposal Point (BCDP) is strongly supported. Brownfield site, well located to serve Greater Nottingham with access to M1. Owners have excellent track record of delivery of complex sites. Application anticipated September 2025.	Noted.	None	1260094 1243523	Harworth Group (c/o agent) Harworth Group Plc (Mr Stuart Ashton)
Policy 2: The	Windfall overstated, does not comply with NPPF para 75 regarding "compelling evidence". Even more	Windfall supply is based on robust	None	1259726	Hinchley c/o Brown and Co (c/o Tim Brown)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Spatial Strategy	important as Rushcliffe are not proposing any new allocations. Does not give certainty as to where housing will be delivered.	evidence including past supply.			
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	Focusing housing delivery in Nottingham fails to address affordable housing needs effectively. Consideration of additional sites adjacent to Nottingham required. Full Green Belt review to identify further sustainable sites for housing required.	The Standard Method includes an affordability uplift, so takes into account affordability to some degree. Sufficient supply of housing is available, so a full Green Belt review is not required at this time.	None	1262499	Home Builders Federation (Ms Rachel Danemann)
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	There is an overreliance on strategic scale growth which typically requires significant amounts of infrastructure to facilitate development and is vulnerable to delays to delivery. A more balanced approach is required, including sites less reliant on infrastructure	The sustainable urban extensions benefit from existing infrastructure and accessibility and are considered appropriate.	None	1261403	IM Land

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	provision so they can be delivered early. A site in Cotgrave is promoted on this basis.				
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	Broadly support the spatial strategy. However, decisions on the scale of growth at Hucknall (which is in Ashfield) should be determined by Ashfield rather than Gedling Borough or the GNSP.	Gedling is no longer party to the GNSP.	None	1258402 1258433 1243307	Langridge Homes Ltd (Mr David Fletcher) Trustees of Hammond Farm Hammond Farms (Mr Robert Hammond)
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	Support the spatial strategy of prioritising sites for development firstly within the main built up area of Nottingham. Question the requirement to ensure development maximises opportunities to enhance the Blue and Green Infrastructure (BGI) network.	Blue and Green Infrastructure is key to making new development sustainable and acceptable. Its inclusion in policy 2 is considered appropriate.	None	1259933	Lone Star Land Ltd (Reuben Bellamy)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	This could be onerous, and Policy 16 covers BGI. This criterion should be deleted as it is unnecessary.				
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	Response form needs an explanation of 'legally compliant'. Para 2.8.2 is confusing, it references 6 towns and larger villages, and it refers to medium sized villages in different places, what is the difference? Or is this referring to a different set of villages? In which case, why are the 'larger villages' not named?	The paragraph is sufficiently clear when read in conjunction with the preceding paragraph 2.8.1.	None	1253528 1258324	Mr Jonathan Good
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	GNSP places an over reliance on the delivery of urban brownfield sites within the built-up area of Nottingham. These can be complex, costly	Nottingham City has a record of strong housing delivery, and has exceeded the Standard Method housing need for as	None	1259883 1261236 1246975 1243732 1243760	Mr Richards and Mrs Hurst William Davis (Mr Tom Dillarstone) Mr Richards and Mrs Hurst

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	to remediate and prepare for development. A more dispersed strategy should be taken. Ability of brownfield sites to yield affordable housing also cited, and Keyworth/Cropwell Bishop promoted as a sustainable location as part of a more dispersed approach.	long as it has been relevant.			Romans Group (Mr David Hutchinson) William Davis Homes (Mrs Hannah Price)
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	Object to the lack of support for development within some smaller settlements. GNSP should be more explicit in acknowledging ability of some smaller settlements to accommodate growth and the need for growth in some of these settlements to ensure services and facilities can be maintained, and local housing needs met.	Additional allocations in these locations are not required to meet housing targets, and existing allocations, infill etc are considered sufficient to meet need. Further allocations at smaller settlements are a matter for future Plan making.	None	1258666 1243555	Oxalis Planning (Mr Ben Holmes) Hawksmoor (Jonathan Wood)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	Support development adjacent to the built up area of Nottingham, but failure to allocate additional sites for development in Broxtowe throughout the remainder of the Plan period appears to be a somewhat short-sighted approach. Toton/Chetwynd unlikely to deliver as anticipated. Other sites are compliant with the strategy, such as Catstone Green, Trowell (adjacent to the urban area).	Further allocations are not needed to meet Broxtowe's housing target.	None	1260190 1260199 1245806 1245812	Parker Strategic Land (c/o agent) Parker Strategic Land Limited (Mr Andrew Bamber) Parker Strategic Land Limited (Mr Andrew Bamber)
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	Identification of Key Settlements for growth is welcomed, but lack of allocations. No new allocations in Rushcliffe, but existing allocations are delivering, and towards the back end of the GNSP period few homes will be developed.	Currently there is no need to provide for further allocations. Provision has been made at Key Settlements and overall sufficient allocations exist to meet the housing targets. Any further allocations will	None	1290016 1261284 1246638	Aldergate Properties Ltd (C/O Agent) Parker Strategic Land (c/o agent) Parker Strategic Land Limited (site at Cotgrave) (Mr Andrew Bamber)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Site at Colston Gate, Cotgrave could help in addressing this shortfall.	therefore be considered through future Plan making.			
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	Support the settlement hierarchy. Given evidence provided and Councils' own assessments, it is inconceivable that Catstone Green has not been allocated. Policy 2 includes both development priorities (part 1) and spatial guidance (part 2). This does not accord with NPPF guidance that policies should be clearly written. Parts 1a), 1d) and 1e) of policy 2 should be part of a separate policy. Those policies considered to be strategic should also be clearly identified.	Further allocations are not required to meet Broxtowe's housing target. Policy 2 is considered appropriate in its current form.	None	1262547 1259624 1245913	Parker Strategic Land Limited and William Davis Homes (c/o agent) Stantec (Oliver Haydon) Parker Strategic Land Limited and William Davis Limited (Gareth Wilson)
Policy 2: The	GNSP is not justified, is not effective and is not consistent	The focus of development on the	None	1260046	Persimmon Homes (c/o agent)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Spatial Strategy	with national policy. A more balanced, mixed approach to housing is required. Key Settlements should play more of a role. Removal of Gedling from the Plan should have led to reconsideration of the strategy. Since the Aligned Core Strategy was adopted there have been changes to national policy, so the reliance on past allocations is inappropriate and lack of Green Belt review means the GNSP is not positively prepared. Policy 2 implies an order and chronology to site selection, which is not considered appropriate. Overemphasis on urban living is at expense of Key Settlements and could lead to town cramming. Over-emphasis also on risky Brownfield sites which is likely	built up area of Nottingham is considered appropriate and sustainable. Development here can support existing infrastructure and has the highest level of accessibility to facilities. Past allocations continue to be appropriate as they are sustainable and accord with the spatial strategy. Policy 2 seeks to implement a sequential approach to direct development to the most sustainable locations, and is considered appropriate The windfall assumptions in the		1260060	

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	to result in housing requirements not being met. There is an over-emphasis on windfall sites (32% of supply). In Broxtowe, windfall is expected to contribute significantly to Key Settlement need, but without strategic policies to guide development. Broxtowe has an over-reliance on windfall, and Green Belt Boundary Review is required to ensure a sound approach. West of Moorgreen on the eastern edge of Eastwood (B02.1PA) is a reasonable alternative in a sustainable location, and Policy 2 should be amended to allow new strategic and non-strategic growth.	Plan are explained in the Housing Background Paper Addendum, 2025, and are considered to be robust. Further allocations are not required to meet the GNSP housing targets.			
Policy 2: The	The proposed spatial strategy does not follow from the Vision and the Objectives – there are	Whilst there are no new allocations proposed, the spatial strategy and	None	1261258	Taylor Wimpey (Land West of Ruddington)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Spatial Strategy	no new housing sites in Rushcliffe which adjoin the urban area e.g. at Pasture Lane Ruddington, or East of Gamston (extension to existing SUE). Hucknall should not be included in the Spatial Strategy as it is not within the parameters of the Plan.	distribution of development do accord with the vision and objectives. Hucknall is not mentioned in the policy. References to Hucknall in the GNSP only remain where they are factual or descriptive.		1261273	Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land (Land East of Gamston)
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	Land at Bramcote sits within the higher part of the spatial hierarchy adjoining the main urban area, second in the spatial hierarchy behind only sites within the urban area. Site could be used to ameliorate any shortfalls in housing land supply, including within 5 years.	No further allocations are required to meet the housing targets.	None	1260972	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land (James Beverley)
Policy 2: The	GNSP vision is too narrowly focussed, placing an over emphasis on housing growth in	The focus of development on the built up area of Nottingham is	None	1260208 1246607	The Crown Estate The Crown Estate (Iona Cameron)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Spatial Strategy	Nottingham with limited guidance in more rural areas. More nuanced approach required, that recognises the role of Key Settlements and transport corridors. Key Settlements are not prioritised to the most sustainable and accessible settlements such as Bingham, which also has land available outside of the Green Belt (Site RO3). District centres such as Bingham should have their own category within the settlement hierarchy.	considered appropriate and sustainable. Development here can support existing infrastructure and has the highest level of accessibility to facilities. Appropriate levels of development are identified for Key Settlements. The hierarchy of settlements is based on the Key Settlements Review, September 2024.			
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	We support this Policy 2 (parts 1a) to 1f)) but there is no written justification for Policy 2 part 1e) which should be central to the overall strategy.	Agree that additional justification text in relation to Policy 2 part 1e) would provide additional clarity.	See Suggested Main Modification document for proposed wording.	1258354	The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	Policy 2 does not sufficiently recognise the wider role that the City Centre can play in delivering housing growth and urban renaissance. There is no distinction between areas of the City that have poor access to services and that are not capable of delivering sustainable development. Policy should specifically recognise the ability for the City Centre to contribute to housing delivery.	Whilst the importance of the City Centre for housing development is fully accepted, virtually all areas of Nottingham City have excellent accessibility. Housing development in the City Centre is specifically encouraged at Policy 6.	None	1259960	VCP Nominees Victoria Centre (c/o agent)
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	The Spatial Strategy (for employment) is predicated on the Employment Land Study. This does not take account of recent and unprecedented shifts in the economy or unforeseen events like Brexit or the covid pandemic. Looking at past take up does not recognise the consequences of long term	The "Regeneration Scenario" has been used from the ELS which provides for the largest amount of employment land. In addition further land for strategic logistics has been allocated. It is not considered that further land is required.	None	1261334 1246946	Whitefields Farm (Mr & Mrs Hammond)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	suppression of demand, or the importance of emerging and growing markets. In addition, sites such as Toton are unlikely to deliver housing or employment as envisaged by the Plan. More employment land should be allocated as a result.				
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	Strongly support the objectives of Policy 2 and it appropriately establishes the focus of growth within and adjoining the urban area of Nottingham, delivering accessible and sustainable neighbourhoods that can maximise the use of brownfield land and provide opportunities for urban living. WDH supports the broad settlement hierarchy outlined in Criterion 2 which states that new development in Greater Nottingham will be	Comments noted.	None	1259651 1247151	William Davis Homes (Hannah Price) William Davis Homes (Mrs Hannah Price)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	focused in areas in or adjoining Key Settlements.				
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	More emphasis on Key Settlements is required, and less emphasis on large sites, Policy 2 should include minimum number of homes to be delivered by SMEs on smaller sites. Land at Hollygate Lane, Cotgrave promoted.	The Key Settlements are considered to be appropriate, and their growth is considered appropriate to their functions. Smaller sites are already allocated through Part 2 Local Plans.	None	1242053	Cora Homes Ltd (Mr Robbie Locke)
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	The GNSP identifies the main built-up area of Nottingham as the top of its settlement hierarchy, but allocates minimal housing within it, relying heavily on windfall sites and small-scale future allocations. Most strategic growth is directed to areas outside the city, particularly those adjoining the built-up area, which undermines the hierarchy's effectiveness and contradicts	Development within and adjoining the main built up area is considered to be a sustainable strategy. Housing delivery in Nottingham has consistently been strong. The sustainability appraisal is considered to be appropriate, and includes an option for	None.	1243775 1243768	David Lock Associates (Mr David Akam) Hallam Land (Will Martin)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	the NPPF, especially regarding Green Belt protection. The plan's approach to removing land from the inner Green Belt lacks justification and fails to demonstrate that all reasonable alternatives have been considered, as required by NPPF Paragraph 147. The site selection and sustainability appraisal processes are flawed, discarding potentially viable sites based on their location rather than sustainability merits. New settlements were excluded prematurely, despite their potential to deliver infrastructure and self-contained growth. The strategy's overreliance on urban capacity risks speculative development. The plan overlooks opportunities to align housing growth with employment sites like Ratcliffe-	dispersed development which explicitly references new settlements.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	on-Soar, which would be sustainable development.				
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	Spatial Strategy is too housing focussed, ignores industrial and logistics development. It fails to recognise that, in many cases, the locational advantage of an urban / suburban location is not always appropriate for industrial, manufacturing, logistics or distribution facilities e.g. extending existing facilities or at motorway junctions. Justification text also does not expand on employment matters. A separate spatial strategy for employment is required. New Farm Nuthall is a suitable site for logistics development and is an extension to Blenheim Business Park.	One of the key elements of the spatial strategy is to maximise the economic development potential of key sites and this is also reflected within the justification text. This matter is also fully covered under policy 5. The strategy therefore does not ignore industrial or logistics development.	None	1261601 1242837	Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd (c/o agent) Wilson Bowden Developments (Land at New Farm, Nuthall)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	Supports the draft policy.	Noted.	None	1263730	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO)
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	Believe site at Cotgrave Wood is suitable in terms of Policy 2, and elderly persons accommodation would assist in meeting GNSP objectives.	Further land for housing is not required to meet the housing targets of the GNSP.	None.	1243638	Alexandra Blue (Cotgrave) Ltd Director - PMC Land and Planning Limited (Mr Philip Coyne)
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	Due to Gedling's departure from the GNSP, questions whether the joint working between the 4 Councils was indeed nothing but 'lip service' and the plan itself not built upon effective cross boundary working. Questions whether based on historic trends, many of the strategic sites allocated can really deliver at the pace proposed within the plan period. Queries if all elements of the GNSP are truly effective	The Councils continue to work together and have a shared evidence base. Effective cross boundary working has taken place, as evidenced through the Statements of Common Ground. Trajectories for the strategic sites have been updated based on the latest evidence.	None.	1279661	Richborough Estates

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	in terms of the delivery of homes within the plan period. Some additional development within smaller settlements would increase affordability for first time buyers and families who are ordinarily priced out of the smaller, often relatively affluent settlements. This could be achieved either through greenfield or grey belt development, the latter of which could significantly contribute to affordable housing provision. There is no current provision within the GNSP to provide a joined-up commitment as to how all 3 Councils should address this matter to ensure truly strategic planning that meets the needs of communities Borough wide in a sustainable manner.	Additional sites are not currently required to meet housing targets. There are existing allocations within or adjacent to smaller settlements.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	Supports strategy of directing growth in or adjacent to the urban area. However, allocations in the GNSP have not conformed to this strategy. Promotes site at New Farm, Gedling.	Gedling are no longer party to the GNSP.	None.	1243717	Bidwells (Ms Suzi Green)
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	Focusing growth within the city and the built-up areas immediately surrounding Nottingham will not meet the wider needs of Greater Nottingham in terms of housing need, will fall woefully short in tackling affordability issues in more rural areas, and will inhibit economic growth.	The spatial distribution of development is considered to be sustainable, as evidenced by the Sustainability Appraisal.	None	1243760	William Davis Homes (Mrs Hannah Price)
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	End date of 2041 unlikely to provide a 15 year time horizon. Vision priority of urban living unevidenced, and doesn't provide for the needs of rest of Greater Nottingham. Promotes	The settlement hierarchy is considered to be appropriate, and further housing development is not	None	1243732	Leaders Romans Group (Mr David Hutchinson)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	alternative site at Cropwell Bishop.	required to meet GNSP housing targets.			
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	Policy supported, question how points 1c) and 2d) will be achieved, as further sites at Key Settlements/sustainable locations required for flexibility.	Further allocations for housing development are not required to achieve GNSP housing targets.	None	1246023	Aldergate Properties Ltd (Mr Wayne Scholter)
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	Insufficient provision of housing. Simplistic assumptions for housing supply and viability Sequential approach not followed. Development Management policies of GNSP unnecessary as will be replaced by national ones.			1243421 1243435	Geoffrey prince Associates Ltd (Mr Geoffrey Prince)
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	Advocates north Ruddington as a housing site.	It is considered that the approach to housing complies with the NPPF transitional arrangements, and	None	1247145	William Davis Homes (Mrs Hannah Price)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Considers housing target too low, should comply with Standard Method.	sufficient housing sites have been identified.			
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	EMCCA fully endorse regeneration opportunities at Ratcliffe on Soar and Toton and look forward to helping deliver the strategic regeneration opportunities afforded by this region.	Noted	None	1246018	East Midlands Combined County Authority
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	Mentions East Leake as a key settlement, and that GNSP is unsound.	The Settlement Hierarchy is well evidenced and considered appropriate.	None	1242458	Mrs Elizabeth Bohane
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	Sequential approach to identifying some strategic sites for new residential development has not been followed, eg Top Wighay Farm in Gelding; also there are serious questions regarding the	The settlement hierarchy and approach to allocation is considered sound. Housing trajectories are based on the most up	None	1291888	Langridge Homes Ltd (Mr David Fletcher)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	deliverability of some strategic sites.	to date information and are considered robust.			
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	Supports the policy	Noted	None	1241102 1241159	Mr Christopher Smith Mr Christopher Smith
Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy	No written response.	N/A	N/A	1236531 1235222 1241309 1237984	Dr Martin Goodfellow Mrs Emily Quilty Harworth Group Plc (Mr Stuart Ashton) Hawksmoor (Jonathan Wood)

Policy 3

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 3: Housing Target	Terminology: The term "provided for" should be replaced with "planning for the delivery of new homes" for clarity. Housing Target: The term should be "minimum housing requirement" to align with the NPPF. We object to the absence of mention that the proposed minimum housing requirement is a measure of net additional dwellings and not just the gross number of new dwellings built.	As this is a strategic plan, the term "providing for" is considered appropriate. The term Housing Target is used as it is plain language, clearly understood by everyone. The Policy clearly references that the Target is a minimum. Although the term net is not used, this is clear from the Housing Background Paper,	None	1261254 1261259 1260954 1259984 1259986 1292236 1292252	Taylor Wimpey (Land West of Ruddington) Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land (Land East of Gamston) Cora (Matthew Westwood) Taylor Wimpey (Land West of Ruddington) Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land (Land East of Gamston)
Policy 3: Housing Target	Many developers consider that there is Insufficient provision of housing, and the plan is questioned for its legal compliance,	It is considered the appropriate standard method to be that referred to in the transitional	None	1262115 1262116 1262118 1258967 1261405	Marrons on behalf of a consortium of developers and land promotion companies

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	soundness, and duty to cooperate. Specifically: The housing requirement of 47,600 homes is seen as flawed, not meeting the minimum need of 51,084 homes (3,484 shortfall). The housing requirement across the GNSP 2024 Reg 19 area including Gedling of 54,670 homes is seen as flawed, not meeting the minimum need of 59,526 homes, 64,890 inc 35% urban uplift in Nottingham City. The plan does not justify the deviation from the Standard Method. The plan does not comprehensively consider constraints like Green Belt and fails to demonstrate why the full housing need cannot be met	arrangements, i.e. December 2024. Progressing the GNSP to adoption now is considered to be a pragmatic approach to replace the 2014 Core Strategies for the three councils, which are significantly out of date. To start plan making from scratch risks a very significant delay likely to be exacerbated by local government review, which is not programmed until 2028. The Government has stated how important it is for local authorities have an up-to-date local plan in place (Minister's letter to the Inspectorate, Oct 2025), and the quickest and most certain way to achieve this is to progress the GNSP		1261316 1261458 1261435 1261442 1258961 1258959 1260565 1262469 1259932 1259652 1262544 1261819 1258434 1249408 1243544 1246210 1246721 1245886 1243549 1243553 1233540 1246819 1246792 1243757 1247141 1245907 1245775 1250374 1243729	John A Wells Ltd (Mr Brian Wells) IM Land Bloor Homes (Sally Smith Bloor Homes Limited (Sarah Milward) Oxalis Planning (Mr Ben Holmes) R. Taylor and Bloor Homes Ltd. Harworth Group Gladman Developments Ltd Lone Star Land Ltd William Davis Homes (Hannah Price) Parker Strategic Land Ltd and William Davis Homes MyPad (C/O Agent) Trustees of Hammond Farm Consortium of developers and land promotion companies

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	and there is a lack of exceptional circumstances for not applying the Standard Method.	through examination now, and using the transitional arrangements is therefore fully justified to achieve this. (See Housing Background Paper Submission Addendum).			John A Wells Ltd (Mr Brian Wells) IM Land Bloor Homes (Sally Smith) Bloor Homes Limited (Sarah Milward) Oxalis Planning (Mr Ben Holmes) R. Taylor and Bloor Homes Ltd. Harworth Group Gladman Developments Ltd Lone Star Land Ltd William Davis Homes (Hannah Price) Parker Strategic Land Ltd and William Davis Homes MyPad (C/O Agent) Trustees of Hammond Farm
Policy 3: Housing Target	The plan does not meet the requirements of the NPPF, specifically Annex 1 Para 234 a and b, as it makes	Disagree – GNSP does meet the transitional arrangements set out in the 2024 NPPF.	None	1258403 1260063 1262500	Langridge Homes Ltd Stagfield Grp Home Builders Federation

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	insufficient provision of housing and does not meet the minimum housing requirements. Many assumptions in the GNSP are overly optimistic, particularly regarding housing land supply and viability.			1243705 1291884	Savills (Mr David Bainbridge) Langridge Homes Ltd (Mr David Fletcher)
Policy 3: Housing Target	The plan is considered unsound due to unmet housing and employment needs, and call for a full Green Belt review. The housing requirement should be modified to c. 62,708 homes, reflecting the area's full LHN. The GNSP should set a target of 68,979 homes (with 10% buffer). The housing requirement across the GNSP 2024 Reg 19 area including Gedling should be modified to c.70,988	The Housing target is considered appropriate and complies with the NPPF transitional arrangements. Employment provision is based on the most optimistic scenario in the Employment Land Study. Sufficient land has been allocated for housing so a full Green Belt review is not required to support the Strategic Plan.	None	1261388 1259215 1262222 1259619 1260056 1260048 1259729 1262544 1261254 1261259 1260954 1261269 1261274 1243711 1243533 1292236	David Wilson Homes & Averill Land Ltd Define Planning & Design on behalf of Bloor Homes Ltd Stantec (Oliver Haydon) Persimmon Homes (DLP) Hinchley c/o Brown and Co Parker Strategic Land Ltd and William Davis Homes Taylor Wimpey (Land West of Ruddington). Trinity College

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	homes, reflecting the area's full LHN. The GNSP should set a target of 78,087 homes (with 10% buffer). The provision is 2,566-2,584 dwellings lower than the Standard Methodology				Define Planning & Design on behalf of Bloor Homes Ltd Taylor Wimpey (Land West of Ruddington).
Policy 3: Housing Target	From July 2026, the GNPP must demonstrate a 20% buffer of housing land for a 5-year supply. There is concern that there isn't enough allocated land to meet the requirements, potentially leading to a shortfall by July 2026.	The 20% is for monitoring 5 year land supply and is irrelevant for the GNSP, and even in respect of decision making, the criteria do not apply in Greater Nottingham.	None	1259903 1258434	Mr Woodhouse Trustees of Hammond Farm
Policy 3: Housing Target	GNSP targets are the result of playing the 'numbers game', with a reactive 'number-crunching' post-hoc rationalisation of the Plan to reflect the	The GNSP targets comply with NPPF transitional arrangements. Progressing the GNSP to adoption now is considered to be a	None	1259659 1259943 1259953	Hallam Land and Davidsons Developments

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	evolution of national planning policy, standard methodology, and the Plan area which allows for an end-goal of minimised housing delivery. This is demonstrated by the chronology in the detailed response. The housing evidence base papers merely report the 98% as an achievement rather contain any justification for the failure to target the full amount. Nor do they include any commentary on whether the GNSP area is able to accommodate any unmet need from neighbouring areas.	pragmatic approach to replace the 2014 Core Strategies for the three Councils, which are significantly our of date. To start plan making from scratch risks a very significant delay likely to be exacerbated by local government review, which is not programmed until 2028. The Government has stated how important it is for local authorities have an up-to-date local plan in place (Minister's letter to the Inspectorate, Oct 2025), and the quickest and most certain way to achieve this is to progress the GNSP through examination now, and using the transitional arrangements is			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		therefore fully justified to achieve this. (See Housing Background Paper Submission Addendum). Unmet need is addressed through Statements of Common Ground.			
Policy 3: Housing Target	The GNPP has not provided sufficient housing or employment to meet the growth needs, especially the need for homes outside the main urban area. A comprehensive Green Belt review is necessary, and, an evaluation of the proposed allocations is needed to determine the realistic prospects and speed of site development.	The Green Belt has been reviewed, and land allocated at Ratcliffe on Soar and Bennerley Coal Disposal Point. A wider Green Belt review is not required, as sufficient land supply to meet the minimum housing target.	None	1259882	Mrs Hurst and Mr Richards
Policy 3: Housing Target	Whilst the housing figures have been	Realistic trajectories are provided for all the	None	1260193 1261286	Parker Strategic Land (C/O Agent)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	increased to meet NPPF transitional arrangements, it must be acknowledged that these are very much the 'minimum' requirements and ideally the plan should be ambitious in meeting the full requirements of the revised standard method. The housing figures are very reliant on existing allocations.	GNSP allocations, in accordance with the agreed SHLAA methodology.			
Policy 3: Housing Target	Since the publication of the 2024 affordability ratio and implications this has to the new standard method, we consider the GNSP can only meet the 80% threshold across the strategic plan as a whole and not within each individual authority	The Transitional Arrangements are clear that the Dec 2024 Standard Method is the one to use.	None	1261375	Barratt David Wilson (North Midlands) (c/o agent)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Area. Therefore we consider the Plan is failing to meet the transitional arrangements of the NPPF (Dec 2024)				
Policy 3: Housing Target	Criticism of the strategy based on an artificially low housing target and a not robust assessment of housing supply, which excludes new land for housing development. Real prospect of delays and lower delivery levels on two of the Sustainable Urban Extensions, contrary to projections in Appendix C	The housing trajectories are considered to be robust and assessments, the SHLAA process is thorough and all new sites have been assessed, see Site Selection Background Paper.	None	1260954 1261269 1261274 1291822 1292252	Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land (Land East of Gamston) Cora Homes Ltd (Mr Robbie Locke) Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land (Land East of Gamston)
Policy 3: Housing Target	It is considered that Strategic Plan's approach to assessing and setting out its housing provision requirements over the plan period are soundly based and well	Noted.	None	1259634	Derbyshire County Council

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	justified. In addition, the land supply that has been identified for each of the constituent local authorities over the Plan period would also be sufficient to meet the housing provision requirements and so provides for a robust approach in balancing housing need and supply and likely delivery.				
Policy 3: Housing Target	Local Plans which are at an advanced stage of preparation, such as this Plan, have been granted transitional arrangements in which they can accord to the December 2023 NPPF. This allows Local Plans to continue to progress as long as the annual housing requirement in the emerging plan is no less than 80% of the	Noted.	None	1259903	Mr Woodhouse

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	requirement within the new Standard Method.				
Policy 3: Housing Target	The plan relies heavily on windfall development and subsequent 'Part 2' plans to meet housing targets, with no new allocations proposed in Broxtowe or Rushcliffe. Concerns about under-delivery. Broxtowe (33.3%), Nottingham City (37.8%), and Rushcliffe (22.3%). (34% across the GNSP 2024 Reg 19 area including Gedling).	The windfall assumptions are considered to be robust and evidenced, see Housing Background Paper Submission Addendum.	None	1261238 1261405 1260056 1260048 1258961 1258967 1259619 1259729 1262544 1243558 1243704 1246210 1247814 1243549 1243443 1243544 1245907	William Davis (Mr Tom Dillarstone) IM Land Persimmon Homes (DLP) Oxalis Planning (Mr Ben Holmes) John A Wells Ltd (Mr Brian Wells) Stantec (Oliver Haydon) Hinchley c/o Brown & Co Parker Strategic Land Ltd and William Davis Homes Hawksmoor Barwood Dev Securities Ltd William Davis (Mr Tom Dillarstone) IM Land Persimmon Homes (DLP) Oxalis Planning (Mr Ben Holmes)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
					John A Wells Ltd (Mr Brian Wells) Stantec (Oliver Haydon) Parker Strategic Land Ltd and William Davis Homes
Policy 3: Housing Target	Rather than rely on unproven levels of windfall development, the GNSP should instead, allocate a supply of specific sites that fully address LHNs. Potential double counting in Rushcliffe and Broxtowe.	The windfall assumptions are considered to be robust and evidenced, see Housing Background Paper Submission Addendum.	None	1261316 1261458 1261435 1261442	Bloor Homes (Sally Smith) Bloor Homes Limited (Sarah Milward)
Policy 3: Housing Target	The high windfall allowance for Nottingham City is not justified by evidence and may lead to double-counting.	The windfall assumptions are considered to be robust and evidenced, see Housing Background Paper Submission Addendum.	None	1262115 1262116 1262118 1261819	Marrons on behalf of a consortium of developers and land promotion companies MyPad (C/O Agent)
Policy 3: Housing Target	The City Council should clarify what element of the 7,612 dwellings on non-	See City Council assumptions in the Housing Background Paper Submission	None	1260975	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land (James Beverley)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	allocated sites supply is from commitments and what in essence forms windfall. In the 2023 SHLAA, about 2,400 dwellings are unallocated sites which do not form part of the Plan's small sites windfall allowance. Most of these sites are listed under the "10 or more dwellings without planning permission" category, but they do not meet the definition of deliverable or deliverable over the Plan period (and thus replace allocations). The City Council has chosen to use the last 6-year period to justify the highest level of windfall. The 10-year trend being significantly lower suggests a potentially more accurate or sustainable	Addendum, covering the make up of housing supply and revised windfall assumptions based on a ten year trend.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	position for future planning. The Councils should provide up to date monitoring data and assumptions ahead of the Examination and at adoption to ensure the Plan can be tested and confirmed as sound.				
Policy 3: Housing Target	Urban Uplift: Nottingham is required to provide a 35% uplift to housing need, but the GNPP has not fully accounted for this in the plan. The plan does not meet Nottingham City's local housing need (LHN) of 33,210 homes. Address unmet housing needs from Nottingham City within neighbouring authorities.	Not agreed, transitional requirements specify the use of Dec 2024 SM which does not include an urban uplift. Nottingham City's need is 22,451 according to 2024 Standard Method. There is no unmet City need	None	1261238 1260056 1260048 1260202 1259882 1260565 1260120 1260063 1262500 1261435 1261442 1259659 1259943 1259953 1259652	William Davis (Mr Tom Dillarstone) Persimmon Homes (DLP) Parker Strategic Land (C/O Agent) Mrs Hurst and Mr Richards Harworth Group Strawsons Stagfield Grp Home Builders Federation Bloor Homes Ltd (Sarah Milward) Hallam Land and Davidsons Developments

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
					William Davis Homes (Hannah Price)
Policy 3: Housing Target	The GNSP should be more aspirational in its housing delivery targets to support these economic ambitions. Recommend updating the housing and economic needs evidence to account for recent trends and key interventions.	Housing delivery and economic needs align, see Housing Background Paper March 2025.	None	1259604 1262115 1262116 1262118 1261819	Ceylon Tea Growers Association Marrons on behalf of a consortium of developers and land promotion companies MyPad (C/O Agent)
Policy 3: Housing Target	Recommend increasing the housing requirement to address affordable housing needs There is a significant need for affordable housing, with the net need for rented affordable housing across the GNSP area being 2,750 homes per annum. (3,037 across	The Standard Method already includes an affordability factor. Consideration has been given to affordability and viability in Policy 8 which draws on the Housing Needs and Plan-wide Viability Assessments.	None	1262115 1262116 1262118 1261819 1262469 1259652 1259619 1246792 1243757 1247141 1243711	Marrons on behalf of a consortium of developers and land promotion companies MyPad (C/O Agent) Gladman Developments Ltd William Davis Homes (Hannah Price) Haydon)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	the GNSP 2024 Reg 19 area including Gedling)				Stantec (Oliver Haydon) Gladman Dev Ltd William Davis Homes (Hannah Price) Haydon) Stantec (Oliver Haydon) Trinity College
Policy 3: Housing Target	Recommend incorporating a buffer for flexibility. Previous plan included a 10% buffer for flexibility, which is now removed. The buffer should be 10% Incorporate a buffer of 20% to ensure flexibility.	Although the Regulation 18 consultation did include a buffer, the NPPF does not refer to using a buffer. However, a lapse rate has been incorporated into the trajectory to allow for non delivery.	None	1262115 1262116 1262118 1261819 1259729 1260056 1260048 1258967 1258959 1258961 1259619 1259652	Marrons on behalf of a consortium of developers and land promotion companies MyPad (C/O Agent) Hinchley c/o Brown and Co Persimmon Homes(DLP) John A Wells Ltd (Mr Brian Wells) Mr R Taylor and Bloor Homes (Mr R Taylor) Oxalis Planning (Mr Ben Holmes) Stantec (Oliver Haydon)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
					William Davis Homes (Hannah Price)
Policy 3: Housing Target	The Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Local Plan (BCPLP) Examination took place There are considerable parallels between the GNSP and the BCPLP, in respect of a negatively prepared plan with demonstrable lack of cooperation before concluding the SM requirement could not be met and resorting to constraint-led justification for a de minimis approach. Given this risk, the Councils should not submit the Plan as is but to take the time to properly address its housing requirement and co-operate positively with its	All surrounding authorities have been engaged under the Duty to Cooperate (see relevant Statements of Common Ground).	None	1259659 1259943 1259953	Hallam Land and Davidsons Developments

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	neighbouring plan-making authorities.				
Policy 3: Housing Target	The housing target should align with the minimum housing requirement rather than the (200 below) 80% annual threshold of the transitional arrangements. Policy 3 states a minimum of 47,600 new homes will be provided, but the approach to this figure is considered flawed and not justified. The housing requirement has been contrived to meet transitional arrangements without sufficient evidence. Progressing the plan under the transitional arrangements is a short-sighted strategy	The GNSP targets comply with NPPF transitional arrangements. Progressing the GNSP to adoption now is considered to be a pragmatic approach to replace the 2014 Aligned Core Strategies, which are significantly out of date. To start plan making from scratch risks a very significant delay likely to be exacerbated by local government review, which is not programmed until 2028. The Government has stated how important it is for local authorities have an up-to-date local plan in place (Minister's letter to the	None	1261051 1261405 1262469 1262380 1260082 1262500	David Wilson Homes East Midlands IM Land Gladman Developments Ltd Hallam Land (C/O Agent) Mulberry Land (Mrs Emily Bishop) Home Builders Federation

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	The Councils using transitional arrangements to justify planning for (200 below) only 80% of the standard method housing requirement is disingenuous and fails to meet housing needs.	Inspectorate, Oct 2025 2024), and the quickest and most certain way to achieve this is to progress the GNSP through examination now, and using the transitional arrangements is therefore fully justified to achieve this. (See Housing Background Paper Submission Addendum).			
Policy 3: Housing Target	The housing figures are considered to be compliant with the transitional arrangements set out in the NPPF.	Comments noted	None	1259634	Derbyshire County Council
Policy 3: Housing Target	Strategic Sites: The plan places significant pressure on strategic sites, which can take a long time to deliver.	Housing Trajectories are based on latest information and considered robust.	None	1261405 1262380 1262115 1262116 1262118 1258434 1260056	IM Land Hallam Land (C/O Agent) Marrons on behalf of a consortium of developers and land

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Concerns about the deliverability of strategic sites like Toton and Chetwynd Barracks, Stanton Tip, Broad Marsh, and East of Gamston. which have not yet delivered completions despite long-standing allocations.			1260048 1260120 1261388 1261634 1261375 1261819	promotion companies Trustees of Hammond Farm Persimmon Homes (DLP) Strawsons Barratt David Wilson Homes and Averill Land Ltd Barratt David Wilson (North Midlands) (c/o agent) Barratt David Wilson (North Midlands) (c/o agent) MyPad (C/O Agent)
Policy 3: Housing Target	Analysis by Taylor Wimpey results in an overall reduction in the assumed delivery of the housing trajectory of the strategic allocations by 2,639 dwellings over the plan period (1,100 in Broxtowe, 655 in the City and 884). We suspect there is a	Trajectories are considered to be robust. (Refer to individual sites for delivery rates.) Most sites are allocated now, so planning permissions are not contingent on adoption of the GNSP.	None	1260975	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land (James Beverley)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	shortfall of supply up to 12,250 dwellings (to deliver at least a 10% buffer and depending on the justification on the SHLAA site delivery (see comments on windfall in the City)).				
Policy 3: Housing Target	Can we assume no further large housing development in East Leake? if so we support the Housing. East Leake has had a least 5 large housing developments over the last 5 Years.	The Policy currently states that there will be no further allocations in East Leake.	None	1260170 1242476 1242478 1242479	East Leake Parish Council Dominic Banks Philip Dunn Ms Mandy Taylor
Policy 3: Housing Target	We support the use of the standard method (with the 200 dwelling/80% reduction of the annual threshold) for Rushcliffe's housing target. Should the overall housing target for the plan area be increased, we believe this should be met	Noted.	None	1260887	Gotham Ward Parishes and Borough Councillors (Councillor Rex Walker)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	within Nottingham City. We support the production of the plan under the draft NPPF transitional arrangements.				
Policy 3: Housing Target	Broxtowe: Population trends from 2011-2021 are now largely redundant, impacting the need for new housing. The Broxtowe housing targets are over ambitious.	Noted.	None	1259784	Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum
Policy 3: Housing Target	Imbalance in the housing spatial strategy, with an over-reliance on sites in the south of Broxtowe. Doubts about the ability of current allocations to deliver the required housing numbers, especially in Awsworth. The need for a housing allocation in Awsworth to address the	South of Broxtowe has a stronger housing market than the north. The sites are considered appropriate and available over the Plan period.	None	1258192 1259533	Hall Construction Services Ltd

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	imbalance and ensure housing delivery.				
Policy 3: Housing Target	Amend the Broxtowe housing target to meet the minimum of 11,180 new homes. Include additional strategic sites to fulfil the housing allocation required during the plan period.	The plan is being progressed under NPPF Transitional Arrangements, for reasoning see the Housing Background Paper Submission Addendum.	None	1259463 1243671	Mr Terry Anthony
Policy 3: Housing Target	The newly published affordability ratio for 2024 (one of the inputs to the new SM formula) has already changed the SM calculation such that the Plan's housing target for Broxtowe no longer reaches 80% of the SM requirement.	NPPF transitional arrangements are clear that the relevant SM is Dec 2024.	None	1259659 1259943 1259953	Hallam Land and Davidsons Developments
Policy 3: Housing Target	Awsworth: Policy 3 (5) (a), APC support delivery of new homes only through existing commitments. As regards providing the	Noted, no further allocations are planned at Awsworth.	None	1262385 1259368 1259401	Awsworth Parish Council

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	350 new homes required in or adjoining Awsworth Key Settlement, APC supported this provision through the Awsworth Neighbourhood Plan, including an extension for 250 new dwellings. APC is concerned about the pressure on local facilities due to the significant increase in housing. APC believes that existing sites with planning permission should be developed before considering further Green Belt release.				
Policy 3: Housing Target	Nottingham City Shortfall**:** Nottingham City cannot meet its standard method-derived housing target, resulting in a projected shortfall of at least 2,608 dwellings.	Disagree, Nottingham City exceeds its need under the 2024 SM.	None	1290296 1262115 1262116 1262118 1261819 1260120 1258959	Ceylon Tea Growers Association Marrons on behalf of a consortium of developers and land promotion companies MyPad (C/O Agent)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Nottingham City's unmet housing need is not addressed, and there is no evidence of cooperation to meet this need within the plan area or with neighbouring authorities. Concerns about the achievability of housing targets due to lack of land and reliance on urbanisation and windfall				Strawsons Mr R Taylor and Bloor Homes (Mr R Taylor)
Policy 3: Housing Target	Boots site: The current draft policy could limit housing allocation to 613 dwellings, which fails to reflect the site's true potential. Boots advocates for up to 1,600 additional dwellings.	The Boots housing allocation is a minimum. Delivery of more homes is acceptable subject to compliance with the site specific policy and other policies of the GNSP	None	1262211	Boots UK (Mr Stephen Boyce)
Policy 3: Housing Target	Rushcliffe Housing Target: The anticipated	The approach to housing numbers is set	None	1259604	William Davis (Mr Tom Dillarstone)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	housing supply in Rushcliffe exceeds the target, but the increase in housing requirement raises concerns about under-delivery.	out in the Housing Background Paper 2025 and the Housing Background Paper Submission Addendum.			
Policy 3: Housing Target	Rushcliffe's proposed housing requirement is lower than its previous commitment and does not accommodate any neighbouring unmet need.	The approach to housing numbers is set out in the Housing Background Paper 2025 and the Housing Background Paper Submission Addendum	None	1290296	Ceylon Tea Growers Association
Policy 3: Housing Target	Rushcliffe Borough's Housing target appears to be set to fit within transitional arrangements, potentially leading to double under-provision. The housing trajectory for Rushcliffe Borough is unrealistic and may not be deliverable.	The approach to housing numbers is set out in the Housing Background Paper 2025 and the Housing Background Paper Submission Addendum	None	1261254 1261259 1260954 1261269 1261274 1259984 1259986 1292236	Taylor Wimpey (Land West of Ruddington) Cora (Matthew Westwood) Taylor Wimpey (Land West of Ruddington)
Policy 3: Housing Target	Amend the housing requirement for Rushcliffe to 14,950 homes and include an	The approach to housing numbers is set out in the Housing Background Paper	None	1260210	The Crown Estate (C/O Agent)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	extension of 800 homes at North Bingham to boost delivery in the latter half of the Plan period.	2025 and the Housing Background Paper Submission Addendum			
Policy 3: Housing Target	Rushcliffe's housing target is (11,360) 11,960 dwellings, but the new Standard Method and affordability ratio suggest a need for 15,408 dwellings.	The approach to housing numbers is set out in the Housing Background Paper 2025 and the Housing Background Paper Submission Addendum	None	1260565 1260063	Harworth Group Stagfield Grp
Policy 3: Housing Target	Rushcliffe has already exceeded it's previous target by a substantial amount. The current proposals do not meet community requirements – specifically Food Security, Houses (type and energy), Facilities, Draining & sewerage and Transport	Rushcliffe's housing target is considered appropriate. The community requirements will be considered at planning application stage.	None	1243787 1243112	Angelorange Ltd Angelorange Ltd

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 3: Housing Target	We fully support the housing targets for Rushcliffe as set out in Policy 3. We are hopeful that the overall Strategic Plan will be examined under the current 2023 NPPF.	Noted.	None	1258355	The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council
Policy 3: Housing Target	The strategic plan is unsound with regard to housing because Rushcliffe has already met the housing targets required of it. The plan should not require any additional housing development in Rushcliffe for the next ten years.	GNSP approach complies with government guidance.	None	1262210	Brennig Jones
Policy 3: Housing Target	We support the use of the standard method (within 200 dwellings of annual threshold) for the Rushcliffe Boroughs' housing target. Should the overall housing target for the plan area be	Support noted (although the transitional arrangements have now changed). Nottingham City's housing target is based on its evidenced housing supply, so	None	1249414 1249417	Consortium of Parish Councils

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	increased, we believe this should be met within Nottingham City (as per 2.3.3) which, when compared to other core English cities, has historically failed to deliver significant housing growth	increases to its housing target would not be justified or deliverable.			
Policy 3: Housing Target	More clarity is needed in respect of where and how these properties 'through existing commitments' are expected to be spread, and, what percentage of properties are likely to come forward as infill / windfall sites") and what "infill / windfall sites" will entail. More work could be done to provide reassurances to residents that house building will work towards the target rather than the housing	Existing commitments are included as allocations in Broxtowe and Rushcliffe's extant Part 2 Local Plans. Windfall and infill development is by its nature not possible to accurately project, however some housing supply from these sources is a reasonable assumption. The housing targets included in the GNSP are minimum figures,	None	1246846	James Naish MP

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	supply figure, and to explain how this buffer will or won't be used towards the end of the Strategic Plan period if house building is tracking ahead of target	so there is no mechanism to hold the difference between supply and target back from development.			
Policy 3: Housing Target	Housing is very much needed in the area. Whether this is housing for rent or sale, those responsible need to keep in mind the housing needs of those without families living with them.	Noted	None	1235739	Mr Craig McAlees
Policy 3: Housing Target	The housing target for Rushcliffe is too high	Noted.	None.	1253679	Mr Marc Shaw
Policy 3: Housing Target	East of Gamston/North of Tollerton: The housing target for Rushcliffe is (11,360) 11,960. This could still be met without this site.	Beyond 2030 East of Gamston/North of Tollerton provides for a significant proportion of Rushcliffe's housing delivery. It also provides housing	None	1258331 1258877 1235680 1235853 1236756 1239146	Mr Richard Farnsworth Mrs Beverley Leonard Mrs Ann Adkin Nick Stubbs Mr David Cottam Mr Mark Hickman

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Remove site from Policy 3	beyond the Plan period.		1242851 1242893 1243475	Mrs L Onyett Miss Natasha Jones Mr Darren Wheeler
Policy 3: Housing Target	Remove Policy 3.2i and Policy 31 re - Replace this strategic allocation with a new sustainable extension to Cotgrave	A new SUE in this location is not required.	None	1256822	Langridge Homes Ltd
Policy 3: Housing Target	Rushcliffe have had development in Cotgrave Kegworth, and Keyworth, please no more housing in Tollerton.	Beyond 2030 there is limited housing supply without East of Gamston/North of Tollerton, it also provides housing beyond the Plan period.	None	1258322	Tollerton Park. (Mr Ian Martin)
Policy 3: Housing Target	There was lack of consultation in the first place with due regard to the importance of having an airport for the City of Nottingham	The site has been subject to extensive consultation. It has been included in all consultation versions of the GNSP, and is an existing allocation in the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy.	None	1235850	Mrs Dawn Evans

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 3: Housing Target	Re Tollerton airport - No aviation stakeholders were advised on or included in planning and or consultation discussions prior to the plan being created. The proposed plan also contravenes regulations in place to prevent the loss of the UK general aviation network	The site has been subject to extensive consultation. It has been included in all consultation versions of the GNSP, and is an existing allocation in the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy.	None	1239614 1242644 1243601	MBC Ltd Margaret Grocock Stephen Messenger
Policy 3: Housing Target	Would like to see a more detailed plan of the areas considered for housing, so that it can be better identified.	Included in GNSP site specific Policies.	None	1258337	Mrs Janet Eastgate
Policy 3: Housing Target	Significant concern re pollution at the Airfield and its impact on health. The airfield is important for emergency services and future aviation opportunities. Believes	These issues will be considered at the planning application stage, and appropriate conditions imposed.	None	1258737 1256365 1255995 1257181 1257912	Mrs Barbara Pugh Mrs Hannah Foskett Coolex Heat Transfer Ltd (Captain Steve Parker) Jen Saunders Mrs Caroline Warren

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	there are more suitable areas for housing development nearby..			1258180 1258909	Mr Mike Godwin Mr William Howie
Policy 3: Housing Target	Support the site East of Gamston/North of Tollerton.	Noted.	None	1261292	Arc Partnership/ Nottinghamshire County Council
Policy 3: Housing Target	The housing target should align with the minimum housing requirement rather than the (200 below) 80% annual threshold of transitional arrangements.	See Housing Background Paper and Housing Background paper Submission Addendum.	None	1261634 1243588	Barratt David Wilson (North Midlands) (c/o agent) Barratt David Wilson Homes (Mr Robert Galij)
Policy 3: Housing Target	The housing numbers planned for Rushcliffe are broadly appropriate but only if infrastructure is developed in parallel.	Noted	None	1235676	Mr Chris Kemp
Policy 3: Housing Target	Other issues: Ensure the policies on new Housing targets and the use of 'grey belt' land are reflected in the final document. Land between and behind 126/130 Melton Road,	Grey Belt is not included in the 2023 NPPF which the GNSP is being examined under, but is relevant for planning decisions.	None	1259488	Mr Robert Wilson

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Stanton on the Wolds, Keyworth should be classed as 'grey' land.				
Policy 3: Housing Target	Policy 3 should include a requirement for future plans to allocate sites to meet the specific needs of different groups including older people and people wishing to commission or build their own homes. More sites should be allocated, including those for the elderly. The plan currently lacks provisions for retirement homes.	Policy 8 covers the needs of different groups. Detailed allocations may follow in future plan making.	None	1258671 1258967	Oxalis Planning (Mr Ben Holmes) John A Wells Ltd (Mr Brian Wells)
Policy 3: Housing Target	Other Issues: Unfortunately, Sport England does not have the resource to check all of the sites in this Policy to see if they include or have any impact on playing field	Noted.	None	1259912	Sport England

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	and/or built sport facilities and it is noted that some of these sites are existing commitments.				
Policy 3: Housing Target	Other Issues: Para 3.3.1: The approach is certainly not ambitious. The sentence should be removed.	Not agreed, the housing targets are considered to be ambitious, and accord with employment targets.	None	1258434	Trustees of Hammond Farm
Policy 3: Housing Target	Object to the lack of clarity over the statement at limb 6 of this policy which states that in other settlements development will be smaller scale as defined through future plan preparation. What 'future plan preparation' is being referred to here?	GNSP is a strategic plan and will be replaced in due course by a full local plan.	None	1260954 1261269 1261274 1292252	Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land (Land East of Gamston) Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land (Land East of Gamston)
Policy 3: Housing Target	Other Issues: Plan Period: Several respondees thought the plan period should be	Adoption is anticipated in December 2026, giving a 15 year time horizon.	None	1261292 1259984 1259986 1261634	Arc Partnership/ Nottinghamshire County Council

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	extended beyond 2041 to ensure 15 years from adoption. Suggests extending the plan period to at least 30 years to accommodate larger scale developments.			1243711	Cora (Matthew Westwood) Barratt David Wilson (North Midlands) (c/o agent) Trinity College
Policy 3: Housing Target	DIO supports the inclusion of Chetwynd Barracks within the list of Strategic Sites. DIO is confident that the site will deliver 1,200 homes within the plan period.	Comments noted	None.	1263731	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO)
Policy 3: Housing Target	Policy 3 is not underpinned by a national policy-compliant assessment of unconstrained housing need. The Plan and its evidence base does not demonstrate why the housing requirement should be restricted to an amount below that	The Government has stated how important it is for local authorities have an up-to-date local plan in place (Minister's letter to the Inspectorate, Oct 2025), and the quickest and most certain way to achieve this is to progress the GNSP	None.	1279662	Richborough Estates

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	indicated by the Standard Method. There is no justification within the GNSP or its evidence underpinning the assumptions about windfall development, but the reader is directed to the Joint Methodology Report for Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments dated January 2024, namely Appendix D, which contains supporting evidence for Nottingham City Council. It is not clear how the SHLAA has been sifted to avoid double-counting with other sources of supply, such as allocations. Localised housing needs have not been considered nor has the Framework's advice in regards to strategic policies defining a housing requirement for	through examination now, on the basis of the regulation 19 housing targets, and using the transitional arrangements is therefore fully justified to achieve this. If a new Local Plans process is begun now, there will be a further period of at least 3 years where no up to date Local Plans are in place, but with a high risk that the replacement Local Plans would face significant further delay due to uncertainties around Local Government Review. The GNSP targets comply with NPPF transitional arrangements. The windfall assumptions are considered to be robust and evidenced, see Housing			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	neighbourhood planning areas The housing requirement has not been subject to sufficient testing through the SA process Have considerable concerns over the assumed rate of windfall, as this is not justified by the evidence.	Background Paper Submission Addendum.			
Policy 3: Housing Target	Meeting only 80% of Broxtowe and Rushcliffe need means GNSP does not meet the standard method, therefore is not positively prepared. Given identified supply, there is no reason why GNSP cannot plan for the full housing need. There is an over-reliance on large SUEs which are failing to deliver as planned, eg	The overall provision is well above 80% when Nottingham City housing is taken into account. There is an urgent need to adopt a Plan to guide development now, rather than preparing new local plans from scratch, which would take a minimum of 3 years.		1259526	Aldergate Properties Ltd (C/O Agent)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Gamston and Toton/Chetwynd Barracks. Distribution fails to provide for Key Settlements There are overoptimistic projected annual delivery rates for housing and not reflective of past performance. There has been significant under-delivery of housing in Rushcliffe and Broxtowe, raising doubts about the plan's effectiveness. In addition, the lapse rate in housing delivery is insufficient, given historical under-delivery. GNSP restriction on allocation of new sites	The projected delivery rates are based on evidence and are considered to be realistic. The lapse rate is based on past trend analysis.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	in event of non delivery (RBC in particular) given RBC and BBC only delivering 80% of need.				
Policy 3 Housing Target	No Response / incomplete	N/A	N/A	1243698 1241161 1242324 & 1242326 1239848 & 1240784 1242482 1235221 1235581 1235837 1239835	Mrs Melody Cotes Mr Christopher Smith Ms Susan Bell Tor & co Ruth Morgan Mrs Paula King Lynette Armstrong Mrs Helen Joyce Mr Greg Dawson

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
				1242196 1242211 1242456 1243023 1243094 1242240 1243337 1243541	Mrs Dora Kostiuk Mrs Jackie Salmon Mrs Janet Burgess Beth Holmes Dr Joe Brennan Dr Ian Smillie Independent Clerk for School Admissions Barwood Development Securities Ltd
Policy 3 Housing Target	When Gedling was part of the plan many developers responded that the housing requirement across the GNSP 2024 Reg 19 area including Gedling of 54,670 homes is seen as flawed, not meeting the minimum need of 59,526 homes, 64,890 inc 35% urban	Gedling have withdrawn from the GNSP and are preparing a separate Local Development Plan. The general principle of the points made (increasing housing targets, reliance on windfall development, need for affordable	None.	1243381 1243798 1243704 & 1243718 1243711 1249408 1250397	Hammond Farm GRL Planning Barwood Development Trinity College Consortium of Developers Burhill Group Limited

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	uplift in Nottingham City. The GNSP should set a target of 78,087 homes (with 10% buffer). The plan relies heavily on windfall development and subsequent 'Part 2' plans to meet housing targets: 34% across the GNSP 2024 Reg 19 area including Gedling. There is a significant need for affordable housing.	housing) are addressed in responses to the 2025 version of the GNSP.			
Policy 3 Housing Target	Object to the allocation of sites in Gedling: Ravenshead, especially Silverland Farm and development near Ashfield inc Top Wighay Farm	Gedling have withdrawn from the GNSP and are preparing a separate Local Development Plan.		1249440 1243404 1235318 1235399 1235407 1235647 1239285 1241909	Sherwood Forest Conservatives and Cllr S Bestwick, includes 1,545 signatures. Gedling Borough Councillor Mr Peter Davies Mr Sean Staley Anthony Ducker

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
				1242567 1243699 1258925	Mrs Louise Gungaram-Rolp Mrs Louise Gilmore Mrs Jane Baxter Mrs Sue Henson Mrs Melody Cotes
Policy 3 Housing Target	Gedling housing target is too high	Gedling have withdrawn from the GNSP and are preparing a separate Local Development Plan		1242787	Calverton Parish Council

Policy 4

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 4: Green Belt	Land at Hollygate Lane, Cotgrave, should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing development, for a variety of reasons including that it would not jeopardise the merging of Nottingham and Derby.	The Councils consider that sufficient sites have been identified to meet the housing targets.	None	1261376	Barratt David Wilson Homes (North Midlands)
Policy 4: Green Belt	A full Green Belt review should be undertaken, as part of an update to the GNSP evidence base.	The need to undertake a full Green Belt Review was considered as part of the Green Belt Background Paper. It was concluded that there was a need for further Green Belt review focusing on updating the 'Broad Area' assessments, to inform the preparation	None	1261376 1261636 1261389 1261320 1261446 1261341 1261348 1261355	Barratt David Wilson Homes (North Midlands) Barratt David Wilson Homes (North Midlands) and Averill Land Bloor Homes Davidsons Developments

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		of the Strategic Plan. This was then was used as part of the evidence base and informed changes to Green Belt boundaries proposed as part of the Strategic Plan.		1261358 1259945 1259946 1262502 1261406 1258404 1260197 1260204 1261287 1262545 1261260 1261275 1261239 1260568 1259731 1260065 1259622	Hallam Land and Davidsons Developments Home Builders Federation IM Land Langridge Homes Parker Strategic Land Parker Strategic Land and William Davis Homes Taylor Wimpey Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land William Davis Homes Harworth Group Hinchley Stagfield Group Stantec

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
				1260122 1261335 1243707 1243719 1247793 1247805 1246223 1246760 1243785 1247184 1247000 1247042 1247132 1245811 1246642 1246707 1292253	Strawson Group Investments Whitefields Farm (Mr & Mrs Hammond) Barwood Development Securities Woolbro Morris Cameron Homes Taylor Wimpey and Barwood (Land East of Gamston)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 4: Green Belt	Land east of Church Lane, Brinsley should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing development.	The Councils consider that sufficient sites have been identified to meet the housing targets.	None	1261636	Barratt David Wilson Homes (North Midlands)
Policy 4: Green Belt	Land at Wheatcroft Island, Edwalton, should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing development, for a variety of reasons including that it would not jeopardise the merging of Nottingham and Derby.	The Councils consider that sufficient sites have been identified to meet the housing targets.	None	1261389 1246760	Barratt David Wilson Homes (North Midlands) and Averill Land
Policy 4: Green Belt	Land adjacent to the Toton and Chetwynd Barracks Strategic Allocation should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing and other development,	The Councils consider that sufficient sites have been identified to meet the housing targets. This site is currently subject to a planning application which is pending consideration.	None	1261446 1245888	Bloor Homes

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	for a variety of reasons including that it would enable access to the Strategic Allocation.				
Policy 4: Green Belt	Land at Nicker Hill, Keyworth should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing development.	The Councils consider that sufficient sites have been identified to meet the housing targets.	None	1261341 1247000	Davidsons Developments
Policy 4: Green Belt	Land at West Leake Road, East Leake should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing development.	The Councils consider that sufficient sites have been identified to meet the housing targets.	None	1261348	Davidsons Developments
Policy 4: Green Belt	Land south of Gamston, north of Tollerton should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing development.	The Councils consider that sufficient sites have been identified to meet the housing targets.	None	1261355 1247042	Davidsons Developments

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 4: Green Belt	Land east of Gypsum Way, Gotham should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing development.	The Councils consider that sufficient sites have been identified to meet the housing targets.	None	1261358	Davidsons Developments
Policy 4: Green Belt	Land north of Memorial Hall, Cropwell Bishop should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing development.	The Councils consider that sufficient sites have been identified to meet the housing targets. The site is also below the size which would be appropriate for allocation in a Strategic Plan.	None	1247132	Davidsons Developments
Policy 4: Green Belt	The policy should say that Part 2 Local Plans should undertake further reviews of Green Belt boundaries to identify opportunities for non-strategic development.	This is covered by the existing policy wording which states "Green Belt boundaries will be reviewed through future plan preparation to meet the other development land requirements of the Strategic Plan…. 2.	None	1290030 1262223 1246723 1243535	Aldergate Properties Ltd (C/O Agent) Bloor Homes

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		Where it is necessary to review Green Belt boundaries to deliver the distribution of development in Policies 3 and 5, a sequential approach will be used as set out in Policy 2 to guide site selection"			
Policy 4: Green Belt	There has been a lack of engagement with Derbyshire districts, particularly Erewash, and with Derbyshire and Leicestershire on strategic cross-boundary matters including the Green Belt.	Cross boundary engagement has taken place as part of preparing the Strategic Plan, including on Green Belt issues, as documented in Statements of Common Ground.	None	1259945 1243785 1247184	Hallam Land and Davidsons Developments
Policy 4: Green Belt	Land east of Kingston-upon-Soar should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for a new settlement.	The Councils consider that sufficient sites have been identified to meet the housing targets.	None	1259945 1243785 1247184	Hallam Land and Davidsons Developments

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 4: Green Belt	The Plan should give explicit consideration to whether 'BNG development' is acceptable within the Green Belt and whether Green Belt boundaries need to be reviewed to accommodate schemes that deliver biodiversity gains.	Any BNG development in the Green Belt would be subject to normal policies for controlling development in the Green Belt. It is considered that there is no need to review Green Belt boundaries to accommodate BNG.	None	1262502 1246223	Home Builders Federation
Policy 4: Green Belt	Land north and south of Plumtree Road, Cotgrave should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing development.	The Councils consider that sufficient sites have been identified to meet the housing targets.	None	1261406 1246214	IM Land
Policy 4: Green Belt	Land south of Nottingham Road, Trowell should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for mixed-use development.	The Councils consider that sufficient sites have been identified to meet the housing and employment targets.	None	1260197 1260204 1245811	Parker Strategic Land

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 4: Green Belt	Land at Colston Gate, Cotgrave should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing development.	The Councils consider that sufficient sites have been identified to meet the housing targets.	None	1261287 1246642	Parker Strategic Land
Policy 4: Green Belt	Land at 'Catstone Green', Broxtowe should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing development.	The Councils consider that sufficient sites have been identified to meet the housing targets.	None	1262545 1259622 1245909	Parker Strategic Land and William Davis Homes Stantec
Policy 4: Green Belt	The policy should incorporate triggers (such as those relating to land supply and affordability) for a comprehensive review of the Plan, including Green Belt boundaries.	Monitoring indicators are included in the Strategic Plan. Triggers are not considered necessary as in the event of the plan not delivering, a full review of the plan would take place.	None	1260049 1260055	Persimmon Homes

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 4: Green Belt	Land west of Moorgreen, Broxtowe should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing development.	The Councils consider that sufficient sites have been identified to meet the housing targets.	None	1260049	Persimmon Homes
Policy 4: Green Belt	Land west of Pasture Lane, Ruddington should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing development.	The Councils consider that sufficient sites have been identified to meet the housing targets.	None	1261260	Taylor Wimpey
Policy 4: Green Belt	Land east of Gamston should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing development.	The Councils consider that sufficient sites have been identified to meet the housing targets.	None	1261275 1292253	Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land Taylor Wimpey and Barwood (Land East of Gamston)
Policy 4: Green Belt	The Plan should identify further housing allocations (and safeguarded land), to ensure adequate supply and/or avoid the need for Green Belt review	Sufficient supply has been identified so there is no need to review the Green Belt at the current time. Allocations within the plan, which include sites removed	None	1260976 1259661 1260568 1261299	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land William Davis Homes Harworth Group Northern Land Trust

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	immediately or at the end of the Plan period.	from the Green Belt as part of previous plans, will deliver beyond the plan period. Should development need to change in the future, a full Green Belt review will be undertaken at that time.		1260099 1245765 1246942	
Policy 4: Green Belt	Land at Chilwell Lane, Bramcote should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing development.	The Councils consider that sufficient sites have been identified to meet the housing targets.	None	1260976 1245765	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land
Policy 4: Green Belt	Land south of Platt Lane, Keyworth should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing development.	The Councils consider that sufficient sites have been identified to meet the housing targets.	None	1261239	William Davis Homes
Policy 4: Green Belt	Land at Wilford Road, Ruddington should be removed from the Green Belt and	The Councils consider that sufficient sites have	None	1259661 1243767	William Davis Homes

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	allocated for housing development.	been identified to meet the housing targets.		1247139	
Policy 4: Green Belt	Land at Cotgrave Wood, Cotgrave, Rushcliffe should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for older persons housing development.	The Councils consider that sufficient sites have been identified to meet the housing targets.	None	1291587	Alexandra Blue (Cotgrave) Ltd Director - PMC Land and Planning Limited (Mr Philip Coyne)
Policy 4: Green Belt	Further employment land should be released from the Green Belt.	Office and warehouse needs have been fully met. The logistics study identifies a need for logistics across the Nottingham inner and outer Housing Market Areas. This has been partially addressed in the Strategic Plan area, where Green Belt sites accessible by rail have been allocated.	None	1261603	Wilson Bowden Developments.

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 4: Green Belt	Land at New Farm, Nuthall should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for 'general employment development' / 'large scale and strategic employment provision'.	The logistics study identifies a need for logistics across the Nottingham inner and outer Housing Market Areas. This has been partially addressed in the Strategic Plan area, where Green Belt sites accessible by rail have been allocated.	None	1261603 1261592 1258566 1261594 1242838	Wilson Bowden Developments
Policy 4: Green Belt	Broadly supports the proposals for Bennerley, including removal from the Green Belt, however, considers that sufficient and effective safeguards are needed regarding a range of matters.	Comments noted and dealt with in detail under Policy 22.	None	1262386 1243694	Awsworth Parish Council
Policy 4: Green Belt	References to 'Land at the Former Bennerley Coal Disposal Point' are incorrect and	This refers to the site name. It is considered the wider site is	None	1262386 1243694	Awsworth Parish Council

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	misleading, as the allocation site includes other adjoining land.	identifiable through the site diagram.			
Policy 4: Green Belt	Strongly supports the principle of the Nottingham-Derby Green Belt being maintained and enhanced, given that the areas immediately between, and north of, Nottingham and Derby are strategically the most important areas of the Green Belt.	Comments noted.	None	1259646	Derbyshire County Council
Policy 4: Green Belt	Considers that the changes to the Green Belt at Bennerley, Ratcliffe and Toton/Chetwynd are justified.	Comments noted.	None	1259646 1259648 1246322	Derbyshire County Council
Policy 4: Green Belt	The removal of the Ratcliffe power station	Comments noted.	None	1260914 1259945	East Midlands Freeport

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	site from the Green Belt is supported.			1243662 1243684 1243662	Hallam Land and Davidsons Developments Uniper UK
Policy 4: Green Belt	A justification for changes to the Green Belt at Ratcliffe power station should be set out in the justification text.	Justification has been set out as part of the evidence base, including the Green Belt Background Paper. Propose that additional text should be added to the justification text for Policy 32.	See Suggested Main Modifications Document for proposed wording.	1260914	East Midlands Freeport
Policy 4: Green Belt	They are unclear as to the extent to which the proposed removal of Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station from the Green Belt complies with the requirements to a) establish a permanent, defensible boundary and b) offset the impact of removal through compensatory	Green Belt boundaries have been drawn to establish a permanent, defensible boundary, following the line of the previous power station site. Compensatory improvements are identified as part of the policy through	None	1260889 1249418	Gotham Ward Parishes and Borough Councillors Consortium of Parish Councils

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land.	landscape enhancements.			
Policy 4: Green Belt	Strongly supports Green Belt release at the Former Bennerley Coal Disposal Point; however, the Green Belt Background Paper, and potentially other evidence base documents, should be amended so as to clearly set out the exceptional circumstances.	Exceptional circumstances are set out in Policy 22 and within the Green Belt Background Paper.	None	1260096 1243524	Harworth Group
Policy 4: Green Belt	The Green Belt Background Paper should be updated, to reflect Gedling leaving the GNSP.	It is considered that Gedling leaving the GNSP does not fundamentally change the contents of the Green Belt Background Paper.	None	1260568	Harworth Group

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 4: Green Belt	Land at Melton Road, Tollerton should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing development.	The Councils consider that sufficient sites have been identified to meet the housing targets.	None	1260568 1246820	Harworth Group
Policy 4: Green Belt	The policy should clarify its reference to 'future plan preparation'.	Future plan preparation refers to the next local plans and it is considered no further clarification in the policy is required.	None	1259731	Hinchley
Policy 4: Green Belt	Nottingham Airfield should revert to Green Belt status.	The site is allocated for development in the Strategic Plan and forms a key element of future housing supply.	None	1259703	Mr Nigel Barkley
Policy 4: Green Belt	Land south of Nottingham Road, Cropwell Bishop should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing development.	The Councils consider that sufficient sites have been identified to meet the housing targets.	None	1259881 1246977	Mr Richards and Mrs Hurst

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 4: Green Belt	Objects to housing development on Green Belt land, especially at Tollerton airport.	Comments noted.	None	1258641	Mrs Clare Farley
Policy 4: Green Belt	Land at Coventry Lane, Bramcote should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing development.	The Councils consider that sufficient sites have been identified to meet the housing targets.	None	1261822 1261816 1245780	MyPad
Policy 4: Green Belt	Land at Bunny should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing development.	The Councils consider that sufficient sites have been identified to meet the housing targets.	None	1261299 1246942	Northern Land Trust
Policy 4: Green Belt	The Lady Bay Sports site should be removed from the Green Belt and designated as an 'important sports hub'.	Consider that there are no exceptional circumstances to release the site from the Green Belt. Any planning applications related to the site would consider whether Very	None	1258655 1243192	Nottinghamshire Sports Properties

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		Special Circumstances exist.			
Policy 4: Green Belt	Land north of Butt Lane, East Bridgford should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing development.	The Councils consider that sufficient sites have been identified to meet the housing targets.	None	1260065 1246707	Stagfield Group
Policy 4: Green Belt	Land at Cossall Road, Trowell should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing development.	The Councils consider that sufficient sites have been identified to meet the housing targets.	None	1260122 1260155 1260154 1245717	Strawson Group Investments
Policy 4: Green Belt	There should be a review of the safeguarded land status of Edwalton Golf Course.	There has been no change in circumstances which would justify reviewing the safeguarded status at this stage. Whilst not required at the current time, it is retained as a	None	1258364 1238580	The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		long-term development option.			
Policy 4: Green Belt	Part 1 of the policy should be amended to say that land off Lodge Farm Lane (Stockings Farm), Arnold is allocated as a strategic housing site.	The site does not fall within the Strategic Plan area.	None	1258435 1258404 1243429 1250338 1250376	Trustees of Hammond Farm Langridge Homes
Policy 4: Green Belt	Safeguarded land that is considered suitable for housing should be changed to housing allocations 'at the first opportunity'.	The Councils consider that sufficient sites have been identified to meet the housing targets without amending existing safeguarded land.	None	1258435 1258404 1243429 1250338 1250376	Trustees of Hammond Farm Langridge Homes
Policy 4: Green Belt	Land at Margidunum, north of Bingham should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for employment development.	The Councils consider that sufficient sites have been identified to meet the employment targets.	None	1261335	Whitefields Farm (Mr &Mrs Hammond)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 4: Green Belt	Land west of Woodhouse Way, Nuthall should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for strategic distribution development. Exceptional circumstances exist due to unmet need.	The site was considered in the site selection process for strategic distribution sites, but not selected due to its Green Belt status. It is not considered exceptional circumstances exist to justify further release.	None	1290065	Stantec (Jonathan Protheroe)
Policy 4: Green Belt	Land west of Woodhouse Way, Nuthall should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing and/or employment development.	The Councils consider that sufficient sites have been identified to meet the housing and employment targets.	None	1259868	Mrs Rachel Salmon
Policy 4: Green Belt	States it is short sighted that the 3 GNSP authorities are not updating their Green Belt Assessment to consider Grey Belt post	The Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan will be assessed under the 2023 National Planning Policy Framework and	None	1279664	Richborough Estates

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	December 2024. It also does not appear that Nottingham City and Broxtowe have taken the same approach as Rushcliffe. The significant contribution that could be made to the affordable housing supply by Grey Belt sites is likely to have been vastly underrepresented. This is a missed opportunity. Queries whether the Authorities propose to prepare separate evidence in respect of grey belt for development management purposes?	therefore does not need to consider the introduction of grey belt. A joint methodology has been followed and an updated Green Belt Framework has been prepared which will be used to inform Green Belt Reviews as part of future plan preparation. It is considered that it is not necessary to undertake a further Green Belt Review at this time.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	It is considered prudent to take the opportunity to undertake further green belt assessment and consider the potential contribution from Grey Belt sites prior to progressing further. As such, there are soundness questions to consider in respect of how justified the strategy set out within the GNSP is in terms of its appropriateness as a strategy and the lack of reasonable alternatives which have been considered in the light of a significant Grey Belt policy shift that should not simply be ignored because Grey Belt appears only in the December 2024 NPPF.				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 4: Green Belt	Policy is supported	Noted	None	1243660 1241162	Uniper UK Mr Christopher Smith
Policy 4: Green Belt	Green Belt land near Ravenshead should not be developed for housing.	Gedling no longer forms part of the Plan area.	None	1242614 1243029 1235314 1242284 1235482 1242098 1242219 1242929 1243499 1243372 1243461 1243777	Mrs Catherine Haskew Ms Susan Bell Mr Robert Hurst Mrs Carol Wright Mrs Rachel Hallam Mr C Bentley Mrs Susan Hopkins Mr John Proudley Ms Melissa Solomon Miss Faye Handfield Mr Adam Kingswood Ms Charlotte Powell
Policy 4: Green Belt	The policy should be amended to reflect the	The Plan will be examined on the basis	None	1243383 1243517	Geoffrey Prince Associates Hammond Farms

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	December 2024 version of the NPPF.	of the 2023 version of the NPPF.			
Policy 4: Green Belt	Land off Lodge Farm Lane, Arnold should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing development.	Gedling no longer forms part of the Plan area.	None	1243383 1243517	Geoffrey Prince Associates Hammond Farms
Policy 4: Green Belt	The Plan is not legally compliant with regard to policy 4. (Reasons are not given.)	Disagree.	None	1243428	Geoffrey Prince Associates
Policy 4: Green Belt	The Plan is not legally compliant or sound with regard to policy 4. (Reasons are not given.)	Disagree.	None	1235259 1242227	Mr Hayden Lester Mr Navaz Dean
Policy 4: Green Belt	The Plan is legally compliant, sound and complies with the Duty to Co-operate with regard to policy 4.	Comments noted.	None	1242316	Ms Susan Bell

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 4: Green Belt	The Plan is not legally compliant or sound and does not comply with the Duty to Co-operate with regard to policy 4. (Reasons are not given.)	Disagree.	None	1242323 1243249	Ms Susan Bell Ms Melissa Solomon
Policy 4: Green Belt	The policy should state that Green Belt reviews should be undertaken immediately after adoption of the Strategic Plan.	Green Belt reviews will be undertaken shortly by all the Greater Nottingham authorities.	None	1243560	Hawksmoor
Policy 4: Green Belt	Land south of Flawforth Lane, Ruddington should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing development.	The Councils consider that sufficient sites have been identified to meet the housing targets.	None	1243707	Barwood Development Securities
Policy 4: Green Belt	Land at Middlebeck Farm, Mapperley Plains should be removed from the Green Belt and	Gedling no longer forms part of the Plan area.	None	1243719	Barwood Development Securities

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	allocated for housing development.				
Policy 4: Green Belt	Land at Cornwater, Ravenshead should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing development.	Gedling no longer forms part of the Plan area.	None	1247793	Woolbro Morris
Policy 4: Green Belt	Land east of the B684, Mapperley should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing development.	Gedling no longer forms part of the Plan area.	None	1247805	Cameron Homes
Policy 4: Green Belt	Land at Ramsdale Park Golf Centre should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing development.	Gedling no longer forms part of the Plan area.	None	1250400	Burhill Group
Policy 4: Green Belt	The boundary of the Green Belt at Toton and	Disagree, as this land is an appropriate allocation which will make an important	None	1243748	Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Chetwynd Barracks should not be recast.	contribution to housing provision.			
Policy 4: Green Belt	The policy should be amended with regard to safeguarded sites in Gedling,	Gedling no longer forms part of the Plan area.	None	1247820	Persimmon Homes
Policy 4: Green Belt	The policy wording should be amended to say that Green Belt reviews in Part 2 Local Plans should be in accordance with the NPPF and should achieve sustainable development.	The current wording is considered to be appropriate.	None	1246024	Aldergate Properties
Policy 4: The Green Belt	Objects to the release of further Green Belt land round Key Settlements which have seen significant new housing development unless this is "truly Grey Belt"	Councils are required to undertake a Green Belt review to identify Grey Belt land within their areas. Sites can currently only be removed from the Green Belt through a new local plan.	None	1291863 1290342	Keyworth Parish Council (Mary Butler) Keyworth Parish Council (Mary Butler)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 4: The Green Belt	Pressing need to review Green Belt boundaries due to unmet need. No justification for not doing so now, but GNSP defers further Green Belt review to future plan-making.	Green Belt review is not required to meet housing targets at the present time.	None	1291823	Cora Homes (Mr Robbie Locke)

Policy 5

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 5	Need new offices rather than student accommodation in the City and around NG2 to encourage businesses.		None	1243322 1243462 1243463	Mr Atif Muneer
Policy 5	Whilst we are not proposing any sites of out own, the GNPP are not proposing to provide the identified requirement as per the ELS and Iceni Study and instead are seeking to prioritise protection of the Green Belt. We therefore consider the Plan and Policy 5 to be unsound it its current form and that further consideration for Green Belt release is needed.	The Strategic Plan as a whole has identified a sufficient supply of general industry and warehousing for the plan period. A shortfall has been identified across the Logistics Study area. However, this is larger than the Strategic Plan area. It is considered that two appropriate sites have been identified for logistics development in the Strategic Plan, both of which benefit from	None	1246777	Barratt David Wilson Homes (North Midlands) and Averill Land Limited

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		potential rail access. Alternative sites were assessed and considered not appropriate due to a number of constraints, including Green Belt.			
Policy 5	Supports the policy	Noted	None	1241163 1241165	Mr Christopher Smith
Policy 5	Based upon the representation made amount of office, research and development space to be provided in Gedling should be increased from 8,000 sqm to 20,000 sqm. Land at Lodge Farm Lane (SHLAA Ref G462) should be added to the list of	Gedling Borough Council are no longer part of the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan.	None	1243386	Hammond Farms (Mr Robert Hammond)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	strategic employment sites under 1 (d)				
Policy 5	The city and the plan area as a whole is not creating enough office developments, industrial developments and hospitality developments on a large scale compared to other big cities in the country.	It is considered that policy 5 is constructed in a way to identify the most suitable areas for employment development together with directing such development to the most appropriate locations.	None	1243462	Mr Atif Muneer
Policy 5	Policy 5 (Employment Provision and Economic Development) is unambitious in its aim and fails to refer to or recognise the NPPF's policy on commercial development. Up to date reviews and appropriate sites for commercial	It is considered that there is no need for the supporting text to commit to future studies or to future policy development. The nature and scope of policy development and supporting evidence is a matter to consider alongside future Local	None	1243563	Hawksmoor (Jonathan Wood)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	development which meet the needs of a modern economy should be identified in line with paragraph 87 of the NPPF, including suitable locations for uses such as laboratories, gigafactories, data centres, digital infrastructure, freight, and logistics. Reference should be made to further reports being commissioned in line with future plan preparation (and Local Plan Part 2 documents) to revisit the amount of land required for commercial development and to examine whether sites currently allocated are	Plan reviews for the respective authorities.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	deliverable and continue to be appropriate. Policies in the Strategic Plan should make it clear that Local Plan Part 2 evidence base and consultation documents will be commenced immediately post adoption of the Strategic Plan.				
Policy 5	Support the provision of 68,000 square metres of *"development [within Rushcliffe] falling within Use Class E(g(i)-(ii) (secured by condition) as part of providing for a science and knowledge-based economy"*.	Support welcomed	None	1246847	Member of Parliament (Mr James Naish)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 5	The Strategic Plan sets out welcome and ambitious objectives for growth and development, however it could be strengthened further by providing more detail on how skills and training infrastructure will be developed, particularly through partnership working with education providers. The deliverability of major projects requires careful coordination of skills provision (including the development of new curricula or facilities where required) with development timelines. It could also more explicitly demonstrate how skills development	Support welcomed. The strategic plan concerns itself with the development and use of land. The additional suggested text is not required in relation to the development and use of land.	None	1243784	Nottingham College (Mr James Swift)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	will support national priorities, particularly around economic growth and the transition to net zero.				
Policy 5	*To enable flexibility, we recommend criteria c is amended as per the following text.* ~~*considering*~~ *the release* of sites for **other sustainable development opportunities** that do not meet criteria (a) and (b) **or are no longer suitable, deliverable or viable as employment**	The policy is framed so as to meet as much of the identified employment need as possible under specific uses. It is not considered to be necessary to amend the policy to contain the suggested get-out clause. 'Other sustainable development opportunities' is a broad statement that would significantly weaken the emphasis of the policy.	None	1246039	Carter Jonas (Laura Stops)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	development; and. It would be beneficial if either the policy itself or the explanatory text provides guidance on the information likely to be required in order to demonstrate that sites are no longer suitable, deliverable or viable for employment development. We recommend that this should include a proportionate list of evidence such as a Viability Assessment. Historically, applications have included such assessments to show that previous land use, does not automatically mean that a site is viable or deliverable.				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 5	Policy 5, Point d references 128 hectares of *"industrial and warehousing space"*. I am concerned, without more information, about the majority of the latter falling into Rushcliffe (73.8% of the 173.5-hectare total) which seems disproportionately high, and I am unclear on where this will be located (largely on the Freeport site, as per the text towards the end of point 3.5.7?). Industrial should always be preferable to warehousing space due to the higher-quality jobs likely to be on offer. The link	See employment background paper. Apart from East of Gamston-North Of Tollerton, and aside from a small windfall assumption, this supply comes from development that already has planning permission or indeed from the power station site. Supply figures are based on information contained within the relevant planning permissions and the Local Development Order.	None	1246847	Member of Parliament (Mr James Naish)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	between these statements and Policy 32 (and similar policies) can and should be clearer.				
Policy 5	Awsworth Parish Council has a legitimate and close interest in the proposals for the Strategic Allocation at Bennerley. Were the development to go ahead, the Parish Council want to ensure that impacts on the parish and wider area are minimised, with appropriate compensatory measures and enhancement provided, and that tangible lasting benefits are delivered for the local community	Comments noted. The policy includes measures, including the delivery of a country park, which will benefit the wider area and provide compensatory measures.	None	1243697 1262387	Awsworth Parish Council

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	of Awsworth and surrounding area.				
Policy 5	Policy 5 only provides allocations for 97.4ha of strategic distribution. When taking into consideration the existing supply this increases to a total of 124.4ha. Taking into account the calculated need under the regeneration scenario this demonstrates a shortfall of between 14.6 – 30.6ha of land for strategic distribution purposes.	A shortfall has been identified across the Logistics Study area. However, this is larger than the Strategic Plan area. It is considered that two appropriate sites have been identified for logistics development in the Strategic Plan, both of which benefit from potential rail access. Alternative sites were assessed and considered not appropriate due to a number of constraints, including Green Belt.	None	1261396, 1246953 1261368 1259630	Barratt David Wilson (Boyer) Knightwood developments (Boyer) Richborough Estates
Policy 5	The opportunity for windfall sites to come forward is likely to be	Past monitoring by the 3 councils indicates that windfall sites have	None	1261396, 1261368	Barratt David Wilson (Boyer)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	limited through the plan period given the constraints in relation to Green Belt and absence of policy support for non-allocated employment sites to come forward through the wording of the policy.	contributed to the overall development of employment land and space. There are no indications that this will not continue throughout the plan period. Changes to the approach to Green Belt in the 2024 NPPF may also support future delivery of windfall sites.			Knightwood developments (Boyer)
Policy 5	The Employment Background Paper (March 2025 Paragraph 9.8) states that further sites are likely to come forward in adjoining authorities and the situation will be kept under review and be subject to the Duty to Cooperate. However, there is no evidence that the GNPP have initiated	The GNSP authorities have engaged with neighbouring authorities and have produced Statements of Common Ground. This work included identifying sources of logistics supply coming forward outside of the GNSP area.	None	1261396, 1261368	Barratt David Wilson (Boyer) Knightwood developments (Boyer)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	discussions or agreement with neighbouring authorities to understand what sites may come forward outside of the spatial plan area.				
Policy 5	North West Leicestershire District Council have outlined how there is a shortfall within the GNPP Plan area which needs to be addressed as a priority. Therefore we consider this evidences that there is a lack of support from surrounding authorities and reinforces that the GNPP need to plan properly to meet its requirements in full through the allocation	The latest response from NW Leicestershire DC to policy 32 (Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station, comment ID 1260078) states that they consider that the plan is justified in terms of both future housing and employment requirements.	None	1261396 1261368	Barratt David Wilson (Boyer) Knightwood Developments (Boyer)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	of sites through the GNSP.				
Policy 5	There are available sites being promoted for employment development by others in the vicinity of our Wheatcroft proposal.	It is considered that the site in the vicinity of the named site, known as the "Melton Road Triangle" is unsuitable for allocation for the reasons outlined in Strategic Distribution Background Paper (See https://www.gnplan.org.uk/media/jutp1fmp/strategic-distribution-background-paper-approved.pdf site reference RBC-L10.	None	1261396	Barratt David Wilson (Boyer)
Policy 5	Consider the GNPP's response to this does not 'broadly match' the employment forecasts set out within the ELS. As set out above the GNSP does not properly plan for the	The GNSP is meeting the employment need as identified within the Regeneration Scenario of ELS and is meeting a significant amount of logistics need through the allocation of two	None	1261396	Barratt David Wilson (Boyer)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	employment land requirement across the Plan area. In our view, this exemplifies the clear need for further land and that a Green Belt review would help to identify this.	logistics sites. A shortfall has been identified across the Logistics Study area. However, this is larger than the Strategic Plan area.			
Policy 5	Broadly supportive of site at Bennerley, however it is located in a sensitive part of the Green Belt that prevents the merging of a number of settlements therefore sensitive design required.	Comments noted. The proposed country park will retain a Green Belt gap between settlements.	None	1259648	Derbyshire County Council
Policy 5	The Councils' employment evidence (namely the Employment Background Paper, Sept 2024, and Employment Land	Duty to cooperate statements have been produced to demonstrate engagement which has taken place with	None	1259946 1243788	Hallam Land Management and Davidsons

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Needs Study, May 2021) attempts to absolve any need for regional co-operation by contending that the Nottingham Core Housing Market Area is in complete alignment with the Functional Economic Market Area. This is untrue, most pertinently at the East Midlands Airport and Gateway Industrial Cluster which sits at the confluence of the three East Midlands counties and, as a newly designated Freeport, is primed to be the main driver of economic growth (and associated requirement for housing and sustainable transport	neighbouring authorities. The allocation at the former Ratcliffe-on-Soar Power Station is a significant contribution to employment growth within the Freeport area.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	infrastructure to support travel between jobs and homes) in the region.				
Policy 5	It is unusual that the wording of Policy 5 does not establish an explicit target for new job creation, nor is there clear alignment between job growth and housing growth.	The jobs number is set out in the Employment Background Paper and has been translated into business space which is within the policy. The Housing Background Paper (March 2025) provides an analysis of housing supply and job growth. The employment figures in the policy are based on the regeneration scenario.	None	1243788 1259946	Hallam Land Management and Davidsons
Policy 5	The supporting employment evidence is, by its own admission, out of date.	The Councils have reviewed ELS and have updated the need figures based on the	None	1243788 1259946	Hallam Land Management and Davidsons

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Paragraph 10.19, within the conclusion of the ELNS 2021, states that "The considerable uncertainty regarding changing work practices presented by the pandemic and further uncertainties concerning the implications of Brexit means that these conclusions should be revisited by the Councils and monitored as and when new data on the fallout from the 'new economic normal' becomes more clearly apparent in the years to come."	plan period. The implications of the pandemic in terms of home working have not yet been fully realised but the Councils will continue to monitor the situation. The same evidence was used to support Erewash Borough Council's Core Strategy examination and whilst the inspector required further work on elements of the Core Strategy in relation to other matters, no such conclusions were made in respect of the employment evidence.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 5	Although the selection of the power station site for employment redevelopment is entirely reasonable and justifiable due to the unique opportunity it presents, its selection has clearly not influenced the preferred spatial strategy. Any complementary growth to support this economic driver appears to have been discounted at the outset.	It is considered that whilst the power station represents a redevelopment opportunity supported by its allocation in the Strategic Plan, the most sustainable spatial strategy is to focus most development in and around the main Nottingham conurbation and to a lesser extent in and around key settlements across the plan area.	None	1243788 1259946	Hallam Land Management and Davidsons
Policy 5	The allocation of our client's site, the former Bennerley Coal Disposal Point, for 61 hectares of strategic distribution floorspace in Draft Policy 5 (Employment Provision	Support is welcomed.	None	1260099 1243525	Harworth Estates (Pegasus) Harworth Group

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	and Economic Development) is strongly supported.				
Policy 5	Policy 5 is considered sound subject to the following being included in the supporting text. The supporting text should be clearer that the Ratcliffe Power Station site is already taken into account in identifying a residual need for strategic distribution land and therefore Bennerley is the only proposed site meeting this residual need. The presentation of the total supply of 123.6 hectares is misleading in this context.	This is a matter of presentation. There has been no double counting, as demonstrated within the detailed supply analysis within the Employment Background Paper. The total supply reflects the allocations being made within the Strategic Plan.	None	1260099 1243525	Harworth Estates (Pegasus) Harworth Group

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 5	Ratcliffe-on-Soar Power Station lies within RBC and is one of three sites within the East Midlands Freeport, planned for redevelopment to create a zero-carbon technology and energy hub for the East Midlands. The Power Station will be within a 30-minute drive of Cotgrave. It is anticipated that Ratcliffe-on-Soar Power Station will create around 8,697 full time equivalent jobs. In total, it is expected that almost 24,000 jobs will be created by the Freeport. It is critical that the local planning	It is considered that the plan makes enough provision for housing to support employment growth proposed, in the most suitable locations. The Housing Background Paper provides additional analysis comparing employment need and housing need.	None	1246216 1261407	IM Land

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	authorities nearby (including RBC) are ambitious with their plans for housing growth over the next 20 years. Residential development must keep pace with the job growth anticipated by the Freeport to ensure that there is a sufficient work force located nearby.				
Policy 5	The authorities are not currently planning properly for logistics, they are not meeting the needs identified and the strategy as proposed does not accord with the Government's policies and ambitions. The authorities have followed a reasonable process to identify the	The Councils consider that it is not appropriate to roll forward the requirement figure as the projections from the logistics study have proved to be over-optimistic, with full justification set out within the Strategic Logistics Position Paper.	None	1243745 1258969	John A Wells (Oxalis)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	future strategic logistics needs of the area. The authorities have not rolled forward the requirements identified by Iceni to match the plan period, as they have done with the general employment requirements. The Iceni requirements were for the period from 2021 to 2040, i.e. 19 years and need to be rolled forward to 2041. This would add around 78,000sqm to the base requirement. Additional sites must be identified which can contribute to meeting the strategic logistics needs in full, including clients site.				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 5	The representation is largely promoting a strategic mixed use site at Stockings Farm, within Gedling Borough, with up to 10ha of employment land.	The proposal falls outside of the strategic plan area.	None	1250379 1258436	Trustees of Hammond Farm
Policy 5	The representation is largely promoting a strategic mixed use site at Lodge Farm Lane, within Gedling Borough, on the basis if the plan not containing enough employment land.	The proposal falls outside of the strategic plan area.	None	1258405 1243430 1250339	Langridge Homes Ltd Langridge Homes Ltd
Policy 5	No specific comments but consider that the plan is legally compliant, sound and meets duty to cooperate. Wishes to attend hearing sessions.	Comment noted.	None	1254423	Mr Andrew Paulson

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 5	On behalf of Rachel Salmon, landowner at M1, J26, Nuthall, we write to reaffirm that this land is available for development. Land at M1, J26 is an approximately 12ha site, with the development of this site able to provide a sustainable extension to existing built form at Nottingham Business Park and east of Woodhouse Way. In light of the findings of the Logistics Study, the Councils should seek to locate new industrial and logistics sites in accessible locations in the next stage of plan preparation. There is therefore the ability for	It is considered that two appropriate sites have been identified for logistics development in the Strategic Plan, both of which benefit from potential rail access. Alternative sites were assessed and considered not appropriate due to a number of constraints, including Green Belt.	None	1259866 1242839	Rachel Salmon (Savills) Wilson Bowden Developments (Land at New Farm, Nuthall) (Agent Savills)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	the site to come forward as residential development, or indeed, potentially in combination with employment.				
Policy 5	The Plan is over-reliant on sites that are difficult to deliver and will result in a delay to early delivery of employment land. In order to make the policy sound, there is a need to allocate additional employment land at Broxtowe to boost the supply of new floorspace in the early years of the Plan and to allow development to come forward at key highway locations, alongside	There are a number of sites within the supply that already have the benefit of consent or are under construction that will deliver in the early part of the plan period.	None	1247789 1260083	Mulberry Land (Mrs Emily Bishop)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	residential development, to encourage and sustain the economy, including Land at Shilo Way.				
Policy 5	Although there is a surplus of circa 60ha of general industrial and warehousing across Greater Notts in general, specifically at Broxtowe, there is a need for 16ha, with only a supply of 6ha, leaving a deficit of 10ha. This is set out under Table 6B of the Employment Background Paper September 2024.	The Strategic Plan as a whole has identified a sufficient supply of general industry and warehousing for the plan period.	None	260083	Mulberry Land (Mrs Emily Bishop)
Policy 5	Question why there is such an inequality across the administrative areas,	The Strategic Plan as a whole has identified a sufficient supply of general industry and	None	260083	Mulberry Land (Mrs Emily Bishop)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	for example Rushcliffe is showing as a 111ha surplus, but is the Council area with the lowest population density, the majority of the Borough being predominantly rural. This is a disproportionate level of employment growth at Rushcliffe which is demonstrably less well connected than the rest of the Plan area by virtue of the lack of crossings of the Trent, combined with distances experienced from the urban area.	warehousing for the plan period. All of the sites within Rushcliffe are currently allocated in adopted local plans, have planning permission or are subject to a Local Development Order. Therefore, the sites are suitable for development and available now. The sites also accord with the spatial strategy selected.			
	Not enough land for logistics compared to Iceni study and focussed on only 2 sites, and an assumption that	A shortfall has been identified across the Logistics Study area. However, this is larger than the Strategic Plan area. It is considered	None	260083 ,	Mulberry Land (Mrs Emily Bishop)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	identified sites will all come forward.	that two appropriate sites have been identified for logistics development in the Strategic Plan, both of which benefit from potential rail access. These sites are considered to be deliverable within the plan period and are being actively promoted. Alternative sites were assessed and considered not appropriate due to a number of constraints, including Green Belt.			
Policy 5	We consider the Council's methodology to be flawed in that they have excluded sites below 25ha, but in doing so, this has led to an undersupply of sites capable of	A sufficient supply of office, industry and warehousing sites have been identified within the Strategic Plan to meet the need across the plan area.	None	260083	Mulberry Land (Mrs Emily Bishop)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	delivering employment need, where there is clearly an undersupply. The draft Plan at no point refers to how the Part 2 plans for respective authorities are going to manage delivery, and nor does it set out that the Part 2 plans will cater for smaller sites and their need to be delivered.	25ha was used as threshold for consideration of logistic sites.			
Policy 5	The evidence base does not provide justification for why only two sites with a combined developable area of 97.4ha (an unknown portion of which is developable over an unspecified timeframe) have been allocated for strategic distribution floorspace. The amount of land	A shortfall has been identified across the Logistics Study area. However, this is larger than the Strategic Plan area. It is considered that two appropriate sites have been identified for logistics development in the Strategic Plan, both of which benefit from potential rail access.	None	1259456 1243741 1243740	Peveril Securities Limited & Omnivale Pension Scheme (CarneySweeney)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	allocated is insufficient for a plan comprising a key portion of the country's strategic road network, three local authority areas and a plan period of 18 years.	Alternative sites were assessed and considered not appropriate due to a number of constraints, including Green Belt.			
Policy 5	The policy does not state how much floorspace is allocated to the sites at Bennerley and Ratcliffe on Soar, therefore making it difficult to gauge what contribution the sites would make to towards the identified need for strategic distribution and logistics floorspace and over what timeframe.	It is considered that floor space figures do not need to be within this policy. These figures are included within the Employment Background Paper. The figures are also referred to within either the site specific policies or the justification text.	None	1243741 1259456	Peveril Securities Limited & Omnivale Pension Scheme (CarneySweeney)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 5	The Land at Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station site is surrounded by rural, affluent communities and therefore does not have easy access to a suitable pool of labour or provide opportunities for social inclusion, The nearest areas experiencing deprivation include Clifton in Nottingham. Data from Nomis identifies 865 residents in the 'Clifton North' and 'Clifton South' wards claiming Universal Credit in March 2025 principally for the reason of being unemployed. Appendix C of the SAR document refers to development on this site delivering	This is an existing brownfield site with an LDO in place. The site is well served by public transport, with additional sustainable transport provision a requirement of the LDO and the policy.	None	1243741 1259456	Peveril Securities Limited &Omnivale Pension Scheme (CarneySweeney)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	approximately 3,500-4,000 jobs, assuming 50% reduction due to leakage and displacement. This means that even if (unrealistically) all the existing Universal Credit claimants in Clifton were employed by a distribution and logistics development on this site, they would account for as little as 10.8% of the workforce needed. The development of this site for distribution and logistics will likely compete with existing employers in more sustainable locations and increase the propensity for workers to travel long distances to the site by car, particularly having				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	regard to night shifts when public transport options will be limited.				
Policy 5	Preferred Approach consultation in September 2023 placed significant weight on sites having access to rail freight infrastructure to enable low carbon transportation. This was a key driver in the selection of the Former Bennerley Coal Disposal Point and the Land at Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station sites for strategic distribution and logistics development. The Strategic Distribution and Logistics: Preferred Approach Consultation document states: "In	Section 1A of the policy does refer to rail access. The site selection document also considered potential rail access of sites.	None	1243741 1259456	Peveril Securities Limited &Omnivale Pension Scheme (CarneySweeney)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	order to determine whether the potential sites could deliver sustainable development and critically optimize opportunities to reduce their local and wider environmental impacts, the Councils took into account: whether the site could enable the transfer of freight onto the rail network, or, if direct access to the rail network is not available, whether it is in close proximity to an existing rail freight interchange;" This is not reflected in the overarching draft Policy 5.				
Policy 5	There are issues with the claimed future supply, as well as the	The Employment Background Paper justifies future supply	None	1243721 1246990	Richborough Estates

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	assumed 10%/20% delivery from redevelopment.	and the assumptions related to redevelopment. Delivery from redevelopment is also based on the findings of the Logistics Study.		1259630	
Policy 5	Calculate that the residual need might more accurately be regarded as 292.34-309.34ha a significant shortfall.	The residual need is based on robust evidence, as set out within the Logistics Study and Employment Background Paper.	None	1243721 1246990 1259630	Richborough Estates
Policy 5	The site selection process deviates from the Logistics Study (which is based on market evidence and demand) without justification. The final site selection process remains flawed.	The Logistics Study was 'policy off'. The site selection process considered policy constraints and is therefore justified.	None	1243721 1246990 1259630	Richborough Estates

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 5	Concerns with the two proposed allocations, with both having significant constraints.	Both sites are being actively promoted and are considered to be deliverable within the plan period.	None	1259630 1243721 1246990	Richborough Estates
Policy 5	There are a lack of proposed mechanisms in place to provide certainty for how such residual unmet needs will be addressed now and in the future.	The plan identifies an appropriate mix of deliverable sites. Policy 5 includes criteria for assessing additional sites which come forward.	None	1259630 1243721 1246990	Richborough Estates
Policy 5	Policy 5 should highlight and identify the residual employment needs to be met (strategic or otherwise) based on a more realistic assessment of the existing identified supply of sites and the proposed allocations. Policy 5 should then set out a clear policy	The plan identifies an appropriate mix of deliverable sites. Policy 5 includes criteria for assessing additional sites which come forward.	None	1259630 1243721 1246990	Richborough Estates

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	mechanism for how any residual employment needs will be addressed. Alternatively, Policy 5 could contain a criteria-based policy to support speculative development which meets a proportion of residual employment needs on sites not allocated by the GNSP but which might otherwise be acceptable. Ideally, Policy 5 should allocate additional sites to meet the needs for strategic distribution and logistics. Specifically, this should include allocating a more diverse mix of sites (in terms of size, location, complexity and ability				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	to meet needs in the short-term). Policy 5 should also build in some further flexibility in the form of an additional buffer of land being added to the supply.				
Policy 5	GNSP underprovides for strategic logistics. Paragraph 3.5.24 goes onto explain that 27 hectares of strategic warehousing and logistics needs would be met from the existing supply of employment land and reaches the conclusion that all identified land for strategic distribution across the Greater Nottingham area equates to 124.4 hectares. There is no	The approach is explained in Table 6A of accompanying notes of the Employment Background Paper (March 2025).	None	1243795 1259712 1243795	Stantec on behalf of Hortons Estate

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	explanation as to how the Council have reached this figure of 27 hectares of strategic warehousing and logistics supply, neither does it detail which sites contribute towards this supply. However, the 124.4 hectares of strategic distribution of allocated land still falls short of the residual need identified in the Iceni study by 30.6 hectares compared to the upper estimate of residual need.				
Policy 5	If the Council are acknowledging that strategic additional distribution and logistics may need to come forward within the Greater	It is considered that the plan makes appropriate provision for strategic distribution through the allowance of existing employment sites and with the addition of the	None	1243795 1259712 1243795	Stantec on behalf of Hortons' Estate

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Nottingham area during the plan period then this development should be a matter of consideration during the preparation of this Strategic Plan and should not be left for future planning applications to determine outside of the plan making system. Therefore, a sufficient number of strategic distribution sites should be allocated to meet the future needs of the area across the entire plan period.	two sites at Bennerley and at Ratcliffe on Soar.			
Policy 5	Consider it is likely that there is an under provision of new employment land within Greater Nottingham as a result	The councils are providing a sufficient supply of housing as explained in the Housing Background Paper. The Housing	None	1261261 1261276 1292267 1292272	Taylor Wimpey (Land West of Ruddington)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	of the proposed under provision of housing and this is a matter that needs to be robustly addressed.	Background Paper provides additional analysis comparing employment need and housing need.			Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land (Land East of Gamston) Taylor Wimpey (Land West of Ruddington) Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land (Land East of Gamston)
Policy 5	The Councils seeks to allocate two sites totalling 97.4 ha, therefore leaving a significant shortfall of circa 41-58 ha of strategic distribution & logistics space. It is clear that the Councils are aware that they are not seeking to meet its	A shortfall has been identified across the Logistics Study area. However, this is larger than the Strategic Plan area. It is considered that two appropriate sites have been identified for logistics development in the Strategic Plan, both of	None	1260947 1243674 1246698 1243657	The Trustees of the late George Henry Oxby Deceased and T W Herrick & Sons (Boyer)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	identified required demand for strategic & logistics development.	which benefit from potential rail access. These sites are considered to be deliverable within the plan period and are being actively promoted. Alternative sites were assessed and considered not appropriate due to a number of constraints, including Green Belt.			
Policy 5	The GNPP have continued to neglect to provide sufficient documentation to support the rationale for this approach or justification for disregarding what the Iceni study states on this matter, which is based on market evidence and demand. This is likely to result in	It is considered that the Strategic Distribution and Logistics Background Paper provides a robust approach to assessing the suitability of logistics sites when selecting sites to be included within the strategic plan.	None	1260947 1243674 1246698	The Trustees of the late George Henry Oxby Deceased and T W Herrick & Son (Boyer)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	a flawed site selection process.				
Policy 5	Under Part 1(b) the amount of office, research and development space to be provided in Gedling should be increased from 8,000 sqm to 20,000 sqm. I also propose that Land at Lodge Farm Lane (SHLAA Ref G462) be added to the list of strategic employment sites under 1 (d) e.	Gedling no longer form part of the strategic plan area.	None	1258436	Trustees of Hammond Farm
Policy 5	The reference Policy 5 makes to promoting the City Centre as the primary location for office floorspace is supported. It will help support the viability and vitality of	Support welcomed.	None	1259961	VCP Nominees Victoria Centre

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Nottingham City Centre.				
Policy 5	Deliverability issues at Bennerley and Ratcliffe on Soar mean that additional sites required, Such as East of Watnall.	It is considered that the sites are suitable, available and deliverable.	None	1258372 1291897	Waverider Holdings Ltd Waverider Holdings Ltd (Mr Carrick Casson-Crook)
Policy 5	There is a need for sites of a smaller size to meet the interim employment need for both large-scale and strategic, which is considered to be significant in the short-medium term. Whilst we note that there is a further opportunity for additional sites to be allocated in forthcoming Part 2 Local Plans across the GNSP constituent authorities, we	There are a number of sites within the supply that are allocated or already have the benefit of consent or are under construction that will deliver in the early part of the plan period. Unlike housing sites, under the NPPF, there is not a requirement for the supply of employment land to be constant throughout the plan period. It is considered that the relevant test to apply to	None	1261606	Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	consider that there is a pressing need now for large-scale industrial and warehousing development to be allocated as part of the Part 1 plan. The Publication plan is not accompanied by an employment trajectory so it is unclear whether the Council considers that it will have a sufficient supply of employment sites throughout the plan period. Savills Development has reviewed the pipeline employment supply and current market conditions and considers that the large-scale allocations at Bennerley and Ratcliffe-on-Soar will come forward later in	employment allocations is that there is a reasonable prospect of them coming forward during the plan period. Based upon the sites being suitable and available, the Councils consider there is reasonable prospect of both the Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station and Bennerley coming forward in their entirety during the plan period.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	the plan period, leaving a gap in demand for employment land in the short-medium term. In addition, they state that there is a strong demand for industrial and logistics space on the western edge of Nottingham, where there is a need for new Grade A space.				
Policy 5	Rushcliffe only represents circa 14.5% of the total industrial and logistics need across the plan area, yet 73.8% of the proposed employment provision is located in this LPA. We object to this on the basis that the approach will not ensure that the right	All of the supply within Rushcliffe are either employment allocations within the adopted local plan (part 1 and part 2), have planning permission, are under construction or are a combination of the above. It therefore would not make sense to exclude these sites	None	1261606	Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	jobs are delivered in the right places in line with the evidenced need for employment development.	from the supply. Strategic distribution is being geographically spread to utilise different highway junctions and links.			
Policy 5	The GNPP have followed an appropriate process to commission consultants to identify the future employment needs of the area. However, the GNSP does not take on board the conclusions reached by Lichfields employment study and the Iceni Logistics study either in terms of the scale and urgency of the issue of logistics need, its importance or the locational priorities.	A shortfall has been identified across the Logistics Study area. However, this is larger than the Strategic Plan area. It is considered that two appropriate sites have been identified for logistics development in the Strategic Plan, both of which benefit from potential rail access. Alternative sites were assessed and considered not appropriate due to a number of constraints, including Green Belt.	None	1258962 1243571	Oxalis Planning

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 5	For Logistics, Iceni just identify a global overarching need for the whole of the Nottinghamshire Core and Outer HMA. Iceni do however go on to identify 'Areas of Opportunity' where strategic logistics sites should be located. The areas of opportunity include the area adjacent to the A453 south of Fairham/Clifton.	The Councils consider that through the Employment Background Paper and through its assessments contained within the Strategic Distribution and Logistics Background Paper, the allocations contained within the plan are appropriate. This included the areas of opportunity being a key consideration as part of the assessment.	None	1258962 1243571	Oxalis Planning
Policy 5	Iceni recommend that when new allocations are being considered, a criteria-based approach should be adopted to identify and assess potential new sites for large warehousing. The supply of sites	The criteria used for assessing and selecting sites for allocation are clearly set out in the Strategic Distribution and Logistics Background Paper strategic-distribution-	None	1258962 1243571	Oxalis Planning

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	included in the GNSP does not, individually or collectively, meet these 'qualitative' requirements.	background-paper-approved.pdf			
Policy 5	The analysis in the Employment Background paper does not consider the opportunity for and benefits of, planning for greater growth. Nor does it seek to analyse the quality of supply and whether this meets the criteria set out by Iceni. Furthermore, it does not provide for any flexibility to accommodate needs not anticipated in the Plan (in accordance with 2023 NPPF para 86) or plan to take account of the	The Logistics Study undertook analysis of existing supply and includes sites which the consultants considered to be appropriate. A shortfall has been identified across the Logistics Study area. However, this is larger than the Strategic Plan area. It is considered that two appropriate sites have been identified for logistics development in the Strategic Plan, both of which benefit from potential rail access. These sites are considered to be	None	1258962 1243571	Oxalis Planning

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	potential for some non-implementation. Given the requirements of NPPF paragraph 86 for plans to be flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated in the plan and the need to ensure flexibility and resilience to allow for choice and competition but also to plan for a proportion of non-implementation, an additional 10% should be added to the Iceni estimate of need. It is unclear how else needs not anticipated could be met.	deliverable within the plan period and are being actively promoted. Alternative sites were assessed and considered not appropriate due to a number of constraints, including Green Belt. It is noted that the Iceni recommendations already include a buffer.			
Policy 5	Floorspace assumptions There are a number of reasons why it is	It is considered that the floorspace assumptions are realistic and reasonable.	None	1258962 1243571	Oxalis Planning

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	considered that the floorspace assumption on some of the sites are inaccurate or overly optimistic. The reasons are explained in Appendix 2. More realistic assumptions would reduce the potential floorspace from existing and pipeline supply by around 150,000 sq m and increase the residual requirement. There are a number of existing employment sites included in the commitments and pipeline supply. These include part of Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station, parts of Stanton Ironworks and the former Horizon Factory. These	It is considered appropriate to include floorspace from the Horizon factory as this was redeveloped as a new distribution hub. Strategic logistics sites have been deducted from the general employment supply. Sufficient industrial and warehousing land has been identified which exceeds need, even when strategic logistics has been accounted for. The employment land provisions have made an adjustment in anticipation of future employment land losses and there is no requirement to make such losses up.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	contribute a significant level of supply to the GNPP's strategic logistics figures. Their inclusion in the supply figures, together with an assumption that a further 10-20% of supply would come forward from other redevelopment sites does not appear to be a reasonable and balanced assumption. Lichfields conclude in their Employment Land Study that it would be inappropriate to take account of any new floorspace arising from the development of the Horizon factory because it is an existing employment site. If floorspace figures from this site	There is more than sufficient land across the GN Plan Area to meet the ELS targets for general industrial and warehousing land even taking account of sites accommodating strategic logistics floorspace-there is no need therefore to compensate for this.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	are to be included as contributing to the supply of strategic logistics then the corresponding loss of floorspace to the supply of general employment land must be taken into account. The same must apply to both Stanton and Ratcliffe Power Station. When taking account of the supply coming forward from the redevelopment of existing employment sites, careful thought needs to be given to the effect this will then have on the supply of general employment land/units. I.e. if it is assumed that 57,994sqm (see				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Appendix 2 of the Background Paper) will come forward on redeveloped existing 'general' employment sites, then that loss to the 'general' employment should be planned for and made up through additional provision elsewhere.				
Policy 5	Floorspace Compared to Site Area. Oxalis (and Savills) agree with Iceni's approach to apply a 35% plot ratio. However, in setting out residual requirements and having taken account of supply arising from existing and pipeline sites, it is essential that specific floorspace figures from	Where the plan differentiates from the plot ratio figure, this is based on information provided by site promoters or based on the specific site context. The Employment Background Paper also includes figures based on floorspace.	None	1258962 1243571	Oxalis Planning

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	those sites are carried forward rather than site area. This is important because of sites like Bennerley where there is a very significant site area, stated as 61ha, but a relatively low supply of floorspace, 124,500 sqm (previously 74,000sqm in the draft Plan). The residual (unmet) figures presented at Appendix 2 of the Background Paper are 397,000sqm and 94ha. But 397,0000sqm at a plot ratio of 35% would require a site(s) of 113ha.				
Policy 5	Sites located outside the plan area For the reasons we have set concluded by	Paragraph 8.30 to 8.34 of the Logistics Study identifies the need to recognise that the	None	1258962 1243571	Oxalis planning

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Savills, it would not be appropriate, given the market indicators and availability of suitable sites, for the GNSP area's strategic logistics need to be met in a neighbouring authority area. Notwithstanding, consideration has been given in this Section to the assertions made by the GNPP. For example, the sites proposed to be allocated, including the site adjoining East Midlands Airport, are proposed specifically to meet the needs identified in Leicestershire. It is completely misleading to suggest this, or any other site, in North	logistics market operates over a wide area which overlaps a number of plan and authority areas.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	West Leicestershire, or elsewhere outside of the plan area could meet the needs identified for the GNSP Area. Some of the authorities also lie way outside of the areas of opportunity identified by the Iceni report. The GNSP assumptions on residual need already takes account of supply in neighbouring authority areas elsewhere in the Greater Nottingham area, i.e. Ashfield, Newark and Sherwood, Mansfield, Erewash and also now Gedling. Furthermore, there would be fundamental issues with an assumption				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	that any of these areas could meet the residual needs and Oxalis do not consider that it is a credible strategy for dealing appropriately with identified needs in accordance with the NPPF.				
Policy 5	For the reasons set out when taken cumulatively, Oxalis consider that the GNPP have significantly downplayed need and underestimated residual need. Given the matters raised and depending on the final assumptions used, a more realistic residual requirement, based on the Iceni figures, would be well in excess of	The Councils consider that the identified need is based on robust evidence, as set out within the Employment Background Paper.	None	1258962 1243571	Oxalis Planning

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	700,000sqm. Overall, this would result in a land requirement of over 200ha.				
Policy 5	States there are issues with the site selection methodology which underpins the selection of strategic logistics sites Notes that whilst the proposed Bennerley Coal Disposal Point will deliver a notable contribution towards the supply (if the policy is found sound), it is clear that there will still be a significant unmet need arising across the wider HMA. By the authorities' own calculations this will be some 78-94 ha. Considers the unmet	It is considered that the Strategic Distribution and Logistics Background Paper (2023) provides a robust approach to site selection for logistics development. A shortfall has been identified across the Logistics Study area. However, this is larger than the Strategic Plan area. It would therefore be inappropriate to identify a scale of unmet need for logistics that is solely attributed to the plan area.	None	1279658 1247801	GLP GLP

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	need will actually be 94-125 ha. This is a critical issue that must be dealt with in a positive manner across the wider HMA, given the emphasis on meeting identified needs in national policy and the importance of boosting economic growth. Has ongoing objections to the site selection methodology for the strategic logistics allocations. States that the two strategic site allocations will take some considerable time to be developed, given the significant scale and infrastructure required	It is considered that two appropriate sites have been identified for logistics development in the Strategic Plan, both of which benefit from potential rail access. In addition, the Ratcliffe on Soar site has the benefit of an LDO, and forms part of the East Midlands Freeport. There are a number of sites within the supply that are already allocated, already have the benefit of consent or are under construction that will deliver in the early part of the plan period. Unlike housing sites, under the NPPF, there is not a requirement for the supply of employment land to be constant			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	to support them. Consequently there is a need to identify additional supply in the short term in order to meet pressing demand for new space now. Regards that in order for the approach identified in the draft GNSP to be found sound it is necessary to clearly define the unmet need for strategic logistics, and ensure that this is actively accommodated in the remaining HMA areas. Significant weight should be given to meeting the full objectively assessed need for strategic	throughout the plan period.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	logistics, as advocated by national policy.				
Policy 5	The two strategic logistics allocations both have significant constraints and are unlikely to deliver logistics space early in the Plan period. Consequently it is anticipated that these strategic sites would not result in any meaningful delivery early in the Plan period. This would result in a need to bring forward sites in the short term to accommodate the significant demand for strategic logistics floorspace that currently exists, before these sites can	The two allocations are considered appropriate. An EIA screening opinion has been submitted for Bennerley Former Coal Disposal Point and demolition approved for Former Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station.	None.	1247799	GLP

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	realistically be developed.				
Policy 5	Refers to Policy 5 but includes no further information	N/A	N/A	1243730	Roebuck Land & Planning Ltd (Mr Jim Rawlings)
Policy 5	We look forward to addressing our mutual concerns around the August 2022 Iceni Nottingham Core and Outer HMA Logistics Study in a subsequent Statement of Common Ground.	A Statement of Comment Ground has since been prepared.		1242113	Erewash Borough Council
Policy 5	Argues the provision of strategic logistics land is too low to satisfy the residual need. Also suggests the estimated deliverable supply is too high.	The demand/supply balance with regards to strategic logistics space is set out in the Nottinghamshire Logistics Study (2022) within the evidence base. This highlights how different sources including the strategic allocations mentioned	None	1290383	Richborough Commercial (Boyer Fiona Duffy)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		contribute to the demand for logistics space. It is not considered that more prescriptive floorspace figures are required within this policy			

Policy 6

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 6: Nottingham City Centre	Policy 6, para 3.6.14 The Parish Council questions whether a mixed-use approach is most likely to maximise redevelopment opportunities at the Broadmarsh site. Significant vacancy rates already exist in retail, leisure and office uses in the City. A greater focus on housing delivery on this site is proposed.	A mix of uses is proposed but there is a strong emphasis on housing (1,000 homes).	None	1260891	Gotham Ward Parishes and Borough Councillors
Policy 6: Nottingham City Centre	Policy 6, clause g) iii How will tall buildings impact upon the historic environment and the significance of heritage assets? What is meant by a tall building within the context of Nottingham City Centre? How have key views been ascertained?	A tall buildings strategy will be undertaken, with work starting later in 2025. Detailed assessments are undertaken at planning application stage, including utilising the Council's 3D model and the Design Review Panel.	None	1262393	Historic England (Rosamund Worrall)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Concerns about the impacts of tall buildings on the significance of heritage assets and need to ensure that this policy will be effective in its use.				
Policy 6: Nottingham City Centre	Policy 6, para 3.6.24 We are supportive of this paragraph and its intention to protect the heritage tourism assets within the centre.	Noted.	None	1262393 1246157	Historic England (Rosamund Worrall) Historic England
Policy 6: Nottingham City Centre	The introduction to Policy 6.1 should refer to the inter- dependency of Nottingham City Centre and the surrounding Districts for employment supply and demand. With respect to Rushcliffe, this is referred to in the Justification in para 2.8.9. It would be helpful to illustrate the point by quoting the appropriate	Consider that this is adequately covered within the Spatial Portrait section of the Plan.	None	1258356 1237034	The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	figures from the 2021 Census.				
Policy 6: Nottingham City Centre	Policy 6.1 c) The redevelopment of the Broadmarsh centre should retain as little of the old 1960s/70s structures as possible.	Noted. There is no policy requirement to retain the existing structure.	None	1258356 1237034	The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council
Policy 6: Nottingham City Centre	Policy 6.1e) Reference should be made to review the feasibility of tram extensions from the City Centre to the Sustainable Urban Extensions including the land East of Gamston/North of Tollerton.	This matter is dealt with as part of Policy 15 and within the IDP.	None	1258356 1237034	The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council
Policy 6: Nottingham City Centre	The overall approach of Policy 6 is strongly supported. The "promoting and strengthening the City Centre as the location of	Noted. In respect of the reference to the Primary Shopping Area, this is a matter for a separate local plan and is currently	See Suggested Main Modification document for proposed wording.	1259962	VCP Nominees Victoria Centre (C/O Agent)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	choice for main town centre uses" of the policy should note that the Primary Shopping Area should be the focus for the provision of retail development within the City Centre to reflect national policy and recognise the importance of retail as arguably the key main town centre use attracting visitors to Nottingham City Centre. The supporting text should specifically reference the Victoria Centre and the role it plays providing the most significant part of the City Centre's retail, supporting a large number of jobs and anchoring the whole of the City Centre. The recognition of the potential impact of out of town centre shopping and leisure	dealt with within the NCC Local Plan Part 2. Propose additional justification text to make specific reference to the Victoria Centre to provide clarity of its role as part of the City Centre.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	developments and the resultant threat these developments can pose to the vitality and viability of the City Centre is supported. Due to the transitional period the retail market has undergone in recent years, city and town centres can sometimes be vulnerable to competition from out of centre retail developments. It is therefore welcome that the need to carefully consider such proposals to ensure they do not pose the threat of a significant adverse impact upon the City Centre is recognised. In addition to this, the recognition of the importance of balancing the needs of shoppers and long stay users in terms of accessibility and car parking to				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	ensure a vital and viable City Centre is also strongly supported. To maintain the attractiveness of the City Centre as a place to visit, some visitors and workers will continue to need to access the area by private car for a variety of reasons including the distance they live from the City Centre, poor public transport accessibility in parts of the wider region and due to limited mobility. The recognition that there is a need for the private car to remain a part of the modal share, albeit a reducing one over time as sustainable transport accessibility improves, for visitors to Nottingham City Centre is therefore supported.				
Policy 6	Despite its large student population and	Noted. The Policy approach seeks to	None	1243436	Mr Atif Muneer

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Robin Hood legacy, Nottingham lacks modern infrastructure and cultural investment. Student retention is low. The City is seen as outdated, with minimal high-rise development, few new businesses, and limited retail or housing expansion. Key zones like Broadmarsh and The Island need major regeneration. The Civic Society is obstructive to development. Minority communities and creative districts are under-supported. Victoria Centre dominates due to lack of alternatives but is outdated.	address the issues raised.			
Policy 6	As drafted, object to Policy 6. Policy 6 allows the Victoria Centre to	Protection will be through the planning system, and can only	None.	1243790 1245989	WSP (Sam Pullar/Holly Ganderton) on behalf of The Victoria Centre Partnership

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	adapt to market trends, potentially reducing vacant units. However, while the policy aims to protect uses that contribute to vitality outside core shopping hours, it lacks clarity on how this protection will be implemented. Encouraging family and older people's housing in the City Centre may conflict with efforts to support the evening economy, which relies on vibrant nightlife and leisure activities. The inclusion of schools and health centres suggests a push for family living, but the City Centre's environment is seen as unsuitable for families due to limited access to amenities like gardens. The policy does not adequately reflect the agent of	apply where planning permission is required. The City centre is large enough to accommodate a range of uses which may not be suitable as direct neighbours and may be subject to the agent of change principle.. This is recognised in existing Quarters polices of the Part 2 Local Plan.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	change principle as required by the NPPF. Specific criteria (f.ii and f.iii) should be removed to align with this principle.				
Policy 6	Support draft Policy 6 promoting electric vehicle (EV) charging in Nottingham City Centre but emphasises the need for broader infrastructure. They reference the Climate Change Committee's goal for all new light-duty vehicles to be battery-electric by 2032 and all vehicles to be fossil fuel-free by 2050. Key barriers include limited charging infrastructure, network capacity, and EV supply. To effectively support the transition to EVs and meet climate targets, they recommend expanding EV charging provision	Nottingham has an excellent and growing network of EV charging points. For new development, provision of EV charging is now covered by the Building Regulations, and the detail suggested is inappropriate to a strategic plan.	None.	1246040	Carter Jonas (Laura Stops)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	beyond the city centre to surrounding areas, as many journeys do not involve travel into the centre. To make the Strategic Plan sound we recommend; 1. Prepare a standalone planning policy which supports the provision of electric charging developments across Nottingham City, Rushcliffe, Broxtowe and Gedling. 2. Allocate sites for electric charging with a focus on key transport routes across the plan area. This approach will ensure the plan is justified by being prepared utilising a proportionate evidence				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	base and consistent with national planning policies by supporting the overarching objective of enabling sustainable development and adapting to climate change.				
Policy 6	Clause 3, g; How will tall buildings impact upon the historic environment and the significance of heritage assets? What is meant by a tall building within the context of Nottingham City Centre? How have key views been ascertained? We are concerned about the impacts of tall buildings on the significance of heritage assets and want to ensure that the policy will be effective in its use.	A Tall Building Strategy is to be prepared (commencing 2025) and policy recommendations will be incorporated into a future Local Plan.	None	1246156	Historic England

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 6	Supports policy	Noted	None	1241166	Mr Christopher Smith

Policy 7

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 7: Role of Town and Other Centres	Policy 7 is unsound as it contains an inaccurate statement. Policy 7 1.d) states Local Centres within Broxtowe as none. Whereas the Chetwynd: The Toton & Chilwell Neighbourhood Plan (CTTCNP), the Toton & Chetwynd Barracks Strategic Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document (SM-SPD), and GNSP Policy 21 (2.C.7.) include Local Centres within Toton & Chetwynd Barracks. These Local Centres should be recognised within Policy 7 1.d) and included in Figure 7.1 to make the policy sound.	The list comprises existing local centres. This will be updated as part of future Plan preparation when additional local centres are constructed.	None	1261794	Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum (Mr David Lovett)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 7: Role of Town and Other Centres	Agree that Health Care facilities should be within walking distance of the village.	Noted.	None	1260171	East Leake Parish Council (Mrs Susan Lewis)
Policy 7: Role of Town and Other Centres	The plan fails to recognise Stapleford as a town. The plan reveals (by omission) that Stapleford is not a town that will be promoted (**Policy 7** para 1) despite it being recognised as being "in need of enhancement or to be underperforming" (Policy 7 para 4).	Stapleford is identified as a town centre within policy 7. Stapleford also forms part of the Main Built Up Area so is not always explicitly referred to in respect of housing.	None	1259786	Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum
Policy 7: Role of Town and Other Centres	We propose the inclusion of Fairham as a 'local centre' in Rushcliffe. We propose the inclusion of Nottingham City in the	The list comprises existing local centres. This will be updated as part of future Plan preparation when additional local centres are constructed. In	None	1260892	Gotham Ward Parishes and Borough Councillors

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	list of underperforming centres (Part 4).	respect of Nottingham City, there is a separate detailed policy focusing on the City Centre.			
Policy 7: Role of Town and Other Centres	"Not to join the city council independent Borough of Broxtowe" and "To keep the local council and its finances as they are not a super council merger".	This is not relevant to the Strategic Plan.	None	1255674	Andrew Paulson
Policy 7: Role of Town and Other Centres	Cropwell Bishop acts as a communal and commercial centre to many villages further out into the Vale of Belvoir many of which do not have any facilities at all, i.e. a supermarket, butcher, GP medical centre, hairdresser, beautician, playground and playing field, etc. Many of the users and customers	The hierarchy and network of centres is considered appropriate at the present time. Changes will be considered as part of future Plan preparation.	None	1258326 1235227	Jonathan Good Jonathan Good

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	travel by car from outside Cropwell Bishop to use these facilities. There is no frequent or adequate bus or other service between these villages. This creates a special need in Cropwell Bishop which must be addressed. In the present Local Plan Part 2, Rushcliffe Borough failed to identify Cropwell Bishop as a local centre for the village let alone the wider network of the Vale villages which is the case. Despite complaints and promises that this Policy would be reviewed - no review has taken part during the lifetime of this policy. The centre of Cropwell Bishop has				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	parking and congestion issues negatively affecting service users as well as many of the adjoining residents and integrity of the surrounding Conservation Area. It is imperative that these are identified and addressed properly in any future Local Plan. Policies are needed to enable the provision of proper parking facilities in Cropwell Bishop to take cars off the street in the central business area. Any new parking facilities must not detract from local residents and the integrity of the surrounding Conservation Area.				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 7: Role of Town and Other Centres	Full support for the network and hierarchy of centres set out in Policy 7.1. Para 3.8.4 should refer to the benefits of Community Wealth building principles. Para 3.8.6 should refer to the contribution of Nottingham Citizens Advice (and other organisations) to the social fabric of the Plan area. There is a requirement for significant public funding for this service.	Noted. In relation to para 3.8.4 and 3.8.6, consider that these are not strategic planning matters.	None	1258357 1237053	The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 7: Role of Town and Other Centres	Policy 7 is supported in making clear through the retail hierarchy proposed that emphasis is placed upon the City Centre at the top of the retail hierarchy for Greater Nottingham and the resultant assistance this will provide to the promotion of the vitality and viability of centres across the city.	Noted.	None	1259963	VCP Nominees Victoria Centre (c/o Agent)
Policy 7	No comments made.	N/A	N/A	1243446	Atif Muneer
Policy 7	Many town centres (Bulwell, Arnold, Carlton, Stapleford, Hyson Green, Clifton) suffer from underinvestment, limited retail space, and lack of strategic development. Nottingham City Centre is perceived as	The policy seeks to promote the viability and vitality of centres. Many of the proposals are beyond the remit of the Local Plan. Retail and residential development near J24 is not considered to be a sustainable location, and will impact on the	None	1243449	Atif Muneer

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	outdated and ineffective in driving regional growth. The tram network has not delivered expected economic benefits. Areas like Hyson Green and Beeston show potential but lack broader support or diversity in offerings. Retail parks (Giltbrook, Victoria Retail Park) are outperforming traditional centres in job creation and development. Encourage a mix of retail, cultural, and community spaces to reflect local identities. Attract national and regional brands to	vitality and viability of Greater Nottingham centres.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	increase footfall and economic activity. Develop unique events and attractions tailored to each town to boost tourism, civic pride, and local engagement. Explore Out-of-Town Development: Consider a new shopping and residential hub near J24 of the M1 to stimulate growth and regional visibility.				
Policy 7	No comments made.	N/A	N/A	1241167 1241168	Christopher Smith Christopher Smith
Hierarchy of Centres paragraph 3.7.1	Neutral Propose the inclusion of Fairham as a 'local centre' in Rushcliffe.	Noted. Fairham's position int the hierarchy can be considered as part of future plan making,	None	1249420	Consortium of Parish Councils

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Propose the inclusion of Nottingham city in the list of underperforming centres (Part 4)	once the centre has been constructed..			

Policy 8

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 8: Housing Size, Mix and Choice	Should be modified, or the supporting text at 3.8.31 modified, to confirm that the East of Gamston / North of Tollerton Sustainable Urban Extension is one of the strategic sites mentioned.	It is considered that there is no need to modify the policy text or supporting text. The reference to strategic sites is clear.	None	1261293	Arc Partnership/ Nottinghamshire County Council)
Policy 8: Housing Size, Mix and Choice	Part 1 of the policy should be amended to remove the requirement for 'all residential developments should contain adequate internal living space as set out in the Nationally Described Space Standard' unless sufficient evidence is provided. If sufficient evidence is provided the wording of the policy should still be amended to state 'It is encouraged that all residential development should contain adequate	The Councils have produced additional evidence to justify the requirement for Nationally Described Space Standards. The cost of the requirement has also been subject to plan wide viability testing. However, it is considered that clarification regarding when the requirements come into affect should be added to the policy	See Suggested Main Modifications document for suggested text.	1261637 1261053 1246651 1247020	Barratt David Wilson (North Midlands) David Wilson Homes David Wilson Homes East Midlands (Ms Helen Bareford) David Wilson Homes East Midlands (C/O Agent)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	internal living space as set out in the Nationally Described Space Standard'. Part 4 of the policy should be amended to state 'all dwellings should comply with requirement M4(2) of the Building Regulations regarding accessible and adaptable dwellings where viable and technically feasible…and should be considered on a site by site basis'. Paragraph 14 of the policy should be amended to remove the specific percentages for affordable housing mix. Table 3.8.10 and subsequent paragraph 3.8.11 should be removed.	and clarification regarding any exceptions should be added to the justification text. In respect of M4(2) requirements, it is considered the policy already provides an appropriate level of flexibility without additional wording. It is considered appropriate to set an affordable housing mix based on affordable housing need. It is considered appropriate to include table 3.8.10 and 3.8.11 as this is based on evidence from the Housing Needs Assessment			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		and provides clarification in respect of applying the policy.			
Policy 8: Housing Size, Mix and Choice	Provision should be made for the needs of the elderly and disabled, including through provision of bungalows and suitable flatted accommodation as appropriate, in line with the findings of the Housing Needs Assessment which identifies a significant need for older persons housing to be delivered by 2041: • Broxtowe – requirement for 988 units of open market housing with support. • Rushcliffe - requirement for 7,222 units of open	Note the need for housing for the elderly and disabled and this is covered by Part 3 of the policy. It is considered that stating a specific exemption is not appropriate. The plan wide viability provides a high-level overview and is not site specific. Viability can be tested on a site-by-site basis	None	1262343 1262346 1246346 1246338	Churchill Living and Mccarthy Stone Retirement Lifestyles McCarthy Stone Churchill Living

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	market housing with support • Nottingham - requirement for 487 units of open market housing with support. Following Point 11, the following text should be added: The Viability Study concludes that affordable housing is not viable for older persons accommodation on both greenfield and brownfield sites, and therefore are exempt from the affordable housing requirements in Broxtowe. Following Point 12, the following text should be added: The Viability Study concludes that affordable housing is not viable for older persons				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	accommodation on both greenfield and brownfield sites, and therefore are exempt from the affordable housing requirements in Nottingham City. Following Point 15, the following text should be added: The Viability Study concludes that affordable housing is not viable for older persons accommodation on both greenfield and brownfield sites, and therefore are exempt from the affordable housing requirements in Rushcliffe.				
Policy 8: Housing Size, Mix and Choice	The requirement for all new residential development to meet M4(2) of the Building Regulations is considered	The policy is required until Building Regulations mandates the requirement.	None	1262471	Gladman Developments Ltd

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	unnecessary, as future changes to Building Regulations will mandate this standard.				
Policy 8: Housing Size, Mix and Choice	Policy 8, Part 15 Proportion of Affordable Housing in Rushcliffe – does not consider the 30% target to be achievable due to viability constraints. Policy 8, Part 18 Rural Exception Sites - support the use of rural exception sites and given the overall shortage of social housing, consider that 'robust evidence of local need' is already in place. Would support suitable changes to make it easier to deliver rural exception sites. Policy 8, Part 19. Allocations policy for Rural	The affordable housing requirement has been subject to plan-wide viability. Issues related to the application of Rural The Exception Sites criteria are considered appropriate, as it will be for local decision makers to determine what 'connections' to a local area is relevant..	None	1260896	Gotham Ward Parishes and Borough Councillors

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Exception Sites - Support the principle of a cascade mechanism prioritising applicants with a local connection. That should be amended to include people who have previously lived in the area or with close relatives there (even if the applicant does not currently reside in the LA). would support a similar allocations policy being applied to the rest of the social housing stock.				
Policy 8: Housing Size, Mix and Choice	Considers this policy to not go far enough to provide legal protections for wheelchair users, falling short of the standards set by the Equality Act 2010. The plan should specify exact percentages of	There is no plan wide requirement for M4(3) but this matter would be considered as part of future plan preparation by each authority based on local evidence.	None	1259616	Habinteg Housing Association

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	M4(3) standard homes in the plan. As a minimum, 10% of all new homes should meet Part M4(3) Standard (wheelchair user dwelling).				
Policy 8: Housing Size, Mix and Choice	Consider general approach of policy to be appropriate. An inconsistent approach to affordable housing continues to be taken by the different authorities. Suggests that evidence is out of date and considers that further evidence should be undertaken to ensure that Policy 8 remains informed by the most up to date evidence.	Note comments in relation to general approach. Affordable housing requirements are tailored for each Local Authority based on a common evidence base. The Housing Needs Assessment has been updated to provide up-to-date evidence.	None	1260569 1246822 1260123 1245719	Harworth Group Harworth Group (C/O Agent) Strawson Group Investments Ltd Strawson Group Investments Ltd (C/O Agent)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 8: Housing Size, Mix and Choice	There is a need for flexibility in affordable housing provision to ensure viability, considering factors like increased costs due to new regulations and mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). Accessibility Standards: The requirements for accessible and adaptable dwellings should be left to Building Regulations rather than local planning policies.	Proposed additional wording to refer to viability under Part 8 of the policy. Costs have also been tested through plan wide viability. It is considered appropriate to set accessibility standards due to identified need.	See Suggested Main Modifications Document for proposed wording.	1262503 1246224	Home Builders Federation Home Builders Federation (Ms Rachel Danemann)
Policy 8: Housing Size, Mix and Choice	Has serious reservations about the affordable housing targets set down in parts 8-19 of this policy, and states these are likely to be very challenging. Despite cost pressures and risks the Viability Report does not make	Plan wide viability testing has been undertaken. This has included five year sensitivity testing. Additional wording has also been proposed to Part 8 to	None	1258406 1258437 1250380	Langridge Homes Ltd Trustees of Hammond Farm Trustees of Hammond Farm

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	provision for a contingency allowance on development costs. Suggests provision should be made for a contingency allowance of 5% on construction costs. Greenfield sites being profitable and easy to develop is not the case in reality. Should consider introducing a higher BLV for small sites (up to 10ha).	refer to viability considerations. The viability study considered greenfield and brownfield sites and associated costs. The plan wide viability has included an appropriate BLV and this is justified within the study.		1243388 1243521	Geoffrey prince Associates Ltd (Mr Geoffrey Prince) Hammond Farms (Mr Robert Hammond)
Policy 8: Housing Size, Mix and Choice	Recommend that the Councils: Engage with local NHS partners such as the Nottingham and Nottinghamshire ICB, NHS Trusts and other relevant Integrated Care System (ICS) partners	The Housing Needs Assessment considers affordable housing need based on income and therefore adequately considers need from a range of groups. Site specific requirements would	None	1260086 1245978	NHS Property Services NHS Property Services (Daniel Fleet)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Ensure that the local need for affordable housing for NHS staff is factored into housing needs assessments, and any other relevant evidence base studies that inform the local plan Consider site selection and site allocation policies in relation to any identified need for affordable housing for NHS staff, particularly where sites are near large healthcare employers.	be a matter for future plan preparation by each authority.			
Policy 8: Housing Size, Mix and Choice	Policies regarding housing mix should have a more positive outline of expectations of where student developments will be permitted. Policies should also reflect the Housing Needs assessment's findings that a diversity of rooms are	Policy and guidance regarding HMOs is provided within the policy text. The supporting text provides further detail, including identifying the role of purpose-built student accommodation.	None	1259743	Nottingham Students' Partnership

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	needed in PBSA, and that affordability presents a challenge to PBSA being effective competition to properties which could be occupied by families or young professionals moving to the region. There should also be more recognition that students are more than just a 'community issue'.	More detail is also provided within Nottingham City's Part 2 Local Plan, through SPDs and in the Student Living Strategy. The importance of the universities is highlighted within the Strategic Plan, including within Policy 5.			
Policy 8: Housing Size, Mix and Choice	Policy 8 should be amended to include confirmation, in accordance with the NPPF, that some market housing can be allowed on rural exception sites, where it helps to facilitate the provision of affordable housing.	It is considered that the NPPF is clear in this regard and therefore this does not need to be repeated within the policy text.	None	1258672 1242815	Oxalis Planning Oxalis Planning (Mr Ben Holmes)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 8: Housing Size, Mix and Choice	This is overly lengthy, complex and inaccessible policy. There should be reconsideration of the policy to become more user friendly and accessible for example having a separate policy on housing mix, on build standards and a separate policy on affordable housing. Object to limb 15 of this policy which proposes the proportion of affordable housing which Rushcliffe Borough Council will seek to secure is 30% of the total number of dwellings. Consider it is likely that strategic-scale development is unlikely to deliver to this level and there are some areas of the Borough where the	Whilst the policy is long, it is clearly structured into distinct components. In respect to part 15, additional wording is proposed in relation to viability under part 8 of the policy, the requirements have been subject to plan wide viability and there is specific reference to the approach to strategic sites within the policy.	None	1261262 1260956 1261277 1229268 1292254	Taylor Wimpey (Land West of Ruddington) Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land (Land East of Gamston) Taylor Wimpey (Land West of Ruddington) Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land (Land East of Gamston)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	need and economics would not justify this level.				
Policy 8: Housing Size, Mix and Choice	Support the acknowledgement that within Nottingham there is a need for larger, family homes. These dwellings should be provided outside of the inner urban areas where flats are ultimately more appropriate. As such, such dwellings may need to be provided outside of Nottingham City, but still within or adjacent to the Nottingham MUA. There is some justification for a policy requirement for a number of M4(2), but a slightly higher than the national average level of households with at least one person with a disability simply does not	The policy allows for there to be an appropriate mix of housing, which includes the provision of family homes outside of the 'inner urban area'. The requirement for all dwellings to meet M4(2) is based on a recommendation within the Housing Needs Assessment. It is also noted that the Government intends for this to become a mandatory requirement in the future. The policy also refers to 'where viable and technically feasible'.	None	1260977 1245766	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	adequately justify 100% provision. Suggests the region of 25-50% maximum would be appropriate, but this would need to be informed by more in depth demographic evidence. The requirement for 100% provision has not been justified, therefore is not sound.				
Policy 8: Housing Size, Mix and Choice	Tables would be much more informative they had actual numbers as well as percentages. Strongly urge that the Policy is amended to ensure a much higher proportion of social rent and affordable housing than achieved in the past. Propose that there be a universal approach to the	It is considered that percentages is an appropriate approach and is based on information within the Housing Needs Assessment. The percentages and tenure mix is based on the Housing Needs Assessment and on the plan wide viability study.	None	1258359 1237698	The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	delivery of Disability Grant Funds. Recommend that there be much closer coordination among local authorities with a pooling of expertise, particularly when negotiating with developers and management companies. Ideally this could be delivered by a Greater Nottingham Unitary Authority for the Plan Area.	In respect of Disability Grant Funds, this is not a local plan matter. Noted comments in relation to coordination. Each authority has appropriate expertise in relation to negotiating with developers and management companies.			
Policy 8: Housing Size, Mix and Choice	Supports bringing forward a mix of homes across development sites and recognises that the housing mix of an area should be informed by local need so that development can be responsive and	Comments noted. In respect of viability, additional text is proposed in relation to Part 8.	See Suggested Main Modifications document for proposed wording.	1259663 1243769 1247154	William Davis Homes William Davis Homes (Hannah Price) William Davis Homes (Mrs Hannah Price)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	appropriate to local context. Supports draft Supporting Paragraph 3.8.11 and draft Supporting Paragraph 3.8.17. Suggests an amendment to Criterion 9 to clearly assert that a viability assessment may justify a lower provision of affordable housing being provided on site.				
Policy 8: Housing Size, Mix and Choice	Regards that the affordable housing targets are likely to be very challenging States that ddespite cost pressures and risks the Viability Report does not make provision for a contingency allowance on development costs.	The policy allows for viability to be taken into account at planning application stage. The viability testing was undertaken by qualified consultants and followed relevant guidance. It also	None	1243431 1250340	Langridge Homes Ltd (Mr David Fletcher) Langridge Homes Ltd (Mr David Fletcher)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Other authorities have introduced a higher BLV for such sites, and this should be considered by the Greater Nottingham authorities A more realistic assessment of viability would likely result in affordable housing targets being reduced by 5-10% across the board. It should not be necessary to submit a viability assessment by default with planning applications once a plan has been adopted.	included sensitivity testing.			
Policy 8: Housing Size, Mix and Choice	Supports the policy	Noted	None	1241169	Mr Christopher Smith

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 8: Housing Size, Mix and Choice	States that point 2 of the Policy is "not really happening" in Rushcliffe. States that the Plan should be strengthened to ensure the right types of houses are being built to address acute local needs in Rushcliffe. Notes that some Neighbourhood Plans (e.g. in Bassetlaw District) feature site-specific policies that specify the number and size of houses to be delivered – could this tool (or others?) be used to achieve a better balance across Rushcliffe as a whole? Believes that there are barriers to Affordable Housing and that the Policy and Plan should seek to address these	The policy will allow Rushcliffe to negotiate on housing mix from a stronger position. Neighbour hood Plan policies would be a mater either for Parishes/ Neighbourhood Forums, or for a future round of plan making which makes allocations. Barriers to affordable housing are recognised, and the most appropriate way to address this is to have thresholds set out in the policy.	None	1246848	Member of Parliament (Mr James Naish)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	more clearly at the outset, rather than giving greater influence to developers.				
Policy 8: Housing Size, Mix and Choice	No comments or attachments submitted on response form.	N/A	None	1242517	Julian Owen Associates Architects (Mr Julian Owen)
Policy 8: Housing Size, Mix and Choice	Build a new bigger doctors surgery and employ more doctors or don't build the houses.	Noted -the Integrated Care Board has been involved int eh preparation of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	None	1242622	Miss Tracey Auty
Policy 8: Housing Size, Mix and Choice	Object to Policy 8 criterion 2, which places an emphasis on providing family housing, including larger family housing in Nottingham City Centre. States that this is not effective, nor sound given	The policy on family housing applies to the wider area of Nottingham City Council. The policy states that "Within the City Centre there should	None	1245990	The Victoria Centre Partnership

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	the conflicts with Policy 6 part 1.	be an emphasis on flats of two or more bedrooms to diversify the existing mix, together with innovative family housing on the City Centre fringes". There is no conflict with Policy 6.			
Policy 8: Housing Size, Mix and Choice	Do not consider the 30% target to be achievable due to viability constraints. Support the use of rural exception sites and given the overall shortage of social housing, consider that 'robust evidence of local need' is already in place. We would support suitable changes to make it easier to deliver rural exception sites.	The plan has been subject to appropriate viability testing. Comments noted regarding rural exception sites.	None	1249421 1249422	Consortium of Parish Councils Consortium of Parish Councils

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 8: Housing Size, Mix and Choice	Policy 8 is supported as it provides an appropriate level of detail and guidance for new residential development in Greater Nottingham. Whilst less relevant to Policy 8, it is noted that if the GNSP is to achieve the delivery of a sufficient level of housing to meet need across the Plan period, including the delivery of a mix of homes by size, type, tenure and density, emphasis needs to be placed on delivery and how this can be achieved. The affordable provision of between 20-30% within Gedling is supported including the specification that a lower proportion can be justified on viability evidence.	Support welcomed. Note that Gedling are no longer party to the GNSP.	None	1250402	Burhill Group Limited (Joe Wyatt)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 8 Housing Size, Mix and Choice	Inadequate Affordable Housing Allocation. Object to social housing not being allocated to those with a local connection. Current policies do not prioritise village-level need. Lack of Housing Adaptability. New homes should be pre-adapted for accessibility to avoid costly retrofits. Developer Dominance - Strategic sites are dominated by large developers so there's a lack of diversity in housing types and tenures.	Evidence informing the council's policy on affordable housing is outlined in the Housing Background Paper and Greater Nottingham and Ashfield Housing Needs Assessment. The policy specifies a need for local connection criteria on affordable developments in rural areas, the connection criteria themselves are not a planning matter. The policy also requires all dwellings to comply with M4(2) accessibility and adaptability standards. The policy sets out the requirement for a	None	1291885 1290345	Keyworth Parish Council (Mary Butler) Keyworth Parish Council (Mary Butler)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		mix of types and tenures of housing but detailed plans are dealt with through the planning application process			
Policy 8 Housing Size, Mix and Choice	Housing should be built to the highest spec of insulation, especially council housing to support those least able to pay for energy bills	Policy 1: "Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk" outlines requirements for new buildings to achieve net zero regulated operational emissions where viable and feasible. This is demonstrated through energy statements at planning application stage. This requirement also	None	1290373	Susan Edwards

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		applies to social homes			

Policy 9

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 9	No written response or attachment provided.	Supports the policy	Noted	1241173	Mr Christopher Smith

Policy 10

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 10	Part 1 of the policy offers no flexibility, proposed amendments are: 'where possible all new development should be designed to…'. OR "All new development should be designed to incorporate the following measures, where feasible and viable:"	It is not appropriate or necessary to have these caveats in the policy. Decision makers are required to take into account all material planning considerations.	None	1261640 1261056 1259666 1246653 1247021	Barratt David Wilson (North Midlands) (c/o agent c/o agent) David Wilson Homes East Midlands (Ms Helen Bareford)William Davis Homes (Hannah Price) David Wilson Homes East Midlands (Ms Helen Bareford) David Wilson Homes East Midlands (C/O Agent)
Policy 10	The Policy is currently vague in some aspects, for example: - the Policy does not define what	The policy contains the appropriate level of detail. In respect of density, this will be dependent on a site's context and location, and any site specific policy in a local plan or supplementary planning document.	None	1260125 1260571	Strawson Group Investments Ltd (C/O Agent C/O Agent) Harworth Group (C/O Agent C/O Agent)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	densities would be acceptable or unacceptable.			1245720	Strawson Group Investments Ltd (C/O Agent)
Policy 10	Other undefined elements of this policy are – part c) of the policy states new development should 'reinforce valued local characteristics'. However, the policy does not specify what these 'valued' local characterises are or where they are identified. - In Part 3 of the policy it is unclear	In respect of valued local characteristics, this will be dependent on a site's context and location and may be defined through supporting documents including SPDs, design codes and conservation area appraisals. Best practice guidance, design codes and Supplementary Plans will set out how developments can perform highly against the set criteria.	None	1261640 1261056 1246823	Barratt David Wilson (North Midlands) (c/o agent c/o agent) David Wilson Homes East Midlands (Ms Helen Bareford) Harworth Group (C/O Agent)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	what 'perform highly' means.				
Policy 10 - (2)(k) and P3.10.14	The clause should relate to the significance of heritage assets (which includes setting), rather than simply stating 'setting' as is the significance of heritage assets that are protected. There is no reference to key views, vistas, landmarks etc. in relation to the historic environment. How is the issue of tall buildings being considered within	Proposed modification to include reference to the significance of heritage assets. Key views, vistas, landmarks etc are included in Part 2 Local Plans, and will also be included in future Plan making. The issue of tall buildings principally relates to Nottingham City, who are developing a Tall Building strategy, which will be embodied in a future local plan for Nottingham City.	See Suggested Main Modifications document.	1262394 1246160 1246161	Historic England (Rosamund Worrall) Historic England Historic England

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	the context of the design policy?				
Policy 10	Part 1 d) of the policy should be further explained so it is clear what the 'valued local characteristics' are. Part 3 of the policy should be further explained so it is clear what sites need to do to 'perform highly'.	Valued local characteristics are matters which are dependent on site context, and are therefore best considered on a site by site basis. The policy explains that performing highly is in the context of best practice guidance, design codes and Supplementary Plans.	None	1247021	David Wilson Homes East Midlands (C/O Agent)
Policy 10	Limited reference to heritage within this section and what is meant by local distinctiveness and character. Also, reference is needed to appropriate evidence base documents, and	Heritage is dealt with in detail as part of Policy 11. Consider that it is not necessary to list evidence base documents. More detailed guidance is provided within site specific policies, existing Part 2 Local Plans, SPDs and Design Codes.	None	1262394 1246160	Historic England (Rosamund Worrall) Historic England

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	there is a need to provide developers with certainty in terms of what is expected of them regarding design.				
Policy 10	Key views and vistas are referenced; what evidence exists to support where these key views and vistas are, and Is this information likely to come forward in another way (e.g. design codes)?	Where relevant, this will be defined within existing/ future local plans and other plan documents including conservation area appraisals.	None	1262394 1246160	Historic England (Rosamund Worrall) Historic England
Policy 10 - P3.10.14	The paragraph could go further in setting out what the policy will mean in practice for the historic	Heritage is dealt with in detail as part of Policy 11. Other matters have been dealt with in responses above.	None	1262394	Historic England (Rosamund Worrall)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	environment. In particular, no reference to key views, vistas, landmarks etc. and issue of tall buildings could have greater consideration.				
Policy 10 - (1)(e and f)	A reference to DfT LTN 1/20 design standard should perhaps be added here.	It is considered that it is not necessary to include a list of detailed design standards within the policy.	None	1260894	Pedals (Nottingham Cycle Campaign) (Mr Peter Briggs)
Policy 10	Sport England would welcome the inclusion of reference to the Active Design guidance within the supporting text for Policy 10.	It not considered necessary to include a list of detailed design standards within the policy or justification text. The justification text includes an example of recognised guides and standards.	None	1259914 1246129	Sport England (Mrs Julia Baish) Sport England (Mrs Julia Baish)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 10	Support for the inclusion of land instability and any mitigation measures in 2 (h) due to coal mining legacy.	Noted.	None	1259555 1259908 1242818	The Coal Authority / The Mining Remediation Authority (Mrs Melanie Lindsley) The Coal Authority / The Mining Remediation Authority (Mrs Melanie Lindsley)
Policy 10 – (1)(e)	Policy 10.1 (e) is too vague for a key policy and should allude to the negative aspects of motor vehicles in a residential community. We propose you insert after 'motor vehicles'..."which can have a negative impact on (a to d) above".	Consider the policy contains sufficient detail in respect of the need to reduce the dominance of motor vehicles.	None	1258361	The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 10 - (1)(f)	This policy and 10.1 (f) are referred to in para. 3.10.10 where the respondents recommend that there be more detail about the negative impacts of planning for forecasted travel demand rather than managing it with cross reference to Policy 14.	The plan should be read as a whole and therefore does not need to repeat elements of Policy 14.	None	1258361 1237839	The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council
Policy 10	In order to retain flexibility on development sites, ensure development viability and assist sustainable sites coming forward, a minor wording change is suggested to ensure that design	It is not appropriate or necessary to have these caveats in the policy. Decision makers are required to take into account all material planning considerations.		1243772 1247156	William Davis Homes (Hannah Price) William Davis Homes (Hannah Price)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	measures are incorporated wherever possible.				
Policy 10	No written response or attachment provided.	Supports the policy	Noted	1241173	Mr Christopher Smith

Policy 11

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 11: Historic Environment	To make the policy sound, Policy 11 2.b) should include the WW1 NSFF No.6 and Chetwynd Barracks as part of the historic military and industrial environment.	Listing specific local examples is not a matter for a strategic plan.	None	1261795 1245744	Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum
Policy 11: Historic Environment Clause 1	The policy requires amending in order to be effective and in line with Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Clause 1: It should be clear that the policy relates to protecting and enhancing the	Suggested main modifications to state when planning permission would be refused.	See Suggested Main Modifications Document.	1262395 1246164	Historic England Historic England

	significance of heritage assets, including their setting. The policy should set out what happens in the event of harm and how the application will be managed.				
Policy 11: Historic Environment Clause 2	The clause is welcomed, and it sets out what is important locally and how this should be protected. The beginning of the clause should have a catch all sentence that ensures the policy relates to all heritage assets, including different typologies and then goes on to outline some examples of what is meant by that. The list should be considered an example and not	Consider that clause 2 is sufficiently clear as drafted. Minor change suggested to strengthen the policy and comply with the NPPF.	See Suggested Main Modifications Document	1262395 1246164	Historic England Historic England

	exhaustive. The clause should comply with Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.				
Policy 11: Historic Environment Clause 3, c	The clause should relate to 'heritage assets'. Additionally, the clause should seek the appropriate reuse of heritage assets.	Suggested change to the wording to refer to heritage assets and reuse.	See Suggested Main Modifications Document	1262395 1246164	Historic England Historic England
Policy 11: Historic Environment Clause 3, d	The clause should relate to seeking improvements for the public realm which protect and enhance the significance of heritage assets, including their setting.	Suggested addition to the wording based on comments.	See Suggested Main Modifications Document	1262395 1246164	Historic England Historic England
Policy 11: Historic Environment Clause 3, f	In order to achieve this ambition, planning applications will need to be accompanied with	This is a matter for validation requirements but additional text has been suggested to the justification text.	See Suggested Main Modifications Document	1262395 1246164	Historic England Historic England

	appropriate archaeological evidence base including desk based assessment, and where necessary field evaluations, by an appropriate qualified professional.				
Policy 11: Historic Environment Clause 3, g	Every effort should be taken to ensure that development will proceed before the unavoidable loss of a heritage asset is allowed. Recording of any heritage asset and relevant information should be updated to the Historic Environment Record (HER) as a minimum.	This is already covered within the NPPF and within existing Part 2 Local Plans.	None	1262395 1246164	Historic England Historic England
Policy 11: Historic	Planning applications should be accompanied by Heritage Impact	This is a matter for validation requirements.	None	1262395 1246164	Historic England Historic England

Environment Clause 3, h	Assessment (HIA) or similar and to set out how the significance of heritage assets, including their setting will be protected and enhanced. This should include reference to when harm may occur and how this can be avoided or mitigated.				
Policy 11: Historic Environment Clause 4	Unclear what is meant by this within the policy and what the ambition of the clause is.	Consider this clause is clear and relates to additional scrutiny will be given to proposal which will adversely affect assets already at risk of harm or loss, or which have the potential to impact upon multiple heritage assets with significance derived from group value.	None	1262395 1246164	Historic England Historic England
Policy 11: Historic Environment Consider monitoring indicators	Consider including an indicator that considers % of planning applications approved contrary to heritage advice, for example. The current indicator will	Consider that existing monitoring indicators are appropriate.	None	1262395 1246164	Historic England Historic England

	provide a very limited picture.				
Policy 11: Historic Environment	Against proposed development at East of Gamston. The airfield and its existing function should be maintained.	Any historic assets have been considered as part of the allocation of this site.	None	1255306	Tollerton Park
Policy 11: Historic Environment	No written response or attachment provided.	N/A	None	1243485	Mrs Julia Paterson
Policy 11: Historic Environment	Supports the policy	Noted	None	1241176	Mr Christopher Smith
Policy 11: Historic Environment	The evidence base should be reappraised to ensure that the historic environments of Key Settlements are given sufficient attention.	It is considered that Policy 11 provides sufficient guidance alongside Part 2 Local Plans and locational specific guidance. Gedling have withdrawn from the GNSP and are preparing a separate Local Development Plan.	None	1242788	Calverton Parish Council (Jane Walker)

	The ‘Heritage Assets Assessment’ should be amended to acknowledge the extent of the settings of Calverton’s Scheduled Ancient Monument hill forts, which include the hillslopes of Calverton’s ridgeline. In line with the Duty to Cooperate, an assessment should be made to ascertain whether Gedling’s identified housing land supply would impact on the historic environment to a greater extent than would be the case if the housing shortfall was allocated to other council areas in the Greater Nottingham area.				

Policy 11: Historic Environment	No written response or attachment provided.	N/A	None	1242457	Mrs Bridgette Davis

Policy 12

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 12: Local Services and Healthy Lifestyles	Supports the policy as written and considers it to be flexibly written.	Comments noted.		1261057	David Wilson Homes (East Midlands)
Policy 12: Local Services and Healthy Lifestyles	Welcomes and supports the inclusion of policies that support healthy lifestyles and would recommend that the Council implement the requirement for Health Impact Assessment on significant residential developments Supports the provision of sufficient, quality community facilities but does not consider the proposed policy approach to be positively prepared or	Note the processes which NHS land disposals must follow but consider it appropriate to demonstrate that the community facility is no longer required.		1260087 1245979	NHS Property Services NHS Property Services (Daniel Fleet)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	effective in its current form. Requiring NHS disposal sites to explore the potential for alternative community uses and/or to retain a substantial proportion of community facility provision adds unjustified delay to vital reinvestment in facilities and services for the community. All NHS land disposals must follow a rigorous process to ensure that levels of healthcare service provision in the locality of disposals are maintained or enhanced.				
Policy 12: Local Services and	Agrees that all Community Facilities	Comments noted.		1260172	East Leake Parish Council

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Healthy Lifestyles	should be in the centre of towns and villages.				
Policy 12: Local Services and Healthy Lifestyles	Supports the aim of the creation of compact and connected centres and neighbourhoods. Particularly supportive of paragraph 3.10.10.	Comments noted.		1260898	Pedals (Nottingham Cycling Campaign)
Policy 12: Local Services and Healthy Lifestyles	Requests that a separate criterion is added to Policy 12 to address proposals that involve the loss of sports facilities which is consistent with paragraph 104 of the NPPF (2024).	Sports facilities are dealt with specifically under Policy 13.		1259915 1246122	Sport England Sport England (Mrs Julia Baish)
Policy 12: Local Services and Healthy Lifestyles	The recognition within Policy 12 that the City Centre is the most appropriate and sustainable location for	Comments noted.		1259964	VCP Nominees Victoria Centre

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	a range of community facilities is supported.				
Policy 12: Local Services and Healthy Lifestyles	Supports the policy	Noted	None	1241177	Mr Christopher Smith
Policy 12: Local Services and Healthy Lifestyles	Support Policy 12 Part 1 as written. Part 2 of the Policy is also considered to be flexibly written, parts a) and c) use phrases such as 'wherever appropriate' and 'where possible' which is welcomed.	Comments noted.	None	1247022	David Wilson Homes East Midlands (C/O Agent)
Policy 12: Local Services and Healthy Lifestyles	States there are multiple references to school provision and also to Chilwell Olympia, "owned by	GNSP does not refer to Chilwell Olympia. Noted the need to undertake consultation with the school in	None	1236749	Chilwell School (Mr David Phillips)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Nottinghamshire County Council." Chilwell Olympia is wholly owned by Chilwell School, which as a foundation school has full legal ownership of the land and property. Proposals for both education and leisure development need to identify the school as a key responsible party, as Chilwell Olympia is the name only for the sports facilities owned by the school. Consultation and planning need to be undertaken with the school to ensure legal compliance and effective planning for the future.	respect of any future education or leisure development.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 12: Local Services and Healthy Lifestyles	Housing should be built alongside community facilities such as schools healthcare and shops to reduce the need to travel.	Policy 12 outlines the requirement for community facilities to be built to support major new residential development as well as regeneration objectives	None	1290378	Susan Edwards

Policy 13

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 13: Culture, Tourism and Sport	The Policy would benefit from reference to heritage tourism.	Consider this is too specific for the policy and enhancement of key heritage assets which may be of interest are listed under Policy 11.		1262397 1246165	Historic England (Rosamund Worrall) Historic England (Kezia Taylerson)
Policy 13: Culture, Tourism and Sport	Nottingham Airfield should be saved. The site is used by the community as a leisure facility and for education and to improve mental health.	The site is an existing allocation. Policy 31 includes the requirement to provide community facilities.		1258859	Mrs Lisa Williams
Policy 13: Culture, Tourism and Sport	Elements of the evidence base are out of date or are missing, this is set out in NPPF Para 103. Councils should carry out the necessary playing pitch strategy	Evidence related to playing pitch strategies will be updated as part of future plan preparation work to consider specific local issues.	See Suggested Main Modifications document for proposed wording.	1259916 1246123	Sport England (Julia Baish) Sport England (Julia Baish)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	and sports facility strategy work. Paragraph 104 of the NPPF makes no allowance for proposals where the benefits of the proposal would outweigh the loss of sports facilities. Part 2 of Policy 13 is not consistent with Paragraph 104 of the NPPF.	Proposed amended wording in relation to sport facilities under part 2 of the policy and reflected in the justification text.			
Policy 13: Culture, Tourism and Sport	Policy 13 should be amended to address the issue of excessive on street parking around sporting events in the riverside area of West Bridgford.	Consider that this is not a matter for the Strategic Plan.	None	1258362 1237891	The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 13: Culture, Tourism and Sport	Welcomes and supports the policy as written.	Comments noted.	None	1259177 1243141	Theatres Trust (Mr Tom Clarke MRTPI) Theatres Trust (Mr Tom Clarke MRTPI)
Policy 13: Culture, Tourism and Sport	The policy is supported as it recognises the benefits of improving cultural, sporting and tourism facilities and that the preferred location for such facilities should be the city centre.	Comments noted.	None	1259966	VCP Nominees Victoria Centre (C/O Agent)
Policy 13: Culture, Tourism and Sport	Nottingham needs to do more to attract more tourists. Nottingham needs more hotels and more attractions to boost tourism to the area and the local economy.			1243424	Mr Atif Muneer

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 13: Culture, Tourism and Sport	Policy 13 is supported in principle. Weight should be given to the proximity of new residential development to existing community facilities			1250404	Burhill Group Limited (Joe Wyatt)
Policy 13	Supports the policy	Noted	None	1241178	Mr Christopher Smith

Policy 14

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 14: Managing Travel Demand	Broadly supports Policy 14, however argues there is a disconnect between the priorities of the spatial strategy, the identification of strategic sites, particularly in Gedling, and the key aims of Policy 14. In Gedling, this is best achieved by concentrating major new housing development on land adjoining the edge of the main built up area of Nottingham in Arnold and Carlton, rather than at Top Wighay Farm.	Gedling Borough Council is producing its own Local Development Plan.	None	1258407 1243432 1250341 1258438 1250382 1243389	Langridge Homes Ltd (Mr David Fletcher) Trustees of Hammond Farm Hammond Farms (Mr Robert Hammond)
Policy 14: Managing Travel Demand	Support aspirations for new rail stations and services at paragraph 3.14.9, but this will need collaboration with Train Operating Companies	Comments noted.	None	1262630 1243774	Network Rail (Miss Emma Foster)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	and Network Rail's Strategic Planning team to identify future demand and ensure schemes are located in areas where future services may be possible/viable.				
Policy 14: Managing Travel Demand	Supports the hierarchical approach to managing travel demand within this policy which is consistent with the approach of its current Local Transport Plan.	Comments noted.	None	1260098 1243792	Nottinghamshire County Council (Mr Stephen Pointer)
Policy 14: Managing Travel Demand	Supports all the statements in parts 1-3 (a-e) of the policy. In the Monitoring table following paragraph 3.14.16, suggests the need for better KPIs for the target of reducing the need to use a	Consider that the current monitoring indicators are appropriate. The monitoring indicators are based on information accessible by the authorities on a consistent basis. There	None	1260899	Pedals (Nottingham Cycling Campaign) (Mr. Hugh McClintock)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	private car, i.e. not just a process led measure (proportion of households within a 400m walk of bus or tram stop with an hourly service) but rather some for active travel e.g. the percentage of people that perceive it is safe to cycle to key destinations within 5km of their home (as safety perception has been consistently shown to be the main barrier to people choosing the bike over the car). Active Travel England should be consulted on possible improved suggestions. There is also a need for outcome measures for the target as the lead measures will not help	are additional indicators as part of the SA.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	achieve the target. An example outcome measure is the percentage of short journeys (e.g. under 5-6km) taken by private car or taxi; basically, just putting a bus stop in won't lead to enough people taking a bus. Other suggestions for additional KPIs, responding to issue that active travel isn't given parity of esteem with public transport: "Number of residential developments that have complete LTN-1/20-compliant cycle-routes to both the nearest (mini-)supermarket and the nearest secondary school." And "number of complete LTN-1/20-			1258396 1243505	David Rhead

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	compliant routes between employment developments and off-site residential areas."				
Policy 14: Managing Travel Demand	Strongly support this Policy and the hierarchy set out in part 3. Over-provision of off-road parking for individual properties can have a negative effect on reducing the need to travel by car. It can also be a counter against the successful promotion of public transport, active travel and local car clubs. We appreciate that there is a balance here with being over-restrictive as this can lead to excessive parking problems on-street. This topic should be referred to and a policy steer provided.	Setting specific parking standards is a matter for other planning documents including Design Codes, SPDs and council-specific future local plans.	None	1258363 1238236	The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	(This issue also relates to Policy 10, parts 1e) and 1f), and to paragraph 3.10.10.)				
Policy 14: Managing Travel Demand	It would be helpful if there was reference to and promotion of the concept of Limited Traffic Neighbourhoods for existing and new residential areas.	The policy, combined with other policies in the Strategic Plan, seeks to ensure that non private car methods of transport are prioritised.	None	1258363 1238236	The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council
Policy 14: Managing Travel Demand	The overall approach of these policies is supported through directing development towards the City Centre where appropriate to ensure accessibility and improving the accessibility of the city as a whole.	Comments noted.	None	1259968	VCP Nominees Victoria Centre (c/o Agent)
Policy 14: Managing	In failing to consider co-locating housing growth with jobs growth, key policies such as Spatial	Justification for selecting sites allocated within the Strategic Plan is provided within the	None	125994 1291477	Hallam Land and Davidsons Developments

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Travel Demand	Objective 10 and Part 1 of Policy 14 will be ineffective. Furthermore, Part 2 of Policy 14 states that the priority for new development is selecting sites already, or which can readily be made, accessible by walking, cycling and public transport. This is wholly supported but without the ability to develop homes proximate to jobs, the power station location is deficient of opportunities for walking and cycling. (This issue also relates to Spatial Objective 10 and Policy 32.)	site selection document. This also considers accessibility matters.			
Policy 14: Managing	Supports and agrees with Policy 14; development should be	Support for Policy 14 noted.	None	1260573 1260578	Harworth Group (c/o agent)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Travel Demand	well located to existing highway links within settlements such as Tollerton and Trowell.			1246824 1260126 1245721	Strawson Group Investments Ltd (c/o agent)
Policy 14: Managing Travel Demand	Supports and agrees with Policy 14; Chilwell Lane, Bramcote is indicated as complying with this policy.	Support for Policy 14 noted.	None	1260978 1245767	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land (James Beverley)
Policy 14: Managing Travel Demand	Supports the hierarchical approach to ensure the delivery of sustainable transport networks to serve new development. On a related point, as per DIO's comments on Site 21, the thresholds for delivery of the Toton Link Road and the Bessell Lane works within the Site 21 allocation have not been set out, and	Comments noted. The Toton link Road is required to access the site.	None	1263732 1245868	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	expect the GNPP to publish evidence in due course (presumably in the Strategic Transport Modelling to be published in early 2025) that the GNPP has followed the hierarchical approach required by draft Policy 14 in its approach with Site 21.				
Policy 14: Managing Travel Demand	Disputes that the developments proposed are in a scale appropriate to sustainable transport networks. No improvements are proposed, and there is a lack of road capacity east of Nottingham, on both sides of the Trent. There is a lack of river crossings, the idea of another bridge to the east of Nottingham is	Comments noted. The provision of a new bridge is a matter for EMCCA and/or National Highways. The transport modelling includes a comprehensive range of measures which seek to mitigate the impact of the GNSP proposals as far as practicable.	None	1235388	George Pickering

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	constantly being proposed and needs delivering. Argues for more transport capacity east of Nottingham and a new bridge east of Nottingham before Gunthorpe A6097.				
Policy 14: Managing Travel Demand	Disputes understanding of impacts of plan on communities further away from Nottingham. New housing has already impacted the journey towards town. This is bad for pollution and for mental health, and there for the overstretched medical centres.	The transport modelling and mitigation cover the whole plan area.	None.	1242480	Mrs Alison G-palmer
Policy14: Managing	Supports the policy	Noted	None	1241179	Mr Christopher Smith

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Travel Demand					

Policy 15

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 15: Transport Infrastructure Priorities	The so called "Toton Link Road / Boulevard" (Policy 15 part 4) is an unfunded £40,000,000 ticket to increasing congestion on the A52 that will diminish the importance of the Tram Terminus and hinder access to Broxtowe and the City from the M1 J25 (and vice versa). The idea that 700 more homes should be allowed on land that is currently green belt (between the Bardill and Sherwin roundabouts) in the hope that this will generate money to pay for this asphalt strip is evidence of how poorly thought out the	The need for the road has been considered by the Highways Authority and has been included within the transport modelling to mitigate congestion impacts.	None	1259787	Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum (Dr Paul Nathanail)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	transport policies for the Toton area are.				
Policy 15: Transport Infrastructure Priorities	Policy 15.4 is unsound as some of the wording is unclear. For example under Public Transport Improvements it just states "NET extension Toton" without stating to where, unlike the other NET extensions listed, for example NET extension Clifton to Fairham Pastures. Whilst Para 3.15.10 does provide some context, the policy itself should be more specific. To be sound Policy 15.4 should say "NET extension Toton to a potential new rail station within the Toton Strategic Location for Growth, and potentially	Consider that there is sufficient information within the existing policy and justification text, in conjunction with site specific policies, the key diagram and the IDP. Other comments are considered under Policy 21. In relation to the A52 Bramcote Island signalisation, this is proposed to be removed from the list of Highway Improvements due to the modelling results indicating that it would cause further congestion.	See Suggested Main Modifications document for suggested change.	1261797 1245746	Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum (Mr David Lovett) Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum (Mr David Lovett)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	to Long Eaton and beyond." See also separate comments under Policy 21 in relation to Toton Link Road / Boulevard listed under Highway Improvements within Policy 15.4. The Forum supports improvements to the A52 Bramcote Island signalisation listed under Highway Improvements within Policy 15.4, especially if it includes signals for traffic exiting Town Street on to the island.				
Policy 15: Transport Infrastructure Priorities	GNSP Policy 15's parts 3 and 4 don't show all the travel infrastructure – particularly "active travel" infrastructure – that will be required to accommodate the trips	The policy only lists strategic level infrastructure projects. Transport infrastructure required as part of strategic sites are listed within	None	1258382 1241894	David Rhead David Rhead

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	generated by the Strategic Allocations. If requirements aren't documented, they're unlikely to be delivered. The GNSP will be ineffective. Within parts 3 and 4, its unclear which schemes are listed because they're necessary to accommodate trips generated by specific Strategic Allocations, and which are listed because they're deemed desirable for other reasons. From the point-of-view of GNSP Para 3.15.11, the former may be eligible for S106 funding, while the latter are likely to depend on	the site specific policies.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	non-S106 funding. Because of the lack-of-clarity: • insufficient S106 contributions may be sought • Planning Consent may be given without appropriate S106 contributions being paid. Suggest Policy 15 divides the "other schemes" list into two lists: • one for schemes intended to underpin particular Strategic Allocations (and so potentially eligible for S106 contributions) • the other for schemes deemed desirable for other reasons (and				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	unlikely to attract S106 contributions). Restructure Para 3.15.11 similarly.				
Policy 15: Transport Infrastructure Priorities	EMF anticipate that the most significant highways infrastructure required to bring forward the three EMF sites will be around Junctions 23A/24 of the M1. We therefore welcome the reference at Policy 15 to the importance of M1 Junction 24. However, cross-boundary coordination with neighbouring local authorities (especially Leicestershire County Council as Local Highways Authority for J24) is crucial to ensure that the	Consider that additional text is not required to make the policy sound. There are references within the justification text in relation to joint working with key stakeholders. GNSP has specifically engaged with the Freeport, and is aware of the work it is undertaking. Relevant transport authorities covering the GNSP area are involved in this work.	None	1260921	East Midlands Freeport Ltd. (Mr Paul Miller)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	necessary infrastructure improvements at Junction 24 (and J23A) are delivered, benefitting the wider region. This should include collaboration with National Highways to confirm that the Road Investment Strategy route is plausible. We suggest additional policy text that explicitly commits to working with partners to improve transport links. Highway modelling work is currently being undertaken by EMF across its geography in partnership with the existing local highways authorities and the East Midlands				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Combined County Authority. This will help to form a basis for collaborative network planning going forward and an EMF-wide Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) will be produced to assist with the formulation of a policy at the local plan examinations of each separate local plan affecting South Derbyshire, North West Leicestershire and Rushcliffe. Support local authorities - including in adjoining counties - for considering how growth in south Nottinghamshire can be facilitated by sustainable transport responses.				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 15: Transport Infrastructure Priorities	Support the reference in GNSP Policy 15 (Transport Infrastructure Priorities) to the importance of working with all partners to address constraints at M1 J24. This collaboration will be critical to unlocking the full potential of site redevelopment.	Noted.	None	1243686	Uniper UK Limited (Dr Andy Read)
Policy 15: Transport Infrastructure Priorities	Supports the policy	Noted	None	1241180 1241181	Mr Christopher Smith Mr Christopher Smith
Policy 15: Transport Infrastructure Priorities	The plan is not sound because it contravenes the National Planning Policy Framework that states planning authorities should recognise the importance of maintaining a national	The Gamston allocation is a longstanding allocation, subject to extensive consultation with all relevant bodies.	None	1238770	Mr Robert Dawson

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	network of General Aviation facilities, and the airfield was included with no consultation with the Aviation Community. Tollerton many times, and seen what a vibrant airfield it is, supported not only by the Aviation Community, but also widely used by the local Community."				
Policy 15: Transport Infrastructure Priorities	Nottingham Aerodrome is a vital part of national GA infrastructure. Local benefits include: Employment, economic boost from visitor, Inspirational visits for children,	The Gamston allocation is a longstanding allocation, subject to extensive consultation with all relevant bodies.	None	1241509	Captain Richard Keech

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Environmental advantages: Predominantly green, open space with minimal environmental impact (no chemical fertilisers). GA aircraft emissions are negligible (global aviation <5% of CO2 output). Concerns about proposed development: Tarmac and roofs could strain local drainage infrastructure. Increased commuting, emissions, and congestion. Suggests alternative: distribute development among existing local				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	towns needing economic rejuvenation. Urges preservation of Nottingham Aerodrome as a valuable community and GA asset.				
Policy 15: Transport Infrastructure Priorities	There are no initiatives listed in Policy 15 ('Transport Infrastructure Priorities') – spatial or otherwise - that seek to mitigate/improve the current inaccessibility of Ratcliffe-on-Soar as a key travel destination in the Plan. In terms of public transport, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (September 2023) contains limited suggestions of how the isolated power station	There are transport infrastructure requirements listed within the site specific policy. Highway improvements including M1 J24 improvements and A453 corridor improvements will also support this site. There will be rail access to the site via East Midlands Parkway.	None	1259948 1291477	Hallam Land and Davidsons Developments

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	site could be brought in line with Policy 14 objectives (a potential bus extension is mooted, but did not make it into Policy 15 as a priority). The transport assessment prepared for the recently granted Ratcliffe-on-Soar Power Station LDO acknowledges that the ensuing 8,000 jobs will be heavily reliant on private car, with an anticipated mode share of 90% compared to a national average of around 60%. Given its currently isolated location, that there are no transport priorities identified for sustainably reaching the largest employment				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	allocation in the plan is baffling and, in our view, renders a key aspect of the spatial strategy ineffective. This is exacerbated by the fact that any 'hooks' to apply GNSP policies to ensure the power station development is self-mitigating in respect of sustainable transport are also curtailed by virtue of the LDO which sets out a standalone policy context for its redevelopment.				
Policy 15: Transport Infrastructure Priorities	How is the historic environment being considered through the identification of transport initiatives/ schemes across the Plan area?	These matters are dealt with under Policy 11 and will also be considered as part of future plan preparation by each authority.	None	1262400 1246167	Historic England (Rosamund Worrall) Historic England

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Are the schemes in the appropriate locations in respect of their potential harm on the significance of heritage assets? Are there any benefits for the historic environment, including the opportunity to better reveal the significance of heritage assets?				
Policy 15: Transport Infrastructure Priorities	The majority of transport schemes remain as unfunded commitments. Strategic development allocations can provide a means for unlocking the funding/providing matched funding for such schemes where appropriate.	Comments noted.	None	1258408 1243434	Langridge Homes Ltd (Mr David Fletcher) Langridge Homes Ltd (Mr David Fletcher)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 15: Transport Infrastructure Priorities	Stop house building and allow airport to remain per and general aviation to continue.	The Gamston site is an existing allocation for housing.	None	1257916	Mr Arthur Goetsch
Policy 15: Transport Infrastructure Priorities	As outlined in the policy, if funding becomes available both the A52 capacity improvements at Queens Drive and Abbey Street, as well as potential A52 upgrades involving the signalisation of Bramcote Island, will need to be thoroughly reviewed to assess viable options before they can be supported for allocation within the plan.	The policy makes clear that these schemes are being explored further and are not commitments at this stage. In relation to the A52 Bramcote Island signalisation, this is proposed to be removed from the list of Highway Improvements due to the modelling results indicating that it would cause further congestion.	See Suggested Main Modifications document for suggested change.	1259789	National Highways
Policy 15: Transport	Part 4- Public Transport Improvements: Midland	Comments noted. The contents of a Transport Assessment and	None	1262629	Network Rail (Miss Emma Foster)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Infrastructure Priorities	Mainline Upgrade Electrification to Nottingham station. Network Rail welcomes this. We assume that inclusion is a presumption in favour of electrification works. Part 2: Development located close to Level Crossings can often cause an uplift in user numbers, which in turn, poses greater risk to railway safety. We would ask that specific wording is included within policy 15 to ensure that Transport Assessments and Statements provide sufficient consideration on level crossing impacts as part of proposed	Statement is a matter for each authority and will be considered as part of planning applications on a site by site basis.		1243786	Network Rail (Miss Emma Foster)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	development and that sufficient mitigation measures are secured either via developer contributions or other means.				
Policy 15: Transport Infrastructure Priorities	Nottinghamshire County Council was consulted over the package of sustainable travel modes and the targeted highway investments to be modelled and indicated some concern that concept proposals whilst showing benefits through the modelling exercise in reality may not be deliverable on Nottinghamshire's largely rural / suburban road network. The initial results of the modelling showed that	Comments noted. A Statement of Common Ground has been prepared with the County Council.	None	1260101 1243794	Nottinghamshire County Council (Mr Stephen Pointer)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	a suite of mitigation measures do not result in any significant benefit to the highway network and in some scenarios forecast congestion is worse when mitigation measures are applied. The County Council therefore supports the need for further modelling and more targeted mitigation measures which are expected to improve the position somewhat. The County Council notes this work is ongoing and will be completed prior to submission and examination of the Plan in order to evidence the Plan and improve the				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	soundness of this policy. However, given the already congested nature of the network, and the constrained nature of most junctions restricting their improvement, the scope for significant further mitigation is likely to be limited. It also recognises the limitations of traditional transport models in terms of their application to dense urban areas and notes the publication of a new National Planning Policy Framework in December 2024 which supports a move to more "vision led" transport planning and				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	away from "predict and provide" approaches. The County Council is therefore unable to draw specific conclusions at this point in time regarding the expected impact of the Strategic Plan on the County road network nor on the package of transport mitigations which will be necessary to support development proposals in the Strategic Plan. It will therefore confirm its final comments on transport impacts once the Strategic Transport Assessment is published and do this within a Statement of Common Ground with the Greater Nottingham				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	authorities which will be submitted with the Strategic Plan in due course.				
Policy 15: Transport Infrastructure Priorities	See comments on Policies 1-14 for our main priorities.	Comments noted and dealt with as part of other policies.	None	1261949	Pedals (Nottingham Cycling Campaign) (Mr. Hugh McClintock)
Policy 15: Transport Infrastructure Priorities	Emphasise the importance of the strategic Cycling / Active Travel Projects / Proposals below which we see as being of particular importance to serving major new and existing housing and employment sites as well as helping to upgrade and extend the wider Greater Nottingham Strategic Route Network, including several greatly improved safer and more direct Active	The Strategic Plan supports active travel and there are strategic level active travel projects listed within Policy 15 as well as within site specific policies. A number of active travel projects are more localised and therefore would not be appropriate to include within a strategic level plan. Any schemes not directly related to strategic sites would	None	1261949 1242857	Pedals (Nottingham Cycling Campaign) (Mr. Hugh McClintock) Pedals (Nottingham Cycling Campaign) (Mr. Hugh McClintock)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Travel Connections. The implementation of these would significantly further help to address the vital need to decarbonise transport, and promote the use of cycling and walking for shorter trips, especially in urban areas, for both commuting / utility and leisure trips, while recognising that growing use of ebikes could also help promote cycling in both hillier and flatter rural areas, especially if combined with lower and well-enforced speed limits. The advice and guidance of Active Travel England, particularly with regard	need to be included within a future LCWIP, which will be prepared by EMCCA.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	to ensuring high standards of provision, in line with the DfT Local Transport Note 1/20, and other relevant guidance, is of crucial important, as well as consultation with Sustrans in the case of any routes forming part of, or closely linked, to National Cycle Network routes such as NCN 6, 15 and 48 in Nottinghamshire. Our priorities include:- Completion of the Waterside Foot-Cycle bridge and improved and extended connections on both sides of the River Trent, with regard to other short-term, medium-term and				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	longer-term proposals including the Environment Agency's River Trent Master Plan which includes aspirations for new, extended and upgraded routes on both sides of the river between Sawley and Cromwell as well as improved access / feeder routes. It is of particular importance, we think, to give priority to implementing improved links to and from nearby new major housing schemes, especially in the Gamston Fields Sustainable Urban Extension but also to and from Tollerton, Cotgrave, Radcliffe on Trent and Bingham.				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	The proposed "RoSChet" foot-cycle bridge over the Trent in the Red Hill / Cranfleet Lock area on the Nottinghamshire / Derbyshire border to connect the former Ratcliffe-on-Soar and Chetwynd Barracks-Toton major regeneration areas as well as other nearby major housing developments and East Midlands Parkway Station, etc. Further information on this proposal was submitted on 7 April 2025 to the Mayor's Sustainable Travel Ambassador for the East Midlands Combined County Authority and is now				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	being followed up by him. Reinstated versions of both of the two "Cycle Superhighway" schemes, abandoned by Nottinghamshire County Council in 2023, i.e. the Nottingham-Derby Cycle Superhighway in the A6005 / Sustrans National Cycle Route 6 Corridor and the Nottingham-Clifton-Fairham Pastures-East Midlands Parkway Station-East Midlands Airport-East Midlands Gateway (A453) Corridor. Completion of the improved Active Travel route connecting Edwalton and the whole east side of				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	West Bridgford with Ruddington via an upgraded subway-underpass under the A52 south of Sharp Hill, in the Landmere Lane area. This should link coherently not just to the major new housing developments on both sides of the A52, and to and from the shared paths by the A606 in the Edwalton area, and to and from existing settlements, but also to and from the very popular Rushcliffe Country Park to the south of Ruddington which, at busy times, suffers from acute car parking pressures, and badly needs improved Active Travel connections from different directions				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	to help provide safe alternatives, especially for families. Improved Active Travel connections across the Gamston-Lings Bar section of the A52 in the Tollerton, Gamston and Bassingfield area, and including a possible new towpath under the A52 as part of the Grantham Canal Society's proposed Trent Connections Project, as well as the proposed Gamston Fields Sustainable Urban Extension. These also have the potential for much improved connections through the Gamston area, under the A6011 (Radcliffe Road) south of Lady Bay, and to				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	and from the River Trent riverside path (part of both Sustrans National Cycle Network Route 15 and the Trent Valley Way), including the nearby south bank landing of the new Waterside Bridge. Improved Active Travel connections on the A6011 (Radcliffe Road, West Bridgford) / A52 Corridor between Regatta Way, Gamston, Radcliffe on Trent and Bingham, including safer crossing facilities e.g. in the Bassingfield Lane / Skylarks Nature Reserve area and at the Holme House / Stragglethorpe junction, as well as				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	between Holme House and Cotgrave. Improved Active Travel connections in the A612 Corridor between the City Centre and Burton Joyce etc, including, in particular, improved links to and from the north bank landing of the Waterside Bridge, and extended and upgraded riverside path on the north bank of the Trent between Trent Bridge, Colwick Park and Stoke Bardolph. Also important is to consider the potential for providing a shared path (Greenway) on the former railway between Netherfield and the Chase Farm major				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	housing development, and Gedling Country Park and for these plans to be integrated with any plans to use this former railway for a NET extension to this area. The North-South Active Travelway scheme connecting the centres of West Bridgford and Sherwood via Nottingham City Centre and Nottingham Station, and Trent Bridge, including the Broad Marsh / Maid Marian Way area with the City Council and Homes England's recently renewed expanded regeneration proposals. Improved cycling provision on, and on				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	the approaches to, other major bridges over the River Trent including Clifton Bridge and Lady Bay Bridge, including improved connections, especially to and from the QMC, Nottingham City Hospital, Wilford, Clifton and Fairham Pastures etc. Some improved connections to the main route between these two main hospitals have been made but more are much needed, especially in the Basford and Valley Road areas. Taking full account of the impact on cyclists of any plans for extended / new tram routes, e.g. to Gedling /				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Chase Farm, and Chetwynd Barracks / Toton, etc. with the aim of maximising the potential for new facilities integrated with the new tram routes and minimising the potential risks for cyclists of poorly designed and poorly implemented new tram routes.				
Policy 15: Transport Infrastructure Priorities	Failure to take account of existing businesses based at Nottingham City airport. No apparent consultation has taken place with the airport and the vital service it and they provide.	The site is an existing allocation which is proposed to be carried forward.	None	1259330	save DSA (Mr Mark Chadwick)
Policy 15: Transport	It is positive that the GNSP looks to improve the sustainability of	Comments noted.	None	1260127	Strawson Group Investments Ltd

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Infrastructure Priorities	Greater Nottingham through the requirement for new developments to include a sufficient package of measures to ensure journeys by non-private modes are encouraged and that residual car trips will not unacceptably compromise the wider transport system. This will also assist in improving the transport network whilst reducing the level of carbon emissions through private travel.			1245722	Strawson Group Investments Ltd (C/O Agent C/O Agent)
Policy 15: Transport Infrastructure Priorities	In Policy 15.4 we support the inclusion of a NET extension to Gamston if the current feasibility study outcome is positive.	Comments noted. EMCCA are consulting on the key LTP principles in 2025, with a view to preparing a full LTP in summer 2026.	None	1258365	The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	This should be aligned with the Park and Ride site also listed in the Policy and the new Strategic SUE allocation of 4,000 dwellings set out in Policy 31. We would wish to be consulted on the Bus priority scheme in Policy 15.3 especially that element within West Bridgford. We strongly support the sentiments of Policies 15.1 and 15.2 but care should be taken that financial resources are not swallowed up by major highway improvements at the expense of our stated priorities.			1238675	

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 15: Transport Infrastructure Priorities	We note that the majority of transport schemes remain as unfunded commitments (refer comments on Policy 14). Strategic development allocations can provide a means for unlocking the funding/providing matched funding for such schemes where appropriate.	Comments noted.	None	1258439 1243391 1250383 1250343	Trustees of Hammond Farm Trustees of Hammond Farm Trustees of Hammond Farm Langridge Homes Ltd (Mr David Fletcher)
Policy 15: Transport Infrastructure Priorities	Policies 14 and 15 relate to managing travel demand and transport infrastructure priorities and together seek to ensure the need to travel long distances is minimised, where this is unavoidable directing trip-generating development to the most sustainable	Comments noted.	None	1259969	VCP Nominees Victoria Centre (c/o agent)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	locations and identifying the improvements to travel infrastructure needed to accommodate the growth envisaged through the Plan. The overall approach of these policies is supported through directing development towards the City Centre where appropriate to ensure accessibility and improving the accessibility of the city as whole through the planned infrastructure improvements, particularly those that allow more sustainable access to the City Centre such as the planned extension to the NET system, upgrades to the rail network in the East				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Midlands and bus priority measures across the city.				
Policy 15: Transport Infrastructure Priorities	The Plan lacks any mention of transport and transport infrastructure issues in the area around East Leake - a community which has expanded by close to 50 pc in the last 20 years but with NO road infrastructure improvements. In Costock , a conservation village which is sandwiched between East Leake and the A60 (used by commuters into and out of Nottingham) we now see over 650 vehicles an hour passing through the Main Street at rush hour times and it is intolerable. More	The GNSP does not include further allocations in East Leake.	None	1243561	Mr David Greenwood

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	development in East Leake as is mooted in this Plan will only exacerbate this already completely unacceptable state of affairs. East Leake is now a town (and continuing to expand) that is served by totally inadequate village lanes and the result is repeating traffic chaos.				
Policy 15: Transport Infrastructure Priorities	It is positive that the GNSP looks to improve sustainability through the requirement for new developments to include a sufficient package of measures to ensure journeys by non-private modes are encouraged and that residual car trips will not unacceptably compromise the wider	Noted.	None	1246825	Harworth Group (C/O Agent (Amy Harrison, Boyer)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	transport system. This will assist in improving the transport network whilst reducing the level of carbon emissions through private travel. Agree that this policy supports the Strategic Vision and Objectives of the Plan.				
Policy 15: Transport Infrastructure Priorities	Policy 15 of the local plan focuses primarily on road-based transport infrastructure, largely ignoring rail, air, and river transport. Aviation is only referenced in Objective 11, where it is classified as a pollution source, without acknowledging pollution from other transport modes, particularly roads. This	Nottingham City Airport is part of the Gamston allocation, which is carried forward form previous local plans. It has been subject to extensive consultation over that time.	None	1246361	General Aviation Awareness Council (John Gilder)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	narrow focus raises concerns about the plan's approach to transport infrastructure, especially from an aviation perspective, as outlined below: Use of Existing Infrastructure: The plan does not enhance existing aviation infrastructure, such as Nottingham City Airport (NCA), potentially undermining a key component of the UK's transport network. Environmental Impact: Aviation is progressing towards sustainability with alternative fuels and electric aircraft (e.g., a commercial jet crossed the Atlantic using alternative fuel, and the UK registered				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	its first electric aircraft in 2022). The plan overlooks these advancements. Reducing Private Car Journeys: Expanding commuter airline services could reduce long-distance car travel as road congestion increases, but the plan does not support this. Accessibility to Services: Closing NCA would reduce access to services and facilities, negatively impacting the local economy as businesses may relocate.				
Policy 15: Transport Infrastructure Priorities	No written response	None.	None	1243390	Geoffrey prince Associates Ltd (Mr Geoffrey Prince)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
				1238937 1241824 1242616	Mr Jon Noble Boyer (Amy Harrison) Ms Susan Edwards

Policy 16

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 16: Blue and Green Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space	Add to part 3 'where appropriate' and 'where possible' so it is written in accordance with NPPF paragraph 16 b) which states *'plans should be prepared positively, in a way that is aspirational but deliverable'* and paragraph 35(c). Part 6 lacks clarity and definition regarding "locally valued landscapes." The term is not clearly explained in the policy or its supporting text (paragraph 3.16.12), which creates ambiguity. Additional text should be added which clearly defines what 'locally valued landscapes' are.	This would unduly weaken the policy and where the requirements of the policy cannot be met, this would be a matter considered as part of the planning application. Locally valued landscapes would be defined through future plan preparation and through neighbourhood plans.	None	1261641 1261058 1247023 1246654	Barratt David Wilson (North Midlands) David Wilson Homes East Midlands David Wilson Homes (East Midlands) David Wilson Homes East Midlands (Helen Bareford)
Policy 16: Blue and Green	Part 3 (a) should define "green routes", either here	Strategic networks, including green routes, are identified within the	See Suggested Main Modification document for wording in relation	1261801 1245750	Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space	or within Appendix B Glossary. This policy also includes the statement "..... to maximise the delivery of multi-functionality" in relation to blue and green infrastructure networks. This statement should be qualified to recognise that multi-functional spaces conflict with nature. There needs to be sufficient green/blue space devoid of human activity and access, and devoid of their pets, for nature to flourish and allow increased biodiversity to be achieved. Without sufficient inaccessible (by humans & pets) green/blue space the GNSP will not be effective in its aims of increasing levels of biodiversity	Blue and Green Infrastructure (BGI) Strategy. Local routes would be defined as part of future plan preparation or in neighbourhood plans. Part 3(d) of this policy requires consideration of biodiversity and ecology. Part 4 sets out the mitigation hierarchy. Part 5 of the policy is considered to be clear and states that adverse impacts will be given significant weight. Reference to private gardens is based on Natural England's Green Infrastructure	to adding Neighbourhood Plans to Monitoring Tables.		Forum (Mr David Lovett) Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum (David Lovett)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	above a minimum 10% net gain. Part 4 should define "mitigation hierarchy" for the reader, either here or within Appendix B Glossary. Part 5 should define the weighting used to assess adverse impacts on blue and green infrastructure, and how it will be applied. Para 3.16.1 should include a link to Natural England's Green Infrastructure Principles, and private gardens should not be classified as Green Infrastructure because they lack public accessibility and wider amenity value. They should be excluded from	Planning and Design Guide. The justification text provides an appropriate summary to enable interpretation of how to apply the policy. It is recognised that Neighbourhood Plans have a role in provision of BGI, it is considered appropriate to add Neighbourhood Plans into the delivery table.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	calculations for new green space provision Para 3.16.3 states **"**However, it is accepted that in some instances, such as sensitive biodiversity sites, it would not be appropriate to promote additional access." 'Sensitive biodiversity sites' are neither quantified nor defined, this should be rectified. Para 3.16.5 first sentence reads as 'Policy' as opposed to justification Should also provide a link to Natural England's Green Infrastructure Framework - Principles and Standards for England, and also to the Nottinghamshire and				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Nottingham Local Nature Recovery Strategy. Para 3.16.9 First sentence reads as 'Policy' as opposed to justification Figure 16.1 does not contain any online reference to the source material. This should be rectified i.e. by hyperlinking to the strategy document it has been extracted from. 'Policy Delivery' column of monitoring table should include Neighbourhood Plans above SPDs.				
Policy 16: Blue and Green Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space	Blue infrastructure shouldn't be seen as separate to green infrastructure. A catchment approach is needed which incorporates waterbodies and the land that habitats	The policy already sets out a comprehensive approach in relation to Blue and Green Infrastructure.	None	1262355	Environment Agency

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	that impact and feed waterbodies. Blue-green infrastructure' is a better encompassing term. Focusing only on Blue-green as 'assets' or entities like 'linages', can be limiting. BGI functionalities and multi-functionality benefits should be considered. Though care should be taken so that BGI doesn't conflict, detract or be developed at the expense of others (e.g. providing public access to sensitive ecological areas). Policy could be strengthened by shifting the focus to a more comprehensive approach which sets requirements for BGI to be integral to the design of new developments from the outset. Policy could be strengthened by echoing				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	the aspirational wording that has been included in policy 1. Proposed change 'Blue and Green' to Blue-Green Infrastructure.				
Policy 16: Blue and Green Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space Part 1	Part 1 suggests that alongside the Greater Nottingham BGI strategy, BGI will be defined locally through additional local strategies/future plan preparation. We strongly encourage the development of locally specific strategies due to the added value these would provide in aiding developers in delivering quality BGI. Propose Change: 'A strategic approach to the delivery, conservation and enhancement of Blue-	Comments noted. Part 1 of the policy is sound in this respect as drafted and sets out a comprehensive approach in relation to Blue and Green Infrastructure.	None	1262355	Environment Agency

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Green Infrastructure will be taken at a landscape scale, through the establishment of a more connected, healthier and functional network of Blue-Green Infrastructure and assets.'				
Policy 16: Blue and Green Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space Part 2	Part 2 does suggest that BGI would be required in certain circumstances, however it is unclear based on current policies and supporting guidance/strategies when BGI would be required. Proposed change 2: 'The strategic approach requires development plans and, where appropriate, proposals to create, conserve and enhance Blue and Green Infrastructure networks…'	Proposed addition to the wording to refer to the creation of Blue and Green Infrastructure and addressing deficiencies. In relation to 2(c), the policy wording is sufficient, and the proposed changes would not alter policy outcomes.	See Suggested Main Modification document for proposed wording.	1262355	Environment Agency

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Part 2(a) reads that it is up for the development proposals to identify key deficiencies and priorities. It's better to define these prior to the submission of planning applications in corresponding local plans and SPDs, and informed by key stakeholders. Proposed change 2(a): 'addressing deficiencies in existing provision and priorities for new or enhanced Blue and Green Infrastructure'. Proposed change 2(b): 'prioritising the creation, protection, enhancement and connectivity of Blue and Green Infrastructure within urban and urban fringe locations, and beyond to the wider countryside; and'				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Proposed change 2(c): 'improving the function and quality of the wider network by identifying and creating links to and between Blue and Green Infrastructure networks and assets.'				
Policy 16: Blue and Green Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space Part 3	Proposed change 3(a): 'incorporate a range of types and sizes of blue and green spaces, green routes and environmental features that are appropriate to the development and the wider Blue and Green infrastructure network to maximise the delivery of multi-functionality and connectivity'. Comment: especially key to rivers, where development may impact downstream, or	The idea of multi-functionality includes connectivity. In relation to Part 3(b), propose to add reference to accessible blue and green spaces and corridors to the policy.	See Suggested Main Modification document for proposed wording in relation to change to 3b of the policy.	1262355	Environment Agency

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	enhancements upstream may support benefits at the development site. Opportunities to remove culverts and other barriers to fish movement also benefit from the inclusion of the word 'connectivity.' Proposed change: 3(b) 'encourage healthy and active lifestyles through the provision of active travel infrastructure, accessible blue-green spaces and corridors, sports and recreational facilities;' Comment: access to nature, especially blue-green spaces, are key to improving our physical and mental well-being.				
Policy 16: Blue and Green	Rivers and other 'blue' infrastructure should not be seen as separate to	Agree to proposed change to justification text in relation to	See Suggested Main Modification document for proposed wording	1262355	Environment Agency

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space Para 3.16.1	'green' infrastructure. It is more realistic to think in terms of blue-green infrastructure and catchment-scale improvements. Proposed change: 'Blue infrastructure includes lakes, ponds, rivers, streams, reservoirs**,** canals and their associated in-channel and wetland habitats. It also comprises land within floodplains that stores water during periods of heavy rain and therefore reduces flood risks for residents and businesses. Blue infrastructure often crosses over with green infrastructure, and therefore should be considered within the context of a catchment-scale approach.'	additional examples of blue infrastructure. The reference to a catchment scale approach would not alter policy outcomes.	in relation to change to paragraph 3.16.1 of the justification text.		

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 16: Blue and Green Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space Para 3.16.3	Proposed change: 'Blue infrastructure within the Greater Nottingham Strategic area falls within the Trent Lower and Erewash Management Catchment which is made up of smaller catchments made up of individual waterbodies; it collectively falls within the Humber River Basin management plan. Blue Infrastructure measures should aim to protect, restore, and improve the overall health of the water environment in line with the objectives of the Water Framework Directive (retained through the European Union (Withdrawal) Act 2019). This may include but is not limited to: restoring modified sections and	These changes to the justification text would not alter policy outcomes. This goes beyond a level of detail which is appropriate for a Strategic Plan.	None	1262355	Environment Agency

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	supporting naturalisation; integration of SuDS and natural flood management; prioritising the natural buffering of watercourses; creating and restoring wetlands; and de-culverting and barrier removal. The natural buffering of watercourses is important as to not prejudice existing and future risks associated with climate change, allowing for responding to extreme flood events and supporting healthier rivers.'				
Policy 16: Blue and Green Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space	Suggests wording setting out a requirement to incorporate greening given pivotal role nature plays in providing ecosystem services in towns and cities. The concept has been incorporated within other Strategic Plans to	Specific tools such as UGF would be a matter for future plan preparation or other plan documents.	None	1262355 1246139	Environment Agency Environment Agency (Joshua Milsom)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	guide the scale of required greening is through using the Urban Greening Factor (UGF); a tool which quantifies the amount of greening that is required in new developments. Further details and the example of the London Plan is referred to. Proposed wording: 'Local authorities should develop an Urban Greening Factor to identify the appropriate amount of urban greening required for new developments.				
Policy 16: Blue and Green Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space	The protection given to the existing blue and green infrastructure networks and proposing new networks is positive. However, the scale of the impacts should be given weight in relation to the planning balance. The	This would be considered as part of planning applications.	None	1260575 1246826 1260128 1245723	Harworth Group Harworth Group Strawson Group Investments Ltd Strawson Group Investments Ltd

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	scale of the provision of benefits, such as where there is a significant under supply of housing, should be considered and be given to the housing need and impacts of a lack of supply.				
Policy 16: Blue and Green Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space, Part 3(f)	The policy should refer to the significance of heritage assets including setting. The policy should be clear that the historic environment is a component of Green/ Blue infrastructure and be referenced accordingly.	This would be considered as part of Policy 11.	None	1262402 1246168	Historic England Historic England (Kezia Tylerson)
Policy 16: Blue and Green Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space	More clarity needed to understand how policy will interact with the Local Nature Recovery Strategy and the delivery of mandatory BNG and the proposals for 20% BNG in Rushcliffe. Further information on how the different GNSP	The Local Nature Recovery Strategy is an emerging strategy and will be read alongside development plans such as the Strategic Plan. Part 3(b) of the policy refers to BNG. It is considered the	None	1262504 1246225	Home Builders Federation Home Builders Federation (Rachel Danemann)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	environmental policies (and Part 2 Local Plans) interact is essential to ensure the Plan is effective, and policies do not block or delay much needed housing development.	policy is sufficiently clear.			
Policy 16: Blue and Green Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space	Policy and aims are broadly supported. A significant part of the funding measures will need to come from increase in land values arising from new development. Amendments to Green Belt boundaries should take full account of need to integrate BGI and to improve access to the countryside. This may mean ensuring that master-plans incorporate plans to achieve these objectives. This may mean extending the boundaries	There is no requirement to amend Green Belt boundaries in order to deliver BGI and improve access to the countryside.	None	1258409 1250344 1243438 1258440 1243393 1250384	Langridge Homes Ltd Langridge Homes Ltd (David Fletcher) Trustees of Hammond Farm (Hammond Farms) Robert Hammond Trustees of Hammond Farm

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	of the allocation sites to incorporate blue and green infrastructure.				
Policy 16: Blue and Green Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space Part 4	Strategy of improving BGI networks is supported, however, there are confusing and conflicting elements. Paragraph 5 is consistent with NPPF, as recognises some development proposals may well have unavoidable, adverse impacts on BGI networks and provides for a balancing exercise to be undertaken. Paragraph 4 is at odds with this and does not provide for a balancing exercise and requires equal or better BGI outcomes. Paragraph 4 only needs to refer to the mitigation hierarchy being followed and the remainder of the paragraph is deleted.	The policy is clear and consistent with the NPPF as drafted and removing the wording as suggested would reduce the effectiveness of the policy.	None	1259934 1246037	Lone Star Land Ltd Lone Star Land Ltd (Reuben Bellamy)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Proposed change (strike through text is deleted from policy): 'Where new development would have an adverse impact on Blue and Green infrastructure networks or individual assets, the mitigation hierarchy should be followed~~. and alternative locations for the proposed development and / or re-design of the proposal to avoid adverse impacts must be considered before mitigation. As a last resort, compensation measures may be accepted on site or, if on site is not deliverable, off-site may be acceptable if it delivers equal or better Blue or Green infrastructure and is located within the vicinity~~				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	~~of the site wherever possible~~'.				
Policy 16: Blue and Green Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space	The key environmental and recreational opportunities that community forests bring must form part of Policy 16, which should effectively produce a road map to achieving the community forest's objective of a minimum of 30% tree cover. Policy cannot be sound if does not include the Plan's responsibility to address its part in the country legal requirement to be net zero by 2050. Community Forests carry out a number of functions, including the removal and storing of CO2 released into the atmosphere.	The policy makes clear that there are a range of types of Blue and Green Infrastructure, which would include community forests.	None	1260112 1243240	Michael Lyons Michael Lyons
Policy 16: Blue and Green	The policy is welcomed as it provides a strategic framework to both protect	Comments noted and supported.	None	1258340 1243044	Natural England Natural England

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space	and enhance BGI across the Plan area. We are pleased that the policy recognises the importance of designing and managing BGI as a multifunctional resource which can deliver a wide range of ecosystem services and quality of life benefits for local communities and nature. We also acknowledge that the provision of Green Infrastructure appears throughout the plan as an essential component of development which needs to be considered at the outset of the planning process. We welcome the specific reference to Natural England's Green Infrastructure Framework: Principles and Standards and specifically the				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Accessible Greenspace Standards.				
Policy 16: Blue and Green Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space Part 4 and Part 5	Concerned the final wording of part 4 allows for delivery of compensation outside of the vicinity of the site. This is surprising as it would apply to harm to networks as well as particular assets. It is not clear how it will be judged that "... on site [compensation] is not deliverable; nor what the extent of "in the vicinity" means. Part 5 of policy attempts to balance the need and benefits of a development against its adverse impacts on the asset and the wider BGI. This is contrary to NPPF, para 104 (protection of open space, playing fields, etc.) which allows no loss of	Part 4 of the policy states that this would be a last resort. Propose additional wording in relation to part 5 of the policy to refer to the National Planning Policy Framework.	See Suggested Main Modification Document for proposed wording.	1262215 1243663	Nottingham Open Space Forum (Mr Ben Hunt) Nottinghamshire Open Space Forum (Ben Hunt)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	facilities apart from those criteria specified. The NPPF does not allow for further exceptions, and these should be considered on a case-by-case basis, rather than enshrining the possibility of exceptions in policy. Proposed changes: replace parts 4 and 5 with the following wording: 'Where relevant, the delivery, conservation and enhancement of open space, Blue and Green Infrastructure networks and assets will be given significant weight in planning decisions. New development which would have an adverse impact on Blue and Green Infrastructure networks or				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	individual assets will not be allowed unless the mitigation hierarchy has been followed so that alternative locations for the proposed development and / or re-design of the proposal to avoid adverse impacts have been ruled out before mitigation is considered. As a last resort, where full justification has been provided, compensation measures may be accepted on site or, if on site is not deliverable, off-site may be acceptable. In both cases compensation will only be acceptable if it delivers equal or better Blue or Green Infrastructure to that which would be lost and is located within the vicinity of the site.'				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 16: Blue and Green Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space	Policy needs to emphasise that "Blue and Green infrastructure should be accessible by non-car modes of transport including walking, cycling and public transport", as well as relating this to the statement in 3(b) on page 134 that (the design and layout of new or enhanced Blue and Green Infrastructure) should "encourage healthy and active lifestyles through the provision of active travel infrastructure, sports and recreational facilities".	The policy makes reference to the provision of active travel infrastructure.	None	1260904	Pedals (Nottingham Cycling Campaign)
Policy 16: Blue and Green Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space	Various elements of the policy and supporting text are supported and their importance highlighted. However, changes are sought. Part 3 should specifically acknowledge the value of being out in nature and not	The policy makes reference to healthy and active lifestyles. Recreation includes informal activities. Policy 17 deals with ecological impact specifically. It is considered that other	None	1254671 1243382	Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group (Mr Gordon Dyne) Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	just more formal activities. We also support educational use, this should include the natural environment and obviously we would whole heartedly support the delivery of biodiversity net gain and eco system services and the need to mitigate against climate change. Para 3.16.6 should also state that "B&G Infrastructure projects must not be allowed to disrupt such wildlife corridors". Para 3.16.6 should be made clearer and say "and the ecological network, which comprises pathways or patches of priority habitats of priority habitats, which should be	elements of the policy and justification text are clear as drafted.			Implementation Group (Gordon Dyne)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	a priority for BNG and species interconnectivity". Justification also clearly states that "Blue and green have different functions and issues, so require different forms of management and mitigation". Policy is also quite vague on the interaction of blue and green infrastructure apart from saying they interrelate (3.16.6), which isn't always the case. Concerned that wilder locations that may not "be valued by local communities" could come under threat. Section 3.16.10 should caution against them being perceived as having no intrinsic value.				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Understood B/G Infrastructure documented in the Strategy is drawn from a separate Strategy, but there seem to be some oddities in the Rushcliffe area at least. Not clear why (L8) Great Central Railway, (L10) Smite and (L9) Bingham Railway corridors are regarded as Local/Neighbourhood in nature. These are important linear features for the Borough as a whole. The other corridors listed seem rather nebulous on the ground.				
Policy 16: Blue and Green Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space Parts 4 and 5	Parts 4 and 5 of the policy are not consistent with NPPF para 104 in relation to sports facilities, including playing fields. Part 4 does not address the requirement for the loss of sports and	Additional wording should be added to Part 5 of the policy to reflect the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework.	See Suggested Main Modification Document for proposed wording. Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, will be protected	1259917 1246126	Sport England Sports England

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	recreational facilities, including playing field to be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality. In addition, part 5 requires an assessment of whether the benefits of the proposal would out weight the adverse impact, but NPPF paragraph makes no allowance for the benefits of a proposal to outweigh the loss. The policy could result in the loss of sports facilities, including playing field in a wider range of circumstances than outlined in NPPF para 104. Paragraph 3.16.10 indicates that some open space may become available through rationalisation of other uses, for instance school		in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.		

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	closures. The plan needs to be clear that any proposals which would result in the loss of playing field would need to comply NPPF para 104. Policy 16 should be amended to reflect these requirements, or a separate criterion is added to address proposals that would result in the loss of sports facilities, including playing field.				
Policy 16: Blue and Green Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space	Key principles of policy strongly supported. Pragmatism of Criterion 3 is supported. The North Ruddington proposal would provide a prime opportunity to enhance BGI, which specific measures set out.	Comments noted.	None	1259670 1247160 1243779	William Davis Homes William Davis Homes
Policy 16: Blue and Green	Welcome references to biodiversity and green infrastructure but	Policy 17 includes a requirement to: "plant native species and	None	1242823 1242824	Ben Green (Woodland Trust) Ben Green

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space	disappointed by lack of ambition for trees within policy. Recommends aiming for 30% tree cover with emphasis on native tree planting. Suggest stronger protections for irreplaceable habitats including 50m Buffer zones, root protection areas, recording ancient trees and TPOs. Request longer maintenance period for BNG units (50 Years) an integration with the LNRS. Suggest major development should have increased access to green space requirements including requirements for new trees per dwelling or per 1000 m2 of non-residential space. Suggests adoption of a Tree Retention Standard	create new, or restore existing, priority habitats and / or species;". Native and ancient woodland would fall under this categorisation with the expectation that native trees are prioritised. Policy 17 also states approach to mapping and protecting local sites of biological importance through future plan making including setting up buffer zones around biodiversity features, both would consider trees. It's expected that plans improving access to green space would come forward as part of full applications although the allocation already make			(Woodland Trust)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		provision for retention of mature trees and improvement of BGI which would likely include new tree planting where appropriate.			
Policy 16: Blue and Green Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space	Requests that development of footpaths between settlements be considered where significant increases in traffic have rendered walking and cycling along the lanes dangerous, specifically referencing routes between Bunny, Bradmore, Keyworth and Rushcliffe Country Park	Improvements to active travel and green infrastructure off site are required under Policy 16 which says where Blue Green Infrastructure is proposed or required, the layout should take opportunities to encourage active travel. Routes between the settlements mentioned are identified as part of the infrastructure network in Figure 16.1. The optimisation of the existing highway network to prioritise	None	1235521	Mrs Helen Moore

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		active travel is also an objective of Policy 14 (Managing Travel Demand)			
Policy 16: Blue and Green Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space	Welcomes the identification of strategic network of BGI and questions whether there's a commitment to maintaining the standard of existing public rights of way.	Ensuring public rights of way remain accessible falls upon the local highways authority, the city and county councils in the case of this plan. The maintenance of surfaces and vegetation is the responsibility of individual landowners. Public rights of way are a statutory duty for highways authorities and therefore there is a commitment to maintaining their accessibility.	None	1246317	Nottinghamshire Area Ramblers (Judith Anson)
Policy 16: Blue and Green Infrastructure,	Suggests proximity to BGI should be positively weighted when determining proposals for	Strategic housing allocations improve access to BGI by include requirements	None	1250408	Burhill Group Limited (Joe Wyatt)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Parks and Open Space	new residential development	to create new and enhance existing assets. Therefore, it is not considered that proximity to BGI needs to be weighted differently when considering applications.			
Policy 16: Blue and Green Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space	Support the principle of the policy. Concerned that inclusion of "wherever possible" weakens the policy and may lead to delivery of BNG outside the plan area. Requests clarity on where "last resort" clause could be used.	Inclusion of wherever possible (Policy 16 part 4) is not considered to weaken the policy as the NPPF sets out that BNG may be delivered off site where the statutory metric suggests on site delivery is not possible. Purchase of BNG credits would have to be approved by the council through a submitted BNG plan where it's evidenced that BNG can't be	None	1259022 1245965	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (Ben Driver)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		delivered on or off site in line with the NPPF.			
	Request "retaining existing and linking habitats" be elevated to policy.	Policy 17: Biodiversity is cross referenced, and Part b)iii addresses these issues	None		
	Request paragraph 3.16.10- be reworded to clarify that Threatening or undervalued sites should not be subject to redevelopment, and that becomes available through rationalisation of uses such as schools, reference to redevelopment or partial redevelopment should be removed.	Partially accept, as currently not clear. Propose reference to firstly improving through enhancement and management measures, and as last resort, partial redevelopment.	See Suggested Main Modifications document for proposed wording.		
Policy 16: Blue and Green	Encouraged to develop planning policies that:	Policy 16 has a focus on prioritising blue and green infrastructure	None	1289184	Forestry Commission (Mrs Sandra Squire).

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space	• Protect Ancient Woodland and Irreplaceable Habitats • Safeguard Priority Habitats • Include Tree Planting and Replacement Policies. • Adopt a Landscape-led Approach • Promote Sustainable Timber Use.	which includes trees. This is also highlighted within the justification text.			
Policy 16: Blue and Green Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space	Supports the policy	Noted	None	1241182	Mr Christopher Smith

Policy 17

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 17 - Biodiversity	The proposed requirement for a 20% biodiversity net gain from new development in Rushcliffe is not justified or consistent with national policy. It could affect viability.	The Councils prepared a background paper justifying the 20% requirement in Rushcliffe. The requirement was also tested through plan-wide viability.	None.	1261294 1261321 1246724 1245889 1262349 1246339 1259987 1261060 1247024 1246656 1262474 1262505 1246227	Arc Partnership/ Nottinghamshire County Council Bloor Homes Bloor Homes (Sally Smith) Bloor Homes (Sarah Milward) Churchill Living and Mccarthy Stone Churchill Living (Lauren Bishop) Retirement Lifestyles Cora David Wilson Homes East Midland David Wilson Homes East Midlands David Wilson Homes East Midlands (Helen Bareford) Gladman Developments Ltd Home Builders Federation

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
				1258674 1261288 1242816 1259563 1246643 1261264 1260957 (1261278) 1261248 1259672 1246936 1243780 1247164 1261607	Home Builders Federation (Rachel Danemann) Oxalis Planning Oxalis Planning (Ben Holmes) Parker Strategic Land Parker Strategic Land Ltd (Andrew Bamber) Rula Developments Ltd Taylor Wimpey (Land West of Ruddington) Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land (Land East of Gamston) Vistry Homes Ltd William Davis Homes Vistry Homes Ltd (Jonathan Porter) William Davis Homes (Hannah Price) William Davis Homes (Hannah Price)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
				1291832 1292238 1292255	Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd Cora Homes Ltd (Mr Robbie Locke) Taylor Wimpey (Land West of Ruddington) Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land (Land East of Gamston)
Policy 17 - Biodiversity	Part 1a – as per the comment to Policy 16 "mitigation hierarchy" should be defined. Part 1d – Broxtowe should have a more ambitious minimum BNG target, similar to Rushcliffe, based on evidence in the GNSP Biodiversity Net Gain Background Paper. 20% should be set across the whole GNSP area.	Consider the mitigation hierarchy has been defined in part 1a of Policy 17. The Background Paper justifies the approach for each council in respect of BNG targets. In relation to part 2c, consider the existing policy wording is clear. The policy was prepared using the	See Suggested Modification Document for proposed wording in relation to Neighbourhood Plans within the Monitoring Table.	1261802 1245751	Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum (Mr David Lovett) Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum (David Lovett)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Part 2.c) – wording similar to part 1.a) should be included here: e.g. "the compensation must be equivalent to the biodiversity value of the site's interest feature(s) that are adversely affected or lost and be located within the vicinity of the site wherever possible." Para 3.17.11 – Nottinghamshire's Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) has not been published yet – consultation is ongoing. Priorities as set out in the Broxtowe Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping Report may well be superseded by the LNRS, making	available evidence. Reference is made to the LNRS in 3.17.9 and 3.17.11. It is considered that long term sustainability, as referenced in the text, would include stewardship and management considerations. A link will be provided to the Biodiversity Opportunity Areas source in the final version of the plan. It is considered the justification text provides guidance in relation to applying the policy. Monitoring table's 'Policy Delivery' column			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	policy decisions within Broxtowe on where to achieve biodiversity net gain open to interpretation. Para 3.17.14 – the fourth sentence should include stewardship to ensure that long-term sustainability is secured. Figure 17.1 Does not contain any online reference to the source material. This should be rectified. Monitoring table's 'Policy Delivery' column should include Neighbourhood Plans above SPDs for each of the 'Target' criteria.	will include Neighbourhood Plans.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Para 3.17.10 The third sentence reads as 'Policy' as opposed to justification. Para 3.17.11 The first sentence reads as 'Policy' as opposed to justification. Para 3.17.13 The first and last sentences read as 'Policy' as opposed to justification. They could be brought together as one policy. Para 3.17.14 The fourth sentence reads as 'Policy' as opposed to justification. Para 3.17.15 The last sentence reads as 'Policy' as opposed to justification.				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 17 - Biodiversity	Part 1(b) is not justified as it includes non-designated sites as well as those which do not impact the ecological network of designated sites and priority habitats. Change policy: 'Biodiversity and the ecosystem services that the natural environment provides will be protected and improved across Greater Nottingham over the Plan period by: 1b) protecting, restoring, expanding and enhancing the ecological network of designated ~~and non-designated sites~~, and priority habitats. Where developments are found	Non-designated sites include Local Wildlife Sites. It is considered appropriate to include these within the policy.	None.	1261628 1261060 1246656	Barratt David Wilson (North Midlands) David Wilson Homes East Midland David Wilson Homes East Midlands (Helen Bereford

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	to impact the ecological network of designated sites and priority habitats, they must…'				
Policy 17 - Biodiversity	Whilst EMF is supportive of the aspirations of the policy, as well as the wider benefits associated with maximising BNG, there must be a careful balance with viability. The Ratcliffe Local Development Order includes a 10% BNG requirement but there is also a review mechanism in the LDO that allows change. Clarity is required on whether the assumptions at paragraph 3.17.12 are applicable to Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station, and whether further work is needed to justify	The LDO has been granted with the 10% requirement. The BNG requirement will be considered as part of the review mechanism, considering all material planning considerations and viability.	None	1260922 1243687	East Midlands Freeport Uniper UK Limited (Dr Andy Read)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	the approach. The plan should either align the site's BNG requirement with the LDO's 10% target, or provides a clear and justifiable rationale if a higher percentage is to be applied.				
Policy 17 - Biodiversity	Specific percentage figures for minimum net-gain in biodiversity requirement are supported, particularly 20% requirement in Rushcliffe. Also supported are repeated reference to enhancing the fundamental elements highlighted in the Lawton Review: bigger, better, more joined up. It a shame that all councils aren't committed to the 20%	Comments noted. The Background Paper provides justification for each Council's approach.	None	1262356 1246140	Environment Agency Environment Agency (Joshua Milsom)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	net gain that Rushcliffe have committed to and aligning the target would be supported.				
Policy 17 - Biodiversity Proposed Policy - Ecological Buffer Zone	The inclusion of a specific policy which encourages developments to include an ecological buffer zone adjacent to water courses is recommended. Such policies are becoming more common within other local plans in growing recognition of the multiple benefits of providing undeveloped space next to water courses. We suggest a 10m ecological buffer zone. The 10m distance accords with other local plan precedent and most relevantly corresponds to the riparian zone as defined	Accepted.	See proposed wording in Suggested Main Modifications Document (changes to Policy 10: Design and Enhancing Local Identity, rather than Policy 17)	1262356 1246140	Environment Agency Environment Agency (Joshua Milsom)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	for Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). The following policy wording is proposed: 'Development should include a minimum 10m buffer zone from the top of the riverbank along both sides of the watercourse, to create a corridor favourable to the enhancement of biodiversity. Where development sites are located within 10m of the top of the riverbank on land that has previously been developed, new proposals should reinstate the 10m buffer zone to the top of the riverbank. Wherever possible a minimum 10m buffer should be maintained.'				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 17 - Biodiversity Part 1	Proposed change to 1.a) "This compensation must be <u>at minimum</u> equivalent <u>or ideally greater</u> to the biodiversity value of the asset's interest feature(s) that are adversely affected or lost and be located within the vicinity of the site wherever possible" Proposed change to 1.b) iii. "maintain, strengthen and bridge gaps in existing habitat networks, to <u>reduce fragmentation and improve ecological resilience</u>;"	It is considered that the existing policy wording in relation to 1a and 1b is clear and concise.	None	1262356	Environment Agency
Policy 17 - Biodiversity Figure 17.1	Proposed change: Figure 17.1 should be at a higher resolution image and its recommend adding opportunities for	Resolution of Figure 17.1 will be enhanced in the final version of the plan. The figure is extracted from the	None	1262356	Environment Agency

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	watercourses into this figure as well.	existing Blue and Green Infrastructure Strategy.			
Policy 17 - Biodiversity Para 3.17.13	Proposed change 3.17.13: "*must use the latest Statutory Biodiversity Metric produced and published by Natural England."* Please consistently refer to the 'metric' as the 'latest Statutory Biodiversity Metric' and ensure it is capitalised. Proposed change 3.17.13: *"Use of the metric rewards schemes that minimise their impacts and achieves on-site enhancement/creation, but also gives options to developers where compensation can only be delivered off-site as a last resort.", as*	Agree that these references would provide additional clarity in the justification text. It is not considered necessary to refer to suitability qualified ecologists as this is a matter for validation requirements and for the determination of planning applications.	See Suggested Main Modifications Document for proposed wording.	1262356	Environment Agency

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	important to distinguish that off-site delivery increases the metric multiplier in the tool, so should be a last resort. Proposed change 3.17.13: *"In order to properly inform applications, surveys will be required in line with the latest British Standards and conducted by suitably qualified and/or experienced Ecologists."*				
Policy 17 - Biodiversity Para 3.17.14	Proposed change 3.17.14**:** suggest adding the following wording to the paragraph: "…buffers are also required around/ alongside watercourses. Where a development/ redline	Detailed guidance regarding how to apply the metric is set out in separate national guidance and regulations.	None	1262356	Environment Agency

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	boundary falls within 10 m of a watercourse, the watercourse must be included in the Statutory Biodiversity Metric, and a 10% BNG uplift in Watercourse Units must be achieved."				
Policy 17 - Biodiversity Monitoring	Monitoring targets table – page 151 *Proposed change: "No net reduction A net increase in the land designated Local Nature Reserves (LNR) and Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) due to development"* Addition of a row to reflect the importance of monitoring riparian corridors and watercourse, e.g.	Consider that this change is not required to make the policy sound. The targets are based on recordable information which can be collected consistently and on a regular basis by the authorities.	None	1262356	Environment Agency

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	'Target – increase in watercourse length/condition and wetland features and/or riparian habitat/riparian corridor length Indicators – Net change in watercourse length/WFD condition; Net change wetland features; Net change in riparian habitat area/riparian corridor length/width Policy delivery - Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan, Local Nature Recovery Strategy, Future plans, Supplementary Plans'.				
Policy 17 - Biodiversity	Policy supports the overall plan spatial vision and objective and aligns largely with the requirements set out	Compensation is allowed under part 1a of the policy as a last resort. This would include consideration of	None	1260580 1260134 1246827 1245724	Harworth Group Strawson Group Investments Ltd Harworth Group

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	within the NPPF in protecting biodiversity. However, it does not allow for the delivery of biodiversity to be provided off site or through credits. Amended policy to include off site provision and the use of credits for greater flexibility in the delivery of biodiversity. This will further increase the viability of brownfield sites through the provision of greater flexibility in how biodiversity can be provided and will assist within the Spatial Vision of the Plan.	off site delivery or credits, based on national guidance.			Strawson Group Investments Ltd
Policy 17 - Biodiversity	More details are needed in the plan for BNG implementation, reflecting the Environment Act and	It is considered that this is too detailed for the Strategic Plan and more detailed information	None	1262505 1242840 1243713	Home Builders Federation Wilson Bowden: Developments (Land at New Farm Nuthall)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	emerging policy, guidance and best practice on BNG implementation; and particularly in advance of the Local Nature Recovery Strategies. BNG costs must be considered as part of the whole plan viability assessment. Should be a single specific item; not combined into a generic s106 costs item – both the financial costs and land take, which will impact on densities achievable if BNG is provided on site. There may need to be further additional flexibility in policies elsewhere in the Plan to reflect the non-negotiable nature of 10% BNG costs. BNG	would be a matter for each authority. Biodiversity was considered as a separate element within the viability study to consider the impacts of 10% and 20% BNG. Site specific testing, at an appropriate level, was included within the viability work. Consider that the policy is sufficiently clear in respect of mitigation hierarchy and the BNG hierarchy. It is considered that policies 16 and 17 are complementary, do not conflict and the development plan			Barwood Development Securities (Sam Wilkinson)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	may impacts on housing schemes density, as land used for on-site BNG is not available for housing. This may require larger and/or additional housing sites to be allocated. BNG requirements should fully considered when allocating sites. This includes assessing baseline conditions to understand BNG implications, which could affect site viability and the delivery of other policy objectives like affordable housing, since BNG is mandatory and its costs are non-negotiable.	needs to be read as a whole.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Potential for confusion between the well-established mitigation hierarchy and the new BNG hierarchy. Need for the policy wording and/or supporting text to be clearer about the differentiation between the mitigation hierarchy (which seeks to avoid harm in the first place, then mitigate and only then compensate it in relation to protected habitats) and the BNG delivery hierarchy (which prioritises on-site BNG delivery, then off-site units and finally allows for statutory credits). It is not clear in policies 16 or 17 how they are intended to work together.				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	More thought needed on how environmental policies work together so it is completely clear what is expected, and to ensure that the policies do not serve to make development undeliverable.				
Policy 17 - Biodiversity	Whilst the GNSP includes biodiversity as a policy, based on Broxtowe. Borough Council allowing hedgehog holes to be intentionally blocked, and having no way of knowing how many hedgehog highways both existing and future could be affected, how does the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan safeguard against plans which include biodiversity policies and conditions, but then	This is not a matter for the Strategic Plan and would be a consideration for planning applications.	None	1259732	Miss Sarah Wilkinson

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	those same plans allow for those policy aims to be contradictory.				
Policy 17 - Biodiversity Para 3.17.13	This paragraph refers to the Metric published and produced by Natural England. It should be termed as the Statutory Biodiversity Metric.	This reference should be added to the justification text.	See Suggested Main Modification Document for proposed wording.	1257495	Natural England
Policy 17 - Biodiversity	Support Policy 17 but to achieve its aim of protecting biodiversity and ecosystem services, this policy must be worded more strongly. Following the route of 'if this is not possible' must be discouraged and only allowed in exceptional circumstances and on the presentation of sufficient and robust evidence to back up the decision. The	It is considered that the policy is sound as drafted and is in line with national guidance	"Last resort" added to JT – See suggested Main Modifications document.	1262196 1245966	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (Ben Driver)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	justification should acknowledge that mitigation/ compensation should be a 'last resort' because replacement habitats will often be of lower quality (biodiversity and ecosystem services), than those lost. NPPF recognises that some habitats, such as ancient woodland, are irreplaceable. Proposed change part 1: "Biodiversity and the ecosystem services that the natural environment provides will be protected and improved across Greater Nottingham over the Plan period by: a) following the mitigation				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	hierarchy, ensuring that adverse effects on designated and non-designated biodiversity assets are avoided. If this is not possible, where it can be demonstrated that there is an overriding need for the development, adverse effects must be mitigated and, only as a last resort, compensated for. This compensation must be equivalent to the biodiversity value of the asset's interest feature(s) that are adversely affected or lost and be located within the vicinity of the site wherever possible and within the plan area."				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Reasons: This is now more closely aligned to 2c (impacts on sites).				
Policy 17 - Biodiversity Part 1(d)	Support Rushcliffe Borough minimum of 20% BNG. We suggest policy should encourage 20% minimum BNG for the entire plan area. This would align with Rushcliffe and the aspiration for 20% in the Nottinghamshire BNG Framework, which is pending publication. Change part 1d to: "requiring developments, unless exempt, to achieve a minimum net gain in biodiversity of ~~10% in Broxtowe, Gedling and Nottingham and~~ 20% ~~in Rushcliffe~~. Where achievable, proposals	The approach for each Council is set out in the Background Paper.	None	1262196 1245966	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (Ben Driver)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	that deliver more than the minimum requirement will be supported;" Reasons: to respond to the justification in para 3.17.1 and to align the entire plan area with Rushcliffe Borough.				
Policy 17 - Biodiversity Part 2	The LNRS and BOM Reports are so important that they should be referred to in the policy (section 2b). Proposed change part 2b. "Depending on the biodiversity interest features, buffers around nature conservation assets should be protected, created and enhanced, with the aim to link these to and improve the wider ecological network with	It is considered that it is appropriate to refer to these within the justification text.	None	1262196 1245966	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (Ben Driver)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	BOM and LNRS used to help plan these networks. Reasons: this recognises the importance of the BOM and LNRS and will help ensure their use in a robust, effective policy.				
Policy 17 - Biodiversity Monitoring	LWSs have recently been lost to development, involving allocation in the GNSP. A mechanism is needed to highlight when LPAs are not delivering the biodiversity targets/indicator and this needs to trigger action to help rectify. An increase in 'areas of particular importance for biodiversity' within the Notts LNRS could be a more suitable indicator/ target.	Monitoring LWSs forms part of the target and are reported in Authority Monitoring Reports which will highlight any potential issues which need addressing. This may be through additional guidance or a consideration as part of future plan preparation.	None	1262196 1245966	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (Ben Driver)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Insert increase in 'Areas of Particular Importance for Biodiversity' (As identified in the Notts LNRS) into the monitoring table for policy 17				
Policy 17 - Biodiversity	Policy needs to cover the provision of swift bricks, including because swift bricks are excluded from the DEFRA Biodiversity Net Gain metric so need a separate clear policy. Relevant policies in other local plans are referred to.	This would be a matter for each authority to consider in future plan preparation as part of the review of part 2 local plans.	None	1259510 1243649	Swifts Local Network: Swifts & Planning Group Swifts Local Network: Swifts & Planning Group
Policy 17 - Biodiversity	The principle that nature conservation assets should be protected is supported. However, further consideration must be	Consider that the policy is sufficiently clear in this regard as drafted.	None	1259672	William Davis Homes

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	given to the precise wording of some of the criteria to ensure that the plan is effective and consistent with national policy. The policy makes reference to, "biodiversity interest features", though this is not defined in the plan. It is therefore not clear whether this refers to designated sites or undesignated sites or both. This should be defined within the local plan glossary to provide certainty.				
Policy 17 - Biodiversity	Welcomes approach to BNG and is encouraging of resources being allocated to help enforce this.	Welcome support for the policy	None	1246849	James Naish MP

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 17 - Biodiversity	Questions the wording of the target for "No net reduction in the land designated Local Nature Reserves (LNR) and Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) due to development." Saying it infers land with existing designation could be built on provided new land was allocated for LNR and LWS.	The policy should be read as a whole and refers to "protecting, restoring, expanding and enhancing the ecological network of designated and non-designated sites, and priority habitats". It is therefore considered clear that this indicator refers to maintaining existing designated biodiversity assets.	None	1246315	Nottinghamshire Area Ramblers (Judith Anson)
Policy 17 - Biodiversity	Considers BNG requirement over 10% is not in line with the PPG as this requires local need, viability and availability to be evidenced.	The Background Paper provides justification for each Council's approach. Biodiversity was considered as a separate element within the viability study to consider the impacts of 10% and 20% BNG. Local biodiversity mapping has also been	None	1246347	McCarthy Stone (Lauren Bishop)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		carried out and the depletion of Nottinghamshire's Biodiversity has been evidenced. Site specific testing, at an appropriate level, was included within the viability work.			
Policy 17 - Biodiversity	Supports the reflection of national legislation for 10% BNG uplift across most of the plan area.	The councils welcome support for the policy	None	1250410	Burhill Group Limited (Joe Wyatt)
Policy 17 - Biodiversity	Largely in support of the policy. Requests that paragraph 3.17.16 specifies the duty of individual planning authorities to monitor and enforce delivery of BNG.	The council is proactive in advising developers on BNG and how to achieve the full intended uplift. BNG across the borough will be monitored through the LNRS	None	1243385	Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group (Gordon Dyne)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 17 - Biodiversity	Supports the policy	Noted	None	1241183	Mr Christopher Smith

Policy 18

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 18: Developer Contributions for Infrastructure	To be sound and effective Policy 18 should include long-term stewardship, particularly of open and green & blue spaces within Policy 18 2.c). "Future maintenance of facilities" is unlikely to be achieved unless adequate stewardship is in place from the outset.	It is considered that 2.c) adequately covers this issue as drafted.	None	1261804	Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum (Mr David Lovett)
Policy 18: Developer Contributions for Infrastructure	The last sentence of paragraph 3.18.1 reads as policy as opposed to justification.	The policy and justification are consistent with each other.	None	1261804	Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum (Mr David Lovett)
Policy 18: Developer	Policy 18 outlines that it will support the	The type and level of infrastructure required	None	1260582	Harworth Group

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Contributions for Infrastructure	Spatial Vision of the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan by supporting communities, the local economy and creating development that is sustainable. We acknowledge and support the proposed policy. Policy 18 states that developments are required to contribute to meet all on and off site infrastructure requirements to ensure development takes place in a satisfactory manner. It is considered to be positive that the Regulation 19 Plan (March 2025) allows	is considered on a site by site basis, with further details provided in site specific policies and within the IDP. Other requirements will be dealt with as part of planning applications.		1246828	Harworth Group

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	for the provision of viability assessments where contributions cannot be provided. Also considered positive when contributions can be reviewed where development is considered not viable. Notwithstanding this, it is considered that individual sites should be reviewed to assess which of the above contributions will be required. This will ensure that identified impacts will be mitigated, as well as supporting the viability of the development.				
Policy 18: Developer Contributions	Policies on developer contributions and infrastructure should	A plan-wide viability test has been undertaken, which	None	1262507	Home Builders Federation (Ms Rachel Danemann)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
for Infrastructure	be subject to viability testing to ensure they do not hinder housing delivery.	includes testing, where appropriate, site allocations.		1246228	Home Builders Federation (Ms Rachel Danemann)
Policy 18: Developer Contributions for Infrastructure	Consideration should be given to including the provision of developer contributions for primary healthcare, as agreed with the local councils for housing developments of 25+ dwellings.	Primary health care is covered by the reference to health and is included as part of developer contributions.	None	1259955	Integrated Care Board (Susan Clarke)
Policy 18: Developer Contributions for Infrastructure	Object to allocation at Gamston and consider that there is not sufficient infrastructure to support development.	Infrastructure requirements are considered as part of the site specific policy and will also be a consideration as part of determining planning applications.	None	1258853	Katie Keating

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 18: Developer Contributions for Infrastructure	Recognize the need for new development to meet the costs of new infrastructure required as a consequence of the proposal, and to contribute towards the costs of maintenance. Clearly, though developments need to be viable as the financing institutions will not be willing to lend money to developers, if the rate of return on GDV (around 20%) does not meet their requirements. Thus, the contributions for infrastructure need to be fair and reasonable, and balanced against CIL payments and affordable housing targets.	A plan-wide viability test has been undertaken, which includes testing, where appropriate, site allocations. This includes considering CIL payments.	None	1258410 1243439 1250345	Langridge Homes Ltd (Mr David Fletcher) Langridge Homes Ltd (Mr David Fletcher) Langridge Homes Ltd (Mr David Fletcher)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 18: Developer Contributions for Infrastructure	As outlined in Policy 15: Transport Infrastructure Priorities, if funding becomes available both the A52 capacity improvements at Queens Drive and Abbey Street, as well as potential A52 upgrades involving the signalisation of Bramcote Island, will need to be thoroughly reviewed to assess viable options before they can be supported for allocation within the plan. We welcome the reference to contributions to infrastructure provision at Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe),	Comments noted. With regard to the final point, the type and level of infrastructure required is considered on a site by site basis, with further details provided in site specific policies and within the IDP. Other requirements will be dealt with as part of planning applications.	None	1259790	National Highways (Brittany Grosvenor)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	which emphasises the requirement of contributions from the development. We also welcome the inclusion of Policy 18: Developer Contributions for Infrastructure, also advise that developments identified as required to make such contributions be stated.				
Policy 18: Developer Contributions for Infrastructure	It should be noted that National Highways only accepts financial contributions with respect of works to the SRN in exceptional cases. This is typically when the Government has already committed to making those infrastructure	Comments noted.	None.	1243051	National Highways (Catherine Townend)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	improvements through the Roads Investment Strategy (RIS). Where a highway infrastructure scheme is not already identified in the RIS, National Highways expects infrastructure improvements to be 'developer led' where feasible. Securing the 'forward funding' of highways schemes in the timescales necessary to deliver growth cannot be guaranteed, and any shortfalls in funding could jeopardise the delivery of a scheme. As such, there is a risk that accepting a S106 contributions which effectively allows the				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	development to proceed without necessarily having the required mitigation in place. A Section 278 agreement is an alternative method of securing highway improvements which puts the developer (or consortium of developers) in control of the highway scheme delivery, and subsequently more in control of when their development can come forward. Welcome that the requirement for 'developer led' highway mitigation is referenced in applicable policies."				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 18: Developer Contributions for Infrastructure	Draft Policy 18 states that all new development will be required to provide for the necessary on-site or off-site infrastructure requirements arising from the proposal. We support the policy's drive to provide a framework for sustainable development and we recommend the Council continue its engagement with the ICB and wider NHS stakeholders to further refine the identified healthcare needs and proposed solutions to support the level of growth proposed by the Local Plan, as identified in the IDP.	Comments noted.	None	1260088 1245981	NHS Property Services (Daniel Fleet) NHS Property Services (Daniel Fleet)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 18: Developer Contributions for Infrastructure	The County Council notes that the transport mitigation measures listed in the table on p.34-38 of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) as referenced in Policy 18 are largely unfunded with the sources of funding to be confirmed. It is recognised that the enhanced resources available to EMCCA could help deliver a number of these schemes and it is agreed that the IDP should be revisited once the LTP is published. However, it is considered that there should still be a role for developers to support	Comments noted, including the importance of funding mechanisms including the role of CIL. The Councils will continue to work with the County Council to consider the impact on the road network and ensure infrastructure is delivered.	None	1260103 1243797	Nottinghamshire County Council (Mr Stephen Pointer) Nottinghamshire County Council (Mr Stephen Pointer)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	the funding of the listed schemes. Given the strategic nature of some schemes, which are a product of cumulative background growth, it is considered that the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) would represent the best mechanism to help secure delivery, and this should be referred to as potential source of funding, where appropriate. The County Council would advocate the adoption of CIL by all GN LPAs and would recommend that the projects listed in the table are identified in the list of priorities in each of the LPA's Infrastructure Funding				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Statements (formally the Regulation 123 list), such that they are eligible for developer funding. This could include the identified bus priority measures, NET improvements and park and ride sites. It is noted that the Rushcliffe BC IFS includes the provision of Park and Ride along the A52 corridor and bus priority measures in West Bridgford, for example. Meanwhile localised improvements referred to in the table, such as active travel connections and bus service extensions, could be secured through planning obligations and/or				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	conditions case by case. NCC welcomes reference to developer contributions as an identified source of funding for active travel connections and recommends that this also applies to bus extensions and increased bus services It also recognises the limitations of traditional transport models in terms of their application to dense urban areas and notes the publication of a new National Planning Policy Framework in December 2024 which supports a move to more "vision led" transport planning and away from "predict and provide" approaches.				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	The County Council is therefore unable to draw specific conclusions at this point in time regarding the expected impact of the Strategic Plan on the County road network nor on the package of transport mitigations which will be necessary to support development proposals in the Strategic Plan. It will therefore confirm its final comments on transport impacts once the Strategic Transport Assessment is published and do this within a Statement of Common Ground with the Greater Nottingham authorities which will be submitted				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	with the Strategic Plan in due course.				
Policy 18: Developer Contributions for Infrastructure	This policy is not considered to be sound. This policy provides guidance on where contributions may be required to make a development acceptable. Within Rushcliffe, CIL has already been adopted and as such this policy must ensure that developers are not charged twice (through CIL and S106) for infrastructure improvements. In order to ensure that this isn't the case, the Councils must provide a robust Regulation 122 Statement as part	Consider the policy is sound as drafted. Mechanisms are in place to ensure that developers are not charged twice, with contributions sought via CIL set out clearly within Rushcliffe's Infrastructure Funding Statement.	None	1261290 1246645	Parker Strategic Land (c/o agent) Parker Strategic Land Limited

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	of their request for contributions as part of forthcoming planning applications.				
Policy 18: Developer Contributions for Infrastructure	The inclusion of Policy 18 is welcomed. New residential development will generate demand for sporting provision. The existing provision within an area may not be able to accommodate this increased demand without exacerbating existing and/or predicted future deficiencies. Therefore, Sport England considers that new developments should contribute towards meeting the demand that they generate	Comments noted. It is considered that sports and recreation is covered adequately within the justification text and is also covered specifically under Policy 13. Details for how contributions are secured are matters for each authority. It is considered that more detailed information in relation to sports facilities is not a matter for the Strategic Plan. Detailed evidence will be updated as part of future plan preparation including updating Part 2 Local Plans. Sport	None	1259918 1246127	Sport England (Mrs Julia Baish) Sport England (Mrs Julia Baish)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	through the provision of on-site facilities and/or providing additional capacity off-site. Sport England therefore considers that it is important to ensure that the Strategic Plan provides a clear and robust approach to securing investment into indoor and outdoor sports provision. Sport England's CIL and Planning Obligations Advice Note provides advice on meeting the need for sporting provision generated from new development. Paragraph 3.18.11 lists the types of infrastructure which contributions may be required towards. This	and recreation facilities at Broad Marsh and the former Stanton Tip would be considered as part of future planning applications. Planning permission has already been granted at Boots.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	includes open space which is listed to include sport and recreation. It also lists community facilities which could include indoor sports facilities. Given objective 8 of the plan seeks to create 'Strong, safe, healthy and cohesive communities', including through improving access to sport and leisure, it is requested that indoor and outdoor sports facilities are listed as a separate bullet point within paragraph 3.18.11. Paragraph 103 of the NPPF requires planning policies to be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	need for open space, sport and recreation facilities (including quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses) and opportunities for new provision. The information gained from these assessments should be used to determine what sports and recreation provision is needed, which plans should seek to accommodate. There are currently elements of the evidence base for sports facilities which are either out of date or missing. The supporting text to Policy 18 advises that site specific				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	requirements for developer contributions for infrastructure are set out in the site-specific policies in the Strategic Plan and in the IDP. We have provided comments on the IDP in our response on the Evidence Base section of the plan. We welcome the inclusion within a number of the site-specific policies of requirements for sports provision. It will be important to ensure that where policies provide a broad requirement for new provision that the strategic plan provides clear guidance on how requirements should be calculated.				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Consider that the plan currently does not provide a clear approach to securing sporting provision and there is not currently a comprehensive up-to-date assessment of the need for sports facilities across the strategic plan area. Request that where an up-to-date evidence base is not available the councils commit to carrying out the necessary playing pitch strategy and sports/ built facility strategy work in line with our guidance on Playing Pitch Strategies and Assessing Needs and Opportunities for Indoor and Outdoor Sports Facilities.				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	The Playing Pitch Strategies and Sports/ Built Facilities Strategies can then be used alongside Sport England's Playing Pitch and Sports Facility calculators to determine what is required in terms of new provision and/or contributions towards existing provision. We recommend that the use of the Playing Pitch and Sports Facility calculators, which can be used to assess the demand generated by development sites, alongside an up-to-date evidence base is referenced within Policy 18 and the Infrastructure Deliver Plan (IDP) to provide				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	clear direction on how investment into sports facilities will be secured. It is also noted that the site-specific policies for the following sites, which include residential development, make no reference to requirements for indoor or outdoor sports facilities: Strategic Allocation at Boots, Strategic Allocation Former Stanton Tip and Strategic Allocation Broad Marsh. We would therefore query how the demand generated by these developments for sporting provision would be accommodated. If this				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	cannot be accommodated by existing facilities, then new or enhanced facilities would need to be secured to meet this demand. The inclusion within Policy 18 and the IDP of reference to the use of the Playing Pitch and Sports Facility calculators alongside an up-to-date evidence base would provide a clear and justified approach to securing investment into sports facilities to address the demand generated by new development.				
Policy 18: Developer Contributions	Acknowledge and support that the proposed policy will support the Strategic Vision of the Greater	Comments noted.	None	1260135	Strawson Group Investments Ltd (c/o agent)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
for Infrastructure	Nottingham Strategic Plan through supporting communities, the local economy, and creating sustainable developments. Policy 18 requires developments to contribute as necessary to meet all on and off site infrastructure requirements in order to enable development to take place satisfactorily. It is positive that the Regulation 19 Plan allows for viability assessments to be provided where contributions cannot be provided, as well as reviewing of contributions where			1245725	Strawson Group Investments Ltd (C/O Agent C/O Agent)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	development is accepted as not viable.				
Policy 18: Developer Contributions for Infrastructure	Policy 18 does not account for the different circumstances across the Greater Nottingham area, for example where the Community Infrastructure Levy is in place, is being reviewed or is under consideration. The policy does not define what infrastructure is considered to be eligible as s.106 planning obligations and what are within CIL, where in force. The policy does not consider what might happen should a	It is considered that the policy is sound as drafted. CIL is covered within the justification text. The policy is drafted based on current legislation and regulations and there is no national infrastructure levy in place. Viability matters would be considered as part of specific planning applications.	None	1261265 1261279 1292240 1292256	Taylor Wimpey (Land West of Ruddington) Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land (Land East of Gamston) Taylor Wimpey (Land West of Ruddington) Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land (Land East of Gamston)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	national infrastructure levy be brought in. The policy fails to mention anything about development viability and hence it is not consistent with national planning policy.				
Policy 18: Developer Contributions for Infrastructure	The need for new development to meet the costs of new infrastructure required as a consequence of the proposal is recognised, and to contribute towards the costs of maintenance. Clearly though, developments need to be viable as the financing institutions will not be willing to lend money to developers if the rate of return on GDV	Comments noted. Plan wide viability includes assumptions related to GDV so these are considered in a consistent manner. Specific viability issues for sites would be considered as part of planning applications.	None	1258441 1243394 1250385	Trustees of Hammond Farm Trustees of Hammond Farm Trustees of Hammond Farm

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	(around 20%) does not meet their requirements. Thus, the contributions for infrastructure need to be fair and reasonable, and balanced against CIL payments and affordable housing targets.				
Policy 18: Developer Contributions for Infrastructure	Objects to the wording of Policy 18.2.c) as drafted, which relates to Developer Contributions for Infrastructure. It will not always be necessary for development to provide for future maintenance of facilities provided as a result of development. For example, it would not be appropriate to fund the ongoing costs of maintaining any	The policy refers to the maintenance of "facilities" (meaning such things as open space and sports pitches) rather than highway works. No change is therefore needed.	None	1263733 1245871	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	highway works adopted by the Local Highway Authority.				
Policy 18: Developer Contributions for Infrastructure	Supports the policy	Noted	None	1241184	Mr Christopher Smith
Policy 18: Developer Contributions for Infrastructure	GNSP can only be considered sound if the wellbeing of all residents is properly accounted for. Infrastructure improvements to accompany major house building are essential. Repeated failures to upgrade the transport infrastructure around East Leake are evidence of this. Commit to traffic lights at Costock Crossroads	Trasport Assessments are required for major planning applications, which identify the need to upgrade transport infrastructure associated with that development.	None	1242588	Mr Paul Fileman

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	before there are further fatalities.				
Policy 18: Developer Contributions for Infrastructure	Support the principle of a cascade mechanism prioritising applicants with a local connection. That should be amended to include people who have previously lived in the area or with close relatives there (even if the applicant does not currently reside in the LA). Would support a similar allocations policy being applied to the rest of the social housing stock."	Local Connections tests are matters for individual local authorities, and are not considered appropriate to the GNSP	None	1249424	Consortium of Parish Councils
Policy 18: Developer Contributions	Strongly endorse 2. All development will be expected to: a) meet the costs of new	Noted.	None	1243761	Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum (Dr Paul NATHANAIL)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
for Infrastructure	infrastructure required as a consequence of the proposal;" Specifically,, the development at Chetwynd should meet the costs of new infrastructure it is claimed it needs. The GNSP currently releases land from the green belt for housing to pay for infrastructure that the GNSP says that Chetwynd development needs. The Plan envisages development to raise funds needed for infrastructure that it is claimed is needed by development elsewhere - in contradiction to Policy 18.				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 18: Developer Contributions for Infrastructure	To be sound and effective Policy 18 should include long-term stewardship, particularly of open and green & blue spaces within Policy 18 2.c). "Future maintenance of facilities" is unlikely to be achieved unless adequate stewardship is in place from the outset. See also separate comment on Para 3.18.1	Long term stewardship can be addressed through S106 agreements. No further reference to para 3.18.1 in the representations.	None.	1245754	Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum (Mr David Lovett)

Policy 19

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 19: Strategic Allocation at Boots	Supportive of the development of the site but believe the site is being underdeveloped so will not realise its potential as a sustainable location. Policy 19 should state that the site can support increased housing density and can accommodate up to 2,000 residential units including affordable housing. There should be support for adaptive reuse of Grade I listed buildings D6 and D10, and Grade II* listed Fire Station on the site.	Comments noted. The policy only includes a minimum figure in relation to residential units, and subject to policy requirements additional housing would be acceptable. The appropriate reuse of D6 and D10 buildings is listed under the objectives within the justification text. The Councils are supportive of further	None	1259598 1243738	Boots UK (Mr. Stephen Boyce) Boots UK (Mr. Stephen Boyce)

	The policy should build strategic partnerships with regional and national heritage bodies to support heritage-led regeneration of the area.	dialogue with appropriate heritage bodies, particularly Historic England, as set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan Constraints / Requirements summary.			
Policy 19: Strategic Allocation at Boots	Policy 19 doesn't provide detail on what retail will be provided and doesn't address transport issues within the area. The site doesn't have sustainable connections to nearby Beeston Town Centre or towards the City Centre or a local Secondary School. Lack of sustainable transport planning makes the policy unsound and inconsistent with national policy.	The policy sets out the use class and an upper floor space limit in respect of retail. The policy requires improved linkages (bus, cycle and pedestrian) to the surrounding area including Beeston and the City Centre and other active travel measures. Updates to the LCWIP are outside of the Strategic Plan's remit but should be informed by site allocations and	None	1258384 1242174	David Rhead David Rhead

	Amendments need to be made to the policy to address this, and changes to the IDP and the LCWIP.	committed developments.			
Policy 19: Strategic Allocation at Boots	Have concerns and would anticipate seeing more information and mitigation measures included within the policy text, however site appears to already be under development.	The site has planning permission and is under construction. Should further development be proposed, this will be subject to a new heritage assessment.	None	1262409 1246171	Historic England (Rosamund Worrall) Historic England (Kezia Taylerson)
Policy 19: Strategic Allocation at Boots	Support the Policy as long as the commitment to further dialogue with National Grid regarding the requirement for a new transformer and a circuit from the site to Nottingham is retained.	Comments noted. There is reference to this within Infrastructure Delivery Plan Constraints / Requirements summary.	None	1260158 1243039	National Grid Electricity Distribution (South West) Plc (Mr. Nick Buxton) National Grid Electricity Distribution (South West) Plc (Mr. Nick Buxton)
Policy 19: Strategic	The shared path facilities included as part of the spine road built across this site are	Comments noted. The site has planning permission and is under construction and the	None	1261955	Pedals (Nottingham Cycling Campaign)

Allocation at Boots	of some value but need better integration with other new and upgraded facilities in the area.	policy includes a requirement for improved linkages (bus, cycle and pedestrian) to the surrounding area including Beeston and the City Centre and other active travel measures.			(Mr. Hugh McClintock)
Policy 19: Strategic Allocation at Boots	The site will be developed at a rate of 70dpa. As the site is split 66/34 between the two councils, this should assume a rate of 46dpa within Broxtowe and 24dpa within Nottingham City.	The trajectory is based on information from the developer and is considered to be robust.	None	1261026	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land
Policy 19: Strategic Allocation at Boots	Supports policy	Noted	None	1241185	Mr Christopher Smith

Policy 20

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 20: Strategic Allocation Field Farm	There are no plans for completed cycling routes between this site and anywhere useful. Policy is ineffective and not consistent with national policy. Doesn't comply with Policy 14 of the GNSP or paragraphs 108 or 116 of the NPPF. Additional changes need to be made to the LCWIP and to the text of the policy.	The principles of the Field Farm development were established via the Aligned Core Strategy and Broxtowe's Part 2 Local Plan. The site has planning permission, so the policy will apply to any revised and/or reserved matters applications. Changes to the LCWIP are beyond the scope of the Plan. The Councils recognise the importance of ongoing cooperation with the County Council and EMCCA on active travel issues.	None	1258385 1242175	David Rhead David Rhead
Policy 20: Strategic Allocation Field Farm	Notes that the eastern boundary of the allocation is in close proximity to Moor Farm	Transport details have been agreed as part of the planning permissions. Any	None	1262633 1243672	Network Rail (Miss Emma Foster)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Level Crossing and should be considered as part of any Transport Assessment.	Transport Assessments associated with future applications will need to consider the Level Crossing.			Network Rail (Miss Emma Foster)
Policy 20: Strategic Allocation Field Farm	We agree that there is little cycle and pedestrian infrastructure in the area, especially along Ilkeston Road and what there is needs to be enhanced and extended	Comments noted.	None	1261953	Pedals (Nottingham Cycling Campaign) (Mr. Hugh McClintock)
Policy 20: Strategic Allocation Field Farm	The Council's assumed trajectory has not been amended for this site.	The trajectory is based on the latest available information. The Councils agree with Taylor Wimpey's conclusion that "Broxtowe's housing trajectory is considered reasonable".		1261027	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land
Policy 20: Strategic	Supports policy	Noted	None	1241186	Mr Christopher Smith

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Allocation Field Farm					

Policy 21

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 21: Strategic Allocation Toton and Chetwynd Barracks (Broxtowe)	The consultation has been rushed and the Plan should be reconsulted. Bessell Lane is unsafe to send traffic to a Toton Site. HS2 was moved to East Midlands Parkway, and therefore no longer required on Local Plan.	Disagree. The consultation was repeated in March 2025 following Gedling Borough Council's withdrawal and the publication of the revised NPPF in December 2024, which allowed members of the public an additional opportunity to make representations in relation to the Plan. Comment noted. Irrespective of the HS2 decision, the site will provide much needed housing and employment.	None	1260664 1260667 1260669 1260176 1245737	4QPR and for SSHBRA (Mr Neil Humphrey)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Stapleford & Sandiacre Train Station should be restored at its former site at the Bridge.	Comment noted.			
Policy 21: Strategic Allocation Toton and Chetwynd Barracks (Broxtowe)	Land at Toton should be allocated for 'a Crypto Currency Data Centre / Block Chain / Rail Freight / Tracked Logistics / Leisure Sports Stadium' and/or 'a new Crypto Canary-Wharf'.	Comments noted. The site is required to meet housing and employment needs.	None	1260176 1260671	Mr Neil Humphrey
Policy 21: Strategic Allocation Toton and Chetwynd Barracks (Broxtowe)	Support in principle the continued Strategic Allocation at Toton. Supports the delivery of the of the link road as a strategic transport requirement with its role in releasing land essential for the delivery of the spatial strategy.	Support is welcomed. Comment noted and support welcomed.	None	1261391 1245891	Bloor Homes Limited

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Policy 21 should be amended to make it clear that the additional area of land proposed to be released from the Green Belt by Bloor Homes forms part of the allocation and has the capacity to deliver an additional 605 homes in addition to land already allocated at Toton East. The Policy requirements (in terms of land use and infrastructure requirements) should be reviewed and determined as to whether there is a need for all aspects of the Policy given that HS2 is no longer due to stop at Toton.	Additional amendments are not appropriate, and it is considered that exceptional circumstances do not exist to release additional land from the Green Belt. The policy requirements have been reviewed and further amendments to the policy are proposed. These include references to the western access.	See Suggested Main Modifications Document		

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 21: Strategic Allocation Toton and Chetwynd Barracks (Broxtowe)	Supports the amalgamation of the previously separate strategic development sites of the Toton Strategic Location for Growth (SLG) and Chetwynd Barracks (within Broxtowe's Part 2 Local Plan – policies 3.1. & 3.2) into a single strategic site. Any development within 'Toton West' is unlikely to be deliverable (during the lifetime of the Plan) following the cancellation of HS2. Policy 21 is unsound due to the significant number of issues within it.	Support welcomed. The housing trajectory has been reviewed and updated. It is anticipated that some parts of the site, including Toton West, may not come forward during the Plan period and so the number of homes allocated during the Plan period reflects this.	See Suggested Main Modifications Document	1261806 1245755 1243796	Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Policy 21(1) states the area of the site to be 266 hectares. However, the available area for development is not 266 hectares. A realistic assessment of the amount of land available for development should be made before the GNSP is adopted. The first part of Policy 21(2) should be part of Policy 21(1). The changed numbers for housing and employment cannot be achieved with a 7.5% increase in the suggested area. An accurate proposal for the	Noted. The number of homes, employment floorspace and other uses to be allocated is based upon an assessment of the land available for development. Amendments to the policy format are proposed to improve clarity. The policy provides an accurate amount of employment and housing based on available evidence.	See Suggested Main Modifications Document See Suggested Main Modifications Document		

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	allocation of housing, office space etc. in each of the Character Areas indicated in Figure 21.1 is necessary. Policy 21(2) states that "Development must be in general conformity with * the Toton and Chetwynd Barracks Strategic Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and include:" The following wording should be inserted at * "the Chetwynd: The Toton & Chilwell Neighbourhood Plan and ……." To only mention the CTTCNP within the justification text (para 3.21.2) is insufficient recognition of its relevance to this	Agree. Amendments to the Policy are proposed. Agree. Amendments to the policy are proposed.	See Suggested Main Modifications Document See Suggested Main Modifications Document		

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	strategic site. Policy 21 2.C.7. Includes the phrase "…. to serve their respective catchments only." In this context, a definition as to what this means is required. Policy 21 2.D.9. states "A road from the A52 east of Bardills Roundabout to Chetwynd Barracks, to which all development must contribute" without providing any details or requirements. A Traffic Modelling and Feasibility Study is required for numerous elements of the Policy.	Agree. Amendments to this part of the policy are proposed. Noted. Amendments to the wording of the policy are proposed. Noted.	See Suggested Main Modifications Document See Suggested Main Modifications Document		

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	The route of the road also potentially conflicts with Policy 2. D.13.	Noted. Although disagree as both requirements can be achieved.			
	Given the topography, it would be extremely challenging to construct this junction, and access to and from Bessell Lane would be on to the already congested B6005 Derby Road in Stapleford.	Noted. Amendments to the policy in relation to the western access are proposed.	See Suggested Main Modifications Document		
	The creation of a new park and ride facility near Bessell Lane and removing a further 5 hectares from the SLG would reduce further the quantity of land available for development and makes it unsound.	Noted. The requirement for a park and ride facility is proposed to be removed from the policy.	See Suggested Main Modifications Document		

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	The existing park & ride should remain in situ, without affecting the extension of the tram line to a potential new rail station within the Toton SLG. Supports the GNSP ambition to create attractive and convenient walking and cycling routes, and linking them to local housing, employment, tram and bus stops etc. However, linking them to "green or blue infrastructure corridors where possible" may limit the "effective" criteria and possibly inhibit delivery of the routes, which may be unsound.	Noted. It is proposed that the policy should be amended in relation to a potential new park and ride facility. Support welcomed. Agree. It is proposed re-word this part of the policy.	See Suggested Main Modifications Document See Suggested Main Modifications Document		

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	The potential expansion of secondary education provision should be included within the policy wording. Policy 21 2.F.16. states "Retention of, and public access to, the Memorial and Gardens". The following wording should be added at the end of the sentence "and other heritage assets within Chetwynd Barracks as listed within the CTTCNP." Policy 21 2.H.20. states "Relocation of utility and transport infrastructure or mitigation of its impacts." The following wording should be added at the end of the sentence "potentially including	Secondary education contributions are referred to within part 3 (proposed part 4 of the policy) in terms of developer contributions. Noted. Other assets are already protected by the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan. Noted. Consider the wording is sufficient as drafted.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	the undergrounding of electricity lines east & west of Stapleford Lane."				
	Policy 21 2. Community & Leisure facilities are missing from the policy wording.	Noted. Some community facilities are referred to within the policy.			
	Policy 21 3. The wording "Financial contributions may be sought towards the provision of additional infrastructure …." conflicts with the wording under Policies 21 2.D.9. &10. "…. to which all development must contribute" and "…. which development at Toton (North & South) must facilitate."	There is not a conflict between the wording of these elements of the policy.			
	Para 3.21.2 needs amending so that the second sentence	Noted. It is proposed to amend this part of the policy to improve clarity.	See Suggested Main Modifications Document		

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	relating to the CTTCNP is moved to become the first sentence. Whilst the strategic advantages of the SLG remain (as stated within para 3.21.3) they are significantly weakened by the significant change in circumstances arising from the cancellation of HS2. The GNSP should recognise this particularly in terms of funding opportunities. Para 3.21.14 The 'Infrastructure Delivery Plan constraints / requirements summary' table should be amended:- ● Leisure Facilities should be included under Community	Noted. Amendments to the policy and supporting text are proposed to reflect the change in circumstances. Minor amendments to this table are proposed. Noted.	See Suggested Main Modifications Document See Suggested Main Modifications Document		

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Services in the Infrastructure column; ● Under BGI/Open Space in the Summary Assessment Column it should state "At least 10% biodiversity net gain required."; ● Under BGI/Open Space in the Summary Assessment Column after "Required BGI has been set out within the Toton and Chetwynd SPD" the following wording should be added "and is also indicative within the CTTCNP, along with Locally Designated Green Space." Para 3.21.15 The 'implementation, delivery and monitoring' table should be	Agreed. This amendment (i.e. at least 10% BNG) is proposed. Noted. The CTTCNP is already an adopted part of the development plan.	See Suggested Main Modifications Document		

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	amended to include in the Policy Delivery column "Chetwynd: The Toton & Chilwell Neighbourhood Plan" which should be placed above SPDs. There should be recognition within Policy 21 of the proximity to, and impact on, Attenborough Nature Reserve SSSI from major development at this strategic site.	Noted. It is proposed to amend this section to reflect this point. It is not anticipated that there will be any significant impact upon the Attenborough Nature Reserve SSSI resulting from the development at this site, in part due to the distance between the site and the Nature Reserve.	See Suggested Main Modifications Document		
Policy 21: Strategic Allocation Toton and Chetwynd Barracks (Broxtowe)	In "2 D 13", replace "Attractive and convenient walking and cycling routes through the site" by "Attractive and convenient cycling routes through the site, and between the site	Noted. There are limitations in relation to requirements, outside of the site boundary, in part because some land within 2 or 5 miles of the site would be within a different borough /	None	1258391 1242743	David Rhead

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	and likely external origins/destinations within a 5-mile radius. Attractive and convenient walking/wheeling routes through the site, and between the site and likely external origins/destinations within a 2-mile radius." Replace "2 D 14" by "Walking and cycling routes whose alignments are chosen: • using the methodology specified in DfT's 'LCWIPs Technical Guidance' • so the cycle-routes' gradients comply (as far as practicable) with Table 5-8 of LTN 1/20. Within the development, the origins/destinations that the methodology will	county and outside of the area of the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan. Policies cannot mandate requirements within neighbouring authorities. Noted. Consider this level of detail is not appropriate for a strategic policy.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	link will include housing, employment, the railway station site, tram and bus stops, local centres, community facilities, open spaces, and through-boundary "active travel" links to external destinations. Since one of the desired 'five core outcomes' of 'LCWIPs Technical Guidance' is that routes should be attractive, routes should follow green or blue infrastructure corridors where possible." In "2 C 7", replace the current text by "Three local centres – in Toton North/South, Toton East/Northeast, and Chetwynd East – to serve their respective catchments only".	Noted. Two local centres will be sufficient to serve the scale of development proposed without risking the viability of nearby town and district centres,			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		including Stapleford District Centre.			
	For "filtered permeability", Figure 21.1 could be modified to show "indicative cycle/pedestrian access-points" through the site-boundary.	Noted. The size and scale of the plan (Figure 21.1) is such that adding this information would be both unclear and / or could unnecessarily complicate the plan.			
	Figure 21.1 could also be modified to show: • a bus-gate on Chetwynd Road, for eastbound services • a bus-gate en route to Midland Street (Long Eaton) for a My15-like bus-service linking Stapleford, Toton/Chetwynd, Long Eaton town-centre, East Midlands Gateway, East Midlands Airport • a	Please refer to previous comment.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	bus-gate en route to Willoughby Avenue (Long Eaton) for an Indigo-like service between the development and northern Long Eaton, Breaston, … , Derby. Irrespective of whether a rail-station gets built at Toton, bridges over (or underpasses under) the railway will be required to provide: • a cycling/walking/wheeling/bus link between the development and Long Eaton town-centre (e.g. Midland Street) • a cycling/walking/wheeling/bus link, aligned with Long Eaton's Willoughby Avenue, from the Toton North/South "character areas", through the	Noted but consider there is not sufficient evidence that this is required to make development in this location acceptable.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Toton West "character area", to the Longmoor Road area.				
Policy 21: Strategic Allocation Toton and Chetwynd Barracks (Broxtowe)	a) DIO supports the Spatial Strategy set out in draft Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy. b) DIO supports the inclusion of Chetwynd Barracks within the list of Strategic Sites in Policy 3: Housing Target and supports the continued allocation of the land that it controls at Chetwynd Barracks. DIO is confident for reasons set out above that the Site will deliver 1,200 homes within the plan period. This support and confidence is qualified by DIO's comments on the matters arising from the	Support welcomed. Support welcomed. Support welcomed. Agree in relation to site delivery.		1263726 1263730 1263731 1263732 1263733 1263734 1245875	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	combination of sites into a single Strategic Allocation. c) DIO supports the inclusion of Chetwynd Barracks in a site specific allocation (i.e. Policy 21:Strategic Allocation Toton and Chetwynd Barracks). d) DIO objects however to Policy 21 as drafted given the current absence of any explanation of the mechanisms that will allow parts of the Strategic Allocation to be consented and developed on their own. This is based on the reasonable assumption that the delivery timelines associated with different parts of the allocation will differ.	Support welcomed. Whilst the Toton and Chetwynd Barracks site allocations have been merged into one policy, this is not intended to delay development at the site. Different planning applications for different ownerships and for different phases will be welcomed. It is not the intention that decisions on applications for different parts of the site should be delayed by the	See Suggested Main Modifications Document		

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	DIO assumes that the GNPP/BBC is not expecting to prevent any application(s) from being positively determined if such application(s) do not comprise a single application covering the whole of Site 21.	revised policy. It is proposed to clarify this within the justification text for the policy.			
	Whether a standalone allocation or part of Policy 21 the site boundary should include the access point from Stapleford Lane.	Several access points to the site are likely to be required.			
	e) DIO objects to the wording of draft Policy 21: 2 which says that applications "must be in general conformity with the Toton and Chetwynd Barracks Strategic Masterplan SPD." The SPD is a non-statutory	Disagree. However, amendments are proposed to also refer to other SPDs and to give more prominence to the Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Plan as	See Suggested Main Modifications Document		

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	document, elements of which attracted substantial representations from DIO and others which were disregarded by BBC. DIO is concerned that the wording has the effect of elevating the status of the SPD. Policy 21.2 should be amended to either delete reference to the SPD (which is a material consideration in any event) or to make it clear that proposals need only to "have regard" to its relevant content. f) DIO proposes also that the wording of Policy 21:G.17 which refers to the "retention and provision of green and blue infrastructure	a part of the development plan. Disagree. However, amendments are proposed to this part of the policy following	See Suggested Main Modifications Document		

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	corridors and spaces" be amended. The draft GNSP does not identify any such corridors and spaces (other than Local Green Space) and so the reference to "retention" should be deleted. g) DIO objects to the inclusion of the reference in Policy 21 B. 4. to "at least 8,000 sqm of office (Class E(g)(i) only at Chetwynd South. DIO considers that the amount of office floorspace proposed is neither justified nor necessarily desirable on Chetwynd Barracks site and is unsure why office use would not be appropriate at or adjacent to the planned new station at Toton.	representations by the Environment Agency. Amendments to the policy are proposed to require 'around' 8,000 square metres of office (Class E (g) (i)) floor space within 'Chetwynd Barracks', rather than being overly specific in relation to the location within the site.	See Suggested Main Modifications Document		

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	The reference should be amended to refer to "up to" 8,000 sqm of offices on a combination of Chetwynd East and South and Toton North and South. DIO also considers it unnecessary and premature to fix any office allocation to 'Chetwynd South' given that there may be opportunities to accommodate elements of office uses in any retained buildings outside Chetwynd South, or otherwise where best able to meet market needs. h) DIO objects to the inclusion of reference in Policy 21 C. 7 to the local centre at	Amendments are proposed to amend the location of the local centre to 'Chetwynd	See Suggested Main Modifications Document		

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Chetwynd Barracks being only at Chetwynd East, because parts of Chetwynd South are at least as appropriate to accommodate main town centre uses including, potentially, in any retained buildings. i) DIO objects to the requirement in Policy 21 D. 9. and 10 to the reference to "all development" contributing to a road to the east of Bardills Roundabout to Chetwynd Barracks and a west-facing junction from the A52 near Bessell Lane into the site. This is on the basis that the need for and/or timing of these schemes is not yet demonstrated in	Barracks', rather than specifically to Chetwynd South. Amendments are proposed to the policy in relation to accessing the Toton North and South parts of the site.	See Suggested Main Modifications Document		

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	published evidence. The capacity of the Barracks and Toton SLG has not changed since the adoption of the BLP2 so that it is not clear what material changes have arisen to change the approach. Moreover, Policy 21 does not explain whether appropriate contributions may take the form of the delivery of infrastructure rather than financial contributions. Nor does it give any indication as to how any costs and financial contributions are to be determined or apportioned, or the triggers or development thresholds at which any justifiable contributions would be made. DIO	Amendments to the justification text are proposed to clarify that contributions could, at the discretion of the LPA, include either financial contributions and / or contributions of infrastructure.	See Suggested Main Modifications Document		

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	wishes to emphasise that its objections are driven by the current lack of evidence to justify the references in D.9. and D.10. DIO's position may change as and when that evidence becomes available for examination. j) DIO supports the approach set out in Policy 14: Managing Travel Demand which is to take a hierarchical approach to ensure the delivery of sustainable transport networks to serve new development which will seek to provide (in order of priority) site-specific and area-wide travel demand management measures, improvements to public	Support welcomed.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	transport and local infrastructure as well as active travel, optimisation of the existing network and highway management measures ahead of highway capacity enhancements. On a related point, the thresholds for delivery of the Link Road and the Bessell Lane works have not been set out, and we expect the GNPP to include that in evidence in due course so that it will be evident in the Strategic Transport Modelling to be published in early 2025 that the GNPP has followed the hierarchical approach required by draft Policy 14.	Noted.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	k) DIO objects to the wording of Policy 18.2.c) as drafted, which relates to Developer contributions for Infrastructure. It will not always be necessary for development to provide for future maintenance of facilities provided as a result of development. For example, it would not be appropriate to fund the ongoing costs of maintaining any highway works adopted by the Local Highway Authority.	Amendments to the policy and justification text are proposed to clarify that this would not apply if the land is no longer in private ownership.	See Suggested Main Modifications Document		
Policy 21: Strategic Allocation Toton and Chetwynd	B09.4COM This area should not be considered for expansion of housing. Redevelopment of the Chetwynd barracks is perfectly acceptable,	Noted. Some additional development land will be required outside of the Barracks to ensure that the access road is deliverable.	None	1258455	Dr William Robotham

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Barracks (Broxtowe)	but further development outside of this area is not as it will ruin an area of green space that is enjoyed by a significant number of people and put a strain on infrastructure.				
Policy 21: Strategic Allocation Toton and Chetwynd Barracks (Broxtowe)	There is huge potential for this development to deliver ambitious gains and improvements in blue-green infrastructure. Within the policy, there is no mention of improving existing BGI or creating BGI to support a more connected and better functioning BGI network. Wording is recommended. There is a need for creative and robust	Noted and agreed. Amendments to the policy are proposed.	See Suggested Main Modifications Document	1262357 1246141	Environment Agency

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	integration of SuDS within the urban environment. There is an identified water pathway within the Chetwynd East section of the development. This area would benefit from SuDS as part of Blue-Green Infrastructure linkages and should be integrated within this section. The design policy element of this development should be inclusive of a more permeable and greener environment. This is an important site for code 2 species (great crested newts) – so careful planning, surveys, mitigation,	Agreed. Covered by additional policies within the Plan. Noted. These issues are covered under separate policies including Policies 10 and 16. Noted.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	compensation and enhancement will be expected as part of this development to prevent harm to this protected species. Would expect to see a landscape and species management plan to ensure that these are achieved, and would likely be conditioned as part of the planning process.				
Policy 21: Strategic Allocation Toton and Chetwynd Barracks (Broxtowe)	Concerns about the deliverability of this strategic allocation. The site has faced delays, and there is insufficient evidence to support the projected delivery timescales and rates. Three issues raise concern with regards to the	The size of the allocation (number of homes) and timing has been reviewed and is based on evidence.	See Suggested Main Modifications Document	1262476	Gladman Developments Ltd

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	site's deliverability, these being: • The reduction in the scope of the HS2 project; • The Ministry of Defence delaying closure of the barracks until 2026 (having previously delayed the closure); and • Nottinghamshire County Council's failed bid for funding to support delivery of the link road	The size of the allocation and requirements in relation to supporting infrastructure have been reviewed and these have been updated accordingly. Updated information has been obtained in relation to this site to inform the revised policy. The site allocation includes additional land to the north east of Toton, which is to be released from the Green Belt in order to provide funding to support the	See Suggested Main Modifications Document		

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	required to mitigate strategic transport impacts.	development of the link road.			
Policy 21: Strategic Allocation Toton and Chetwynd Barracks (Broxtowe)	Within the Lichfield's Start to Finish Report development sites that are for more than 2,000 dwellings taken on average 6.7 years to be delivered. This needs to be given consideration in addition to the nature of the site being brownfield which can present further delays to delivery. If the Plan continues to rely on the site at Chetwynd Barracks to provide housing from 2026/27, this will have detrimental impacts on its ability in meeting the housing needs of	The Toton part of the site is greenfield and large parts of the Chetwynd Barracks part of the site are, in practice, also greenfield in nature. It is anticipated that these will come forward in the earlier years of the Plan.		1260583 1246829	Harworth Group

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Greater Nottingham and Broxtowe. To ensure the Plan and delivery of the site is accurate, the housing trajectory within the Housing Background Paper should be amended to provide a revised delivery trajectory, with delivery commencing from 2033/34. Consider that the allocation of the land at Toton and Chetwynd Barracks will be undeliverable in its current form and that the site at land off Melton Road, Tollerton will be able to deliver a portion of the growth previously targeted	The housing trajectory has been reviewed and updated accordingly. Disagree. Consider the site is deliverable.	See Suggested Main Modifications Document		

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	towards Chetwynd Barracks.				
Policy 21: Strategic Allocation Toton and Chetwynd Barracks (Broxtowe)	Note the lack of any clear and objective assessment within the GNSP or its evidence base underpinning the anticipated delivery timescales or rates. Whilst the site may be retained as a long-standing aspiration for growth, there is virtually no evidence that it will yield housing completions by 2026/2027 and the available information suggests that most of the capacity on this site is undeliverable within the current Plan period.	Disagree. Information has been provided by developers. Disagree. Evidence has been obtained from site owners / developers to justify the housing trajectory.	None	1262117 1261821 1245777 1262546 1245912 1259623 1246941 1249411	Marrons MyPad Parker Strategic Land Limited and William Davis Homes Stantec Northern Trust Land Consortium of Developers
Policy 21: Strategic Allocation	The site has remained as an allocation for over 5 years, and to date	It is considered that the site will provide employment	None	1289569	Mulberry Land

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Toton and Chetwynd Barracks (Broxtowe)	there is certainly no evidence of a planning application coming forward to enable actual delivery of employment land. Given the site is dependent on significant funding for new junctions and a link road, there is likely to be viability issues in delivery at this location, hence the allocation remains and has not been developed to date.	development during the plan period. Planning applications are now pending which would support the delivery of key infrastructure.			
Policy 21: Strategic Allocation Toton and Chetwynd Barracks (Broxtowe)	Fails to adequately consider the impact of the Government's Integrated Rail Plan (IRP) and the impact upon the Strategic Land for Growth (SLG). As a result it over-estimates the land available, the number of dwellings and business &	The size of the allocation and number of units allocated within the Plan period have been reviewed in light of the IRP decision.	See Suggested Main Modifications Document	1253468 1253471 1241674 1241680	Mr Mark Trought

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	industrial space that could be created. Concern regarding lack of funding. The creation of a railway station at Toton was included in the IRP but relied upon 50% private funding and 50% government funding neither of which are guaranteed and should not be expected to be available in the GNSP.	Noted. Land to the northeast is to be released from the Green Belt in order to increase funding for the link road. These requirements have been reviewed and it is proposed to remove a number of requirements from the Policy. Disagree.	See Suggested Main Modifications Document		

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Policy 21 Paragraph 3.21.6 should be deleted. The effectiveness of the junctions and the link road may have been considered in the Transport Modelling as included in the Background Papers however, as stated in the conclusions of that document "there is significant unresolved congestion" and alternative solutions ought to be considered. It is unclear from figure 21.1 what form the Link Road connection to the A52 will take. Paragraph 3.21.11 states "to ensure that Toton Lane can continue effectively to	Noted. Figure 21.1 provides a strategic overview of site requirements. Noted.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	serve local traffic needs only". However, this specifically excludes requiring Stapleford Lane to serve local needs only and the junction between Swiney Way and Stapleford Lane is heavily congested during the day. Much of the traffic on Toton Lane/Stapleford Lane is traffic to/from the M1/Derby or from Nottingham to Long Eaton and this traffic will not be mitigated by either of the proposed junctions. A new junction will be required across Stapleford/Toton Lane which will affect the traffic on Bardill's roundabout, particularly	Noted. There are unfortunately limitations in terms of the funding for infrastructure which can be sought from developers to resolve existing issues, not caused by the development of the site. Noted.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	with the proposed NET extension also crossing Stapleford/Toton Lane. Bardill's Roundabout should be modified using the land of Bardill's Garden Centre and Japanese Water Gardens to provide the link road to Toton East & Chetwynd Barracks and to Toton North & Toton South without the need to put additional junctions onto the A52 or most of the additional 20Ha of Toton Northeast.	Noted. This will form part of detailed transport modelling which will be required to support planning applications.			
Policy 21: Strategic Allocation Toton and Chetwynd	Policy 21 is not sound as it conflicts with other policies within the GNSP.	Disagree.	None	1260108 1243237	Mr Michael Lyons

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Barracks (Broxtowe)	The building of a junction and a road does not require a release of 20 hectares of Green Belt land. This release of land is purely a device to increase developers' profits which will in turn be used to fund the infrastructure of a separate development at Chetwynd Barracks and as such does not meet the aspirations of Policy 18. The planned 4,800 dwellings across the Toton and Chilwell Strategic Plan area, will increase population of South Broxtowe by at least 11,000 (based upon the borough's average occupancy per dwelling - Census	Disagree. The scale of the infrastructure required will require significant funding. The number of units proposed within the Plan period has been clarified within the policy.	See Suggested Main Modifications Document		

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	2021). The provision of only 16 hectares of accessible green open space does not meet the aspirations of Policy 16 The development of land at Toton North-East will sever the green infrastructure network that is the A52 Corridor south-east of Stapleford. This is contrary to Policy 16, which seeks to protect and enhance such corridors. Any change in land use must make a positive contribution to minimum 30% tree cover target.	Noted. Noted.			
Policy 21: Strategic Allocation Toton and	The site is being retained as part of the MOD, therefore, the assumptions made on	Disagree, the site is still being promoted for development.	None	1259878 1246983	Mr Richards and Mrs Hurst

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Chetwynd Barracks (Broxtowe)	both viability grounds and deliverability are unfounded and not supported by up-to-date evidence. The allocation of Chetwynd Barracks for development should therefore be removed from the GNSP and its housing trajectory due to the retention of the site for military use and the lack of evidence to suggest it will be able to deliver housing in the Plan period.	Disagree.			
Policy 21: Strategic Allocation Toton and Chetwynd Barracks (Broxtowe)	Broadly supports the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan Regulation 19 version, subject to retention of the following provisions within the plan:	Broad support welcomed.	None	1260159	National Grid Electricity Distribution (South West) Plc

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Policy 21: Toton and Chetwynd Barracks Strategic Allocation: the acknowledgement that overhead lines on site may remain in situ, and if so, appropriate mitigation would be required.	Noted. Wording in the justification text acknowledges this.			
Policy 21: Strategic Allocation Toton and Chetwynd Barracks (Broxtowe)	Toton is an operational depot and any aspiration for a rail hub (and station) would need careful consideration to ensure it would still function. If consideration is being given to a new railway station, this would need interest from a Train Operating Company and would need to consider the spatial constraints in physically siting a station in the area. It would be	Noted.	None	1262632	Network Rail

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	imperative to work with Network Rail in developing such a scheme.				
Policy 21: Strategic Allocation Toton and Chetwynd Barracks (Broxtowe)	This site includes the playing field and sports facilities at the George Spencer Academy Secondary School. It is noted that the proposal requires new secondary school places and that a range of options would be considered including the expansion of existing secondary schools. Should the detailed proposals for this site result in the loss of, or prejudice the use, of all or any part of the playing field or any other sports facilities at the site these should be consistent with paragraph 104 of the	Any impact on playing fields or sports facilities would need to be considered against the NPPF and Policies 13 and 16 of the GNSP. It is considered that there is no need to repeat these considerations within the site specific policy.	None	1289573	Sport England

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	NPPF. For any development adjacent to the playing field consideration would also need to be given to any ball strike risk or noise generated by the use of the playing field to ensure that proposals do not prejudice the use of the playing field. Request that additional wording is added to the policy and/ or the supporting text to recognise the need for proposals to comply with paragraph 104 of the NPPF.				
Policy 21: Strategic Allocation Toton and Chetwynd	Active Travel links to and from this major regeneration site should be integrated with plans for a new foot-cycle bridge across the Trent nearby connecting the	Noted. There are however limitations to what the policy can require outside of the Borough and GNSP Plan area.	None	1261954	Pedals (Nottingham Cycling Campaign) (Mr. Hugh McClintock)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Barracks (Broxtowe)	major Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station Regeneration Site on the south bank with the area south-east of Long Eaton – Cranfleet Lock – Chetwynd Barracks major Regeneration site on the north bank with links to Sustrans NCN Routes 6 and 67 north of the Trent and NCN Route 15 south of the Trent. The Erewash Canal towpath, much of which is part of NCN67, is only a leisure route, meaning that a much higher standard north-south route in the area is needed for utility / commuting trips, etc., and with connections to adjoining areas in both	Noted.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Broxtowe and Erewash Boroughs.				
Policy 21: Strategic Allocation Toton and Chetwynd Barracks (Broxtowe)	The Local Plan trajectory indicates delivery on site from 2026/27, which is unlikely given the delayed closure of the site. Therefore, it is uncertain whether the Chetwynd site will deliver the full 1,200 units anticipated during the plan period. There are significant barriers to availability and achievability of the site and the ability to achieve delivery at the rates proposed given the absence of clear evidence for how matters such as site-specific infrastructure	The trajectory for the site has been updated based on evidence. This is considered to be realistic and is based upon supporting evidence from site owners / developers. Disagree. The site is being actively promoted by a number of developers.	See Suggested Main Modifications Document	1260051 1247811 1291834	Persimmon Homes (Mr George Breed) Cora Homes Ltd (Mr Robbie Locke)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	requirements and site preparation will be funded. It is highly improbable, given average leads in and build-out rates for strategic sites, that either of these sites (Chetwynd and Toton) will deliver at the rate anticipated within the current trajectory. Uncertainties regarding HS2 and potential longer-term retention of the barracks for matters of national importance have the potential to result in the delivery of the sites being held up further. The reliance on two strategic sites to deliver the vast majority of housing growth during the plan period is	Disagree. However, the trajectory has been updated based on latest evidence. Disagree. The allocation of additional sites is not	See Suggested Main Modifications Document		

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	considered unsound. It is recommended that additional sites are allocated to ensure that housing needs can be met within the Plan period should further delay or lower delivery rates occur.	considered to be necessary.			
Policy 21: Strategic Allocation Toton and Chetwynd Barracks (Broxtowe)	Client owns the Japanese Water Gardens site and advocate for this site together with client's small field to the north of the NET attenuation pond and further land to the north be removed from the Green Belt. Strongly support the review of the boundary to the Green Belt in this location - this is a highly sustainable location	Noted.		1258271 1259797 1245759	Peveril Securities Limited

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	where growth should be directed. The Policy Map Changes March 2025 regarding the Toton Strategic Location for Growth & Chetwynd Barracks are supported in so far as they relate to client's land.	Support welcomed.			
Policy 21: Strategic Allocation Toton and Chetwynd Barracks (Broxtowe)	There is no information available to demonstrate that the site will be able to come forwards for development within the Plan period or beyond, and therefore the delivery of the site should be pushed back within the Trajectory in the Housing Background Paper to 2033/34, or removed	The housing trajectory has been reviewed and updated.	See Suggested Main Modifications Document	1260066 1246708	Stagfield Group

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	entirely from the GNSP and its housing trajectory.				
Policy 21: Strategic Allocation Toton and Chetwynd Barracks (Broxtowe)	It is still unclear due to lack of information from the MOD when the site will come forward and when delivery will commence on site. Does not consider that the allocation of the land at Toton and Chetwynd Barracks will be achievable in its current form. To ensure the trajectory is accurate and does not result in under delivery, the trajectory should be amended to reflect a realistic build out rate. To provide for the shortfall in housing, client's land at Cossall Road, Trowell is	Trajectories are based on latest information from the site promoters. The housing trajectory has been reviewed and updated based on latest evidence. Additional allocations within the Plan are not	See Suggested Main Modifications Document	1260140 1245727	Strawson Group Investments Ltd

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	deliverable and achievable within the initial years of the plan period following adoption.	considered to be necessary.			
Policy 21: Strategic Allocation Toton and Chetwynd Barracks (Broxtowe)	Evidence is needed to demonstrate how a higher delivery rate of 200dpa could be achieved considering all of the constraints on the site. A reduction of 1,100 dwellings delivered in the plan period on this strategic allocation is needed compared to current assumptions.	Supporting evidence has been provided by site owners / developers in relation to the delivery rates and number of dwellings. See above comment.		1261029	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land
Policy 21: Strategic Allocation Toton and Chetwynd	A new partnership between the MoD and Homes England will aim to unlock a further 1,300 homes on the site by partially releasing land at Chetwynd	Disagree in relation to evidence provided. Supporting evidence has been supplied by site owners / developers.		1261243	William Davis

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Barracks (Broxtowe)	Barracks. However, it is concerning that there is no evidence to indicate where the remaining dwellings on the site will materialise from, or whether the remaining land on the Barracks will become available at all. It is also currently expected that the Chetwynd Barracks and Toton will begin to deliver dwellings in 2026/27 which is not realistic considering its current position and the lack of an application being submitted.	The housing trajectory has been updated based on latest evidence.	See Suggested Main Modifications Document		
Policy 21: Strategic Allocation Toton and Chetwynd	Does not consider that the allocation of the land at Toton and Chetwynd Barracks will be deliverable in its	The housing trajectory has been reviewed and revised.	See Suggested Main Modifications Document	1261377	Barratt David Wilson

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Barracks (Broxtowe)	current form. To ensure the trajectory is accurate and does not result in under delivery once adopted, the trajectory should be amended. Further housing allocations should be made to include sites which will ensure the housing need is met, such as the land at Hollygate Lane, Cotgrave, which is deliverable, achievable and realistic in being able to deliver small scale growth.	Disagree. Additional housing allocations are not considered to be necessary.			
Policy 21: Strategic Allocation Toton and Chetwynd	Both Toton and Chetwynd Barracks were previously allocated for development within the adopted Broxtowe Local	The new combined allocation is proposed to include additional land to the north east, the development of	None	1261391	Barratt David Wilson Homes (North Midlands) and Averill Land Limited

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Barracks (Broxtowe)	Plan, and have failed to come forward for development. Furthermore, there is no evidence provided by the MOD to show that the site is viable or deliverable within the anticipated timescales of delivering growth immediately upon adoption of the plan. Does not consider that the allocation of the land at Toton and Chetwynd Barracks will be deliverable in its current form. To ensure the trajectory is accurate and does not result in under delivery once adopted, the trajectory should be amended.	which will help to fund the new link road. Disagree in relation to the supporting evidence. The trajectory has been reviewed and amended.	See Suggested Main Modifications Document		

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 21: Strategic Allocation Toton and Chetwynd Barracks (Broxtowe)	During the examination of the Part 2 Local Plan in 2019, concern was raised about whether the site could realistically deliver 100 homes per year from 2023 onwards and given the GNSP is now predicting first completions by 2026/2027, these concerns were clearly justified. Likewise, Toton was anticipated to commence in 2019/2020, yet still has not done so. Notes lack of any clear and objective assessment within the GNSP or its evidence base underpinning the anticipated delivery timescales or rates. Intervening events	The trajectory has been updated based on the latest evidence and a number of planning applications have been submitted in relation to the site.	See Suggested Main Modifications Document	1280208	Richborough Estates

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	since the adoption of the Part 2 Local Plan for Broxtowe should also give cause for concern, namely the reduction in the scope of the HS2 project, the Ministry of Defence delaying closure of the barracks until 2026 (having done so at least once before) and Nottinghamshire County Council's failed bid for funding to support delivery of a link road required to mitigate the strategic transport impacts of the project. Whilst the site may be retained as a long-standing aspiration for growth, there is virtually no evidence that it will yield housing completions by				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	2026/2027 and the available information suggests that most of the capacity on this site is undeliverable within the current Plan period.				
Policy 21: Strategic Allocation Toton and Chetwynd Barracks (Broxtowe)	Remove the allocation for Toton North East and the link road and seek sustainable transport solutions and less damaging changes to the local road network to manage the increased traffic development of Chetwynd is envisaged to cause.	Disagree, the proposed allocation and link road are appropriate and are required to mitigate transport impacts.	None	1243764	Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum
Policy 21: Strategic Allocation Toton and Chetwynd Barracks (Broxtowe)	The Plan fails to test reasonable alternatives and to identify sufficient land to meet, as a minimum, Local Housing Need (plus provision for flexibility	The site selection document sets out the approach to selecting sites for allocation. A1 0% buffer is considered unnecessary, and	None	1247811	Persimmon Homes (Mr George Breed)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	and choice such as a 10% 'whole plan' buffer) in-line with national policy in the December (2023) version of the NPPF. The Plan is also intending to proceed under transitional arrangements and has a significant absence of strategic policies to attempt to address its housing needs.	buffers are not mentioned in the NPPF. Utilising the transitional arrangements will allow for an adopted local plan to be in place in an expedient way.			
Policy 21: Strategic Allocation Toton and Chetwynd Barracks (Broxtowe)	Broadly supports the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan Regulation 19 version, subject to retention of the following provisions within the plan: Policy 21:Toton and Chetwynd Barracks Strategic Allocation: the acknowledgement that	Noted.	None	1243040	National Grid Electricity Distribution (South West) Plc (Mr Nick Buxton)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	overhead lines on site may remain in situ, and if so, appropriate mitigation would be required				
Policy 21: Strategic Allocation Toton and Chetwynd Barracks (Broxtowe)	Do not consider that the allocation of the land at Toton and Chetwynd Barracks will be deliverable, and the inclusion of the site within the Plan proposes a significant risk to meeting the housing needs of Broxtowe and Greater Nottingham. The Ministry of Defence (MOD) are retaining Chetwynd Barracks for military use and therefore the site will not be brought forward for residential development for the	The trajectory is based on information from the site promoters. There are pending planning applications covering a number of areas of the allocation.	None.	1246761	Barratt David Wilson Homes (North Midlands) and Averill Land Limited

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	foreseeable future. There is no information available to demonstrate that the site will be able to come forwards for development within the Plan period or beyond, and therefore the site should be removed as an allocation within the emerging Plan as it is not suitable or deliverable.				
Policy 21: Strategic Allocation Toton and Chetwynd Barracks (Broxtowe)	Policy 21 Paragraph 1 should be rewritten to accurately reflect the quantity of land that would be available to be developed in the SLG. Policy 21 Paragraph 3.21.3: The Toton SLG was originally allocated to	The figures in the policy are accurate.		1241674	Mr Mark Trought

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	enable and benefit from a high-speed railway station serving the region. That has since been cancelled. The strategic advantages that led to its selection are substantially weakened, with limited access to the motorway, trunk road network and railway. Policy 21 Paragraph 3.21.5 The SLG comprises open fields in three main ownerships, including Nottinghamshire County Council (with extant planning permission for up to 500 homes), the railway depot, the waste water treatment plant, substation (and power	The policy reflects the continuing strategic advantages of the site. The policy takes account of these issues.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	lines to the east and west), part of George Spencer Academy (GSA) secondary school, Bardills Garden Centre and the Japanese Water Gardens. Substantial mitigation of the impacts of these will be required as it has previously been identified that neither the substation nor the waste water treatment plant can be relocated and GSA have stated that they have no plans or funds to relocate. Policy 21 Paragraph 3.21.6 Delete this paragraph. Policy 21 Paragraph 3.21.9				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	The combined allocation has capacity for 3,800 homes, of which 1,700 are capable of delivery within the plan period. Business and industrial development, comprising uses within Class E (g) and B2, will be focussed on high-tech industry, research and development, including the healthcare sector. Between 8,000 – 14,000 square metres of office floor space (falling within Use Class E (g)(i)) should be provided at Chetwynd South.	Disagree: the paragraph contains relevant information. No change is needed.			
Policy 21: Strategic Allocation	Paragraph 21 D.9	No change is needed.		1241680	Mr Mark Trought

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Toton and Chetwynd Barracks (Broxtowe)	A modified layout to Bardill's roundabout to which all developments should contribute, using the land of Bardill's Garden Centre and Japanese Water Gardens as necessary to incorporate access to Toton North, Toton South and Toton East. Paragraph 21 D.10 The access to Toton East to be capable of extension through to Chetwynd Barracks and onwards to Swiney Way to provide access to Chetwynd Barracks and reduce congestion at the junction of Swiney Way and Stapleford Lane. Paragraph 3.21.7	No change is needed.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Chetwynd Barracks is currently operational, but the Ministry of Defence plans to close it and dispose of the land in phases during the early part of the plan period. It contains homes on long lease to a service accommodation provider, various offices, large warehouses, playing fields and woodland. Paragraph 3.21.11 Bardills Roundabout and Stapleford/Toton Lane have limited capacity, so a new layout of Bardill's Roundabout is required connecting Toton North, Toton South & Toton East. The eastern	No change is needed. No change is needed.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	junction must connect with a link road to Swiney Way in order to ensure that Stapleford/Toton Lane can continue effectively to serve local traffic needs only. Paragraph 3.21.12 The new roundabout will require significant funding and so any development on any part of the site will need to contribute financially to its provision. To facilitate the new roundabout, Bardills Garden Centre and Japanese Water Gardens are released from the Green Belt. Paragraph 3.21.13	No change is needed.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	This paragraph is deleted.	Disagree: the paragraph contains relevant information.			
Policy 21: Strategic Allocation Toton and Chetwynd Barracks (Broxtowe)	Toton is an operational depot and any aspiration for a rail hub (and station) would need careful consideration to ensure it would still function. If consideration is being given to a new railway station, this would need interest from a Train Operating Company and would need to consider the spatial constraints in physically siting a station in the area. It would be imperative to work with Network Rail in	Noted	None	1243680	Network Rail (Miss Emma Foster)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	developing such a scheme.				
Policy 21: Strategic Allocation Toton and Chetwynd Barracks (Broxtowe)	"Derbyshire County Council is keen to work with the Greater Nottingham Authorities to help maximise the economic development and regeneration potential for Derbyshire that is likely to be delivered by the Toton and Chetwynd Barracks strategic allocations."	Noted and welcomed.	None	1246325	Derbyshire County Council
Policy 21: Strategic Allocation Toton and Chetwynd Barracks (Broxtowe)	The Plan is legally compliant, sound and complies with the Duty to Co-operate with regard to policy 21.	Noted.	None	1241187	Mr Christopher Smith

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 21: Strategic Allocation Toton and Chetwynd Barracks (Broxtowe)	The Plan is not legally compliant or sound with regard to policy 21, as there should be "a new modern town centre surrounded by apartment blocks".	The proposals for the site are considered to be appropriate.	None	1243452	Mr Atif Muneer
Policy 21: Strategic Allocation Toton and Chetwynd Barracks (Broxtowe)	The "main road infrastructure needs to be addressed before any houses are considered".	The proposals for the site include provisions for main road infrastructure.	None	1243251	Ian Longhurst

Policy 22

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 22: Bennerley	Notes the strategic allocation and the removal of land from the Green Belt to accommodate this; welcomes the Green Belt assessment work that has been undertaken to support the strategic allocation; and welcomes the wording of the policy concerning the provision of strategic distribution and logistics development.	Comments noted and welcomed.	None	1259737	Amber Valley Borough Council (officer comments)
Policy 22: Bennerley	Broadly supports the proposals for Bennerley, including removal from the Green Belt, however, considers that sufficient and effective	Broad support noted and welcomed. Agreed that many safeguards are needed, and the policy is intended to	None	1259403 1259406 1262381 1243692	Awsworth Parish Council

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	safeguards are needed regarding a range of matters.	ensure that these safeguards are in place.			
Policy 22: Bennerley	Concerned that this proposed strategic economic development north of the village, taken together with the current major housing development west of the village, would pose significant pressures on Awsworth's character, infrastructure, biodiversity and residents. These developments require careful planning and implementation and should ensure the best outcomes for the local area and residents.	The concerns about the potential implications are appreciated: the policy is intended to ensure careful planning and implementation and the best outcomes.	None	1259403 1259406 1262381 1243692	Awsworth Parish Council
Policy 22: Bennerley	It will be crucial to ensure the realisation of a new Country Park at	Agreed. Part 2.B of the policy is intended to	None	1259403 1259406	Awsworth Parish Council

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Bennerley, which the Parish Council's adopted Neighbourhood Plan supports.	ensure that the Country Park is realised.		1262381 1243692	
Policy 22: Bennerley	Has serious reservations about the requirement for the site to be rail-connected and to incorporate a rail freight terminal, as the Parish Council has serious concerns about the practicality and implications of the suggested rail access from the Erewash Valley railway line, including for the Country Park.	Rail access has potentially major benefits for carbon reduction. The Council is confident that it need not have adverse implications for the Country Park.	None	1259403 1259406 1262381 1243692	Awsworth Parish Council
Policy 22: Bennerley	Concerned that valuable habitat within the site should not be lost and/or that compensatory provision should be made.	Some loss of habitat is likely to be unavoidable, however paragraph 3.22.11 refers to the need for mitigation or compensation for any	None	1259403 1259406 1262381 1243692	Awsworth Parish Council

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		harm to LWSs and part 2.H.24 of the policy requires that Biodiversity Net Gain should be provided on site.			
Policy 22: Bennerley	Has very serious concerns about traffic implications if there were to be a secondary access from Shilo Way.	The policy sets out access requirements with more detailed work required as part of a future planning application.	None	1259403 1259406 1262381 1243692	Awsworth Parish Council
Policy 22: Bennerley	References to 'Land at the Former Bennerley Coal Disposal point' are incorrect and misleading, as the allocation site includes other adjoining land.	Figure 22.1 makes the allocation site clear, and this is considered to be a reasonable description, as 'Land at…' does not imply 'Land wholly within…'.	None	1259403 1259406 1243692	Awsworth Parish Council
Policy 22: Bennerley	The policy does not adequately address 'active travel' accessibility deficiencies and is only	Parts 2.C.10-13 of the policy are intended to ensure that active travel and the management of	None	1258394 1243264	David Rhead

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	paying 'lip-service' to managing travel demand.	travel demand are thoroughly addressed.			
Policy 22: Bennerley	The County Council 'was broadly supportive of the principle of the Bennerley site being removed from the Green Belt' and welcomes the inclusion of part D regarding design requirements.	Comments noted and welcomed.	None	1259648	Derbyshire County Council
Policy 22: Bennerley	Flood zones have been updated at this site and the most recent data should be used to inform the site layout.	The most recent data have been used.	None	1262358 1246142	Environment Agency
Policy 22: Bennerley	The protection and restoration of the River Erewash at this site is crucial in supporting its overall health (which suffers pressures from sewage and transport	It is agreed that the proposed changes would add some useful detail to the policy.	See Suggested Main Modification Document .	1262358 1246142	Environment Agency

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	pollution). Policy wording should therefore be amended to refer to: the restoration of the River Erewash and Gilt Brook; protection and enhancement of BGI; enhancing river health including water quality and its restoration.				
Policy 22: Bennerley	Welcomes the re-use of this site and considers that the land's removal from the Green Belt is 'clearly justified'.	Comments noted and welcomed	None	1259956	Erewash Borough Council
Policy 22: Bennerley	Considers that the inclusion of the Country Park is essential to maintain a sense of separation and openness between Ilkeston and the proposed development, and to deliver an	Agreed. Part 2.B of the policy is intended to ensure that this is the case.	None	1259956	Erewash Borough Council

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	'overall sustainable development'.				
Policy 22: Bennerley	Strongly supports the allocation.	Comments noted and welcomed.	None	1260100 1260099 1243526	Harworth Group
Policy 22: Bennerley	The policy should reflect the opportunity to also access the site from Shilo Way.	Disagree: access from Shilo Way would be inappropriate as a policy requirement. However, paragraph 3.22.9 refers to potential to provide a secondary access from Shilo Way.	None	1260100 1243526	Harworth Group
Policy 22: Bennerley	There should be a 'level of flexibility' regarding the rail freight terminal, which requires work to investigate its viability.	Suggested amended wording to the policy to reflect the further work required.	See Suggested Main Modification Document for proposed wording.	1260100 1243526	Harworth Group
Policy 22: Bennerley	It is important that 'the full potential of the proposed Bennerley	The policy is considered to be appropriate in this regard.	None	1260099 1243526	Harworth Group

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	allocation is maximised'.				
Policy 22: Bennerley	'Concerned about this site'. There is limited information, including in the HIA, about harm to the significance of the Viaduct and how/if this can be avoided/mitigated. HE 'will require additional detail' on these issues.	These important considerations will be carefully assessed, in liaison with Historic England as part of future planning applications. Part 2.D.14 of the policy incorporates strong protection for the Viaduct and its setting and suggested main modification to strengthen this further.	See suggested Main Modifications Document.	1262411 1246174	Historic England
Policy 22: Bennerley	Recommend having a dialogue with the Council to discuss this site, at the Council's earliest convenience.	Agreed that continuing dialogue with Historic England regarding the development of this site will be essential.	None	1262411 1246174	Historic England
Policy 22: Bennerley	More sites should be allocated in order to meet identified need for	Bennerley and Ratcliffe are considered to be the most appropriate	None	1261369 1259445	Knightwood Developments

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	strategic distribution and logistics.	locations for logistics development and further allocations are not needed.		1259456 1243755 1246956	Peveril Securities and Omnivale Pension Scheme
Policy 22: Bennerley	The Bennerley site is not supported by viability and feasibility evidence and is (or may be) therefore undeliverable.	The Councils are confident that development of this site is viable, feasible and deliverable.	None	1261369 1259445 1259456 1261608 1243755 1246956 1242843	Knightwood Developments Peveril Securities and Omnivale Pension Scheme Wilson Bowden Developments
Policy 22: Bennerley	No evidence has been provided that the proposed rail connection is feasible and that the Erewash Valley Railway Line has sufficient capacity.	The Councils are confident that the rail connection is feasible and that the line has sufficient capacity.	None	1261369 1260947 1246956	Knightwood Developments The Trustees of the late George Henry Oxby Deceased and TW Herrick & Sons

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 22: Bennerley	There is a high number of constraints present on site, including the irregular shape of the site and the likely presence of contaminants, 'which have not been appropriately considered or addressed' and which may prevent or delay development.	The policy thoroughly addresses all the potentially significant constraints. Contamination is referred to in the table following paragraph 3.22.14. The shape of the site allows for the provision of large, efficient logistics units.	None	1261369 1259445 1259456 1261608 1260947 1243755 1246956 1242843 1291899	Knightwood Developments Peveril Securities and Omnivale Pension Scheme Wilson Bowden Developments The Trustees of the late George Henry Oxby Deceased and TW Herrick & Sons Waverider Holdings Ltd (Mr Carrick Casson-Crook)
Policy 22: Bennerley	Land south of the A52 at Whatton should be allocated, in addition or instead.	Bennerley and Ratcliffe are considered to be the most appropriate locations for logistics development and	None	1261369 1246956	Knightwood Developments

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		further allocations are not needed.			
Policy 22: Bennerley	Supports the requirement to provide a rail freight terminal with sidings at this location, given the importance of growing and retaining rail freight opportunities.	Comments noted and welcomed.	None	1262628 1243745	Network Rail
Policy 22: Bennerley	Note that there are playing fields located to the north west of the site and to the south of Shilo Way. Sport England welcomes the inclusion of criterion H26 of Policy 22 which requires that these playing fields are not adversely impacted by the development.	Comments noted and welcomed.	None	1289581	Sports England
Policy 22: Bennerley	Agree that improved walking and cycling	Part 2.C.12 of the policy addresses these issues.	None	1261956	Pedals

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	links are needed with existing settlements including Ilkeston and Eastwood, integrated with the wider network in Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire. These include connections between the Viaduct, Kimberley and Phoenix Park, and should be designed for utility/commuting as well as leisure use.	The details would be dealt with at the application stage, and it is intended that connections of the kind proposed would be made.			
Policy 22: Bennerley	The policy should set out the amount of floorspace required to be delivered.	This is not considered to be necessary within the policy text. There is reference within the justification text.	None	1259445 1259456 1243755	Peveril Securities and Omnivale Pension Scheme
Policy 22: Bennerley	Land at Low Wood Road, Nuthall should be allocated, in addition.	Bennerley and Ratcliffe are considered to be the most appropriate locations for logistics development and	None	1259445 1259456 1243755	Peveril Securities and Omnivale Pension Scheme

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		further allocations are not needed.			
Policy 22: Bennerley	Supports the 'overall proposal' of the policy.	Comments noted and welcomed.	None	1262635 1245784	R Whitehead Concrete
Policy 22: Bennerley	The justification text should be amended to make clear that the Whitehead (Concrete) / Foulds Investments site is 'expressly removed from the Green Belt'.	The Policies Map Changes document (page 5) makes clear that the Whitehead/Foulds site would be removed from the Green Belt. No amendment to the justification text is therefore needed.	None	1262635 1245784	R Whitehead Concrete
Policy 22: Bennerley	The Whitehead (Concrete) / Foulds Investments site should not be subject to the minimum unit size provisions of the policy.	The minimum floorspace size requirement at part 2.A.1 of the policy applies to logistics development and not to other forms of development within the site boundary.	None	1262635 1245784	R Whitehead Concrete

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 22: Bennerley	There are very significant delivery issues - including legacy contamination risks, rail infrastructure challenges, local transport connectivity issues and uncertain funding – which mean that supply from the site cannot be relied upon within the Plan period.	The policy thoroughly addresses all the potentially significant constraints. The Councils are confident that delivery will happen within the Plan period.	None	1258373	Waverider Holdings
Policy 22: Bennerley	Additional/alternative sites need to be identified, 'with fewer constraints and clearer pathways to delivery'.	Bennerley and Ratcliffe are considered to be the most appropriate locations for logistics development and further allocations are not needed.	None	1258373	Waverider Holdings
Policy 22: Bennerley	Land east of Watnall should be removed from the Green Belt and	Bennerley and Ratcliffe are considered to be the most appropriate locations for logistics development and	None	1258373	Waverider Holdings

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	allocated for logistics development.	further allocations are not needed.			
Policy 22: Bennerley	The Plan is legally compliant, sound and complies with the duty to co-operate with regard to policy 22.	Comments noted.	None	1241189	Mr Christopher Smith
Policy 22: Bennerley	Reefers to Policy 22 but includes no further information	Comments noted	None		Roebuck Land & Planning Ltd (Mr Jim Rawlings)

Policy 23

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 23: Top Wighay Farm	Comments made in relation to the proposed extension of the site allocation at Top Wighay Farm, Gedling.	This site no longer forms part of the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan following the withdrawal of Gedling. Gedling are	None	1243440 1250348 1247823 1242200	Langridge Homes Ltd (Mr David Fletcher) Langridge Homes Ltd (Mr David Fletcher)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		working on producing a separate Local Plan.		1243763 1246143 1250390 1241190 1243395 1241958 1239435 1239939 1239287 1241972 1239945 1243223 1246175 1242747 1239348 1242208	Persimmon Homes (Mr George Breed) David Rhead Network Rail (Miss Emma Foster) Environment Agency (Joshua Milsom) Trustees of Hammond Farm Mr Christopher Smith Hammond Farms (Mr Robert Hammond) Linby Parish Council (Ms Liz Gretton) Ms Nicola Shaw Councillor Lee Waters Gavin White Dr Felicity Couldwell

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
					Nottinghamshire County Council and Hallam Land Management Ltd. Nottinghamshire County Council and Hallam Land Management Ltd. Historic England Ashfield District Council (Mrs Melanie Wheelwright) Ms Glynis Williams Ms Francesca Potter

Policy 24

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 24: Strategic Allocation Former Stanton Tip (Nottingham City)	With specific reference to Policy 24 and a number of high level studies and assessments undertaken by stakeholders including ground conditions and ecological assessment, Nottingham City Council are of the view that the Former Stanton Tip cannot now deliver the quantum of development set out within the current Publication Draft Policy to warrant the site's continuing strategic site status and allocation in the GNSP. Nottingham City Council have pre-consulted with Omnivale / Newsholme Developments on this matter and confirmed that whilst the GNSP	The site promoters have confirmed housing delivery on the site will be reduced. It is therefore proposed the site be deleted as a strategic allocation from the Strategic Plan, as the level of housing delivery is uncertain. It will remain an allocation in the existing Nottingham City Part 2 Local Plan, which will allow for some residential development, but the 500 homes previously anticipated are proposed not be included in the City Council's housing land supply, which will reduce its housing target accordingly.	Site proposed for deletion. Housing target amended accordingly. See Suggested Main Modifications to the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan.	1259194	Omnivale Ltd / Newsholme Developments (Mr Adam Jones)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	allocation would be deleted, the site's status as a Nottingham Part 2 Local Plan allocation (RE7) would be retained. Omnivale/ Newsholme Developments raise no objection to the deletion of Stanton Tip as a Strategic Allocation on the basis that its current Part 2 Local Plan allocation is maintained. They will proceed to consider alternative development options with appropriate assessment of the site constraints and the opportunities still presented by Local Plan allocation RE7.				
Policy 24: Strategic Allocation	We agree that new cycling and walking links are required,	The site promoters have confirmed housing delivery on the site will	Site proposed for deletion. Housing target amended	1261958	Pedals (Nottingham Cycling Campaign)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Former Stanton Tip (Nottingham City)	connecting both to other parts of Nottingham and, via Kimberley, to Bennerley Viaduct and other parts of the north of Broxtowe Borough. Improved links in this area should also connect with the sections of Sustrans National Cycle Network Route 6 between Western Boulevard, Basford, Bulwell and Hucknall etc. as well as to and from other parts of Nottingham, especially the City Centre.	be reduced. It is proposed the site be deleted as a strategic allocation from the Strategic Plan, as the level of housing delivery is uncertain. It will remain an allocation in the existing Nottingham City Part 2 Local Plan, which will allow for some residential development, but the 500 homes previously anticipated are proposed not be included in the City Council's housing land supply, which will reduce its housing target accordingly.	accordingly. See Suggested Main Modifications to the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan.		(Mr. Hugh McClintock)
Policy 24: Strategic Allocation Former Stanton Tip	Based on the Lichfields Start to Finish Report (March 2024) the trajectory should be amended to show the	The site promoters have confirmed housing delivery on the site will be reduced. It is proposed the site be	Site proposed for deletion. Housing target amended accordingly. See Suggested Main	1261378 1260069	Barratt David Wilson (North Midlands) (c/o agent) Stagfield Group (c/o agent)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
(Nottingham City)	first delivery of the site from 2030/31, delivering approximately 68 dpa up until 2037/38 where this year it will deliver a final 24 units to make up the 500 unit total. The implications of moving the site back outside of the five year plan period means there is a need for the GNPP to identify additional sites with realistic delivery timescales, such as less complex greenfield sites.	deleted as a strategic allocation from the Strategic Plan, as the level of housing delivery is uncertain. It will remain an allocation in the existing Nottingham City Part 2 Local Plan, which will allow for some residential development, but the 500 homes previously anticipated are proposed not be included in the City Council's housing land supply, which will reduce its housing target accordingly.	Modifications to the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan.	1261392 1260142 1260587 1246709	Barratt David Wilson Homes (North Midlands) and Averill Land Limited Strawson Group Investments Ltd (c/o agent) Harworth Group (c/o agent) Stagfield Group (Sir/ Madam)
Policy 24: Strategic Allocation Former Stanton Tip	We consider that the site is not deliverable and have removed it from the trajectory. This reduces the housing delivery in the whole plan period by 500 dwellings.	The site promoters have confirmed housing delivery on the site will be reduced. It is proposed the site be deleted as a strategic allocation from the	Site proposed for deletion. Housing target amended accordingly. See Suggested Main Modifications to the	1261030	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
(Nottingham City)		Strategic Plan, as the level of housing delivery is uncertain. It will remain an allocation in the existing Nottingham City Part 2 Local Plan, which will allow for some residential development, but the 500 homes previously anticipated are proposed not be included in the City Council's housing land supply, which will reduce its housing target accordingly.	Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan.		
Policy 24: Strategic Allocation Former Stanton Tip (Nottingham City)	North-east corner of the site now falls within Flood Zone 2 and 3 (FZ2 & FZ3). Part of FZ3 is within the 1 in 30 year event, designated as FZ3b – functional floodplain. FZ3b is not suitable for residential development; future	The site promoters have confirmed housing delivery on the site will be reduced. It is proposed the site be deleted as a strategic allocation from the Strategic Plan, as the level of housing delivery is uncertain. It will	Site proposed for deletion. Housing target amended accordingly. See Suggested Main Modifications to the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan.	1262359	Environment Agency (Joshua Milsom)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	development should reflect this. Ideally, areas classified as FZ2 & FZ3 should remain free from residential development. Development in FZ2 and FZ3a will require sequential and exception tests and a site-specific flood risk assessment. As a former colliery spoil tip, careful consideration is needed for land reprofiling and drainage. No development should occur over the existing culvert. Opportunities to open up the culvert should be explored for flood risk management and habitat creation. A minimum 8m easement is requested, ideally 10m. Key Development Considerations:	remain an allocation in the existing Nottingham City Part 2 Local Plan, which will allow for some residential development, but the 500 homes previously anticipated are proposed not be included in the City Council's housing land supply, which will reduce its housing target accordingly. The Environment Agency's comments can be considered through any planning application process.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Culvert runs below part of the site, restricting developable area but providing opportunities for Green Infrastructure. Daylighting culverts can help meet mandatory BNG targets of 10% watercourse metric net gains. Development within 10m of a main river or stream triggers the need to include the watercourse metric in the BNG calculation tool.				
Policy 24: Strategic Allocation Former Stanton Tip (Nottingham City)	Bulwell is a deprived area in need of a greater mix of housing. Increase to 1,000 homes.	The site promoters have confirmed housing delivery on the site will be reduced. It is proposed the site be deleted as a strategic allocation from the Strategic Plan, as the level of housing delivery is uncertain. It will remain an allocation in the existing Nottingham City Part 2 Local Plan,	None	1243455	Mr Atif Muneer

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		which will allow for some residential development, but the 500 homes previously anticipated are proposed not be included in the City Council's housing land supply, which will reduce its housing target accordingly. The Environment Agency's comments can be considered through any planning application process.			
Policy 24: Strategic Allocation Former Stanton Tip (Nottingham City)	No written comments.	N/A	N/A	1241191	Mr Christopher Smith
Policy 24: Strategic Allocation	Significant onsite constraints impact viability and	The site promoters have confirmed housing delivery on the site will	Site proposed for deletion. Housing target amended	1291840	Cora Homes Ltd (Mr Robbie Locke)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Former Stanton Tip (Nottingham City)	deliverability. Opposes its allocation in GNSP.	be reduced. It is proposed the site be deleted as a strategic allocation from the Strategic Plan, as the level of housing delivery is uncertain. It will remain an allocation in the existing Nottingham City Part 2 Local Plan, which will allow for some residential development, but the 500 homes previously anticipated are proposed not be included in the City Council's housing land supply, which will reduce its housing target accordingly.	accordingly. See Suggested Main Modifications to the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan.		

Policy 25

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 25: Strategic Allocation Broad Marsh (Nottingham City)	The new pedestrian and cycle links through this area, including via the Green Heart area and along Canal Street, between Castle Boulevard and London Road, have been very much welcomed but more are required to help facilitate safe access between the City Centre and adjoining areas. This includes the long planned new toucan crossing towards the south end of Maid Marian Way, with links both to Castle Hill / Castle Road and the Western Cycle Corridor via Castle Boulevard. To the east of London Road improved links are needed across the	The site is now in the ownership of Homes England. Sufficient guidance on connectivity is included in the policy (25.1.D). Pedals comments can be considered as part of future master planning and application processes. Although not specifically part of the Strategic Plan, new links are planned at the Island site and in the Waterside.	None.	1261957	Pedals (Nottingham Cycling Campaign) (Mr. Hugh McClintock)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Island Site to and from the Manvers Street and Daleside Road etc, and the north bank landing of the new Waterside Foot-Cycle Bridge				
Policy 25: Strategic Allocation Broad Marsh (Nottingham City)	On average, brownfield sites deliver at a rate of 68 dpa. This is significantly lower than then expect 125 dpa within the trajectory and would not see completion until after the Plan period, with total delivery over 14 years rather than 8 years as currently expected. Concerningly, the whole plan Viability Study has not assessed the site as part of the plan making process. Therefore, at this stage in the plan making process, it cannot be	The site is in the ownership of Homes England, the government's housing and regeneration agency. Lichfield's "Start to Finish" report (2024) specifically looks at urban apartment schemes and explains that annual build-out rates can be lumpy, as homes delivered can only be recorded when a block is completed. Of the 7 schemes considered in the report, 3 had higher average build-out rates than those envisaged at	None	1261245 1246712	William Davis (Mr Tom Dillarstone) Stagfield Group (Sir/ Madam)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	concluded that Broadmarsh is a viable development capable of delivering the required infrastructure and other alternative sites should be sought.	Broad Marsh, and the peak years build out was higher in 6 of them. (2 of the sites with low delivery were delayed by the financial crash, so are not typical examples). The site is made up of a number of distinct parts, and these are capable of parallel delivery. The trajectory has been shared with Homes England and is considered to be robust. Viability has been assessed as part of the previous master planning for the site, with a £6M gap identified. Grant funding has been secured for the demolition of the centre. Viability issues are part of the reason for the			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		involvement of Homes England			
Policy 25: Strategic Allocation Broad Marsh (Nottingham City)	Based on the Start to Finish Report, brownfield nature, known contamination and caves on site we consider that the delivery of housing within the trajectory in Appendix B of the Housing Background Paper should commence at the earliest 6 years from adoption of the Plan, pushing the delivery of dwellings to 2032/33 rather than 2030/31. Brownfield sites delivery rates are 68dpa which is significantly lower than the expected 125dpa within the trajectory, with total delivery over 14 years rather than 8 years as currently expected. This would see only 480	The site is in the ownership of Homes England, the government's housing and regeneration agency. Lichfield's "Start to Finish" report (2024) specifically looks at urban apartment schemes and explains that annual build-out rates can be lumpy, as homes delivered can only be recorded when a block is completed. Of the 7 schemes considered in the report, 3 had higher average build-out rates than those envisaged at Broad Marsh, and the peak years build out was higher in 6 of them. (2 of the sites with low delivery were delayed	None	1260589 1261393 1260073 1261380 1259877 1246985	Harworth Group (C/O Agent) Barratt David Wilson Homes (North Midlands) and Averill Land Ltd Stagfield Group (C/O Agent) Barratt David Wilson (North Midlands) (c/o agent Mr Richards and Mrs Hurst Mr Richards and Mrs Hurst

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	dwellings delivered within the Plan Period.	by the financial crash, so are not typical examples). The site is made up of a number of distinct parts, and these are capable of parallel delivery. The trajectory has been shared with Homes England and is considered to be robust.			
Policy 25: Strategic Allocation Broad Marsh (Nottingham City)	Delivery of 125 dwellings in the first 3 years of development is overly ambitious, and this should be reduced to 50 in 2031/32, 75 in 2032/2033 and 100 in 2033/34. Based on the Start to Finish Volume 3 report (September 2024) the delivery rate of 125dpa is considered ambitious and the delivery rate has been reduced to 90dpa. The assumed delivery has been reduced to 845	The site is in the ownership of Homes England, the government's housing and regeneration agency. Lichfield's "Start to Finish" report (2024) specifically looks at urban apartment schemes and explains that annual build-out rates can be lumpy, as homes delivered can only be recorded when a block is completed. Of the 7 schemes considered in the	None	1261031 1260145	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land Strawson Group Investments Ltd (C/O Agent C/O Agent)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	dwellings over the plan period.	report, 3 had higher average build-out rates than those envisaged at Broad Marsh, and the peak years build out was higher in 6 of them. (2 of the sites with low delivery were delayed by the financial crash, so are not typical examples). The site is made up of a number of distinct parts, and these are capable of parallel delivery. The trajectory has been shared with Homes England and is considered to be robust.			
Policy 25: Strategic Allocation Broad Marsh (Nottingham City)	NOSF supports the wording of Policy 25 itself, welcoming the commitment to open space and green infrastructure in part C3. We also welcome paragraph 3.25.6 in the	The Policy includes provision of open space and Green Infrastructure. Nottingham Open Space Forum's comments can be considered at	None	1262216	Nottingham Open Space Forum (Mr Ben Hunt)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	supporting text. The Green Heart, excellent though it is, is somewhat smaller than the original concept. And part of its current value lies in having open surroundings. The City Council must deliver on this policy in full, and avoid development which crowds around and is overbearing towards the Green Heart. Otherwise the opportunity for the Broadmarsh scheme to be genuinely distinctive and transformative would be missed.	masterplan/planning application stage.			
Policy 25: Strategic Allocation Broad Marsh	Support the policy and the aspiration to regenerate this part of the City. The policy will help to encourage the	Noted.	None	1259970	VCP Nominees Victoria Centre (C/O Agent)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
(Nottingham City)	positive regeneration of the site and if the Broad Marsh site is developed as, it is considered that the impact upon the City Centre will be positive, supporting its vitality and the economic role the City Centre plays in the economy.				
Policy 25: Strategic Allocation Broad Marsh (Nottingham City)	The HIA sets out how a wide number of heritage assets have the potential to be harmed as a result of this proposed development, as well as how there are opportunities for positive impacts and enhancements for heritage assets. The HIA does detail a number of ways in which the allocation could mitigate harm to	The heritage implications of the proposed development are acknowledged (Policy 25 Part E.9, E10 and E11. These are best addressed through the master planning process to be led by Homes England. There are active and ongoing discussions between Homes England, Historic England and	None	1262414 1246176	Historic England Historic England

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	the historic environment and some of these are transferred through into the Plan. Given the nature of heritage assets that could be affected and the potential for harm; we require a meeting with the Council to discuss the findings of the HIA and the site allocation policy and to assess what amendments may be required in order to ensure the policy is effective and harm to heritage is avoided/minimised.	NCC with regard to the site's development.			
Policy 25: Strategic Allocation Broad Marsh (Nottingham City)	Policy 25 – Strategic Allocation Broad Marsh This site includes Nottingham College. The Active Places Power website indicates there is a sports hall	Any impact on sports facilities would need to be considered against the NPPF and Policies 13 and 16 of the GNSP. It is considered that there is no need to	None	1289578	Sport England

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	and fitness suit located at this site. Detailed proposals for the development of this site would need to comply with paragraph 104 of the NPPF. Request that additional wording is added to the polices and/ or supporting text to recognise the need for proposals to comply with paragraph 104 of the NPPF.	repeat these considerations within the site specific policy.			
Policy 25: Strategic Allocation Broad Marsh (Nottingham City)	Shocking that the site remains undeveloped, Council should sell the site. The City Council has ne real ambition for the site.	The site is in the ownership of Homes England, who have a programme of development for the site.	None	1243453	Mr Atif Muneer
Policy 25: Strategic Allocation Broad Marsh	Supports Policy, welcoming its ambitions for housing, commercial, office, and leisure uses to aid city	Support welcomed. Whilst the aspiration is to create a new sustainable community in this location, it is	See Suggested Main Modifications document for proposed changes.	1243584	Homes England

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
(Nottingham City)	centre regeneration. The policy's flexibility and protection of historic assets are endorsed. Realignment of Maid Marian Way is vital for connectivity and should be prioritised in the EMCCA's transport investment programme. Requests rewording of paragraph 3.25.5 to allow for purpose-built student accommodation (PBSA), which may suit parts of the site such as Severns House. Recommend avoiding ruling out PBSA prematurely.	recognised that an element of student accommodation could be part of the mix.			
Policy 25: Strategic Allocation Broad Marsh (Nottingham City)	Should be more focus on housing rather than mixed uses.	1000 homes is considered appropriate for the site.	None.	1249419	Consortium of Parish Councils

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 25: Strategic Allocation Broad Marsh (Nottingham City)	Supports the policy	None.	None.	1241192	Mr Christopher Smith

Policy 26

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 26: Strategic Allocation Melton Road, Edwalton	The policy is confusing as it relates to the need to protect the significance of heritage assets, yet the justification table states that there are no heritage assets that could be affected. The HIA for the site has no information.	It is sensible to retain mention of heritage assets within the policy should any relevant issues arise which are currently unknown.	None	1262415 1246178	Historic England Historic England
Policy 26: Strategic Allocation Melton Road, Edwalton	The policy is supported	Noted	None	1241193 1241194	Mr Christopher Smith Mr Christopher Smith
Policy 26: Strategic Allocation Melton Road, Edwalton	The thrust of the policy is supported.	Noted	None	1258675 1242819	Oxalis Planning Oxalis Planning
Policy 26: Strategic Allocation	The southern part of the allocation, along Landmere Lane, contains a wide variety	The policy and accompanying figure reflect the strategic allocation and its	None	1258675 1242819	Oxalis Planning Oxalis Planning

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Melton Road, Edwalton	of land uses and is a vibrant area as a result. This mix of uses should be reflected more closely in the Policy which describes the suitability of the area for employment uses but does not describe the suitability of the area for a range of other uses. Accordingly, the plan at Figure 26.1 should be amended so that the blue area of the plan is described as 'mixed use'.	primary land use intentions. While a range of uses exists, the employment designation supports the Local Plan's economic objectives. The policy provides flexibility for complementary uses where appropriate through the development management process.			
Policy 26: Strategic Allocation Melton Road, Edwalton	There are several half-completed Active Travel links in this area between Village Street (Edwalton) and the A606 / A52 Lings Bar / Wheatcroft roundabouts. They need completing and extending, with good direction signing which is	The comments are noted. In respect of this site specifically, the policy requires improvements to walking and cycling facilities and public transport links through and beyond the site. The implementation of	None	1261959	Pedals

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	largely lacking. They particularly need to connect more coherently and safely with the existing subway-underpass under the A52 south of Sharp Hill, and also the proposed new cycling and pedestrian facilities planned by National Highways as part of their major junction scheme for the A606 Lings Bar / Wheatcroft Junction. This should include improved links to and from Tollerton, Plumtree and Keyworth.	the site is reaching its final stages and detailed requirements for walking and cycling infrastructure have been secured already through planning approvals and associated Section 106 agreements.			
Policy 26: Strategic Allocation Melton Road, Edwalton	Policies 26.2.A 1 and 2 cover the issues of affordable housing and average net density respectively. These measures should be included as Indicators in the Implementation,	Affordable housing and density are already monitored through the Authority Monitoring Report and existing indicators. The indicators at 3.26.7 are consistent with	None	1258366 1238869	The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	delivery and monitoring section 5.10.7.	national guidance and provide sufficient mechanisms to track delivery across the plan period.			
Policy 26: Strategic Allocation Melton Road, Edwalton	The respondent notes that most of the 1,800 dwellings have been built, yet paragraph 5.10.4 states almost all new houses will be built by 2031.	The monitoring framework will continue to track housing delivery across the plan period. The policy and supporting text remain consistent with the adopted allocation and provide clarity for long-term implementation and monitoring.	None	1258366 1238869	The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council
Policy 26: Strategic Allocation Melton Road, Edwalton	Agrees with site's delivery assumptions, but strong delivery on site does not justify similar assumptions on other sites, given there is significantly more outlets delivering now then for much of the build out of	Agreement with the trajectory is noted. The assumptions on other sites are based on robust evidence.	None	1261033	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Edwalton within Rushcliffe.				

Policy 27

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 27: Strategic Allocation Land North of Bingham	The policy is vague and non-committal. The masterplans show some cycle/foot paths, but their alignments seem designed to look curvy on a masterplan, rather than to enable residents/visitors to get from likely trip-origins to likely trip-destinations. The masterplan for the site should show a coherent good-quality continuous traffic free route. Figure 27.1 should show the new bridge over the A46 as a cycle/foot bridge.	The level of detail included within the policy and Figure 27.1 is appropriate to inform and shape more detailed plans. The masterplan illustrates the broad overall objectives and intention of the policy. The policy makes clear that any bridge over the A46 should be for use by pedestrians and cyclists.	None	1258388 1242221	David Rhead David Rhead
Policy 27: Strategic Allocation Land North of Bingham	The policy is not consistent with national planning policy nor national transport policy regarding cycle and walking infrastructure.	The strategic allocation identifies the need for improved infrastructure and services for travel and this is in line with the NPPF and the national transport policy	None	1258388 1242221	David Rhead David Rhead

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		that encourages newer strategic allocation to foresee provisions for active travel and transport.			
Policy 27: Strategic Allocation Land North of Bingham	Expresses a wish to "improve and enhance connectivity between "New Bingham" north of the railway line and "Pre-existing Bingham" to the south of the railway line. Other than the level crossing, links are both dangerous and inconvenient.	Agreed. The Council has identified the need to improve and enhance the connectivity and the existing features and links. The improvements and provisions would be funded through S106 contributions according to what has been agreed already in granting planning consent.	None	1254550 1242798	Alan Folwell Alan Folwell
Policy 27: Strategic Allocation Land North of Bingham	We note that this site now benefits from planning permission and that heritage issues have been considered within the planning permission. Given this information from the	Noted.	None	1262416 1246179	Historic England Historic England

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Plan we have no further comments to raise at this time.				
Policy 27: Strategic Allocation Land North of Bingham	This site needs improved links along the A52 to and from West Bridgford and Nottingham. The A52 route largely forms part of Route 15 of the National Cycle Network and just west of Bingham Route 15 intersects with NCN Route 48, between Bingham and Newark. NCN48, following the A46 "Corridor" and using parts of the old A46 alignment needs upgrading, with better surfaces and signing.	The policy identifies the need for improved links and upgrading and the necessary improvements would be made via planning permissions and associated Section 106 funding.	None	1235705	Mrs Sharon Roberts
Policy 27: Strategic Allocation Land North of Bingham	The policy should be amended to allow for further growth north of Bingham by 800 dwellings. Figure 27.1	This would be a new area of allocated land. The GNSP identifies sufficient provision for new housing within	None	1260212 1246610	The Crown Estate The Crown Estate

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	should be amended to reflect this change.	Rushcliffe. There is no requirement for this site to be allocated.			
Policy 27: Strategic Allocation Land North of Bingham	The policy should be amended to provide greater flexibility on the range of permissible employment generating uses.	The around 15.5 hectares of employment uses on site for E(g), B2 and B8 uses for an important part of the future plan-wide supply for such uses. To broaden the definition of to include employment generating uses is not appropriate in this location.	None	1260212 1246610	The Crown Estate The Crown Estate
Policy 27: Strategic Allocation Land North of Bingham	Agrees with site's delivery assumptions.	Noted	None	1261035	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land
Policy 27: Strategic Allocation Land North of Bingham	North Bingham and former RAF Newton need improved links along the A52 to and from West Bridgford and Nottingham, including via the new	The comments are noted. In respect of these sites specifically, the policy requires improvements to walking and cycling facilities and public	None	1261960	Pedals

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Waterside Foot-Cycle Bridge.	transport links through and beyond the site. The implementation of site is reaching its final stages and detailed requirements for walking and cycling infrastructure have been secured already through planning approvals and associated Section 106 agreements.			
Policy 27: Strategic Allocation Land North of Bingham	The respondent disputes that development north of Bingham will be sustainable, referencing Romans' Quarter's lack of shops, limited bus service, incomplete country park, and existing pressure on Toot Hill School as an evidence of poor planning.	The policy is supported by the Sustainability Appraisal, Transport Assessment, and Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which together ensure the allocation will be supported by new services, facilities, and transport improvements to create a sustainable community. This site already has planning	None	1235382	George Pickering

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		consent and an associated Section 106 agreement.			
Policy 27: Strategic Allocation Land North of Bingham	Considers the existing green and recreational space design poor, lacking ambition and quality landscaping, facilities, and biodiversity value. They cite Cotgrave Country Park as a better example and request more engaging, community-oriented green space provision.	The policy seeks to secure high-quality blue and green infrastructure as part of the site's comprehensive masterplan. The site already has planning consent and an associated Section 106 agreement covering matters such as green infrastructure and open space provision.	None	1235377	Catherine Middleton
Policy 27: Strategic Allocation Land North of Bingham	The policy is supported.	Noted	None	1241195	Mr Christopher Smith

Policy 28

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 28: Strategic Allocation Former RAF Newton	The policy is vague and non-committal. The masterplans show some cycle/foot paths, but their alignments seem designed to look curvy on a masterplan, rather than to enable residents/visitors to get from likely trip-origins to likely trip-destinations. The masterplan for the site should show a coherent good-quality continuous traffic free route. Figure 28.1 should show the new bridge over the A46 as a cycle/foot bridge.	The level of detail included within the policy and Figure 28.1 is appropriate to inform and shape more detailed plans. The masterplan illustrates the broad overall objectives and intention of the policy. The policy makes clear that any bridge over the A46 should be for use by pedestrians and cyclists. Further to this, the allocation is already subject to planning permission and as such, active travel arrangements have come forward through a masterplanning process. There is no need to amend the policy or Figure 28.1 further.	None	1258389 1242222	David Rhead David Rhead

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 28: Strategic Allocation Former RAF Newton	The policy is not consistent with national planning policy nor national transport policy regarding cycle and walking infrastructure.	The strategic allocation identifies transport improvements required for the development to come forward including a safe active travel link to nearby local amenities in Bingham. This is in line with policy contained in the NPPF including considering transport issues from an early stage in the planning process and promoting access to local amenities through active travel.	None	1258389 1242222	David Rhead David Rhead
Policy 28: Strategic Allocation Former RAF Newton	Para 3.28.5 seems non-committal about whether the bridge over the A46 will ever be delivered	The paragraph as worded appropriately reflects the current circumstances and expectations in respect of provision of the bridge.	None	1258389 1242222	David Rhead David Rhead
Policy 28: Strategic Allocation	We have no further comments to raise at this time.	Noted.	None	1262418 1246180	Historic England Historic England

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Former RAF Newton					
Policy 28: Strategic Allocation Former RAF Newton	Supports the retention of the allocation.	Noted	None	1260152 1246854	Newton Nottingham LLP Newton Nottingham LLP
Policy 28: Strategic Allocation Former RAF Newton	The policy is supported	Noted	None	1246854 1241196	Mr Christopher Smith Mr Christopher Smith
Policy 28: Strategic Allocation Former RAF Newton	There is no alignment between the Green Belt boundary and the strategic allocation. For the policy to be effective at a minimum the Green Belt boundary ought to align with the strategic site area.	The areas of the allocation retained within the Green Belt are expected to accommodate Green Infrastructure; not built development. To help ensure this happens, it is appropriate for these areas to remain within the Green Belt. Therefore the allocation boundary and Green Belt inset boundary correctly do not align.	None	1260152 1246854	Newton Nottingham LLP Newton Nottingham LLP

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 28: Strategic Allocation Former RAF Newton	Part 1 of draft policy 28 refers to the site being 'identified as a strategic site for housing for around 530 dwellings'. The additional '530 dwellings' is very similar to the previous figure and what was originally permitted on the site albeit it is unclear whether this is additional to completed or constructed dwellings. In our view, it can only be 'additional' to completed dwellings. But to deliver these additional dwellings will necessitate an increase in densities and a revised masterplan to deliver any additional dwellings. The revised masterplan has devised a strategy to increase the total dwellings of the	The figure of around 530 dwellings represents the total anticipated capacity of the allocation, including those already permitted or under construction. These are not additional dwellings to those already allocated by the 2014 Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy. The policy does not allocate additional land beyond the defined boundary, and there is no housing need requirement that would justify this.	None	1260152 1246854	Newton Nottingham LLP Newton Nottingham LLP

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	site that is likely to achieve the additional dwellings that the policy expects. Moreover, there is scope for additional land at Newton to deliver further dwellings in future, as indicated in our proposed Green Belt boundary changes.				
Policy 28: Strategic Allocation Former RAF Newton	Given the time that has elapsed at the permissions subsequently granted, it is considered that the 'indicative distribution of uses' shown at Figure 28.1 should be deleted from the Plan.	The indicative distribution of development shown on Figure 28.1 is appropriate to ensure that a mix of housing and employment development is delivered on site in accordance with Policy 28's requirements.	None	1260152 1246854	Newton Nottingham LLP Newton Nottingham LLP
Policy 28: Strategic Allocation Former RAF Newton	The transport strategy within the original Policy 22 and draft Policy 28 and, as permitted, have resulted in some conflict	The policy wording reflects the preferred approach to manage commercial traffic in a way that limits impacts	None	1260152 1246854	Newton Nottingham LLP Newton Nottingham LLP

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	between commercial and residential traffic movements (Part 3.D.6). Therefore, the strategy for a new commercial access road would remove this conflict. It is appreciated that this solution does not yet have planning permission. The language in 3.D.6 and .7 should be refined to reflect the option of alternative solutions should these be feasible.	on existing and new residential areas. Any alternative solution would need to be justified at the planning applications stage.			
Policy 28: Strategic Allocation Former RAF Newton	The A46 footbridge is no longer viable, and nor is the bridge necessary since alternative links to Bingham are available. 3.D.8 should be amended to remove reference to the A46 foot and cycleway	The importance of a footbridge across the A46 for making the site as sustainable as possible remains. It has not been demonstrated that a footbridge is no longer viable.	None	1260152 1246854	Newton Nottingham LLP Newton Nottingham LLP

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	bridge.				
Policy 28: Strategic Allocation Former RAF Newton	Query why a statement relating to impact on a Special Protection Area has been included in the policy.	To ensure compliance with the Habitats Regulations, it is essential that relevant manufacturing proposals demonstrate they will not result in adverse effects on the integrity of designated sites, including existing or potential Special Protection Areas and other nature conservation sites.	None	1260152 1246854	Newton Nottingham LLP Newton Nottingham LLP
Policy 28: Strategic Allocation Former RAF Newton	The County Council has recently concluded that provision of a school at Newton is not viable and instead the existing school at East Bridgford will be expanded. The policy should be updated to reflect current circumstances.	Future capacity pressures at existing schools cannot be ruled out. Retaining reference to a primary school within the policy ensures flexibility to respond to changing circumstances and supports the long-term objective of meeting educational	None	1260152 1246854	Newton Nottingham LLP Newton Nottingham LLP

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		infrastructure needs.			
Policy 28: Strategic Allocation Former RAF Newton	Policy 28 D8 states it is a requirement of the development that a foot and cycleway bridge over A46 is built providing a direct connection to Bingham. We strongly agree with this so we are very concerned that para 5.12.5 [3.28.4] waters down the requirement. It is vital that this link is secured and should be integrated with the development in Policy 27 on the land north of Bingham.	The paragraph as worded appropriately reflects the current circumstances and expectations in respect of provision of the bridge.	None	1258367 1238970	The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council
Policy 28: Strategic Allocation Former RAF Newton	Policy 28.3.A1 and A2 refer to affordable housing and density targets. These should be included as Indicators in Table 5.12.7 [3.28.7].	Affordable housing and density are already monitored through the Authority Monitoring Report and existing indicators. The indicators at 3.28.7 are consistent with national	None	1258367 1238970	The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		guidance and provide sufficient mechanisms to track delivery across the plan period.			
Policy 28: Strategic Allocation Former RAF Newton	Agrees with site's delivery assumptions.	Noted	None	1261037	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land
Policy 28: Strategic Allocation Former RAF Newton	North Bingham and former RAF Newton need improved links along the A52 to and from West Bridgford and Nottingham, including via the new Waterside Foot-Cycle Bridge.	The comments are noted. In respect of these sites specifically, the policy requires improvements to walking and cycling facilities and public transport links through and beyond the site. The implementation of site is reaching its final stages and detailed requirements for walking and cycling infrastructure have been secured already through planning approvals and	None	1261960	Pedals

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		associated Section 106 agreements.			
Policy 28: Strategic Allocation Former RAF Newton	Concerns about inadequate public transport, existing road congestion, and lack of planned improvements, particularly at Gunthorpe Bridge and A46 junction. Objections include pressure on medical facilities, loss of green belt, flood risk, and perceived overdevelopment in Rushcliffe.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan identifies transport and health improvements to support growth, including junction upgrades and sustainable transport measures. Flood risk assessments will inform masterplanning. The Sustainability Appraisal confirms allocations meet sustainable development objectives and green infrastructure will be integrated.	None	1235655	Mr David Skelton

Policy 29

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 29: Strategic Allocation Former Cotgrave Colliery	Given the residential element of the allocation has now been delivered, it is unclear why this policy still refers to the delivery of residential dwellings and it is considered that any reference to housing should be deleted from Policy 29.	The policy reflects the full plan period and retains reference to residential development to ensure consistency with the adopted allocation, monitoring framework, and any remaining or future phases of delivery. This approach provides clarity.	None	1261062 1246658 1247025	David Wilson Homes East Midlands David Wilson Homes East Midlands
Policy 29: Strategic Allocation Former Cotgrave Colliery	There is no reference to any heritage issues within the Plan or justification text. Yet the text also states that heritage issues have been dealt with as part of the planning permission. This is confusing and should be amended.	The supporting text in respect of heritage identifies that there are no issues that need to be dealt with. Any amendments to the policy or supporting text are unnecessary.	None	1262422 1246181	Historic England
Policy 29: Strategic	Although regarded as "complete" this	The comments are noted. In respect of this	None	1261962	Pedals

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Allocation Former Cotgrave Colliery	development needs improved commuting / utility links to and from the centre of Cotgrave and also to and from West Bridgford, including via the new links to be provided through the Gamston Fields Sustainable Urban Extension and across the Gamston-Lings Bar section of the A52.	site specifically, the policy requires improvements to walking and cycling facilities and public transport links through and beyond the site. The implementation of site is reaching its final stages and detailed requirements for walking and cycling infrastructure have been secured already through planning approvals and associated Section 106 agreements.			
Policy 29: Strategic Allocation Former Cotgrave Colliery	While not strictly speaking part of the former colliery site, significant housing developments are currently taking place further down and either side of Hollygate Lane, effectively extending the	The policy recognises potential impacts on existing assets and systems. Protection and enhancement of these features form key objectives of the policy, ensuring development is delivered in a way	None	1258342 1243387	Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	ring of housing on one side of the Country Park. With Policy 31 'Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton' 4,000 houses, a large swathe of former open countryside around the Country Park will disappear so any corridor out along the Grantham Canal will become squeezed down and come under a significant increase of pressure from human activity. This will inevitably damage the value of canal wildlife corridor and emphasise the importance of looking outside of the borders of sites and view the wider effects of developments.	that safeguards valued characteristics and supports long-term sustainability.			Group
Policy 29:	This site is fully built out	Agreed	None	1261041	Taylor Wimpey

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Strategic Allocation Former Cotgrave Colliery	and does not contribute to the housing trajectory of the GNSP.				Strategic Land
Policy 29: Strategic Allocation Former Cotgrave Colliery	Objection to further housing in Cotgrave, citing biodiversity loss and impact on Cotgrave Country Park. Concerns raised about inadequate transport, healthcare, education (including lack of secondary school), retail provision, policing, and community facilities such as sports support.	Cotgrave's housing allocation has been completed, and no additional housing is proposed in this Plan. Biodiversity and green infrastructure were secured through planning permissions and legal agreements. Infrastructure needs, including education, health, and transport, are addressed through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Section 106 obligations.	None	1242446 1243512	Town Councillor (Mr Darren Stothard) Mr Jak Swain
Policy 29: Strategic Allocation Former Cotgrave	The policy is supported	Noted	None	1241197	Mr Christopher Smith

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Colliery					

Policy 30

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 30: Strategic Allocation South of Clifton	Policy 30 is considered ineffective and inconsistent with national policy due to unclear provision of cyclable links to Summerwood Lane, lack of filtered permeability, cancelled strategic route projects, no LCWIP update, and poor cross-river connectivity for active travel.	Policy 30 already references "improvements to walking, cycling and public transport links through and beyond the site," which includes connections to Summerwood Lane and the wider area. Detailed alignments and cyclable links will be secured through masterplanning, planning conditions, and obligations identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	None	1258387 1242215	David Rhead David Rhead
Policy 30: Strategic Allocation South of Clifton	A golden opportunity has been missed to extend the tramway into the heart of the development and give direct access to NET for the new residents. Unfortunately if not available at the outset, many residents will use their cars in preference to a walk and transfer to	The policy includes safeguarded land to extend the tram (NET) through the site. While the full cost of extending the tram cannot be placed on the developer, contributions to development of transport infrastructure through the site will be sought through section 106 agreement in line with policy 18 (Developer Contributions for Infrastructure).	None	1253419	Hayhoe Marine Services

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	either bus or NET. The cost of installing the NET into this new estate should have been a cost borne by the developer; on a green field site building a tramway into the new roads would have been a marginal cost increase compared to the cost of a retrospective installation when the size of the estate is further extended and the capital outlay is prohibitive.				
Policy 30: Strategic Allocation South of Clifton	There is no information in the Plan about the heritage implications and what harm to the significance of heritage assets there will be. The justification text states that heritage will form a consideration of	The summary of constraints states that development will not impact on any heritage assets as there are no designated or non designated heritage assets within close proximity of the site. Full applications for future phases of the site's development will include	None	1262423 1246184	Historic England Historic England

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	the phasing applications to come. What is the harm to the significance of heritage assets and how can this harm be avoided/ mitigated? The text also states that no heritage assets will be affected. The HIA states impacts for archaeological remains. We consider that the information for this site should be clarified and updated.	discussion of how the development could enhance local heritage assets through their design. The HIA identifies iron age or roman archaeology away from the site near Glebe Farm at Gotham.			
Policy 30: Strategic Allocation South of Clifton	Substantial new Active Travel provision is being developed within the major Fairham Pastures development but needs linking coherently to and from the provision within the Clifton area, including the Southern Cycle Corridor between Clifton and the City Centre via Compton	The policy identifies a requirement for "Improvements to walking, cycling and public transport links through and beyond the site", while active travel infrastructure on and abutting the site is being considered through full applications on the site. The Council will seek financial contributions to off-site infrastructure through section	None	1261963	Pedals

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Acres and Wilford etc., as well as improved provision over Clifton Bridge. It also needs much safer links along the A453 to and from East Midlands Parkway Station and the former Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station site.	106 in line with Policy 18 (Developer Contributions for Infrastructure).			
Policy 30: Strategic Allocation South of Clifton	Support the allocation	The Council welcomes support for the allocation of this site.	None	1258368 1238986	The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council
Policy 30: Strategic Allocation South of Clifton	Welcome the proposal to safeguard a future NET extension into the site and through it in order to allow access further to the south, subject to feasibility and viability study outcomes.	The Council welcomes the support for safeguarding the route for a potential tram extension.	None	1258368 1238986	The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council
Policy 30:	We strongly support	The Council welcomes support	None	1258368	The Labour Group,

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Strategic Allocation South of Clifton	Policy 30.E.18 to create significant southern and eastern boundaries of the site to help create permanent defensible Green Belt boundaries.	for the creation of significant green infrastructure on the site's periphery.		1238986	Rushcliffe Borough Council The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council
Policy 30: Strategic Allocation South of Clifton	Policy 30.2.A.1 and A.2 refer to affordable housing and housing density targets. These should be included as Indicators in the Table in para 5.14.12 [3.30.11]	Affordable housing and density are already monitored through the Authority Monitoring Report and existing indicators. The indicators at 3.30.11 are consistent with national guidance and provide sufficient mechanisms to track delivery across the plan period.	None	1258368 1238986	The Labour Group
Policy 30: Strategic Allocation South of Clifton	We object to the delivery rate of 250 dpa and believe this should be reduced. Assumed delivery of this strategic allocation for the whole plan period should be reduced by 884 homes to 2,116 dwellings.	The trajectory is based on robust information, including reasonable assumptions as to annualised delivery and the number of developers who are expected to be active on site throughout the lifetime of development. The assumptions used are informed by Strategic Housing :Land Availability Assessment methodology and site specific information.	None	1261045	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 30: Strategic Allocation South of Clifton	The policy is supported	Noted	None	1241198	Mr Christopher Smith

Policy 31

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	The site is unsuitable as it is contaminated.	The policy identifies that some contamination on site is possible due to longstanding use of the airport. Planning conditions would be attached to planning permissions requiring further investigation and assessment of potential land contamination matters, in order to ensure the land is suitable for the proposed use. There is nothing to suggest potential contamination cannot be dealt with at the planning application stage and through appropriate planning conditions.	None	1259497 1259587 1258738 1254176 1258529 1258902 1254203 1259262 1259748 1259509 1258919 1257549 1257553 1258863 1257940 1253393 1253455 1254589 1257929 1257943 1259127 1259352 1257927 1257928 1256045	Aiko Ramdin Alan Wilkinson Mark Lidgett John Bratty Gill Stevenson G-INAS Dee Scott Brennig Jones Bryan Woolley Chris Whitehurst Peter Langridge Richard Farnsworth Robert Bush Robert Crunkhorn Sebastian Willcocks Stephen Wainer Trevor sexton Carole Hall Diane Kidger Emma Emery Emma Thomson Frances Robinson Harriet Pashley Jane Cook Joanne Pullen

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
				1256048	Julia Paterson
				1257125	Kathryn Bull
				1254577	Lynda Crunkhorn
				1259458	Mary Willcocks
				1258855	Poppy Skelton
				1259427	Shirley Cooke
				1258870	Jean Pring
				1258683	Nina Fisher
				1253498	Rowena Hayward
				1255359	Sarah Deacon
				1256340	Tessa Bunby
				1256342	Ian Stanley
				1257535	Swords Aviation
				1259638	Diane Kidger
				1258914	Kevin Savage
				1258862	Ross Dickie
				1256472	Andrew Dyson
				1254195	Prof Norbert Schmitt
				1257108	Darren Short
				1259551	Gary Goldsmith
				1257107	Brennig Jones
				1259508	John Bratty
				1259710	Sebastian Wilcocks
				1259466	Frances Robinson
				1259765	Swords Aviation
				1253415	(Tetyana

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
				1240873 1240874 1240875 1241456 1238229 1243280 1243379 1243409 1243486 1243508 1243473 1243433 1242576 1242493 1242191 1241982 1241437 1242148 1236753 1238968 1243312 1243539	Schevchenko) Emma Emery Emma Thomson Robert Crunkhorn Lynda Crunkhorn Robert Bush Kathryn Bull Sarah Deacon
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of	The proposed allocation would result in the loss of an active airfield which is an asset that needs to be	The plan sets out strategic and economic policies to promote targeted growth in the economy. These policies are informed by	None	1259497 1259587 1259802 1258177	Aiko Ramdin Alan Wilkinson Angelorange Ltd Anne Felton

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	protected as it contributes to the local, regional and national economy.	our evidence base. Allocation of the site for housing will also enable better access for the workforce to employment opportunities, the majority of which are in and adjoining the built-up area of Nottingham.		1260072 1254176 1258529 1259009 1253407 1258902 1258894 1259262 1259273 1257132 1259748 1258919 1259487 1258178 1259675 1257376 1257825 1257888 1258937 1258938 1253400 1257780 1253934 1257553 1260067 1258863	Patrick Holden John Bratty General Aviation Awareness Council Giles Greensmith Gill Stevenson Jan Arins Dee Scott Kim Armstrong Nina Livsey Brennig Jones Chris Whitehurst Dominic Sweeney Duncan Wylie Jason Rimell John Truman Jordan Burke Mark Batin Michael Berry Mike Guppy Peter Langridge Philip Nodding Richard Farnsworth Sebastian Willcocks Stephen Wainer Tony Medlar

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
				1257943	Wayne Long
				1259127	MRAeS
				1254522	Clare Farley
				1253536	Denise Stamp
				1253371	Dilys Addey
				1258644	Emma Emery
				1257114	Emma Hughes
				1257391	Frances Robinson
				1257125	Jane Cook
				1257111	Janet Eastgate
				1259458	Joanne Pullen
				1259427	Kathryn Bull
				1254189	Linda Boothright
				1258870	Linda Gothard
				1253498	Lynda Crunkhorn
				1256342	Mary Willcocks
				1258886	Michelle Harrison
				1257547	Nicola Staley
				1257535	Elizabeth Whitehead
				1259638	Nina Fisher
				1253488	Rowena Hayward
				1259503	Sarah Deacon
				1257097	Tessa Bunby
				1254195	Ian Stanley
				1257108	Natasha Bacciarelli
				1259551	Nottingham City

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
				1257107 1259508 1259710 1259466 1259765 1256907 1259391 1254489 1259312 1257782 1236730 1236732 1237256 1238695 1238916 1238946 1239628 1239342 1239579 1239601 1239802 1239917 1240119 1240837 1241996 1242120	Airport Christopher Bruce Sophie Sloan Tim Pinder John Bloor Helena Webster Richard Menage Joe Lewin Tim Ball Marcus Clarke Stephen Pearl Electsau Designs Ltd (Mark Saunders) Mr Brendan Moran Simon Hobson Michael O'Neill Gideon Ewers Philip Mickelborough Sherwood Flying Club (Martin Admanson) Krista Livsey Rich Williams Cory Christman Pat Waite Ian Smilie

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
				1242115	Sarah Davis
				1242147	Catherine Vass
				1243369	Kathy Shaw
				1242455	Katherine Wilson
				1242459	Julian Buckley
				1242496	L Onyett
				1242518	Richard Anderson
				1242841	(DNC)
				1242855	Matthew temple-Fry
				1242884	Ross Dickie
				1242886	George Stephens
				1243280	Prof Norbert Schmitt
				1243380	Alan Wright
				1243409	Margaret Barr
				1243451	Darren Short
				1243471	John Manson
				1243486	Duncan Wylie
				1243750	Brennig Jones
				1243494	Natasha Bacciarelli
				1243473	John Bratty
				1243469	Michelle Harrison
				1243433	Angelorange Ltd
				1243328	Sebastian Wilcocks
				1243112	Frances Robinson
				1242576	Philip Nodding
				1242493	Elizabeth Whitehead

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
				1242454 1242184 1242170 1242485 1241982 1241839 1240865 1239731 1243397 1242532 1238726 1238708 1236741 1236719 1236699 1243312 1243481 1243539 1240832 1236705 1240819 1242477	Anne Felton Nottingham City Airport (Yvonne Burn) Emma Emery Giles Greensmith Patrick Holden Mark Batin Janet Eastgate Linda Gothard Mike Guppy Tim Pinder Wayne Long MRAeS (Daniel Hayes) Lynda Crunkhorn Kathryn Bull Dominic Sweeney Sarah Deacon Clare Farley Steve Hornsby Andrew Broome Krista Dunning
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation	The airfield is currently used to train future aviation professionals,	The airfield is no longer in operation. The allocation of the site is necessary to meet	None	1259497 1259587 1254131	Aiko Ramdin Alan Wilkinson Alison Lees

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	university courses, schools and other programmes. The development of the airfield will mean the loss of an educational facility which will be a loss to the community.	housing needs and provide for those needs in accordance with the Plan's spatial strategy and in locations that can most sustainably accommodate growth.		1258177 1254176 1258529 1259009 1254806 1259468 1259262 1259273 1259748 1259509 1258919 1257373 1259487 1258178 1259675 1255018 1253934 1257553 1257940 1257943 1253371 1257114 1256045 1257111 1259458 1258279	Anne Felton John Bratty General Aviation Awareness Council Judith Efford Allison Clarke Dee Scott Kim Armstrong Brennig Jones Bryan Woolley Chris Whitehurst Christian Charalambous Dominic Sweeney Duncan Wylie Kieran Ruston Mike Guppy Peter Langridge Robert Bush Sebastian Willcocks MRAeS Denise Stamp Diane Kidger Emma Hughes Frances Robinson Helen Terrington

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
				1254189	Janet Eastgate
				1253498	Kathryn Bull
				1257547	Linda Gothard
				1257535	Lynda Crunkhorn
				1254473	Margaret Grocock
				1259638	Mary Willcocks
				1258862	Shirley Cooke
				1257097	Elizabeth Whitehead
				1256472	Jean Pring
				1257107	Sarah Deacon
				1259710	Ian Stanley
				1259765	Natasha Bacciarelli
				1256907	Swift Aero
				1258696	Maintenance
				1253415	Swords Aviation
				1246362	Mr Simon Robinson
				1236644	Theta Squared
				1236686	Aviation (Mr Paul
				1236710	Tolhurst)
				1237256	Rohan Chotai
				1238229	Paul Wheal
				1238696	Richard Menage
				1238695	Kevin Savage
				1238916	Matthew Kay
				1238977	Joe Lewin
				1239628	Tim Ball

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
				1239024/1 239030 1239342 1239601 1239708 1239727 1239807 1240119 1241996 1242120 1242460 1242841 1242882 1242884 1243325 1243379 1243380 1243633 1243644 1243715 1243750 1243494 1243473 1243469 1243433 1242576	Arcstone Ltd (James Astor) Stephen Pearl Robin Batchford Electsau Designs Ltd (Mark Saunders) Simon Hobson Aerodynamics Dry Leasing Ltd (Mrs Gillian Courage) AOPA Member (Stephen Nuttall) John Shankland Philip Mickelborough Krista Livsey Rich Williams Linda Hirst Julian Buckley Bradley Atkins Richard Anderson (DNC) Jenni Bishop Andrew Dyson George Stephens Lynsey Button Christopher Meadows

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
				1242493 1242191 1242188 1242184 1242170 1243397 1242532 1238726 1238704 1236719 1236753 1240646 1235651 1243312 1243481 1240873	Mark Jabbal John Manson Duncan Wylie Brennig Jones Natasha Bacciarelli John Bratty Sebastian Wilcocks Frances Robinson Swords Aviation (Tetyana Shevchenko) Helen Terrington Elizabeth Whitehead Anne Felton Janet Eastgate Linda Gothard Mike Guppy Kieran Ruston MRAeS (Daniel Hayes) Lynda Crunkhorn Alison Lees Robert Bush Kathryn Bull Dominic Sweeney Diane Kidger

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	The development of the airfield will mean the heritage of the site is lost.	The policy specifically states a requirement to protect the site's heritage through a heritage strategy which will inform the layout of the scheme. The layout will as such be designed to protect and/or enhance the heritage assets present and their setting, mitigating significant negative impacts on them.	None	1259497 1259009 1259509 1257373 1253495 1256339 1258178 1259675 1257943 1259127 1253536 1257927 1257928 1257114 1256045 1257391 1257125 1257453 1258855 1259427 1254189 1259346 1253498 1258886 1257547 1254473	Aiko Ramdin General Aviation Awareness Council Bryan Woolley Christian Charalambous Christopher Bull Duncan Wylie Sebastian Willcocks Stephen Wainer Wayne Long Carole Hall Denise Stamp Diane Kidger Dilys Addey Emma Emery Harriet Pashley Jane Cook Janet Eastgate Jennie crabot Kathryn Bull Linda Boothright Linda Gothard Margaret Grocock Mary Willcocks Shirley Cooke

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
				1259638 1258862 1258698 1254195 1257108 1253415 1239628 1240119 1242120 1242147 1242496 1243409 1243486 1243750 1243494 1242576 1242191 1241982 1241452 1243397 1242532 1236741 1241785 1243479/ 1236708 1240873	Susan Wilks Nina Fisher Swords Aviation Stephen Pearl Philip Mickelborough Rich Williams Pat Waite Kathy Shaw Prof Norbert Schmitt Darren Short John Manson Duncan Wylie Sebastian Wilcocks Swords Aviation (Tetyana Shevchenko) Emma Emery Christopher Bull Janet Eastgate Linda Gothard Wayne Long Kathryn Bull Harriet Pashley Diane Kidger

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	The closing of the site will impact emergency services as the air ambulance currently use the site.	The Air Ambulance currently uses the site and will continue to do so until an appropriate alternative arrangement can be found.	None	1259497 1259587 1254131 1259802 1258177 1258738 1259262 1259273 1257132 1259748 1259509 1258919 1257373 1259487 1258178 1259675 1257888 1255018 1257940 1257929 1257943 1257927 1257928 1258644 1257114 1256045	Aiko Ramdin Alan Wilkinson Alison Lees Angelorange Ltd Anne Felton Mark Lidgett Dee Scott Kim Armstrong Nina Livsey Brennig Jones Bryan Woolley Chris Whitehurst Christian Charalambous Dominic Sweeney Duncan Wylie John Truman Kieran Ruston Robert Bush Robert Crunkhorn Sebastian Willcocks Carole Hall Clare Farley Denise Stamp Diane Kidger Emma Emery

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
				1256048	Emma Hughes
				1257125	Frances Robinson
				1257111	Harriet Pashley
				1259458	Helen Terrington
				1257453	Janet Eastgate
				1258855	Jennie crabot
				1258279	Kathryn Bull
				1254189	Linda Boothright
				1259346	Linda Gothard
				1253498	Lynda Crunkhorn
				1256342	Margaret Grocock
				1258886	Mary Willcocks
				1257547	Nicola Staley
				1257535	Susan Wilks
				1254473	Elizabeth Whitehead
				1259638	Jean Pring
				1259503	Rowena Hayward
				1258698	Sarah Deacon
				1257097	Tessa Bunby
				1256472	Nottingham City Airport
				1259551	Sophie Sloan
				1257107	Swords Aviation
				1259710	Tollerton Park
				1259466	Mr Simon Robinson
				1259391	George Pickering
				1259312	

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
				1253415	Shane Meakin
				1259118	Kevin Savage
				1246362	Martin Bowles
				1235366	Michael O'Neill
				1235591/1	Gideon Ewers
				235592	Cory Christman
				1238229	Pat Waite
				1238913	Sarah Davis
				1239802	Catherine Vass
				1239917	Kathy Shaw
				1242115	Sarah Smythe
				1242147	Matthew Temple-Fry
				1242455	Mark Ruston MBE
				1242459	Lucie Mills
				1242496	Ross Dickie
				1242829	Andrew Dyson
				1242886	George Stephens
				1243255	Prof Norbert Schmitt
				1243273	Alan Wright
				1243280	Margaret Barr
				1243379	Cameron Bell
				1243380	Darren Short
				1243409	Neil Foster
				1243451	Lynsey Button
				1243471	Christopher
				1243483	Meadows

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
				1243486 1243501 1243633 1243644 1243750 1243494 1243473 1243112 1242576 1242493 1242191 1242188 1242184 1242170 1242485 1241982 1242148 1243397 1242532 1238704 1236753 1240646 1238968 1243312 1243481 1243539/	John Manson Duncan Wylie Brennig Jones Angelorange Ltd Sebastian Wilcocks Nottingham City Airport (Yvonne Burn) Frances Robinson Swords Aviation (Tetyana Shevchenko) Helen Terrington Elizabeth Whitehead Anne Felton Emma Emery Robert Crunkhorn Janet Eastgate Linda Gothard Kieran Ruston Lynda Crunkhorn Alison Lees Robert Bush Kathryn Bull Dominic Sweeney Sarah Deacon

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
				1240876 1240832 1243479 1240873	Clare Farley Harriet Pashley Diane Kidger
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	The site is not brownfield.	A substantial portion of the site which was formerly Nottingham Airport is brownfield land. While some greenfield land will be lost through development the policy requires improvement of green infrastructure across the site including significant southern and northern borders to provide a clear boundary to the greenbelt. Housing needs cannot reasonably be met with the use of greenfield land.	None	1259587 1254176 1258529 1257132 1253495 1256339 1259487 1255018 1253400 1253934 1257553 1257929 1257114 1256048 1257111 1254577 1257453 1258855 1253498 1256342 1257535 1254473	Alan Wilkinson John Bratty Nina Livsey Christopher Bull Dominic Sweeney Kieran Ruston Mark Batin Mike Guppy Peter Langridge Robert Crunkhorn Denise Stamp Diane Kidger Emma Hughes Emma Thomson Harriet Pashley Kathryn Bull Lynda Crunkhorn Margaret Grocock Michelle Harrison Shirley Cooke Nina Fisher Sarah Deacon

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
				1253488	Ian Stanley
				1258862	George Pickering
				1254195	Shane Meakin
				1257108	Kevin Savage
				1257107	Angus Stewart
				1259710	Martin Bowles
				1259765	G MOTI (Kieth Hunt)
				1235366	David Taylor
				1235592	Electsau Designs
				1238229	Ltd (Mark Saunders)
				1238689	Brendon Moran
				1238913	Anthony Oliver
				1238965	Simon Hobson
				1238995	AOPA Member
				1239342	(Stephen Nuttall)
				1239579	Philip Mickelborough
				1239587	Pat Waite
				1239601	Mark Ruston MBE
				1239727	Ross Dickie
				1240119	Andrew Dyson
				1242147	Margaret Barr
				1243256	Darren Short
				1243280	Gary Goldsmith
				1243379	John Manson
				1243471	John Bratty
				1243486	Michelle Harrison

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
				1243508 1243750 1243433 1243328 1241452 1241437 1242148/ 1240823 1239731 1238726 1238704 1236699 1241785 1243481 1243539 1240873	Christopher Bull Emma Thomson Robert Crunkhorn Mark Batin Mike Guppy Kieran Ruston Lynda Crunkhorn Kathryn Bull Dominic Sweeney Sarah Deacon Diane Kidger
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	The people that will be affected by the closure were not consulted – e.g. aviation industry and local businesses.	Allocation of the site for housing development first occurred as part of Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (2014) for which statutory consultees and the public were consulted in 2011. A public examination of that plan was also held in 2014. The Plan, including its approach to sites and policies, has evolved	None	1254131 1259802 1258177 1260072 1254176 1258529 1253407 1259262 1259748 1258919	Alison Lees Angelorange Ltd Anne Felton Patrick Holden John Bratty Giles Greensmith Dee Scott Brennig Jones Chris Whitehurst Christopher Bull

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		from several public consultations beginning with a "Growth Options" consultation in 2020. Relevant consultees have been given the opportunity to engage.		1253495 1256339 1254552 1259487 1258178 1259675 1255018 1253400 1257780 1253934 1257553 1257940 1255333 1253371 1258644 1256048 1257453 1258855 1258279 1254189 1259346 1253494 1256338 1253498 1255359 1256340	David Craik Dominic Sweeney Duncan Wylie Kieran Ruston Mark Batin Michael Berry Mike Guppy Peter Langridge Robert Bush Zac Marsden MRAeS Clare Farley Diane Kidger Harriet Pashley Helen Terrington Janet Eastgate Jennie Crabot Kathleen Scriven Kathryn Bull Linda Boothright Lynda Crunkhorn Mary Willcocks Nicola Staley Sarah Deacon Natasha Bacciarelli Sophie Sloan

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
				1256342 1258886 1257535 1259638 1259503 1257107 1259710 1256907 1259312 1253415 1259118 1240821 1240873 1246362 1242042 1236709 1236711 1236716 1236729 1236730 1236732 1236736 1236748 1236750 1237256 1238229	Swords Aviation Tollerton Park Kathleen Scriven Diane Kidger Mr Simon Robinson Dr Mohsen Koupaie Dr Ian Jalowiecki Compass North Aviation (Adam Harris) Richard Lewin Victoria Webster John Bloor Helena Webster MOD (George Puttock) JetAviation (New Zealand) (Mr Scott Wood) Shane Meakin Richard Menage Kevin Savage Joe Lewin Peter Stephens Martin Bowles Marcus Clarke

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
				1238695 1238707 1238913 1238946 1238965 1238977 1238995 1239024 1239335 1239342 1239579 1239708 1239802 1239807 1239874 1240837 1240867 1241480 1241862 1242120 1242001 1242115 1242147 1242193 1243369 1242378	G MOTI (Kieth Hunt) Arcstone Ltd (James Astor) David Taylor Robin Batchford Dr Peter Riley Electsau Designs Ltd (Mark Saunders) Brendon Moran Aerodynamics Dry Leasing Ltd (Gillian Courage) Michael O'Neill John Shankland Jennifer Ellison Sherwood Flying Club (Martin Adamson) Chloe Holden Albert OIlivier Susannah Steel Rich Williams Lisa Drury Cory Christman Pat Waite James Smith

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
				1242518 1242742 1242829 1242841 1242849 1242874 1242884 1242886 1242891 1242895 1242896 1243066 1243144 1243280 1243325 1243380 1243409 1243451 1243483 1243493 1243501 1243633 1243644 1243715 1243750 1243494	Ian Smilie R Jephson Katherine Wilson Tom Walton Sarah Smythe Julian Buckley Mark Onyett Wellesbourne Matters (Duncan Mackillop Richard Anderson (DNC) Matthew Temple-Fry James Baldwin John Akinin Sten Lai Tim Bell Gary Thomas Ross Dickie Jenni Bishop George Stephens Prof Norbert Schmitt Alan Wright Cameron Bell Michael Dyer Neil Foster

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
				1243473 1243469 1243433 1243112 1242191 1242188 1242170 1241839 1241452 1240865 1239731 1239630 1243397 1238726 1238704 1236719 1236753 1240646 1238968 1243312 1243481 1243539 1240832 1243479 1238768	Lynsey Button Christopher Meadows Mark Jabbal John Manson Duncan Wylie Brennig Jones Natasha Bacciarelli John Bratty Angelorange Ltd Swords Aviation (Tetyana Shevchenko) Helen Terrington Anne Felton Giles Greensmith Christopher Bull Patrick Holden Mark Batin David Craik Janet Eastgate Mike Guppy Kieran Ruston MRAeS (Daniel Hayes) Lynda Crunkhorn

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
					Alison Lees Robert Bush Kathryn Bull Dominic Sweeney Sarah Deacon Clare Farley Harriet Pashley Tomas Miskinis
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	The site is at risk of flooding.	Some areas at the site's edge sit within Flood Zones 2 and 3. The policy states that SuDS (Sustainable Drainage Systems) will be required alongside sewage and offsite drainage improvements. The design of SuDS and drainage schemes will be subject to further scrutiny at the planning application stage.	None	1254131 1258738 1254176 1258529 1257132 1259748 1253495 1256339 1259487 1260067 1257943 1257337 1257927 1257928 1258644 1256045 1256048 1257391	Alison Lees Mark Lidgett John Bratty Nina Livsey Brennig Jones Christopher Bull Dominic Sweeney Philip Nodding Sebastian Willcocks Alison G-palmer Carole Hall Clare Farley Diane Kidger Dilys Addey Emma Thomson Janet Eastgate Jennie Crabot Kathleen Scriven

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
				1254577	Kathryn Bull
				1254189	Lynda Crunkhorn
				1259346	Mary Willcocks
				1253494	Michelle Harrison
				1256338	Poppy Skelton
				1253498	Sarah Deacon
				1255359	Diane Kidger
				1256340	Harrison Philips
				1256342	Kevin Savage
				1257535	Linda Hirst
				1259638	Sheila Weston
				1253488	Ross Dickie
				1258914	Andrew Dyson
				1257107	Prof Norbert Schmitt
				1259710	Darren Short
				1240873	Gary Goldsmith
				1235652	John Manson
				1238229	Brennig Jones
				1242460	John Bratty
				1242719	Michelle Harrison
				1243280	Sebastian Wilcocks
				1243379	Philip Nodding
				1243409	Christopher Bull
				1243486	Emma Thomson
				1243508	Janet Eastgate
				1243750	Lynda Crunkhorn

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
				1243473 1243433 1243328 1242576 1242454 1241452 1241437/ 1241332 1243397 1236753 1240646 1243312 1243481 1243539 1240832	Alison Lees Kathryn Bull Dominic Sweeney Sarah Deacon Clare Farley
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	The roads in the area would not be able to cope with the proposed allocation.	The site selection process has been informed by transport modelling. The plan also identifies key transport projects required for sites to come forward. This included improvements to the A52 locally which are underway to accommodate increases in traffic. Improvements to public transport and active travel links	None	1254131 1258177 1254176 1258529 1257132 1259748 1258919 1253495 1256339 1258178 1259675	Alison Lees Anne Felton John Bratty Nina Livsey Brennig Jones Chris Whitehurst Christopher Bull Duncan Wylie Peter Langridge Philip Nodding Robert Crunkhorn

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		through and beyond the site, including, where necessary enhancements to existing bus services, are also required to help enable development to go ahead without causing severe impacts on the road network .		1257553 1260067 1257929 1257337 1257927 1257928 1258644 1256048 1257125 1254577 1257453 1258855 1259346 1253494 1256338 1253498 1255359 1256340 1256342 1259746 1259638 1253488 1258698 1259551 1259765 1258690	Alison G-palmer Carole Hall Clare Farley Diane Kidger Emma Emery Emma Thomson Harriet Pashley Jennie Crabot Kathleen Scriven Kathryn Bull Margaret Bonney Mary Willcocks Michelle Harrison Susan Wilks Rowena Hayward Ian Stanley SP Ashton Mr Simon Robinson Dr Robert Kemp Krista Livsey David Hobbs Nicole Hanratty Ross Dickie Prof Norbert Schmitt Darren Short Duncan Wylie

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
				1246362 1235670 1241996 1242509 1242642 1243280 1243409 1243486 1243494 1243473 1243433 1243328 1242454 1242170 1241982 1241452 1241437 1242975 1240646 1241785 1240832 1243479 1240873 1235846	Brennig Jones John Bratty Michelle Harrison Philip Nodding Anne Felton Emma Emery Christopher Bull Emma Thomson Robert Crunkhorn Alison Lees Kathryn Bull Clare Farley Harriet Pashley Diane Kidger Rebecca Jones
Policy 31: Strategic	The airfield has the potential to be involved	The airfield is no longer in operation. The allocation of the	None	1259802 1254176	Angelorange Ltd John Bratty

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	in future research to promote sustainable aviation.	site is necessary to meet housing needs and provide for those needs in accordance with the Plan's spatial strategy and in locations that can most sustainably accommodate growth.		1258529 1253407 1258919 1259458 1253498 1257097 1257107 1259710 1243715 1243433 1243112 1242785 1242493 1242184 1241839 1243312 1243539	Giles Greensmith Chris Whitehurst Frances Robinson Kathryn Bull Elizabeth Whitehead Sarah Deacon Mark Jabbal John Bratty Angelorange Ltd SP Ashton Frances Robinson Elizabeth Whitehead Giles Greensmith Kathryn Bull Sarah Deacon
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	The site supports a huge variety and amount of wildlife. The development will cause environmental harm.	Most of the site is taken up by the airfield's runways and arable land. The Sustainability Appraisal identified key areas of blue green infrastructure on the site important to supporting biodiversity, including the Grantham Canal and hedgerows, grassland and	None	1259802 1258738 1254176 1258529 1253407 1259509 1258919 1259487 1257825	Angelorange Ltd Mark Lidgett John Bratty Giles Greensmith Bryan Woolley Chris Whitehurst Dominic Sweeney John Truman Mark Batin

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		watercourses across the site. The Policy specifies a requirement to enhance green infrastructure and biodiversity specifically creating buffers on the southern and northern boundaries, this will protect biodiversity around the Grantham Canal and create new biodiversity on areas previously used for crops. Further measures to enhance biodiversity such as Biodiversity Net Gain will be dealt with through planning applications.		1257888 1253400 1257553 1260067 1259127 1257927 1257928 1258644 1256048 1257125 1259427 1254189 1259346 1258683 1253498 1256342 1259638 1258698 1259551 1257107 1259710 1240873 1235652 1238229 1240119 1241996	Peter Langridge Philip Nodding Stephen Wainer Carole Hall Clare Farley Diane Kidger Emma Emery Jane Cook Janet Eastgate Jennie crabot Julia Paterson Kathryn Bull Mary Willcocks Susan Wilks Rowena Hayward Sarah Deacon Diane Kidger Harrison Philips Kevin Savage Philip Mickelborough Krista Livsey Linda Hirst Kathy Shaw Sarah Smythe Ross Dickie Prof Norbert Schmitt

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
				1242460 1242496 1242829 1243280 1243409 1243486 1243633 1243750 1243433 1243112 1242454 1241982 1241839 1239731 1243397 1241785 1243481 1243539 1240832	Darren Short Lynsey Button John Manson John Bratty Angelorange Ltd Philip Nodding Emma Emery Giles Greensmith Mark Batin Janet Eastgate Kathryn Bull Dominic Sweeney Sarah Deacon Clare Farley
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton	The policy (or its thrust) is supported.	The Council welcomes support for the policy.	None	1261295 1258676 1260958 1258370 1261249 1238988 1242822	Arc Partnership/ Nottinghamshire County Council Oxalis Planning Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land The Labour Group,

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
(Rushcliffe)				1246937	Rushcliffe Borough Council Vistry Homes Ltd The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council Oxalis Planning Vistry Homes Ltd
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	The policy should be amended to reflect the current position with the preparation of a comprehensive masterplan as part of a Supplementary Planning Document to avoid any uncertainty about whether the requirement for a comprehensive masterplanning and design code process has been satisfied.	The policy states the need for masterplanning and design codes and paragraph 3.31.7 makes clear that these are currently being prepared by the Council. The Council considers the policy and supporting text adequately reflect the current position and are clear in that these documents will be used to determine any future applications for development of the site.	None	1261295 1260958	Arc Partnership/ Nottinghamshire County Council Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of	The policy, including reference to Figure 31.1 Land east of Gamston north of Tollerton, should	The policy, supporting text and Figure 31.1 provide an appropriate framework on which to support the preparation of	None	1261295 1260958 1261249 1246937	Arc Partnership/ Nottinghamshire County Council Taylor Wimpey and

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	be updated to reflect the current position agreed with the Council through the preparation of the Supplementary Planning Document and masterplan.	more detailed plans for the site. It is premature to consider any changes to them when the Supplementary Planning Document and associated masterplan are still being drafted.			Barwood Land Vistry Homes Ltd Vistry Homes Ltd
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	The policy should be modified to align with Draft Policy 8 in relation to affordable housing and state 'up to 30% affordable housing'.	Policy 8 states that the council will seek a proportion of 30% affordable dwellings on all developments on all sites of 10 dwellings or more. The policies are aligned.	None	1261295 1260958	Arc Partnership/ Nottinghamshire County Council Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	Concerns over the deliverability, timescales and trajectory of the site, with some respondents promoting sites to make up for expected under delivery on the site.	The Council is working proactively to bring the site forward through preparation of supporting guidance, design codes and a masterplan. Development will be able to start on site when these have been adopted. This is expected to reflect the assumptions made within the trajectory.	None	1261381 1246769 1261394 1260590 1246833 1259880 1246982 1260074 1246714 1260148 1245730	Barratt David Wilson Homes (North Midlands) Barratt David Wilson homes (North Midlands) Barratt David Wilson Homes (North Midlands) and Averill Land Limited Harworth Group

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
				1261241 1259580 1246351 1291846	Harworth Group Mr Richards and Mrs Hurst Mr Richards and Mrs Hurst Stagfield Group Stagfield Group Strawson Group Investments Ltd Strawson Group William Davis Tollerton Parish Council Tollerton Parish Council Cora Homes Ltd (Mr Robbie Locke)
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	The policy wording regarding contributions towards infrastructure is ambiguous and unclear, and it is questionable how this can be enforced.	It is not accepted that the policy is ambiguous and unclear and such matters cannot be adequately addressed at the decision-making stage. The Council is also preparing more detailed supplementary guidance which will include further detail to in respect of how infrastructure	None	1261381 1246769 1261394	Barratt David Wilson Homes (North Midlands) Barratt David Wilson Homes (North Midlands) Barratt David Wilson Homes (North Midlands) and Averill

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		will be secured, taking into account the site's particular circumstances.			Land Limited
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	Concerns regarding the effectiveness of the proposed cycling and walking elements of the allocation.	The policy identifies a requirement for improvement of active travel infrastructure. Routes for active travel through the site and connecting to nearby areas will be scrutinised as part of planning applications for the site's development.	None	1258390 1242561 1256048 1257107 1259710 1240873 1246313 1243539	David Rhead David Rhead Diane Kidger Sarah Deacon Diane Kidger Nottinghamshire Area Ramblers Sarah Deacon
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	The proposed allocation is not in accordance with national policy on transport or the Department for Transport's guidance.	The strategic allocation identifies transport improvements required for the development to come forward including highways remodelling along the A52 Lings Bar Road and improvements to active travel and public transport infrastructure. This is in line with policy contained in the NPPF including considering transport issues from an early stage in the planning process and promoting access to local amenities through active travel. Detailed transport improvements will be	None	1258390 1242561	David Rhead

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		dealt with through planning applications.			
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	The airport improves Nottingham's connectivity.	The airport was used primarily for private charter flights and therefore its closure will not impact connectivity of the city for the general public.	None	1254176 1258529 1259009 1254552 1253400 1257943 1253371 1254473 1257107 1259508 1259710 1240873 1238969 1243433 1242576 1239630 1236719	John Bratty John Bratty General Aviation Awareness Council David Craik Mark Batin Sebastian Willcocks MRAeS Margaret Grocock Sarah Deacon Sarah Deacon Sarah Deacon Diane Kidger David Guilor John Bratty Sebastian Wilcocks David Craik MRAeS
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of	The closure of the airfield is not consistent with the NPPF which requires the maintenance of a network of General Aviation Airfields.	The NPPF says local plan policies should recognise the importance of maintaining a network of general aviation airfields. There is no requirement to maintain every individual	None	1254176 1258529 1259009 1253495 1256339 1254552	John Bratty General Aviation Awareness Council Christopher Bull David Craik John Milner

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Tollerton (Rushcliffe)		airfield. The airfield is no longer in operation. Even if its retention were possible, the importance that the NPPF attaches to general aviation airfields is one of a number of competing factors that need to be balanced by the Council when aiming to satisfy housing and other development needs and aiming to deliver sustainable development.		1253548 1255018 1253934 1259352 1253371 1257114 1256048 1257125 1257111 1253494 1253498 1256342 1257107 1259710 1256907 1253415 1246850 1235656 1235652 1236716 1236730 1236732 1236736 1236748 1236750 1238229	Kieran Ruston Mike Guppy Trevor Sexton MRAeS Denise Stamp Diane Kidger Emma Emery Emma Hughes Kathleen Scriven Kathryn Bull Sarah Deacon Natasha Bacciarelli Swords Aviation James Naish MP Shane Meakin Harrison Philips Richard Lewin John Bloor Helena Webster MOD (George Puttock) JetAviation (New Zealand) (Mr Scott Wood) Shane Meakin Kevin Savage

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
				1238689 1238695 1238915 1238913 1238946 1238965 1238977 1238995 1239335 1239579 1239601 1239625 1239626 1239727 1239802 1239807 1239917 1240837 1240878 1241480 1242120 1243130 1242459 1242518 1242874 1243255	Angus Stewart Joe Lewin Edward Pinnegar Martin Bowles Marcus Clarke G MOTI (Keith Hunt) Arcstone Ltd (James Astor) David Hunt Dr Peter Riley Brendon Moran Simon Hobson Bradair Aviation Consultancy Ltd (Captain Brian Bradley) Chris Bigos AOPA Member (Stephen Nuttall)) Michael O'Neill John Shankland Gideon Ewers Sherwood Flying Club (Martin Adamson) Jane Giffould Albert Olivier

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
				1243280 1243379 1243486 1243750 1243469 1243433 1242191 1241982 1241452 1239630 1238822 1238726 1238704 1236719 1243312 1240873 1236674	Rich Williams Anthony Nowak Catherine Vass Katherine Wilson Wellesbourne Matters (Duncan Mackillop) Mark Ruston MBE Ross Dickie Andrew Dyson Darren Short John Manson Natasha Bacciarelli John Bratty Swords Aviation (Tetyana Shevchenko) Emma Emery Christopher Bull David Craik John Milner Mike Guppy Kieran Ruston MRAeS (Daniel Hayes) Kathryn Bull

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
					Diane Kidger Midland Air Training Ltd (Ron Walker)
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	The occupants of the proposed allocation will need jobs, yet the allocation will result in the employment closures rather than developed/grown.	The plan sets out strategic and economic policies to promote targeted growth in the economy. These policies are informed by our evidence base. Allocation of the site for housing will enable better access for the workforce to employment opportunities, the majority of which are in and adjoining the built-up area of Nottingham. This site is particularly important in this respect by allocating land for around 4,000 homes. Additionally, the site includes around 15 hectares of land for new employment development.	None	1254176 1258529 1243433	John Bratty John Bratty
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of	Tollerton Airfield could serve as a strategic site for both AAM, UAM and RAM operations. It is suggested that an appropriate study be	The airfield is no longer in operation. Moreover, the allocation of the site is necessary to meet housing needs and provide for those needs in accordance with the Plan's	None	1260676 1257943 1253371 1259458 1253498 1259638	EA Maven Sebastian Willcocks MRAeS Frances Robinson Kathryn Bull Mary Willcocks

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	undertaken to ensure the right decision is taken that protects future jobs and economic prosperity for the region.	spatial strategy and in locations that can most sustainably accommodate growth.		1258698 1257107 1259508 1259710 1243720 1242576 1242493 1236719 1243312 1243539 1242355	Susan Wilks Sarah Deacon EA Maven (Darrell Swanson) Sebastian Wilcocks Frances Robinson MRAeS (Daniel Hayes) Kathryn Bull Sarah Deacon Kathleen Stapley
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	The allocation of the site does not align with Government Aviation Policy.	The NPPF says local plan policies should recognise the importance of maintaining a network of general aviation airfields. There is no requirement to maintain every individual airfield. The airfield is no longer in operation. Even if its retention were possible, the importance that the NPPF attaches to general aviation airfields is one of a number of competing factors that need to be balanced by the Council when aiming to satisfy	None	1259009 1256045 1240873 1236709	General Aviation Awareness Council Diane Kidger Diane Kidger Dr Ian Jalowiecki

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		housing and other development needs and aiming to deliver sustainable development..			
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	The airport is a recreational asset enjoyed by many.	The NPPF says local plan policies should recognise the importance of maintaining a network of general aviation airfields. There is not a requirement to maintain every individual airfield. The airfield is no longer in operation. Even if its retention were possible, the importance that the NPPF attaches to general aviation airfields is one of a number of competing factors that need to be balanced by the Council when aiming to satisfy housing and other development needs and aiming to deliver sustainable development.	None	1259009 1259262 1259509 1257825 1257888 1256045 1254189 1259391 1258696 1242485 1240873 1243349	General Aviation Awareness Council Dee Scott Bryan Woolley John Truman Diane Kidger Janet Eastgate Nottingham City Airport Swift Aero Maintenance Nottingham City Airport (Yvonne Burn) Diane Kidger Alistair Greer
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston /	The airport should be retained, and the allocation of housing and/or employment could be provided around the	The continuous operation of the airport would be incompatible with the development of the surrounding areas for housing.	None	1259009 1257376 1253548 1257549 1254189	General Aviation Awareness Council Jason Rimell John Milner Peter Langridge

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	airport.			1259391 1258696 1237317 1238689 1243130 1242485 1243397 1238822 1243547/ 1243550 1242477	Janet Eastgate Nottingham City Airport Swift Aero Maintenance Neil Murgatroyd Angus Stewart Anthony Nowak Nottingham City Airport (Yvonne Burn) Janet Eastgate John Milner Peter Howarth Krista Dunning
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	Why does a perfectly good local airport have to close for housing? There is already more than enough housing in the area, and the infrastructure will not support more.	A housing need is identified both nationally and locally.. The additional infrastructure necessary to bring the development forward is identified in the plan document.	None	1256903	Rick Goold
Policy 31: Strategic	The decision to close Nottingham Tollerton	The airport was used primarily for private charter flights and	None	1259937	Scott Pendry

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	Airfield is deeply short-sighted and risks serious long-term consequences for our region's connectivity and economic vitality.	therefore its closure will not impact connectivity of the city for the general public. The plan sets out strategic and economic policies to promote targeted growth in the economy. These policies are informed by our evidence base. Allocation of the site for housing will enable better access for the workforce to employment opportunities, the majority of which are in and adjoining the built-up area of Nottingham. This site is especially important in this regard as it allocates land for around 4,000 homes. Additionally, the site includes around 15 hectares of land for new employment development.			
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of	Closure of airfield is a mistake and would be highly detrimental to local businesses. It supports several businesses that may now	The plan sets out strategic and economic policies to promote targeted growth in the economy. These policies are informed by our evidence base. Allocation of the site for housing will enable	None	1256541 1235366 1238689	Chris Wade Aviation Limited Shane Meakin Angus Stewart

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	have to incur huge disruption and loss of income (and perhaps even closure) due to the need to find new premises in the local area. There is a lack of aircraft Engineers and Flight Instructors throughout the industry, so you currently have constituents doing specialised, highly-trained jobs who may now need to relocate or re-train.	better access for the workforce to employment opportunities, the majority of which are in and adjoining the built-up area of Nottingham. This site is especially important in this regard as it allocates land for around 4,000 homes. Additionally, the site includes around 15 hectares of land for new employment development.			
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	The HIA for this site state is vey limited but does identify harm to listed structures. There is a mitigation measure that is identified within the HIA but this is not drawn through to the Plan. There is a generic reference to heritage	The level of detail for a local plan policy is considered sufficient, alongside other separate policies specifically related to heritage matters and national policy and guidance. Policy 31 explicitly identifies a requirement for a heritage strategy. The HIA suggests policy "Incorporate pillboxes into GI infrastructure	None	1262424 1246185	Historic England Historic England

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	within the policy and the need for a further heritage strategy, but the strategic allocation policy should set out any harm to heritage and how this can be avoided/ mitigated through the policy. Additional information is required to make the policy justified/effective.	that connects them and protects their setting." The high-level masterplan provided in figure 31.1 indicates how green infrastructure may be developed to enhance the pillboxes' setting. Detailed designs for green infrastructure and further mitigations against harm to the pillboxes will be a requirement of any planning application.			
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	Rushcliffe can meet its housing targets without the allocation of the airfield.	Over the plan period to 2041 Rushcliffe has a housing target of 11,960 homes. Around 2,700 of these are projected to be delivered on the strategic allocation East of Gamston North of Tollerton (Policy 31) over the plan period. The land identified in the policy is necessary to deliver the scale of housing development over the plan period.	None	1254806 1253495 1256339 1257553 1253539 1257940 1258644 1257114 1256048 1259458 1253494 1253498 1256342 1257107	Judith Efford Christopher Bull Peter Langridge Richard Farnsworth Robert Bush Clare Farley Denise Stamp Diane Kidger Frances Robinson Kathleen Scriven Kathryn Bull Sarah Deacon Natasha Bacciarelli Diane Kidger

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
				1259508 1259710 1256907 1240873 1242496 1242509 1242719 1242829 1243469 1242493 1241452 1238968 1241785 1243539 1240832	Kathy Shaw David Hobbs Sheila Weston Sarah Smythe Natasha Bacciarelli Frances Robinson Christopher Bull Robert Bush Kathryn Bull Sarah Deacon Clare Farley
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	The proposed allocation will put more pressure on local amenities and infrastructure.	The strategic allocation identifies infrastructure improvements required for the development to come forward including highways works to the A52 Lings Bar Road and active travel links to amenities in the adjoining West Bridgford area. The policy also contains required improvements to local amenities including new school sites and	None	1254806 1259262 1258919 1257780 1257929 1257943 1254522 1257927 1257928 1258644 1257391	Judith Efford Dee Scott Chris Whitehurst Michael Berry Robert Crunkhorn Sebastian Willcocks Tony Medlar Carole Hall Clare Farley Dilys Addey Emma Emery

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		improved health facilities either new as part of the development or improvements to existing services.		1257125 1254577 1257453 1258855 1254189 1259346 1258683 1255359 1256340 1253488 1258914 1258690 1242460 1242829 1243328 1242785 1242576 1241982 1241437 1242975 1243397 1243312 1240832	Emma Thomson Harriet Pashley Janet Eastgate Jennie crabot Julia Paterson Kathryn Bull Michelle Harrison Poppy Skelton SP Ashton Linda Hirst Sarah Smythe Michelle Harrison SP Ashton Sebastian Wilcocks Emma Emery Emma Thomson Robert Crunkhorn Janet Eastgate Kathryn Bull David Willey
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation	There appears little appetite or available finance to upgrade the	Improvements to the Gamston roundabout have already occurred and National Highways	None	1257391 1240873 1235670	Diane Kidger Diane Kidger Dr Robert Kemp

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	A52 Gamston -Lings Bar Road to support this proposed development in the foreseeable future.	are bringing forward further improvements along the whole of the A52 south of West Bridgford. Further infrastructure improvements will be implemented as part of full applications for infrastructure on the site and using financial contributions already or due to be collected by the Council from this and other developments.			
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	It is also important that the integrity of Bassingfield and Tollerton as distinct settlements should be protected as far as possible.	The policy includes a requirement for "The creation of significant Green Infrastructure areas and buffers, particularly on the southern and northern boundaries to contribute to the creation of permanent defensible Green Belt boundaries between the development and Tollerton and Bassingfield."	None	1257391 1258683 1240873	Diane Kidger Julia Paterson Diane Kidger
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston /	The huge housing development will change the character of Tollerton.	The policy states a requirement for "The creation of significant Green Infrastructure areas and buffers, particularly on the southern and northern	None	1257391 1258696	Dilys Addey Swift Aero Maintenance

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)		boundaries to contribute to the creation of permanent defensible Green Belt boundaries between the development and Tollerton and Bassingfield."			
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	Instead of building on the airfield, why not include housing on the Power Station site as it is good to have housing near work places and there would be no extra road alterations as it has good connections via the A453. It would not take up any more green belt.	The site of the former power station will involve significant work to demolish the existing buildings and remediate the land. That site would be highly unlikely to be able to provide for sufficient housing over the plan period to compensate for the loss of this allocated site. Locating housing to the east of Gamston/north of Tollerton provides better accessibility to the local economy with the majority of jobs being in the urban area of Nottingham.	None	1254189 1243397	Janet Eastgate Janet Eastgate
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of	No consideration has been taken into account of the 50 park homes that are to be surrounded by 3 storey houses.	The policy states that the design and layout of the site will be determined through a comprehensive masterplanning and design code process. Decisions on the location and	None	1258698	Susan Wilks

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Tollerton (Rushcliffe)		scale of housing on the site will be takes as part of planning applications. Consideration for the cohesion of existing and proposed uses on the site will be made at both stages.			
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	There is a risk of unexploded ordnance on the site given its previous military history.	A Geo-environmental Assessment Report was undertaken in 2014 in relation to the site's development. This recommended a desk study investigating the potential for unexploded ordnance be carried out prior to any ground investigation. This would be expected to be carried out in conjunction with planning applications.	None	1257107 1259710 1243633 1243539	Sarah Deacon Lynsey Button Sarah Deacon
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	The loss of the airfield will reduce the number of opportunities for women and ethnic minority groups to be involved in STEM careers.	An Equalities Impact Assessment has been undertaken as part of the preparation of the plan which did not identify any negative impacts from the policy 31 on the protected characteristics of race or sex.	None	1257107 1259710 1243539	Sarah Deacon Sarah Deacon

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	Welcomes the reference to contributions to infrastructure provision within the policy.	The Council welcomes recognition for the proactive approach to infrastructure delivery.	None	1259791	National Highways
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	The established and consented uses (a large new private hospital, a manufacturing facility and a care home and retirement bungalows) should be reflected in the policy and the policy plan.	The policy says that the design and layout of the site will be informed by a masterplanning and design code process. Existing and consented uses will be represented in these masterplans. It is not necessary for further detail in the policy or for these to be represented on Figure 31.1 as this is a high-level diagram.	None	1258676 1242822	Oxalis Planning Oxalis Planning
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton	Figure 31.1 should be amended so that the blue area of the plan is described as 'mixed use area', rather than the restrictive and inaccurate description as	There are buildings within this portion of the site (e.g. the Spire hospital) which would not be classified as employment. To designate these areas as mixed use however would not be appropriate as the policy is clear	None	1258676 1242822	Oxalis Planning Oxalis Planning

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
(Rushcliffe)	'employment area'. This would better reflect the uses that are there and have been permitted and those that might be permitted as part of further development of the allocation.	there is a requirement for 15 hectares of employment land on the site and development of other uses would counteract this. Employment uses cover a variety of manufacturing and office types and the description is not considered to be unduly restrictive.			
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	Priority should be given to improving active travel links to, within and from the proposed allocation. A number of projects could be delivered to achieve this.	The policy states that "Improvements to public transport links through and beyond the site, including where necessary enhancements to existing bus services" and "Improvements to walking and cycling links through and beyond the site, including to enable convenient and safe travel between the site and the existing Gamston area" are required for the sites development. This is considered sufficient detail for a strategic level local plan policy.	None	1261964 1258370 1238988	Pedals The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council
Policy 31: Strategic	We reserve our position in respect of the	This wording has been included to help support delivery of a site	None	1260958	Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	proposed inclusion in this consultation that all development should contribute on a fair, consistent and proportionate basis towards infrastructure requirements including, where appropriate, where infrastructure has been forward funded or delivered by others but is necessary for the delivery of the overall development.	that is split between a number of different landholding interests. Policy 18 (Developer contributions for Infrastructure) says: "Developer contributions may be negotiated to take account of situations where development is phased over time, or where there are significant changes in economic conditions over the period up to completion of a development, to ensure development contributes appropriately to necessary infrastructure." Negotiations will take account of the contributions made by developers at different phases of development in line with this policy.			
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton	In terms of a neighbourhood centre, we would ask for flexibility, which is a neighbourhood centre or two local centres. This is what is shown within the	The policy says that the design and layout of the development will be informed by a masterplanning and design code process. This is the Supplementary Planning Document currently being	None	1260958	Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
(Rushcliffe)	agreed framework plan for the SUE.	prepared. Once adopted, it will be material considerations for any planning application. The policy states that a neighbourhood centre and retail development should be of an appropriate scale to the development.			
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	It is not justified or appropriate for policy to seek changes to land outside of the allocated land. The intention or creation of an enhanced green corridor along the Grantham Canal is supported, but this can only be about land allocated within the SUE and hence the wording should be changed to make this clear.	It is appropriate for the green corridor along the Grantham canal to be shown on figure 31.1 as the policy makes reference to its enhancement as part of the development process. It is anticipated that this may be brought about through a combination of on-site green infrastructure and contributions to improve areas outside the allocation through BNG or Section 106 agreements.	None	1260958	Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of	Query why a statement relating to impact on a Special Protection Area has been included in the	Potential impacts of increased air pollution upon the Sherwood Forrest ppSPA were identified as part of the Greater Nottingham	None	1260958	Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	policy.	Habitats Regulation Assessment 2024. This wording was recommended for strategic sites to mitigate any potential damage to the habitat.			
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	There should be reference to the NET extension to Gedling and Gamston spur and to a potential park and ride site adjacent to the development which are listed in Policy 15.4 under Public Transport improvements.	The development of a new spur on the tram network to Gamston and associated park and ride have not been identified as necessary for the development to come forward. Any scheme is subject only to initial investigation and there is not sufficient certainty over whether and when funding would be available. It would not therefore be appropriate to include reference to it in the policy at this stage.	None	1258370 1238988	The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton	Policy 31.A.1 and A.2 refer to affordable housing and net density targets. These should be included as indicators in Table 5.15.17 [3.31.17]	Affordable housing and density are already monitored through the Authority Monitoring Report and existing indicators. The indicators at 3.28.7 are consistent with national guidance and provide sufficient	None	1258370 1238988	The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
(Rushcliffe)		mechanisms to track delivery across the plan period.			
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	Whilst the site was originally allocated based on the planning policy context at the time, the allocation should be assessed against current policy. In our view, we agree with the GNSP that there is nothing that justifies any change. The recent planning application has triggered renewed interest in the closure of the airfield, but in reality the decision was made with the allocation over 10 years ago and businesses and users of the airfield have had the opportunity to prepare accordingly. We would strongly recommend against any attempts to change the	The Council welcomes support for the allocation and there is no justification to remove the airport from this.	None	1261249 1246937	Vistry Homes Ltd Vistry Homes Ltd

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	allocation to retain the airfield for a number of reasons.				
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	The policy 31 sets out that the indicative distribution of the proposed uses within the site allocation is illustrated on Figure 31.1. Noting that the plan is indicative is welcomed, though it is felt that further confirmation of this should be referenced in the figure caption or on the plan itself to minimise the risk of this plan being misinterpreted.	The policy states that the design and layout of the allocation will be decided as part of a masterplanning and design code process. Once adopted these documents will become material considerations in any future planning application for the site. There is no need to further indicate the high-level nature of figure 31.1.	None	1261249 1246937	Vistry Homes Ltd Vistry Homes Ltd
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston /	Suggest the green infrastructure shown in figure 31.1 is amended as it has been altered compared to the Local	The policy states that the design and layout of the allocation will be decided as part of a masterplanning and design code process. Once adopted these	None	1261249 1246937	Vistry Homes Ltd Vistry Homes Ltd

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	Plan. This has the potential to be misapplied.	documents will become material considerations in any future planning application for the site. There is no need to further indicate the high-level nature of figure 31.1			
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	Paragraph 2.C.6 of the policy currently seeks to restrict the location of community facilities to within or adjacent to the neighbourhood centre. However, Vistry recommends additional flexibility by allowing for a community facility to be provided in either neighbourhood centre or one of the proposed sports centre/ pavilions.	The policy currently says that new community facilities should primarily be in and adjacent to the neighbourhood centre. This does not prohibit the location of some facilities in conjunction with the proposed sports facilities.	None	1261249 1246937	Vistry Homes Ltd Vistry Homes Ltd
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of	The Council has failed the duty to cooperate as it has not engaged positively with the Parish Council over this policy. The Neighbourhood Plan	The process of preparing the Plan has been through a number of public consultations, beginning with the Growth Options consultation in 2020, which the Parish Council has	None	1259580 1246351	Tollerton Parish Council Tollerton parish Council

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	has been developed 'blind' and outside the plan making process for this important strategic site and there has been a significant lack of transparency. This is perhaps exemplified insofar as there is nothing within the plan (as a whole) that even acknowledges either the Tollerton Neighbourhood Plan or the many different Neighbourhood Plans that currently exist.	had opportunity to engage with. Neighbourhood plans form part of the Local Development Plan and as such the Tollerton Neighbourhood Plan will remain a material consideration in considering planning applications within the area.			
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	The proposed allocation is not adjoining, nor within a settlement and is separate from the urban area given the presence of the A52. The approach to the policy should therefore be a self-contained new settlement to ensure it is	The policy seeks to ensure that the new community is fully supported by necessary on-site education, community, retail, health, sports and recreational facilities in order to create a sustainable urban extension and thereby reduce the need to travel off site. At the same time, people will still need to travel	None	1259580 1246351	Tollerton Parish Council Tollerton Parish Council

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	sustainable and delivered holistically.	between the site and the adjoining urban area and beyond. For these trips, the policy includes requirements to maximise non-car means of travel.			
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	The policy is vague and lacks spatial specificity other than including some broad approaches. The way in which this site is to be brought forward is left to determination through future plans or strategies and subject to detailed studies and partnership working between the site owners and the local planning authority at a later date. The Parish Council request that that as part of this policy, and in any future documents and design elements, that local level	The level of detail included within the policy is appropriate for a local plan document. The policy states that the design and layout of the development will be informed by a masterplanning and design code process. Once adopted, these documents will be material considerations in deciding full planning applications for the site. Neighbourhood Plans also form part of the development plan and as such these too will be material considerations in deciding future applications.	None	1259580 1246351	Tollerton Parish Council Tollerton Parish Council

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	requirements as set out in the Neighbourhood Plan are fully integrated.				
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	Supports the need for a Supplementary Plan to support the site. To date, there has been no significant engagement by the LPA with the Parish Council over the preparation and progress of the SPD or for the adopted Neighbourhood Plan to influence the details of this document.	The council welcomes support for the preparation of supplementary guidance for development of the site. These will be consulted on before their adoption.	None	1259580 1246351	Tollerton Parish Council Tollerton Parish Council
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	Considers the site requires a larger scale housing encompassing residential development and hotels to support tourism particularly from nearby sports venues.	The neighbourhood centre on site is required by the policy to be of appropriate scale for the proposed housing development. It would be expected that large hospitality developments occur in locations which can assimilate their scale and operation.	None	1243454	Mr Atif Muneer
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation	The spatial portrait chapter makes no reference to the airport,	The spatial portrait concerns the overarching spatial, social and economic and cultural themes	None	1236329 1236340	Dr Martin Goodfellow

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	and this is a flaw as the airfield predates much local development. Argues major residential development is not incompatible with the airports running as there are larger airports situated near large residential areas. Suggests the council should not accept any harm to heritage assets and their setting. Questions how the airfield's heritage could possibly be preserved.	within the borough. The only specific assets mentioned are the borough's nationally significant sports facilities. As stated in paragraph 3.31.3 the need for the homes that will be delivered on the airport site is considered to justify its closure. Were the airport to continue operation, this land would not be available for development. The housing provided by the development justifies the impact development will have on the setting of heritage assets. It is expected that the development will mitigate harm to this setting by incorporating the pillboxes and some of the runway areas into new green infrastructure and thoroughfares, enhancing the accessibility and character of these assets.			
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation	Allocation of the site undermines Green Belt principles and the	The allocation does not fall within the Green Belt having been removed from it as part of	None	1239807 1243130 1242455	John Shankland Anthony Nowak Sarah Davis

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	biodiversity the site supports	the 2014 Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy. Development of the site is required to achieve Biodiversity Net Gain of at least the statutory figure of 10%. This will involve enhancement of Green Infrastructure including the Grantham Canal and woodland at the southern edge of the site to create defensible Green Belt boundaries.			
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	Concern that affordable housing will not be provided	All developments of 5 dwellings or more or over 0.2 hectares in the Borough are required to provide affordable housing. On strategic sites such as Policy 31 30% affordable dwellings will be sought in order to meet identified needs across the plan area.	None	1242460 1242829	Linda Hirst Sarah Smythe
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston /	States the Council has failed in Duty to Cooperate and that the plan has not involved cooperation on housing,	The Greater Nottingham Strategic plan is being prepared jointly between Rushcliffe, Nottingham City and Broxtowe Councils. The duty has been	None	1243256 1243493	Mark Ruston MBE Michael Dyer

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	transport and the environment. Also states there is no impact assessment for selection of allocating the site for housing.	complied with, as set out and justified in the separate Duty to Cooperate statement. The relevant assessments to justify the site's allocation have been undertaken and are available as supporting evidence.			
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	The policy is supported	Noted	None	1241199 1242617	Mr Christopher Smith Ms Susan Dyke
Policy 31: Strategic Allocation East of Gamston / North of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)	Policy is not supported.	The allocation is justified for the various reasons set out in the policy's justification text and the evidence supporting the GNSP as a whole.	None	1243477 1238722 1239862 1242182 1242449 1242863 1243502	Cameron Bell Lewis Foster Donna Osmond Shari Osborne Sharon Sanchez Benjamin Draper Kelly Valentine

Policy 32

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 32: Strategic Allocation Former Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station	There is insufficient mention of active travel within the policy and the requirements for walking and cycling infrastructure are vague.	The level of detail within the policy is considered sufficient.	None	1258397 1243511	David Rhead David Rhead
Policy 32: Strategic Allocation Former Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station	Support the removal of the site from the Green Belt, but the exceptional circumstances required to justify this change have not been stated.	While Paragraph 7.8 of the Green Belt Background Paper outlines the exceptional circumstances for the release of the site from the Green Belt, there would be merit in referencing the exceptional circumstances in the policy's supporting text	See Suggested Main Modification Document for suggested wording.	1260920 1243669	East Midlands Freeport Ltd East Midlands Freeport Ltd
Policy 32: Strategic Allocation Former Ratcliffe on	Additional flexibility could be added through the allocation. This could allow for earlier delivery of a wider range of already	In order to ensure that new development accords with the vision for the site, restrictions are placed on which uses are permitted on	None	1260920 1243669	East Midlands Freeport Ltd East Midlands freeport Ltd

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Soar Power Station	consented uses on the less constrained Southern Area, without affecting the overall limits of the LDO or increasing the total limit of logistics floorspace. This would give additional policy certainty to allow the site to respond to immediate market demands and help kick start delivery, contributing to the funding of further work and infrastructure to facilitate the wider site's delivery.	particular parts of the site. The Southern Area (south of the A453) in particular is expected to be a focus for advanced manufacturing producing technology or using technology to deliver the net-zero transition. The site's ability to support growth of such uses formed part of the very special circumstances for the LDO granting planning permission on land that was within the Green Belt at the time the LDO was approved in July 2023.			
Policy 32: Strategic Allocation Former Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station	We stress the importance of the phrase "for the purposes of delivering an industrial park focused on advanced manufacturing	Comments noted.	None	1260900 1249425	Gotham Ward Parishes and Borough Councillors Gotham Ward Parishes and Borough Councillors

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	(including technology needed to transition to net-zero), green and low-carbon energy generation and storage." The developer requirements mirror the Local Development Order (LDO) – which we support. We would oppose any divergence from the provisions of the LDO, particularly around land use on the south of the site and increases in the quantum of logistics.				(Consortium of Parish Councils)
Policy 32: Strategic Allocation Former Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station	We are concerned that traffic impacts from the development are only being considered in isolation. There is an urgent need for a rigorous, extensive Transport Study & Strategy for the A453,	It is considered that criteria 10 to 14 of the policy outline what is required in relation to transport and the provision of mitigation, both site wide and scheme specific. The LDO contains	None	1260900 1249425	Gotham Ward Parishes and Borough Councillors Gotham Ward Parishes and Borough Councillors (Consortium of Parish Councils)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	M1 J23 & 24, other major and local roads in co-operation with Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire & Leicestershire as well as the East Midlands Combined Mayoral Authority. This needs to set clear milestones and targets for delivery.	conditions in relation to transport mitigation.			
Paragraph 3.32.4 Radcliffe on Soar Vision	Support	Noted	None	1260900 1249426	Gotham Ward Parishes and Borough Councillors Gotham Ward Parishes and Borough Councillors (Consortium of Parish Councils)
Paragraph 3.32.5 Radcliffe on Soar land use restrictions	Support. The land south of the A453 is different in character to the North. Support for the redevelopment of the green/open South side is dependent on the	Noted	None	1260900 1249427	Gotham Ward Parishes and Borough Councillors Gotham Ward Parishes and Borough Councillors (Consortium of Parish Councils)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	land use restrictions in the LDO/GNSP.				
Policy 32: Strategic Allocation Former Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station	Whilst we support the policy allocating the land for development, we oppose the removal of the land from the Green Belt. We query whether the removal leaves a defensible Green Belt boundary in place. We are aware that it may be argued that as the land benefits from permissions under the LDO, not removing the land from the Green Belt via the Plan could be seen to be inconsistent. However, we note that any such inconsistency exists currently and that the link between land use restrictions and very special circumstances	Paragraph 7.8 of the Green Belt Background Paper outlines the exceptional circumstances for the release of the site from the Green Belt. It is considered that the proposed Green Belt inset predominantly follows features on the ground, such as roads and field boundaries capable of forming a defensible Green Belt boundary.	None	1260900 1249428	Gotham Ward Parishes and Borough Councillors Gotham Ward Parishes and Borough Councillors (Consortium of Parish Councils)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	is so intrinsic that keeping the land in the Green Belt is more appropriate. We propose that consideration is further given to safeguarding the South side of the site rather than releasing from the Green Belt.				
Policy 32: Strategic Allocation Former Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station	Supports the identification of the former Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station as a strategic industrial and logistics opportunity. However, the allocation of the power station as the largest employment site in the Plan is glaringly at odds with the overarching spatial strategy for growth set out in Policy 2. The plan is not sound, because it fails to locate strategic	The support for the Policy 32 is noted. The lack of a strategic scale residential allocation in the vicinity is addressed in response to separate representations.	None	1259949 1291479	Hallam Land and Davidsons Developments Hallam Land and Davidsons Developments

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	scale residential alongside the strategic employment growth at the former Ratcliffe-on-Soar power station.				
Policy 32: Strategic Allocation Former Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station	Historic England has been involved in the Local Development Order for this site and will continue to engage, as and when required.	Noted.	None	1262425 1246187	Historic England Historic England
Policy 32: Strategic Allocation Former Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station	The building of an energy from waste (EfW) incinerator at Ratcliffe on Soar does not comply with any sustainability and climate target. If it is built there will be overcapacity of incineration facilities in the area so, unless we import waste from abroad, we will be unable to meet our	The energy from waste facility benefits from planning permission which has been implemented.	None	1260679 1242553	Susan Edwards Susan Edwards

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	statutory targets of halving residual waste.				
Policy 32: Strategic Allocation Former Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station	NGED broadly supports the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan Regulation 19 version, subject to the retention of the statement in policy 32 that existing electricity infrastructure will remain on the site.	Noted		1260161 1243042	National Grid Electricity Distribution National Grid Electricity Distribution
Policy 32: Strategic Allocation Former Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station	Request the inclusion of the following requirement in the policy: "The development will include a strategy for responding to the National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) assets present within the site which demonstrates how the NGET Design Guide and Principles have been applied at the masterplanning stage	It is accepted that the policy could be strengthen by the inclusion of appropriate wording relating to existing electricity supply infrastructure on site. However, the wording suggested for inclusion in the policy is not considered acceptable in its present form because it refers to specific guidance that could change or be	See Suggested Main Modification Document for suggested wording.	1258563 1242813	National Grid Electricity Transmission National Grid Electricity Transmission

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	and how the impact of the development on the assets has been reduced through good design."	withdrawn. Alternative wording is proposed.			
Policy 32: Strategic Allocation Former Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station	Support continued rail use at the site.	Noted.	None	1262631 1243766	Network Rail Network Rail
Policy 32: Strategic Allocation Former Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station	Welcomes the reference in policy 32 and paragraph 3.32.9 to the need for improvements to J24 of the M1 and A453.	Support noted.	None	1260078 1245974	North West Leicestershire District Council North West Leicestershire District Council
Policy 32: Strategic Allocation Former Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station	This major site must include good Active Travel provision within the site and to other extended and improved routes nearby, especially in the A453 Corridor. Plans for such	The policy contains criteria in relation to transport improvements, including walking and cycling measures.	None	1261966	Pedals

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	provision should also be integrated with plans for a new foot-cycle bridge across the Trent.				
Policy 32: Strategic Allocation Former Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station	It is not clear how quickly this site can deliver the much-needed employment development required to meet the identified need. It is considered that the redevelopment of the existing power station will require significant works to decontaminate the site ahead of the development, which could take a number of years to come to fruition. We consider that greater detail needs to be provided setting out the delivery plan for this site and its associated infrastructure, which will	The site promoters, through the LDO documentation, have indicated that the site can be brought forward in phases, and phases that are currently free from development can be brought forward early.	None	1261609 1242845	Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	be crucial to ensuring that the development is deliverable within the plan period.				
Policy 32: Strategic Allocation Former Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station	Uncertainties and obstacles make the site's successful delivery highly doubtful. These include extended decommissioning and remediation timelines, severe infrastructure deficiencies, planning and regulatory ambiguities, market unpredictability, and broader contextual challenges. In comparison to alternative sites that are better prepared and less constrained, the site is a far less reliable option. Its inclusion in the plan with delivery by 2041 should be reconsidered in light of	The site promoters, through the LDO documentation, have indicated that the site can be brought forward in phases, and phases that are currently free from development can be brought forward early.	None	1290098 1258374 1291906	The Trustees of the late George Henry Oxby Deceased and T W Herrick & Sons Waverider Holdings Waverider Holdings Ltd (Mr Carrick Casson-Crook)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	these significant and unresolved concerns.				
Policy 32: Strategic Allocation Former Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station	Support the allocation's removal from the Green Belt. Suggest wording around "Neighbourhood Centre" on site change to match "Community Hub" described in LDO text. Similarly request that land uses in the policy include data centre and the red line boundary be changed to match the LDO. Question whether the development corporation should be specified if its powers are transferring to EMCCA	The term neighbourhood centre is consistent with the term used for all strategic sites within Rushcliffe. The policy clearly references the scope for a data centre under the employment uses. There is a minor difference in that the GNSP shows Remembrance Way within the site boundary. The only difference between the site boundaries in the two documents is the inclusion of the A453 running through the site. It is agreed that references to the Development Corporation need to be	See Suggested Main Modification Document for suggested wording.	1243690	Uniper UK Limited

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		removed from the policy's supporting text.			
Policy 32: Strategic Allocation Former Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station	Suggests the site should be allocated for large scale retail similar to Meadowhall or White Rose	The allocation of the site for employment and industrial development is formed by an identified need for employment within the borough over the plan period.		1235361 1235841	Atif Muneer Atif Muneer
Policy 32: Strategic Allocation Former Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station	Support the allocation of the land for development in line with the LDO. Would oppose any increase in the proportion of the site developed for logistics. Assets need for further transport studies in conjunction with Northwest Leicestershire and South Derbyshire	The policy asserts the parameters for development of logistics on the site to ensure these don't have negative impacts upon the surrounding infrastructure. Further transport assessments would be expected as part of detailed proposals for development. Engagement with National Highways and other relevant transport authorities will continue			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		throughout development			
Policy 32: Strategic Allocation Former Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station	Questions whether the provision for logistics floorspace across this allocation and policy 22 (Bennerley Coal Disposal Point) meet the identified need for logistics space and suggests the allocation of further sites to rectify this.	The demand/supply balance with regards to strategic logistics space is set out in the Nottinghamshire Logistics Study (2022) within the evidence base. This highlights how different sources including the strategic allocations mentioned contribute to the demand for logistics space. It is not considered that more prescriptive floorspace figures are required within this policy		1259453 1291898 1243758 1246990	Peveril Securities Limited & Omnivale Pension Scheme Richborough Commercial Peveril Securities Limited & Omnivale Pension Scheme Richborough Commercial
Policy 32: Strategic Allocation Former Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station	Refers to Policy 32 but includes no further information.	None	None	1243730	Roebuck Land & Planning Ltd

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policy 32: Strategic Allocation Former Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station	Supports the policy	Noted	None	1241200	Mr Christopher Smith

General Comments

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Other section of document	Deletion of Policy 23 Top Wighay Farm noted.	Noted.	None.	1259518	Ashfield District Council
Other section of document	EA additional comments: Water Framework Directive (WFD) Information is publicly available including data on ecological status via the Catchment Data Explorer, covering classifications from 2009-2019. The 2022 data is not yet available. Water Resource availability should be considered. Adaptive Investment for Growth Report highlighted as it	Comments noted. Water resource availability has been considered as part of the Water Cycle Study.	None.	1262360	Environment Agency

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	provides insights into environmental quality, threats, risks, and adaptive opportunities. The Environment Agency is developing a River Leen Strategy focused on flood risk management and sustainability for the Leen river corridor, aiming to reduce engineered flood risk assets and improve biodiversity in the light of increasing flood risk. This strategy will consider long-term changes and the role of strategic planning in managing future flood risks.				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Other section of document	Para 2.2.15 include reference to supporting environmental improvements within blue-green corridors eg River Leen Valley Corridor and the Erewash Valley Trail network. Para 2.2.24 change the word green corridors to 'blue-green corridors' Para 2.2.25 reference the Lower Trent and Erewash River Catchment which is part of the Humber River Basin District. Para 2.2.26 impacts from extreme heat is an important issue which needs referencing.	Consider wording is sound as drafted but suggest amendments to paragraphs based on the comments to provide additional clarity.	See Suggested Main Modifications Document for proposed wording.	1260515 1246131 1246132 1246133 1246134 1246135 1246136 1246137 1246145	Environment Agency

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	improving resilience to the impacts from flooding and extreme heat can go hand in hand. Also include the wording 'other watercourses, such as the River Leen, River Erewash and their tributaries…' Para 2.3.2 important that blue and green infrastructure are integrated within new development as opportunities and not as merely constraints. Suggested wording to incorporate: "blue and green infrastructure will become integral to the design of new development, supporting improved resilience in the face				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	of climate change, including supporting improved water quality, biodiversity and urban cooling." Para 2.3.6 amend to: "The area's unique built and natural environment will be protected and enhanced through sensitive, inspired and well-designed places, neighbourhoods and developments which will be strongly connected, inclusive and adaptive through multifunctional blue-green infrastructure. Environmental net gains will be integrated within and delivered alongside developments and				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	through connecting existing and newly created habitats and green and open spaces. This will integrate natural capital, adaptive growth and equitable environment principles." Para 2.4.1 - Climate change objective add reference to improving resilience, integrating nature-based solutions and reducing the urban heat effect Para 2.4.1 - Strong safe communities objective - add reference to nature. "leisure, ***nature*** and lifelong learning"				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Other section of document	Withdrawal of Gedling Borough Council undermines the GNSP's credentials and highlights the lack of cooperation and cross-boundary thinking and the negative approach the Plan takes regarding housing targets. The process of plan-making has not been followed from a legal perspective. This is a fundamental change to the subject of the Plan, so it requires a review of the overall spatial strategy.	The Councils continue to work closely with adjoining authorities, as demonstrated within Duty to Cooperate statements. It is considered that the GNSP is sound and legally compliant and there is no need to review the spatial strategy.	None.	1259950	Hallam Land and Davidsons Developments

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Other section of document	GNSP has been rushed out to conform with NPPF transitional arrangements. Remaining authorities should follow the example of Gedling and prepare a new plan.	Continuing with the GNSP is expedient in that it will ensure an adopted local plan is in place as quickly as possible. Preparing new local plans would take a minimum of 3 years, and would very likely be further delayed by Local government reform.	None	1290032	Aldergate Properties Ltd (C/O Agent)
Other section of document	Consultation Process - disappointed that concerns raised in December 2024 response have not been addressed. The current consultation is driven solely by Gedling's withdrawal.	Disappointment is noted. The Councils made clear the justification for the further consultation and provided an opportunity for comments to be carried forward.	None.	1262508	Home Builders Federation (Ms Rachel Danemann)
Duty to cooperate	It is unclear if the Duty to Cooperate has been met, particularly in light of Gedling's withdrawal	A Duty to Cooperate Statement, supported by Statements of Common Ground form part of the	None.	1262510 1246218	Home Builders Federation (Ms Rachel Danemann)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	and the ongoing Erewash Local Plan Examination, notably with neighbouring authorities in Leicestershire and Derbyshire. Surprising that GNSP authorities have not followed example of Erewash and looked at Green Belt opportunities to meet unmet need.	examination evidence base. The Statement of Common Ground with Erewash explains that Erewash are not meeting any unmet need from other authorities.			
Monitoring Indicators	Monitoring framework needs to be robust including and actions to address housing under-delivery, suggesting explicit measures to permit additional sites if necessary.	Consider the monitoring framework is robust. An early review of the GNSP would be undertaken in the event that there is significant under delivery.	None.	1262511 1246229	Home Builders Federation (Ms Rachel Danemann)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Other section of document	Consider GNSP should not proceed to examination, as each Council has to meet 80% of its need, and Broxtowe (73.8%) and Rushcliffe (76.0%) do not (table in representation). Full separate local plans should be prepared, or parallel GNSP and part 2 plans.	The Councils consider that the housing targets comply with the transitional arrangements. The Broxtowe and Rushcliffe figures have increased since the 2024 Reg 19 GNSP	None.	1258411 1258400 1258431	Langridge Homes Ltd (Mr David Fletcher) Langridge Homes Ltd (Mr David Fletcher) Trustees of Hammond Farm
Other section of document	Consider the GNSP is sound. Plan-making Authorities have considered comments made and taken them into account. The evidence base is considered to be relevant and appropriate.	Comments noted and welcomed.	None.	1259796	Mansfield District Council (Andrew Norton)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Duty to Cooperate	There is no evidence that the plan has been formulated with the cooperation of Erewash and Gedling that border Broxtowe – albeit those authorities chose not to be part off the GNSP process.	Statements of Common Ground have been produced to demonstrate cooperation which has taken place as part of preparing the GNSP.	None	1289565	Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum
Duty to Cooperate	Through process, GNSP authorities have engaged with MDC, including a Duty to Cooperate meeting. The previous Statement of Common Ground prepared when Gedling were involved will need to be refreshed. GNSP has met Duty to Cooperate with Mansfield District Council.	Comments noted and updated Statement of Common Group has been produced.	None.	1259793	Mansfield District Council (Andrew Norton)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Other section of document	Consider the GNSP to be legally compliant.	Comments noted and supported.	None.	1259794	Mansfield District Council (Andrew Norton)
Other section of document	Sets out structure of representations.	Noted.	None.	1262108	Marrons (Ben Ward)
Other section of document	Confirms response made on behalf of the of locally active developers and land promoters: • Barratt Homes North Midlands • Clarendon Land and Development • Davidsons Developments Limited • David Wilson Homes East Midlands • Gladman • IM Land • Northern Trust • Parker Strategic Land • Richborough	Noted.	None.	1262107	Marrons (Ben Ward)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	• William Davis Homes				
Other section of document	Nottingham City is incompetent so Rushcliffe and Broxtowe should not be part of the GNSP	The Councils are committed to working jointly as part of producing the GNSP.	None.	1259728	Ms. Sandra Atkin
Other section of document	Important that the Strategic Plan is consistent with and working towards the targets in the "Greener, Healthier, Happier Nottingham" open space strategy. Spatial strategy welcomed, especially reference to better access to open space. NOSF does not object to the vision and objectives for the plan but focus on	Comments noted. Open space provision would be considered as part of planning applications and site specific requirements are set out within policies.	None.	1262213	Nottingham Open Space Forum (Mr Ben Hunt)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	urban area results in a risk of pressure to deliver developments with minimal open space benefits.				
Other section of document	Summarises representations (addressed elsewhere in this document): Own the whole of Catstone Green; GNSP does not provide standard method housing targets; No exceptional circumstances to deviate from standard method; Use of transitional arrangements not consistent with national policy, positively prepared, justified or effective;	See separate responses to representations from consultee.	None.	1262549 1260205	Parker Strategic Land (C/O Agent) Parker Strategic Land Limited and William Davis Homes (C/O Agent)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Over-reliance on sites that have failed to deliver in the past; Plan will be out of date by 2026 in accordance with NPPF paragraph 78c) (December 2024); Broxtowe in particular has a record of poor delivery, site can deliver 2,200 homes in sequentially compliant location; Addresses housing shortall in full; Site is Grey Belt and makes a weak contribution to Green Belt.				
Other section of document	Agree very much that BGI assets should include cycle routes. Recommend improved cycling/walking link	Comments noted. Consideration in respect of cycling and walking routes is included under summaries for Policy 15.	None.	1261967	Pedals (Nottingham Cycling Campaign) (Mr. Hugh McClintock)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	from Waterside to Colwick Park and to reviving plans for a Greenway between Netherfield and Plains Road.				
Other section of document	Introduction to the suite of representations. Submitted. Plan fails to test reasonable alternatives and to identify sufficient land to meet Local Housing Need. Broxtowe Borough Council and Rushcliffe Borough Council as individual authorities do not meet the (200 below) 80% threshold. Urban	Comments noted and covered in detail under other parts of the consultation summaries.	None.	1260044	Persimmon Homes (C/O Agent)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	uplift for Nottingham not included. Increase between Regulation 18 and Regulation 19 is a cynical example of attempting to address the transitional arrangements.				
Other section of document	Concluding comments on representations GNSP has not provided adequate levels of housing or employment to meet the needs for growth. A full Green Belt Review should be carried out, and further consideration should be given towards GNSP ability	Consider that adequate levels of housing and employment have been identified to meet need. There is not a need for a full Green Belt Review as the Councils are meeting their need.	None.	1260075 1260061 1246701 1246716	Stagfield Group Stagfield Group

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	to meet housing needs, including the inability of Nottingham City to meet the 35% uplift.				
Other section of document	The Context of Greater Nottingham section is considered to be positive and ambitious It is considered that specific reference in this part of the Plan should be made to the City Centre being the principal centre for the city region and include recognition of the importance of retail to the vitality of the City Centre and the local economy. Plan should support for continued operation and	Comments noted. The plan and policies strongly support the City Centre. Further reference in the GNSP would however add clarity, and text changes are proposed in the context of Greater Nottingham section and in Policy 6 Nottingham City Centre justification text, where specific reference to the Victoria Centre will be made.	See Suggested Main Modification Document for proposed wording.	1259959	VCP Nominees Victoria Centre (C/O Agent)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	improvement of Victoria Centre, there is no reference within the Plan to the centre. This approach would be consistent with the Plan's evidence base in the form of the Centres Study.				
Other section of document	Summary of representation - the owners of the centre have plans to develop and improve it. The GNSP could go further in facilitating a thriving and productive City Centre over the plan period.	Noted.	None.	1259972	VCP Nominees Victoria Centre (C/O Agent)
Other section of document	Generally support the broad settlement hierarchy in section 2, in particular the role	It is considered the housing targets within the	None.	1259632	William Davis Homes (Hannah Price)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	of Key Settlements. However the housing requirement should be 51,084 homes consistent with the Standard Method.	plan are sound and justified.			
Other section of document	Proposes enhanced role for Civic Society in planning for an area of the City.	The Civic Society are a consultee on major planning applications in the City.	None	1243464	Mr Atif Muneer
Other section of document	Quotes para 1.3.1 but no other information in the form, apart form plan unsound.	Noted	N/A	1243725	Waverider Holdings Ltd (Mr Carrick Casson-Crook)
Other section of document (general comments)	Would wish to support the scope to evolve further the role of East Midlands Parkway to enable communities to easily access new employment uses at the former Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station site via rail.	Comments noted. The Councils are engaging with the relevant transport bodies in respect of strategic transport matters. This includes specific discussions in relation to A453 and M1 J24. Meetings have also taken place with North West	None	1243683	Leicestershire County Council (Mr Tim Smith)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	The proposals contained within the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan tie in with E Midlands Freeport aspirations for the future use of the former Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station site; the vision to move towards becoming a zero-carbon technology and energy hub for the East Midlands, supporting continued economic growth through modern industrial and manufacturing uses and helping meet the region's decarbonisation goals is clearly reflected in the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan. In the	Leicestershire in relation to growth plans in their area and growth around the airport. The Strategic Plan strongly supports sustainable transport methods. The IDP has been updated to reflect latest information regarding funding and to ensure that necessary infrastructure is in place to meet the levels of growth proposed and considers the impact on neighbouring areas, where growth in close proximity to these areas is planned.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	supporting text to Policy 32: Strategic Allocation Former Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station (Rushcliffe) reference is made to the Local Development Order (LDO) signed in July 2023 and in paragraph 3.32.6 reference is made to the limit on Strategic B8 floorspace (approximately 22% of the permitted floor area and restricting such uses to the Northern Area (north of the A453)). The 36.4ha of proposed Strategic B8 falls within this limit. The likely impacts on the A453 and M1 J24 need to be flagged given the significant				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	pressures on the Strategic Road Network. There is a need to engage with Leicestershire County Council when working on plans for improvements at M1 J24. It should be noted that there will be a need to coordinate efforts at cross-county boundaries, such as East Midlands Airport, Freeport and along Rushcliffe border, especially surrounding the Power Station developments, and developments close to Melton. This also includes the potential for future growth in NW Leicestershire as				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	well as the proposed growth areas as set out in the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan (llstrategicgrowthplan.org.uk), such as the International Gateway. Query what improvements are being made at the A52/A453 junctions/roundabout. Note consideration should be given as to how the proposed growth can help to improve sustainable travel to EM Airport. (Although the location falls in Leicestershire, the growth in Nottinghamshire will generate new travel demands to/from the East Midlands				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Airport) This also includes the need to access East Midlands Airport via all modes, particularly freight. There is a need for consideration and detail on the sustainable transport strategy, travel plan and plot travel plans required at the Power Station. Query what impact will the developments at Bingham have on the A46? Query what are the 'financial packages' for the various improvements funded via S106 or alternative means (e.g. CIL)? Proposed growth in the Greater Nottingham Strategic				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Plan area will impact on Loughborough, Coalville and Melton Mowbray, though note opportunities will arise from a greater use of services in the respective town centres and wider employee and customer base for local businesses.				
Plan Period	Plan period needs to be extended to 2043 to ensure a minimum 15 years.	Adoption is anticipated to be December 2026, providing a 15 year plan period.	None.	1261234 1261385 1261372 1260556 1261365 1259885 1261171 1261252 1261255 1262483 1258372 1243760 1246973	William Davis Homes Barratt David Wilson Homes (North Midlands) and Averill Land Limited Barratt David Wilson (North Midlands) Harworth Group Knightwood Developments

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
				1246951 1243733 1246701 1246716 1246218	Mr Richards and Mrs Hurst Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land (Land East of Gamston) Taylor Wimpey (Land West of Ruddington) Gladman Developments Ltd Waverider Holdings Ltd William Davis Homes (Mrs Hannah Price) Mr Richards and Mrs Hurst Knightwood Developments Waverider Holdings Ltd (Mr Carrick Casson-Crook) Stagfield Group

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
					Home Builders Federation
General	The Plan is difficult to understand and feels it fails to clearly communicate its impact on local residents. There is a lack of meaningful consultation, meaning most people will remain unaware of the plan's consequences until it's too late. Towns like Bingham, Radcliffe on Trent, and East Bridgford have been negatively affected by large-scale housing developments, leading to a loss of community character, increased pressure on infrastructure, and insufficient new	It is considered that sufficient consultation has been undertaken as part of preparation of the GNSP and a significant number of consultation responses have been received and have formulated the drafting of the Regulation 19 plan. The impact on infrastructure is considered as part of the GNSP.	None.	1259780	Mr Hardy, F.H.Farms

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	facilities. The overall sentiment is one of disappointment and concern, with a strong belief that planners are disconnected from the real-life impacts on South Nottinghamshire communities.				
Duty to cooperate	There is has been a failure to meet the Duty to Cooperate. This cannot be resolved at later stages of the plan-making process. It must be addressed now, with no further progression of the GNSP until the Partnership agree an approach, either amongst the constituent authorities, or with	The Councils have engaged with key stakeholders, organisations and authorities, as demonstrated within the Duty-to-Cooperate statement.	None.	1262486	Gladman Developments Ltd

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	neighbouring authorities outside of the Plan area, but within the HMA, to apportioning the additional unmet housing need for the area.				
Approach to Strategic Allocations / Policies 19 to 32	With regard to the fourteen Policies which relate to specific strategic allocations, we note that the dwelling capacity figures indicated for each allocation is only 'approximate'. Planning permission may be granted for proposals with higher or lower numbers of homes subject to the overall scheme being considered suitable and sustainable. Clearly, there is a risk	Assumptions have been made in respect of site capacity based on evidence. A large number of sites have planning permission in place. Monitoring indicators have been included and will be monitored to identify if there was significant under delivery.	None.	1259733	Hinchley c/o Brown and Co

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	that if lower numbers are delivered across the allocations, then this would further compromise the ability of the GNPP to meet their housing need				
Transitional arrangements	Support the production of the plan under the draft NPPF transitional arrangements.	Comments noted	None	1249416	Consortium of Parish Councils
First [un-numbered] paragraph of Section C	In the final sentence (and 'throughout the GNSP') it should be noted that 'there needs to be sufficient green/blue space devoid of human activity and access, and devoid of their pets'.	It is considered that there is a sufficient focus on the importance of green and blue infrastructure and the importance of multifunctionality which may includes spaces not used by humans or pets.		1261799 1261800 1245748	Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum
Section C	Several documents referred to in the	It is considered that the documents do not need	none	1261799	Chetwynd: The Toton and

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	justification text in this section [examples are given] should be referenced in the glossary or in footnotes, and links should be provided.	to be explicitly referenced in a glossary or footnote.		1261800	Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum
Appendix B: Glossary	The definition of Neighbourhood Plan should be expanded, so as to include the procedures for their production and their status.	It is considered that the existing description is appropriate.	None.	1261807 1245756	Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum
Appendix C	There are overoptimistic projected annual delivery rates for housing and not reflective of past performance. There has been significant under-delivery of housing in Rushcliffe and Broxtowe, raising doubts about the	The projected delivery rates are based on evidence and are considered to be realistic. The lapse rate is based on past trend analysis.	None	1246020	Aldergate Properties Ltd (C/O Agent)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	plan's effectiveness. In addition, the lapse rate in housing delivery is insufficient, given historical under-delivery.				
Appendix E: List of extant Supplementary Planning Documents	This appendix should also include a list of adopted and emerging Neighbourhood Plans for each Local Authority, which should appear in the appendix before the SPDs, because the GNSP 'does not adequately recognise Neighbourhood Plans as part of the Development Plan'.	The Strategic Plan does not change the status of adopted Neighbourhood Plans. It is therefore considered that there is not a requirement to list Neighbourhood Plans under Appendix E.	None	1261807 1245758	Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum
General	The Plan should encourage HS2 to compensate residents who have	This is not a matter for the Strategic Plan.	None.	1260176 1245737	Mr Neil Humphrey

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	been affected by HS2 safeguarding.				4QPR and for SSHBRA (Mr Neil Humphrey)
General	Broxtowe's SCI should have been amended, to exclude reference to Gedling, before the second Regulation 19 Publication took place.	It is considered that the SCI did not require updating prior to undertaking the consultation.	None.	1260671	Mr Neil Humphrey
General	The whole consultation process should be done again, or there should be a smaller consultation just concerned with modifications arising from HS2 safeguarding.	It is considered that there is no requirement to undertake the consultation again and that the consultation followed the relevant legislative requirements.	None.	1260176 1260668	Mr Neil Humphrey

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
General	The Trust 'has no comment to make on the draft Plan'.	Noted	None.	1259737	Canal & River Trust
General	Throughout the Plan, any references to the East Midlands Development Corporation (such as at paragraph 3.2.12) should be amended because 'EmDevCo has now been wound up with its projects passing to the East Midlands Combined County Authority'.	References to the East Midlands Development Corporation have been updated to refer to the East Midlands Combined County Authority.	See Suggested Main Modifications document for suggested wording.	1261789	Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum
General	The Plan contains several maps, figures and diagrams [examples are given] where the resolution is poor or which lack clarity. Some of the diagrams are	Noted. The final published plan will include higher resolution diagrams.	Include higher resolution images.	1261789	Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	therefore unreadable when expanded to see the detail. Hyperlinks might be provided to diagrams elsewhere with higher resolution and improved clarity.				
General	The wording within the justification text of several policies [examples are given] read as policy, with 'imperative' statements which should be policy.	This is considered separately under each policy.	None.	1261809	Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum
General	The Plan has 'an overly optimistic view of the importance of the City of Nottingham', with 'only a passing acknowledgement of the non-City areas'. Concerned about 'the	It is considered that there is an appropriate balance between the City of Nottingham and other areas. Alternative growth options were considered as part of the SA.	None.	1254187	Mr Mark Jarman

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	reliability and accuracy of the evidence that is being used to underpin this plan'. [Examples are not given.] The Plan should 'provide proper alternative options for debate'.				
General	Does not want Broxtowe Borough Council to join Nottingham City Council	Noted. This is not a matter for the Strategic Plan.	None.	1259606	Mrs Sue Sambells
General	Question whether Publication is 'a year premature', given recent changes regarding EMCCA, 'grey belt' and housing targets.	Noted. It is considered vital to continue preparing the Strategic Plan to ensure an up-to-date plan is in place.	None.	1254281 1243642	Beeston and District Civic Society
General	Local Plans will need to be updated as	Noted.	None.	1254281 1243642	Beeston and District Civic Society

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	soon as the GNSP is finalised.				
General	Beeston may need a Neighbourhood Plan.	This is not a matter for the Strategic Plan.	None.	1254281 1243642	Beeston and District Civic Society
General	Larger areas of Beeston need protection regarding HMOs.	Comments noted. This is not a matter for the Strategic Plan.	None.	1254281 1243642	Beeston and District Civic Society
General	There is no mention of Erewash River flooding in Stapleford and Attenborough.	It is considered that flooding is adequately dealt with in the Strategic Plan.		1254281 1243642	Beeston and District Civic Society
General	Concerned about the 'lack of resources for local government to	Comments noted.	None.	1254281 1243642	Beeston and District Civic Society

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	plan, deliver and monitor proposals'.				
General	'The lack of County Council input into the strategy and Policies 15 & 16 is of great concern.'	The County Council has been involved in the preparation of the Strategic Plan, including relating to transport infrastructure.	None.	1254281 1243642	Beeston and District Civic Society
General	BBC need to be more proactive in protecting non-designated heritage assets.	This is not an issue for the Strategic Plan.	None.	1254281 1243642	Beeston and District Civic Society
General	Develop brown sites in Mansfield, Hucknall, Sutton in Ashfield, Newstead and Kirkby in Ashfield. These areas are in dire need of investment, have huge amounts of brown sites and desperately need	Mansfield, Hucknall, Sutton in Ashfield, and Kirkby in Ashfield are in Manfield and Ashfield District Council areas. Gedling no longer forms part of the Plan area.	None	1239015	Mr Achyuth Menon

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	their local economy developing. There is absolutely no need to build on green sites in Ravenshead or any part of this county.				
Proposal to build 1000 houses on land off Main Road, Ravenshead (Gedling)	Identify different brownfield sites for housing development. Stop or significantly limit housing developments on greenfield land and near villages that are unable to cope with expansion on the scale proposed in the draft plan. For example, stop the 1000 housing development proposed for Main Road, Ravenshead. For developments in villages, drastically	Gedling no longer forms part of the Plan area.	None	1236104	Mrs Lisa Clifford

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	reduce the size of housing plans to ensure they can effectively integrate with the community without overwhelming amenities and infrastructure.				
Proposed building development at Ravenshead. Key Settlement Review, and all policies associated with this building proposal	The Equality Impact Assessment undertaken is not reflective of the potential negative impacts on existing residents, new residents (of different equality groups such as the elderly, disabled, children, pregnancy and maternity, and women (more likely to be carers/require childcare facilities)) and their access to services. This should	Gedling no longer forms part of the Plan area.	None	1235609	Mrs Susanna Dermody

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	then inform decisions relating to the proposed development. The Key Settlement review for Ravenshead has not been fully taken into consideration in relation to protected groups and provision of services.				
Document wide	The GNSP should be withdrawn as it does not comply with the NPPF Annex 1 Para 234 a and b, and work commenced immediately by each authority on new Local Plans combining strategic and non-strategic policies.	Transitional arrangements, which the GNSP complies with, were revised on publication of the 2024 NPPF.	None	1243302 1243396	Hammond Farms (Mr Robert Hammond) Langridge Homes Ltd (Mr David Fletcher)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Area G01: Ravenshead extension G01.2PA Silverland Farm, Ricket lane Site B	The current infrastructure including roads, schools and general practitioner services need major upgrades before an influx of 1000+ homes which could potentially mean accommodating around another 2000 to 5000 citizens and the services needed for them. This would have major financial implications, as well.	Gedling no longer forms part of the Plan area.	None	1236455	Mrs Minna Menon
General	Wish to work closely with promoters Harworth, Friends of Bennerley Viaduct, Broxtowe Borough Council, Nottinghamshire County Council and other organisations	Comments noted.	None	12436651	Awsworth Parish Council (Mrs Hayley Holt)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	with vested interests in the area. Consider it crucial to ensure that the proposed developments are innovative, high-quality and sustainable.				
General	Many of the assumptions used in the GNSP appear to be somewhat optimistic, particularly having regard to housing land supply and viability. The sequential approach to identifying some strategic sites for new residential development has not been followed; also there are serious question marks	Trajectories and assumptions are based on the most up to date information. The site selection document sets out the approach to site selection.	None.	1243396	Langridge Homes Ltd (Mr David Fletcher)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	regarding the deliverability of some strategic sites The development management policies set down in the GNSP are unnecessary as they are either covered by legislation and building regs (Policy 1), or duplicate policies to be found in Part 2 Local Plans.	Policies within the GNSP are necessary to provide a clear strategic policy basis for the plan area.			
General	Objects to: • Length and accessibility of the GNSP • Approach to strategic planning, including the relationship with Erewash Borough and Ashfield District • Approach to growth	The Plan is considered to appropriately address strategic planning matters. Local Plan preparation is a matter to be determined by each district. Erewash Borough is in Derbyshire, their Core Strategy Review is at examination.	None	1243714	Taylor Wimpey (Land West of Ruddington)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	targets, especially housing growth • Approach to assessment of housing supply in Rushcliffe Borough • Approach to employment development, in particular due to the objections to housing growth levels • The lack of a Green Belt review and identification of new land for housing, especially in Rushcliffe Borough • The approach to infrastructure which fails to adequately include development viability • The approach to a policy target for biodiversity net gain from development in	Ashfield are also at examination. The other points are addressed elsewhere in this report.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Rushcliffe Borough • The absence of policy and explanation on monitoring against targets and actions where delivery falls short				
General	To determine the minimum number of homes needed, strategic policies should be informed by a local housing need assessment, conducted using the Standard Method in national planning guidance. This has not been done for GNSP, because a previous version of the NPPF and Standard Method have been followed.	The GNSP is progressing under transitional arrangements set out in the 2024 NPPF.	None	1243695	Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land (Land East of Gamston)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
General	States that the Trust has no comment to make on the draft Plan.	Comments noted.	None	1243064	Canal & River Trust (Mr Ian Dickinson)
Built and Natural Environment	2.6.6 - Built and Natural Environment (p.29) The reference to extensive open space at the University of Nottingham Campus and Wollaton Park is misleading. Both these open spaces are the city boundary and Nottingham City Council have these factored in for their own population needs. No residential property in the Broxtowe Borough Council area is within 1 km walking distance of any access point to	Disagree, both open spaces are accessible to Broxtowe residents who live nearby.	None	1243243	Mr Michael Lyons

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Wollaton Park and very few such properties are within 1 km distance to an access point to the University Campus. Neither of these open spaces are within walking distance of the most populated areas of South Broxtowe. This unsubstantiated and misleading reference should be deleted.				
General comments	The plan is unsound without additional housing being identified and further Green Belt review and release. Land South of Nottingham Road, Cropwell Bishop is available for 80 residential dwellings. It is	The GNSP identifies sufficient provision for new housing for the reasons out in the Housing Background Paper. There is no requirement for this site to be identified as suitable for development.	None	1246988	Mr Richards and Mrs Hurst

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	suitable and developable to support growth within Cropwell Bishop across Rushcliffe and the Greater Nottingham area.				
General	The changes to the NPPF means the plan cannot be progressed and should be withdrawn and each authority should commence work on its local plan immediately, and make best use of the GNSP evidence base which is up to date.	Disagree – the Councils can justify why it is appropriate to continue with preparation of the GNSP, albeit without Gedling.	None	1250364	Trustees of Hammond Farm
General	The document is aspirational, particularly around improving access to active travel opportunities and	Disagree, where infrastructure is specifically required of development, then this is expected to be deliverable, taking into	None	1246318	Nottinghamshire Area Ramblers

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	access to public transport. Many of the ideas are not funded as yet and the impression is that developers will be asked/required to fund infrastructure as part of the development.	account likely funding sources and viability considerations.			
General	The district council do not consider that any further changes are required to demonstrate that the Strategic Plan has met the requirements of the Duty to Cooperate.	Comments noted.	None	1245968	Mansfield District Council (Andrew Norton)
Document wide	Mansfield District Council consider the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan to be Sound.	Comments noted.		1245972	Mansfield District Council (Andrew Norton)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Document wide	The plan is sound	Noted	None	1238876	Ruddington Parish Council (Miss Claire Dorans)
Document wide	Nottingham should improve shop fronts, clean the areas and even advertise the areas as 'alternative' areas as London, Manchester, Birmingham and Bradford do. Nottingham has such a rich history of ethnic minorities that have made a positive mark on this world in law, sports, acting and music, and it would be nice to see this promoted. Nottingham should invest or promote a	Comments noted. However, they are not matters for a strategic land use plan.	None	1243459	Mr Atif Muneer

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Mela, Eid events, Diwali events, European circuses and expand the excellent Carnival, St Patrick Day and Chinese New Year. Also Nottingham should do more to promote Asians, Africans, West Indians, Chinese, Arabs and Europeans to open more shops and build on the already rich ethnic diversity.				
Other section of document	Stop any plans for more houses in East Leake	The GNSP does not propose any further allocations in East Leake.	None	1242475	Sam Agar
General comments	Colston Bassett is a small settlement with no realistic public transport options car	Support for settlement hierarchy noted. The other comments are not	None	1246350	Colston Bassett Parish Council (Nick Stanford)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	transport will remain a necessity beyond the duration of this plan. New technology, materials and building practices will need to be considered within conservation villages such as ours. We support the streamlining of the planning process as reported in the national press allowing developers to offset losses of biodiversity and pollution so long as that fund is used to improve the environment in other planned areas.	related directly to the GNSP.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	We are aware that Nottingham is a target for extensive new housing development by the government, surely this will require major re-consideration within the plan once those details become available. We would be keen to see green spaces around the city rather than all boundaries extending. We support the development hierarchy and are keen to learn more about greenbelt classification where it relates to our village and the immediate locality.				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Public Rights of Way	Where any PRoWs from Long Eaton, Sandiacre, or Ilkeston meet the Greater Nottingham border, DCC would request that they should also be given such consideration and protected or improved if within a development area. The paths must remain available and unobstructed and on their legal alignment, with no disturbance to the path surface or encroachment on the path or path width, or installations made, without consulting the DCC's PRoW section.	Detailed matters relating to public right of ways will be addressed at the planning applications stage.		1246328 1246324	Derbyshire County Council (Mr David Michael Dale)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Climate Change	Welcomes the fact that most of DCC's Climate Change Team comments on the Strategic Plan Preferred Approach (DCC response dated 14 February 2023) seem to have been considered and applied in the Publication Draft.	Noted.	None	1246326 1246324	Derbyshire County Council (Mr David Michael Dale)
Employment	Suggest that in relation to employment matters in the Publication Draft, the importance of a growth in green/ low carbon skills, training and employment should be a stronger focus within the document.	Noted, the plan provides for employment in a full range of sectors, and this would include green/low carbon sectors.	None	1246326 1246324	Derbyshire County Council (Mr David Michael Dale)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
General comments	Policies should take account of issues, within and beyond statutory safeguarding zones regarding RAF Syerston and other MoD properties, with regard to issues such as birdstrike, solar PV and wind turbines.	Noted: policies do take account of these issues.	None	1245738	Ministry of Defence
General comment	The GNPP should organise the production of a 'Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan for Strategic Allocations' catchments'.	The site allocations policies contain appropriate detail on cycling and walking issues.	None	1243712	David Rhead
General comments	Concerns about the timing of the consultation.	The timings of both consultations are considered appropriate.	None	1246218	Home Builders Federation
General comments	Concerns about the approach to the transitional	The treatment of these issues is considered	None	1246218	Home Builders Federation

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	arrangements, housing requirements and the 35% uplift.	appropriate and is dealt with regarding policy 3.			
Other section of document	Active Travel England's statutory consultee role does not extend to local or strategic planning documents, therefore ATE does not currently intend to respond to any planning policy consultations that it does receive.	Noted.	None.	1245973	Active Travel England (Sir/ Madam)
Other section of document	Is the GNSP needed given the recently announced changes to the planning system? Should it be withdrawn and work commenced immediately in preparing new local plans by making use	It is essential to have an up to date local plan adopted as soon as possible.	None	1291892	Langridge Homes Ltd (Mr David Fletcher)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	of the evidence base documents? The development management policies set down in the GNSP are unnecessary as they are either covered by legislation and building regs (Policy 1), or duplicate policies to be found in Part 2 Local Plans. Also they are likely to be superseded by a set of national development management policies soon.				
Other section of document	Document is aspirational, particularly improving access to active travel opportunities and access to public	Noted.	None.	1246318	Nottinghamshire Area Ramblers (Judith Anson)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	transport. Many of the ideas are not funded and the impression is that developers will be asked/required to fund infrastructure.				
Other section of document	Doesn't believe Plan addresses the matter of Green Belt/Grey Belt Land and is worried this will result in the erosion of true Green belt land at the expense of areas which should not hold this designation and which could accommodate significant growth whilst preserving precious Green Belt /open countryside in Greater Nottingham. Also states that the lack of suitable C2	The Strategic Plan is being prepared against the 2023 NPPF and therefore does not need to consider grey belt. The provision of a range of housing is supported through Policy 8.	None.	1246862	Mr G Doug Smith

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	accommodation is substantially affecting downsizing from family properties and fails to address independent living for this age group and then later life care. Feels that the current version of the Plan could result in Greater Nottingham could be a target for the current governments drive to build their target of 1.5 million homes over the next 5 years unless the above matters are accommodated in your plan.				
Other section of document	The Forestry Commission also encourages	Policies 16 and 17 support the role of trees,	None.	1246034	Forestry Commission

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	authorities to consider the role of trees in delivering planning objectives as part of a wider integrated landscape approach. For instance through: • The inclusion of green infrastructure (including trees and woodland) as a requirement in and around new development. As stated in the Environmental Improvement Plan 2023 it is a strategic government	with a particular focus on green infrastructure.			(Mrs Sandra Squire)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	objective to increase the net area of tree canopy and woodland cover to 16.5% of total land area in England by 2050. Therefore, the Forestry Commission is seeking to ensure that tree planting is a consideration in every development not just as compensation for loss. • Promoting the use of home grown timber used in				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	construction as a sustainable building material, therefore reducing the embodied carbon emissions of new builds. In line with the Government's 25 Environment Plan (Page 47), the "Timber in construction" roadmap and the Net Zero Strategy.				

Housing Background Paper

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Housing Background Paper	Housing Land Supply and Delivery – provide insufficient evidence for windfall, therefore doubts about potential double counting and over-reliance on strategic sites which are susceptible to delay.	It is considered that the windfall is based on robust evidence. Further evidence has been provided in the Housing Background Paper.	None	1262109	Marrons (Ben Ward)
Housing Background Paper and Gedling Borough Council Housing Background Paper	Support the proposed housing target and have submitted Land at Cornwater for consideration as a housing allocation under Part 2 of the Plan.	Gedling no longer forms part of the Plan area.	None	1247795	Woolbro Morris Limited

Infrastructure Delivery Plan

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Infrastructure Delivery Plan	Representation includes generic guidance for LPAs on how to engage with NGED, and ensure development is located appropriately with regard to capacity and infrastructure. The GNSP is supported subject to retention of the following provisions within the plan: • Policy 19: Boots Major Employment Site: the commitment to further dialogue with National Grid regarding the requirement for a new transformer and a circuit from the site to Nottingham; and • Policy 21:Toton and	Comments noted.	None	1260156	National Grid Electricity Distribution (South West) Plc (Mr Nick Buxton)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Chetwynd Barracks Strategic Allocation: the acknowledgement that overhead lines on site may remain in situ, and if so, appropriate mitigation would be required; and • Policy 32: Former Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station: the statement that existing electricity infrastructure will remain on site.				
Infrastructure Delivery Plan	There is a need for alignment between the Strategic Plan and the D2N2 Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP), which has not been updated despite new developments. There is a need for	The Strategic Plan has sought to align with the existing LCWIP and Local Transport Plan. It is acknowledged that both of these are out of date and that the responsibility for updating these documents is with	None	1261951	Pedals

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	compatibility with upcoming Local Transport Plans, updated Local Plans, and national guidance, especially from Active Travel England and Sustrans. Failure to update LCWIP despite new developments violates DfT guidance. Key concerns include: Dropped LCWIP schemes (e.g., A453 and A6005 corridors) without replacements. Strategic Allocations (Policies 19–32) prioritize motor vehicles over sustainable transport, contradicting national	EMCCA, who the Councils will continue to actively engage with. The Strategic Plan supports active travel and there are strategic level active travel projects listed within Policy 15 as well as within site specific policies. A number of active travel projects are more localised and therefore would not be appropriate to include within a strategic level plan. Any schemes not directly related to strategic sites would need to be included within a future LCWIP, which will be prepared by EMCCA.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	planning policies and GNSP Policy 14. Compact, connected neighbourhoods to reduce car dependency are supported. Support the South-West Orbital and East-West cycling corridors, which should include specific infrastructure improvements (e.g., Clifton Bridge shared path widening). Developer contributions for Active Travel infrastructure should be planned in from an early stage, with coherent integration and signage. Micromobility trials, 'Wheel and Ride'	Other comments are noted.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	facilities, and bus/tram extensions, provided they support Active Travel, are welcomed. Improved rail access including transport interchanges are supported. Toton link road requires good active travel provision, and the wider development requires a new Trent crossing to link to Ratcliffe on Soar and better connections to the surrounding Broxtowe and Erewash areas. A453 improvements should include a revised version of the former Cycle Corridor scheme.				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	A52 corridor upgrades are required including the subway underpass infrastructure, which is not progressing. Major junctions to the south and east of West Bridgford require new cycle and pedestrian facilities.				
Infrastructure Delivery Plan	Concerned about the feasibility of rail freight link at Bennerley.	The site promoters have undertaken work in respect of rail feasibility.	None	1262381	Awsworth Parish Council
Infrastructure Delivery Plan	Primary access to Bennerley should be from the A610 only.	Comments noted. Policy 22 part C.8 says that 'Primary site access should be direct to and from the A610'.	None	1262381	Awsworth Parish Council
Infrastructure Delivery Plan	Awsworth should be specifically mentioned	Consider that there should be specific reference to providing connections to	See Suggested Main Modifications Document for Suggested Wording.	1262381	Awsworth Parish Council

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	regarding active travel measures.	Awsworth and Eastwood.			
Infrastructure Delivery Plan	Strongly supports proposals for a country park and other BGI at Bennerley.	Comments noted.	None	1262381	Awsworth Parish Council
Infrastructure Delivery Plan	Fully supports the requirement for development at Bennerley to be sensitive to the setting of the viaduct.	Comments noted.	None	1262381	Awsworth Parish Council
Infrastructure Delivery Plan	There is too much emphasis on road links and not enough on walking and cycling, including the permeability of development sites for pedestrians and cyclists.	It is considered that there is emphasis on prioritising active travel, including walking and cycling. The three pillars, "avoid, shift, manage and mitigate" have underpinned transport work undertaken as part of the evidence for the Strategic Plan.	None	1258398 1243656	David Rhead

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Infrastructure Delivery Plan	There is too great reliance on 'as-yet-unwritten LTPs'.	The EMCCA are preparing an LTP and the timescales are not in the control of the Strategic Plan authorities. However, EMCCA will be using the transport modelling as part of their evidence base.	None	1258398 1243656	David Rhead
Infrastructure Delivery Plan	As a 'stop-gap', the IDP should commit GNPP to producing a 'LCWIP for Strategic Allocations' catchments'. This should provide a 'systematic plan for the cycling/walking infrastructure needed to underpin the Strategic Allocations'. (An 'indicative draft' is provided.)	The LCWIP is a matter for the local transport authorities, not for the GNSP.	None	1258398 1258399 1243656	David Rhead

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Infrastructure Delivery Plan	There is too much reliance on Transport Assessments produced by developers, which may result in downplaying the need for infrastructure and services.	The GNSP is supported by independent transport modelling, not produced by developers.	None	1258398 1243656	David Rhead
Infrastructure Delivery Plan	The IDP indicates that there has been a failure to cooperate on transport issues by the various tiers of local government.	There has been full cooperation on transport issues with the relevant bodies, as documented within Statements of Common Ground and Memorandums of Understanding.	None	1258398 1258399 1243656	David Rhead
Infrastructure Delivery Plan	At the table following paragraph 4.68, the 'East-West cycle corridor' is not 'largely complete'.	Comment is accepted and it is suggested that the policy wording is updated.	See Suggested Main Modification Document for proposed wording.	1258398 1243656	David Rhead

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Infrastructure Delivery Plan	Various detailed changes are proposed to the constraints and infrastructure requirements regarding the site allocation policies.	Infrastructure requirements for the sites have been made on evidence and input from relevant stakeholders. Site specific matters raised are also considered under each policy summary.	None	1258398 1243656	David Rhead
Infrastructure Delivery Plan	Concerns are raised regarding the inclusion of Gedling in the IDP, who are no longer a part of the GNSP. Accordingly, the IDP should be updated to reflect the correct new housing and employment targets and to exclude Gedling. Until these updates are made, the robustness of the IDP as a supporting document for the	Including Gedling in the IDP allows for infrastructure requirements to be considered at an appropriate strategic scale. This will also allow for infrastructure to be consistently planned for across the area as part of the preparation of the Gedling Local Plan.	None	1261409	IM Land

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	GNSP remains in question, as it does not reflect the spatial scale and growth forecasts and is therefore unsound. This also raises significant concerns as to whether the infrastructure planning and delivery assumptions and conclusions are still valid, undermining the soundness of the GNSP and its ability to effectively support sustainable growth in accordance with policies within the NPPF.				
Infrastructure Delivery Plan	New residential development will generate demand for sporting provision and it is important to	Comments noted. An updated section on Sport and Recreation has been included in the IDP addendum.	None	1259910 1246117	Sport England

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	ensure that the Strategic Plan is based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the need for sports facilities. The list of Evidence Documents does not include any reference to assessments of the need for sport and recreational facilities. However, it is noted that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) lists the Playing Pitch Strategies for each of the local authority areas and makes reference to Leisure Facility Strategies which have been prepared. No information is provided on the Leisure Facilities Strategies.	Council-specific evidence will be updated as part of future plan preparation.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Playing Pitch Strategies need to be kept up to date, where a review has not been undertaken a PPS which is over 3 years old would not be considered to be up to date. The IDP does not provide any information on sports/ built sports facilities strategies for each of the local authority areas. Based on the above, it is clear that some of the evidence base for sports facilities is either missing or out of date.				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Sport England requests that: 1. The IDP is updated to provide the most up to date information on Playing Pitch Strategies and Sports/ Built Facilities Strategies for each of the local authority areas and to refer to the use of Sport England's Playing Pitch and Sports Facility calculators alongside an up-to-date evidence base to provide clear direction on how investment into sports facilities will be secured. 2. Where an up-to-date evidence base is not available the councils commit to carrying out the necessary playing				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	pitch strategy and sports/ built facility strategy work in line with our guidance on Playing Pitch Strategies and Assessing Needs and Opportunities for Indoor and Outdoor Sports Facilities.				
Infrastructure Delivery Plan	The IDP lists schemes at the following locations: • A453 Corridor (Clifton) • A52 Bramcote Island • M1 Junction 24 and Junction 24a • A52 Corridor (South of West Bridgeford) We welcome that the need for improvements at these locations has been identified in the IDP albeit with limited detail in respect	Noted. The Councils are engaging with EMCCA as part of the preparation of a new Local Transport Plan to take account of GNSP growth. The role of developer contributions is also recognised.	None.	1243052	National Highways (Catherine Townend)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	to delivery mechanisms and costings. We appreciate the IDP is live document that will be updated over time. Nonetheless, we would highlight that National Highways does not have any schemes currently planned at any of the above listed locations and there cannot be any presumption that such infrastructure will be funded through a future RIS. NH will work you in identifying realistic alternative funding mechanisms, to include other public funding programmes and developer led schemes.				

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Infrastructure Delivery Plan	The provision of adequate healthcare infrastructure is critical to the delivery of sustainable development. We support that the Council have considered a detailed approach to primary healthcare provision in conjunction with the ICS to ensure that the assessment of existing healthcare infrastructure is robust, and the mitigation options secured align with NHS requirements.	Comments noted.	None	1245984	NHS Property Services (Daniel Fleet)

Viability Study

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Viability Study	There is a lack of consistency across GNSP area in how developer contribution funds are allocated towards health. The S106 headroom identified as part of the site-specific testing is generally sufficient to enable financial contributions to be secured for healthcare. However, the difference in approach to healthcare funding across the strategic area could render development unsustainable and put future residents' health at risk. Recommend that the preparation of additional	The importance of health infrastructure is recognised. However, the requirements vary by site and all of the Councils engage with the ICB as part of the planning application process.	None	1260089	NHS Property Services (Daniel Fleet)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	guidance to provide a consistent methodology for collection of S106 developer contributions should be considered.				
Viability Study	Noted that re contributions towards healthcare have been identified in the policy requirements for site-specific testing, however there is a lack of consistency across the Greater Nottingham Strategic area in how developer contribution funds are allocated towards healthcare and there should be additional guidance.	All of the Councils engage with the ICB as part of the planning application process which includes how collected funds are allocated towards health infrastructure.	None	1260090 1245982	NHS Property Services (Daniel Fleet)
Viability Study	The study justifies concerns about delivery rates and the provision of affordable housing and/or infrastructure at	Viability has been considered through the study. There are active site promoters at Gamston, Chetwynd	None	1261395	Barratt David Wilson Homes (North Midlands) and Averil Land

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Gamston, Chetwynd, Broad Marsh and Bennerley.	and Bennerley. Broad Marsh is owned by Homes England.			

Key Settlements Review

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Key Settlements Review	The Key Settlements Review (September 2024) confirms that Cotgrave will remain a key settlement within Rushcliffe borough. IM Land support the decision to retain Cotgrave's status as a key settlement within the borough given the availability of services, facilities and access to public transport. However, the document should be updated to remove any reference to Gedling to align with the latest spatial strategy.	Comments noted in respect of Cotgrave. It is considered unnecessary to remove references to Gedling as this provides a consistent evidence base.	None	1261410	IM Land
Key Settlements Review	This document and the Plan is considered sound and legally compliant	Noted	None	1242185 1242165	Mr Mansfield Barker

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Key Settlements Review	It is pleasing to note that Aslockton continued to be classified as an "Other Settlement" in Key Settlements review, continuing its status as an "Other Village" in the Rushcliffe Local Plan. It is also good to note the significant constraints on development because of Flood Risk and that Aslockton, as a settlement, has "no potential for regeneration", meaning no allocation of sites for major housing development. However, a number of specific comments and queries are raised in respect of the details of the review in respect of Aslockton.	The comments made are not considered to materially affect the conclusions reached in the review document. Any subsequent review or updates to it would consider the comments made further.	None	1242206	Councillor Chris Grocock

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Key Settlements Review	Support Ravenshead being identified as a Key Settlement within the hierarchy. However disagree that Ravenshead has 'Low Accessibility' as identified at paragraph 2.7 due to a lack of rail and tram connectivity. Woolbro Morris Limited are promoting Land at Cornwater, Ravenshead to be released from the Green Belt and allocated for 50 new homes which will significantly contribute to Gedling's housing need.	Gedling no longer forms part of the Plan area.	None	1247797	Woolbro Morris Limited (C/O Agent)

Transport Modelling

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Strategic Transport Modelling	The Strategic Transport Modelling (STM) work, which should form part of the evidence base underpinning the plan, is not currently available. Concerns are also raised regarding the inclusion of Gedling in the Strategic Transport Modelling Background Paper. We request the opportunity to comment on and scrutinise this document once available, and prior to the submission of the local plan for examination. Without this document, it is not possible to determine whether the strategy is deliverable.	The Strategic Transport Modelling has now been completed. This will be published as part of submission. The inclusion of Gedling provides a strategic and consistent assessment of transport issues across the area.	None	1261411	IM Land

Habitats Regulations Assessment

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Habitats Regulations Assessment	Natural England has reviewed the HRA and is satisfied that the HRA follows accepted methodology and is in line with appropriate legislation and guidance. We acknowledge the screening process identified Likely Significant Effects within the GNSP that may affect Habitat Sites (European Sites), i.e. the Humber Estuary SAC/SPA/Ramsar, which have been further considered through an Appropriate Assessment. We also acknowledge that further assessment was carried out on the Sherwood possible potential Special	Noted and welcomed.	None	1258341 1243046	Natural England Natural England

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Protection Area (ppSPA) to ensure that a risk-based approach was followed. Natural England agrees with the conclusion of the HRA that the GNSP will have no adverse effects on the integrity of any Habitats Sites (European Sites) or the Sherwood ppSPA either alone or in combination.				

Policies Map

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policies Map Changes document	Welcomes the fact that land identified for the Country Park, and land south of the Viaduct, at Bennerley would remain in the Green Belt. However, in the Parish Council's opinion, the 'Location Plan' and 'Insert Plan (Proposed)' are inconsistent with the 'Red Outline' ('Site Detail') plan in this regard.	Read together (and read separately from the two maps on pages 5-6 of the document regarding 'Bennerley new site' and 'Inset Plan (Proposed)'), the three maps on pages 4-5, concerning 'Bennerley Green Belt deletion', are clear that the land for the Country Park (and land south of the Viaduct) would remain in the Green Belt.	None	1262381	Awsworth Parish Council
Policies Map Changes document	Concerned that the proposal to exclude from the Green Belt a strip of land to the east of the A6096 would increase pressure for housing development.	The changes to Green Belt boundaries in this location have been made to have regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so they can endure beyond the plan period.	None	1262381	Awsworth Parish Council

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Policies Map	Objects to omission of site west of Cotgrave as a housing allocation. Subject to its inclusion of for circa 200 dwellings within the GNSP, it is requested that the boundary of the site is included within Policies Map as a residential allocation and the site is shown to be removed from the Green Belt.	It is considered that there is a sufficient supply of sites without allocating additional sites. 200 dwellings is also below the threshold for strategic sites included within the Strategic Plan.	None	1261408	IM Land

Employment Land Needs Study

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Employment Land Needs Study	The Study should be 'refreshed'.	The Employment Background Paper explains how the study has informed the Strategic Plan, including extending the study period to cover the plan period.	None	1259946	Hallam Land and Davidsons Developments
Employment Land Background Paper	Meeting 10-20% of the residual logistics need is not unreasonable, but needs justification. Stanton North not delivered any strategic logistics to date. Plot ratio of 0.35ha is achievable, but trends show this is falling due to BNG etc.	The allocations for strategic logistics meet a significant part of the need identified in the logistics study, in an area constrained by Green Belt, and the site selection process is considered to be appropriate.	None.	1247798	GLP

Green Belt Review and Background Paper

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Green Belt Review	With regard to Appendix C (Broxtowe), 'the GNSP should include a long-term strategy for areas 36, 37, 38 & 39, either taking the decision to allow all of these areas to be developed and joining together Stapleford, Bramcote, Toton and Chilwell into a single conglomeration; or preventing development in those areas and continue the separation of those communities. The continued gradual diminution of the green belt only serves to add uncertainty and prevents a holistic development strategy.'	Decisions related to Green Belt boundaries in this location have been made with regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so they can endure beyond the plan period.	None	1261790 1261791	Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Green Belt Review	The Review should be updated to reflect Gedling leaving the GNSP.	It is considered that there is no need to update the review based on Gedling withdrawing. Including Gedling allows for a consistent evidence base across the wider area.	None	1260568	Harworth Group
Green Belt Review	Given the Plan is currently not delivering enough strategic warehousing and logistics floorspace in the plan period, propose that strategic policies within the Plan should facilitate further Green Belt review in this regard.	The GNSP proposes to remove land from the Green Belt in relation to strategic logistics.	None	1289570	Mulberry Land
Green Belt Background Paper	The Paper fails to provide context for the selection of the Bennerley site and should be updated to	The evidence base needs to be read as a whole. Exceptional circumstances are also	None	1260096	Harworth Group

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	cross-reference the Site Selection Report, Logistics Study and Logistics Background Paper.	clearly set out within the policy.			
Green Belt Background Paper	Understood that further assessments to be undertaken as part subsequent local plans preparation. This is supported, particularly in relation to Gedling, to ensure 'exceptional circumstances' are addressed regarding a shortfall of 1,044 homes needed to meet Gedling's housing target.	Gedling no longer forms part of the Plan area.	None	1247796	Woolbro Morris Limited
Green Belt Background Paper	The methodology of reviewing broad areas, rather than individual sites is supported as initial stage. However a further Green Belt	Relates specifically to the promotion of a site within Gedling. Gedling no longer forms part of the Plan area.	None	1250396	Burhill Group Limited (Joe Wyatt)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	review is needed to assess the potential of smaller areas of land for Green Belt release, with attention on weakly performing sites. South west of Calverton scores 9/20 in terms of its performance and therefore it is one of the weakest performing areas within Gedling.				
Green Belt Review: Gedling Appendix	The Green Belt Review, Appendix D, Gedling Borough Council, September 2024 includes analysis of the Top Wighay Farm site (Strategic Safeguarded Land). We would disagree with the 'check the unrestricted sprawl of settlements' purpose being given 2 out of 5,	Gedling are undertaking a separate Green Belt Review as part of the Local Plan preparation.	None.	1242006	Linby Parish Council (Ms Liz Gretton)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	given the proximity to Linby village. Note that the 'to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land' purpose has not been assessed. We would point out that the allocation of the Top Wighay Farm site, together with the other site allocations, have substantial implications for the viability of brownfield sites throughout Greater Nottingham, especially in the urban areas. This appears to be a fundamental failing in the report.				

Heritage Assets Assessment

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Heritage Assets Assessment	HE 'welcome the preparation of this evidence base document to provide additional evidence base to support the Local Plan process'. However, HE note that in some areas 'the detail is very limited'.	Comments noted. The Heritage Assets Assessment is considered to be adequate to inform the preparation of the Strategic Plan.	None	1262408 1262411 1246170	Historic England Historic England

Transport Evidence Base

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Transport evidence Base	National Highways are content with the use of the East Midlands Gateway Model and methodology to consider transport impacts. NH content with traffic growth forecasts. Content with TRICS 7.5.1 to derive trip rates. Some discrepancies for school trips, and B8 trip multi modal surveys are not available outside of London. Evidence of the modal split used should be provided. Based on the details shared in the meetings attended and the	The GNSP authorities have engaged with National Highways, and have agreed a Memorandum of Understanding. Further work has also been commissioned to understand the impact of the GNSP in more detail.	None.	1243050	National Highways (Catherine Townend)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	current modelling, we consider that further mitigation measures may need to be put in place to address the impacts presented on the SRN, and a plan for funding these measures shall need to be explored. In summary, National Highways is content to support the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan but is also concerned that the quantum of proposed development is likely to have a detrimental impact on the already congested SRN.				

Sustainability Appraisal

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Sustainability Appraisal Report	Land south of Wheatcroft Island, Edwalton should be scored more highly.	It is considered the site has been considered appropriately based on the SA Framework.	None	1261397	Barratt David Wilson Homes (North Midlands) and Averil Land
Sustainability Appraisal Report	At Table 13 (pages 84-86), regarding housing targets, option A should score more highly than option D and more justification is needed for the selection of option D.	It is considered the housing targets have been considered appropriately based on the SA Framework. The justification for the scoring is also explained within the SA.	None	1261397 1260591 1260150 1260568	Barratt David Wilson Homes (North Midlands) and Averil Land Harworth Group Strawson Group Investments
Sustainability Appraisal Report	'The Sustainability Appraisal should consider spatial options for the distribution of new development which test specific amounts of development in clearly defined spatial areas [...] Following this work to the SA, the spatial	It is considered that the assessment of different spatial options is appropriate to inform the preparation of the Strategic Plan.	None	1261318 1261459 1261436 1261444	Bloor Homes

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	strategy should be reviewed, and amended/updated as necessary to ensure it is the most appropriate strategy in light of the reasonable alternatives.'				
Sustainability Appraisal Report	The conclusions of the SA regarding policies 2 and 3 are 'partial and imbalanced'.	It is considered that the conclusions are appropriate based on the assessments and provide a balanced judgement.	None	1261459 1261436 1261444	Bloor Homes
Sustainability Appraisal Report	The SA has not been updated to reflect Gedling leaving the GNSP, which is 'a serious flaw'.	It is considered appropriate for the SA to include Gedling to ensure a consistent approach across the wider area.	None	1261459 1261436 1261412	Bloor Homes IM Land
Sustainability Appraisal Report	The SA 'does not robustly test options and fails to justify policy choices'. The 'main fundamental flaws'	It is considered that the SA robustly tests options and reasonable alternatives. The	None	1262479 1261412	Gladman Developments IM Land

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	relate to the options regarding the redistribution of Nottingham City's housing need, in Table 13 (pages 84-86).	Councils consider that the three options related to redistribution of Nottingham City's housing need are reasonable. The 35% uplift is also no longer relevant under the 2024 NPPF transitional arrangements.			
Sustainability Appraisal Report	Some sites of below 500 dwellings, such as at Melton Road, Tollerton, should be treated as 'strategic' and included in the SA.	It is considered that 500 dwellings is an appropriate threshold for the Strategic Plan. Sites below this will be considered as part of future plan preparation.	None	1260591	Harworth Group
Sustainability Appraisal Report	The SA 'does not properly assess the absence of a definition of non-strategic allocations that will need to be prepared'.	The SA is to inform the Strategic Plan and appropriately considers strategic sites. This is justified within the SA and the Site Selection Document.	None	1260058 1260046	Persimmon Homes

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Sustainability Appraisal Report	Disagree with the assessment of Option C in Table 13 (pages 84-86).	It is considered that the assessment has been undertaken appropriately based on the SA Framework.	None	1260058 1260046	Persimmon Homes
Sustainability Appraisal Report	The 'conclusion that Nottingham will meet its need from largely unidentified windfall sites is overstated and will not occur'.	Nottingham has a strong record of delivery and its trajectory is considered to be robust.	None	1260058 1260046	Persimmon Homes
Sustainability Appraisal Report	Land at Cossall Road, Trowell has the ability to provide 500 dwellings and should be assessed in detail in the SA.	The assessment of site capacity was based on information provided as part of site submissions or as part of an assessment of the sites. Sites under the threshold will be considered as part of future plan preparation.	None	1260150	Strawson Group Investments
Sustainability Appraisal Report	The larger area of land north of Trowell should be scored more highly.	It is considered that the assessment has been undertaken	None	1260150	Strawson Group Investments

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		appropriately based on the SA Framework.			
Sustainability Appraisal Report	The report 'gives no consideration to the anticipated delivery timescales of the strategic distribution and logistics sites proposed to be allocated'.	The SA considers that sites will be developed during the plan period.	None	1259445	Peveril Securities and Omnivale Pension Scheme
Sustainability Appraisal Report	Appendix F Gedling Sites: G01 Ravenshead Extension Disagree with outcome that extension to Ravenshead is a realistic option.	Gedling has withdrawn from the GNSP and is preparing a separate Local Development Plan.	None.	1242231	Mr Kieran Lucey
Sustainability Appraisal Report	The SA acknowledges increased house prices, especially in Rushcliffe. Homelessness is also high. Population has also increased significantly. Increased	The housing targets and site selections are considered appropriate, and further allocations are not required.	None	1247169	William Davis Homes (Mrs Hannah Price)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	housing delivery will mitigate house price rises. North Ruddington site could contribute to this.				
Sustainability Appraisal	Deem that the Sustainability Appraisal, in relation to Policy 3, is not legally compliant. It does not properly assess the absence of a definition of non-strategic allocations that will need to be prepared. In Table 13 of the Sustainability Appraisal, Do not agree that 'C – Designate additional safeguarded land' has significant positive effects as we have fundamental concerns as to whether additional sites will become allocated. We also have concerns that	The SA is considered appropriate for a strategic plan.	None	1247821	Persimmon Homes (Mr George Breed)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	non-strategic sites would not make the same contribution to sustainable development in comparison to what Calverton could as a strategic release of safeguarded land ('Site G06.1PA'). Are confident that the conclusion that Nottingham will meet its need from largely unidentified windfall sites is overstated and will not occur. Therefore, these non-strategic sites will not come forward and will not meet the need in full.	Calverton is in Gelding. Gelding has withdrawn from the GNSP preparation, and are preparing a standalone Local Development Plan. Nottingham has a history of strong delivery, including significant windfall development. The housing target for Nottingham is therefore considered appropriate.			
Sustainability Appraisal	The Sustainability Appraisal should be reviewed to provide assessments of	The SA is considered appropriate for a strategic plan. It is not considered the	None	1246834	Harworth Group

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	strategic sites which are reflective to the size of settlement in which they are located. This will provide accurate assessments of sites, which will in turn allow for sustainable development across the Borough. This will also allow the GNPP to meet the unmet 35% uplift from Nottingham City, through the identification of sustainable, reasonable sites in the Green Belt that are located on the edge of settlements, such as Tollerton. Furthermore, sites of a scale of that at the land off Melton Road, Tollerton (approximately 475 dwellings), will be able to provide housing within the initial years of	allocation of further sites is necessary.			

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	the Plan period following adoption, ensuring that the housing needs within the short term are met.				
Sustainability Appraisal	Consider that the Sustainability Appraisal scoring should be re-visited in light of this information to allow for a fair and proper scoring process of the sites to take place and to ensure that the evidence base that underpins the Publication Draft Plan is fully considered and the plan is justified. As part of the Preferred Approach the SA was informed by a number of Growth Options. As set out above this considered Housing Distributions and the	The SA scoring is appropriate, and ensures consistency of approach across all appraisals.		1246782	Barratt David Wilson Homes (North Midlands) and Averill Land Limited

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	need to deliver against the 35% uplift however it seems the responses received and assessment under this have been disregarded and removed from the updated SA report so that the GNPP can bring the plan forward under the transitional arrangements.				
Sustainability Appraisal	Remove site G01.2PA from supporting documents	Gelding has withdrawn from the GNSP preparation, and are preparing a standalone Local Development Plan.	None	1242889	Mrs Helen Lucey
Sustainability Appraisal	Re: G01.1PA: Larch Farm & Ricket Lane, G01.2PA Main Road & Ricket Lane and G01.3PA/4PA	Gelding has withdrawn from the GNSP preparation, and are preparing a standalone Local Development Plan.	None	1243647 1243848	Gedling Borough Council (Cllr Stuart Bestwick) Gedling Borough Council (Cllr Sue Pickering)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Nottingham Road & Grays Drive. Strongly objects to any of the above pieces of Green Belt land being included in any future housing development plans.				
Sustainability Appraisal	Site R13.1PA – West of Keyworth: Incorrectly described as adjacent to Ruddington (editorial error). Suggests the assessment overlooks the following: Loss of high-quality farmland and a sustainable local farm. Proximity to sewage treatment plant (air quality, odour, flies).	The sustainability appraisal notes the areas south of Bunny Lane to be within the "Ruddington Alluvial Farmlands". This is an area of landscape identified in the Greater Nottingham landscape Character Assessment. The assessment notes the majority of the points raised including the site containing features important to	None	1290358	Keyworth Parish Council (Mary Butler)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Flooding issues from stormwater runoff. Visual landscape impact. Lack of proximity to services (especially uphill access).	biodiversity and having moderate importance to the local landscape. Residential amenity such as odour from the sewage plant would be dealt with through the planning application process			
Sustainability Appraisal	The sheer scale of site G0.1.2PA on green belt is not in keeping with the settlement of Ravenshead (currently just over 2,500 dwellings) especially if other sites for this settlement are also adopted (potential grand total of over 4,000 dwellings – over 50% increase on current). The settlement of Ravenshead is currently established as being	These are detailed comments in respect of the settlement rather than the sustainability appraisal of the site. Gedling are considering the role of settlements as part of their own Local Plan.	None.	1247831	Mr Ian Johnson

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	within the boundaries of the A60, B6020 and minor local roads, Chapel Lane/Kighill Lane. Rickets Lane, currently a country lane, would need to be radically upgraded (B status) to run between the A60 and B6020 north of Blidworth (via Cross Lane & Blidworth Lane?), with traffic light-controlled junctions at either end.				
Sustainability Appraisal	The assessment of the housing requirement through the SA process has not been undertaken robustly.	Consider that a robust assessment has been undertaken in relation to housing requirement.	None.	1249409	Consortium of Developers

SHLAA

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
SHLAA	There is no robust information to demonstrate that the figures provided over that period are net of sites forecast within the SHLAA. Therefore have considerable concerns over the robustness of the assumed rate of windfall over the Plan period, as this is not justified by the evidence. The GNSP is underpinned by an assumption about the capacity of Nottingham City to accommodate development over the Plan period to 2041 in the amount of about 26,000 dwellings. A large proportion of that number (7,612) is expected from unallocated sites identified in the SHLAA. Surprisingly, the SHLAA	The Housing Background Paper and addendum provide further details in respect of housing supply and past windfall rates. SHLAAs are updated on an annual basis and are viewable on each of the Councils' websites.	None.	1245778 1249410	MyPad 2020 Limited (John Turner) Consortium of Developers

	has not been included within the evidence base currently subject to consultation. In addition, there is no clear breakdown of how the SHLAA has been used to inform the housing trajectory identified in the Housing Background Paper and the Plan. From a review of Nottingham City Council's January 2024 SHLAA, it includes Local Plan sites, but there is a separate category within the housing trajectory for allocated sites. It is not clear how the SHLAA has been sifted to avoid double-counting with other sources of supply, such as allocations.				

Site Selection Report

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Site Selection Report	Logistics Site Selection Report is flawed, as it does not follow the Iceni recommendations. Iceni suggest rail connectivity is not necessary in the Study area, however this has been prioritised by the GNSP. In addition, sites not within areas of opportunity are not considered. Given the shortfall of provision, they should be,	Rail connectivity is an important factor in future proofing development, and ensuring low carbon logistics sector can be developed. Both selected sites are brownfield, which the alternatives are not.	None.	1290078	The Trustees of the late George Henry Oxby Deceased and T W Herrick & Sons
Site Selection Report Appendix B: Gedling	An assessment should be included of Ramsdale Park Golf Centre Site A (the central parcel of Strategic Site G06.2/G06.3/G06.4PA), which we are promoting	Gedling has withdrawn from the GNSP and is preparing a separate Local Development Plan.	None.	1250411	Burhill Group Limited (Joe Wyatt)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	through these representations				
Site Selection Report	Proposes the criteria didn't follow Iceni evidence by giving weight to a rail connection.	While the initial logistics study which informed site assessment didn't consider rail served sites, a rail connection was viewed favourable to align with local and national policy on decarbonising freight. The absence of a rail connection didn't rule sites out of the selection process.	None	1291913	Richborough Commercial
Site Selection Report	The Report is inconsistent with policy 23 regarding the top Wighay Farm site.	Gedling is no longer part of the GNSP.	None	1242012	Linby Parish Council
Site Selection Report	Site GO1.2PA at Ravenshead is not a realistic option.	Gedling is no longer part of the GNSP.	None	1240231	Miss Louise Gungaram-Rolph

Omission Sites (Broxtowe)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Omission site in Awsworth	Objects to the omission of this site from the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan.	It is proposed that strategic sites at Field Farm, Stapleford; Boots; Toton Strategic Location for Growth and Land at Chetwynd Barracks should be carried forward as part of the GNSP. These sites are existing allocations either within the Aligned Core Strategy or within the Broxtowe 2 Part Local Plan. Due to these allocations, there is no requirement for the allocation of any new strategic housing sites.	None	1259533 1245841	Hall Construction Services Ltd
Omission site – south-west	Objects to the omission of this site from the Greater	It is considered there is sufficient employment land allocated without	None	1260082 1247789	Mulberry Land (Mrs Emily Bishop)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
of Shilo Way, Awsworth	Nottingham Strategic Plan.	the inclusion of additional sites.			
Omitted: More sites in sustainable settlements, such as Eastwood	Objects to the omission of sites from the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan.	It is proposed that strategic sites at Field Farm, Stapleford; Boots; Toton Strategic Location for Growth and Land at Chetwynd Barracks should be carried forward as part of the GNSP. These sites are existing allocations either within the Aligned Core Strategy or within the Broxtowe 2 Part Local Plan. Due to these allocations, there is no requirement for the allocation of any new strategic housing sites.	None	1262222 1242322	Define Planning and Design on behalf of Bloor Homes Limited (Mr Sam Perkins)
Omission site - east of Stapleford	Objects to the omission of this site from the Greater	It is proposed that strategic sites at Field Farm, Stapleford; Boots; Toton Strategic	None	1261435 1261442 1245883	Bloor Homes Limited (Sarah Milward)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Lane, Toton South	Nottingham Strategic Plan.	Location for Growth and Land at Chetwynd Barracks should be carried forward as part of the GNSP. These sites are existing allocations either within the Aligned Core Strategy or within the Broxtowe 2 Part Local Plan. Due to these allocations, there is no requirement for the allocation of any new strategic housing sites. Additional land has also been identified at Toton to enable delivery of the link road.			
Omission site - Hill Top Farm, Stapleford	Objects to the omission of this site from the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan.	It is proposed that strategic sites at Field Farm, Stapleford; Boots; Toton Strategic Location for Growth and Land at Chetwynd Barracks should be	None	1258959 1243540	Mr R Taylor and Bloor Homes (Mr R Taylor)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		carried forward as part of the GNSP. These sites are existing allocations either within the Aligned Core Strategy or within the Broxtowe 2 Part Local Plan. Due to these allocations, there is no requirement for the allocation of any new strategic housing sites.			
Omission site - east of Church Lane, Brinsley	Objects to the omission of this site from the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan.	It is proposed that strategic sites at Field Farm, Stapleford; Boots; Toton Strategic Location for Growth and Land at Chetwynd Barracks should be carried forward as part of the GNSP. These sites are existing allocations either within the Aligned Core Strategy or within the Broxtowe 2 Part Local	None	1259463 1261634 1261634 1243671	Mr Terry Anthony Barratt David Wilson (North Midlands) (c/o agent c/o agent)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		Plan. Due to these allocations, there is no requirement for the allocation of any new strategic housing sites.			
Omission site - 'Catstone Green'	Objects to the omission of this site from the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan.	It is proposed that strategic sites at Field Farm, Stapleford; Boots; Toton Strategic Location for Growth and Land at Chetwynd Barracks should be carried forward as part of the GNSP. These sites are existing allocations either within the Aligned Core Strategy or within the Broxtowe 2 Part Local Plan. Due to these allocations, there is no requirement for the allocation of any new strategic housing sites.	None	1259619 1262544 1245913	Stantec (Oliver Haydon) Parker Strategic Land Limited and William Davis Homes (c/o agent)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Omission site - Chilwell Lane, Bramcote	Objects to the omission of this site from the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan.	It is proposed that strategic sites at Field Farm, Stapleford; Boots; Toton Strategic Location for Growth and Land at Chetwynd Barracks should be carried forward as part of the GNSP. These sites are existing allocations either within the Aligned Core Strategy or within the Broxtowe 2 Part Local Plan. Due to these allocations, there is no requirement for the allocation of any new strategic housing sites.	None	1260975 1245764	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land (James Beverley)
Omission site - land to the south of Nottingham Road, Trowell	Objects to the omission of this site from the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan.	It is proposed that strategic sites at Field Farm, Stapleford; Boots; Toton Strategic Location for Growth and Land at Chetwynd Barracks should be	None	1260193 1245809	Parker Strategic Land (c/o agent)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		carried forward as part of the GNSP. These sites are existing allocations either within the Aligned Core Strategy or within the Broxtowe 2 Part Local Plan. Due to these allocations, there is no requirement for the allocation of any new strategic housing sites.			
Omission site - land at Coventry Lane, Bramcote	Objects to the omission of this site from the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan.	It is proposed that strategic sites at Field Farm, Stapleford; Boots; Toton Strategic Location for Growth and Land at Chetwynd Barracks should be carried forward as part of the GNSP. These sites are existing allocations either within the Aligned Core Strategy or within the Broxtowe 2 Part Local	None	1261819 1245781	MyPad (c/o agent)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		Plan. Due to these allocations, there is no requirement for the allocation of any new strategic housing sites.			
Omission site - Cossall Road, Trowell	Objects to the omission of this site from the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan.	It is proposed that strategic sites at Field Farm, Stapleford; Boots; Toton Strategic Location for Growth and Land at Chetwynd Barracks should be carried forward as part of the GNSP. These sites are existing allocations either within the Aligned Core Strategy or within the Broxtowe 2 Part Local Plan. Due to these allocations, there is no requirement for the allocation of any new strategic housing sites.	None	1260120 1245701	Strawson Group Investments Ltd (Cc/o agent)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Omission Site – Land to east of Awsworth	Objects to the omission of this site from the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan.	It is proposed that strategic sites at Field Farm, Stapleford; Boots; Toton Strategic Location for Growth and Land at Chetwynd Barracks should be carried forward as part of the GNSP. These sites are existing allocations either within the Aligned Core Strategy or within the Broxtowe 2 Part Local Plan. Due to these allocations, there is no requirement for the allocation of any new strategic housing sites.	None	1258192 1245841	Hall Construction Services Ltd (Sir/ Madam)
Omission site – Land at Woodhouse Way	Objects to the omission of this site from the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan for logistics.	The site is potentially suitable, however because of sites size and the absence of potential rail or tram	None	1259712 1259866	Stantec on behalf of Hortons' Estate R Salmon

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		access it is not a preferred site.			
Omission site – Land at Low Wood Road	Objects to the omission of this site from the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan for logistics.	The site is considered to be potentially suitable for strategic logistics development. However, due to the absence of rail connection, it was not considered a preferred site for allocation.	None	1259456 1243758	Peveril Securities Limited & Omnivale Pension Scheme
Omission site New Farm, Nuthall	Land at New Farm, Nuthall is a suitable location at which the identified shortfall in both large scale and strategic employment provision can be met and that exceptional circumstances exist to support its removal from the Green Belt owing to a clear unmet need for this type of employment land.	The site is considered to be potentially suitable for strategic logistics development. However, due to the absence of rail connection, it was not considered a preferred site for allocation.	None.	1258566 1242831	Wilson Bowden Developments (Land at New Farm, Nuthall)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Development at New Farm can be delivered within the next 5 years to meet the short term requirement for development, whilst the two identified preferred sites will take significantly longer to deliver.				

Omission Sites (Rushcliffe)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Omission site – Cotgrave	Objects to the omission of site west of Cotgrave as a housing allocation.	The GNSP identifies sufficient provision for new housing within Rushcliffe. There is no requirement for this site to be identified as suitable for development.	None	1261402 1246210	IM Land IM Land
Omission site – Keyworth	Objects to the omission of site east of Platt Lane, Keyworth as a housing allocation.	The GNSP identifies sufficient provision for new housing within Rushcliffe. There is no requirement for this site to be identified as suitable for development.	None	1261246 1247169	William Davis Homes William Davis Homes
Omission site – Ruddington	Objects to the omission of site west of Pasture Lane, Ruddington as a housing allocation.	The GNSP identifies sufficient provision for new housing within Rushcliffe. There is no requirement for this site to be identified	None	1261253 1243714	Taylor Wimpey (Land West of Ruddington) Taylor Wimpey (Land West of Ruddington)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		as suitable for development.			
Omission site – east of Gamston	Objects to the omission of land east of Gamston (south and north of Bassingfield Lane) as a housing allocation.	The GNSP identifies sufficient provision for new housing within Rushcliffe. There is no requirement for this site to be identified as suitable for development.	None	1261268 1243695	Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land (Land East of Gamston) Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land (Land East of Gamston)
Omission site – Aslockton	Objects to the omission of land north of Abbey Lane, Aslockton as a housing allocation.	The GNSP identifies sufficient provision for new housing within Rushcliffe. There is no requirement for this site to be identified as suitable for development.	None	1261338 1247035	Davidsons Developments Davidsons Developments
Omission site – Cropwell Bishop	Objects to the omission of land north of Memorial Hall, Cropwell Bishop as a housing allocation.	The GNSP identifies sufficient provision for new housing within Rushcliffe. There is no requirement for this site to be identified	None	1261345 1247135	Davidsons Developments Davidsons Developments

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		as suitable for development.			
Omission site – East Leake	Objects to the omission of land off West Leake Road, East Leake as a housing allocation.	The GNSP identifies sufficient provision for new housing within Rushcliffe. There is no requirement for this site to be identified as suitable for development.	None	1261349 1247049	Davidsons Developments Davidsons Developments
Omission site – Gotham	Objects to the omission of land east of Gypsum Way, Gotham as a housing allocation.	The GNSP identifies sufficient provision for new housing within Rushcliffe. There is no requirement for this site to be identified as suitable for development.	None	1261359 1247009	Davidsons Developments Davidsons Developments
Omission site – Keyworth	Objects to the omission of land at Nicker Hill, Keyworth as a housing allocation.	The GNSP identifies sufficient provision for new housing within Rushcliffe. There is no requirement for this site to be identified	None	1261342 1247001	Davidsons Developments Davidsons Developments

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		as suitable for development.			
Omission site – land south of the East of Gamston/North of Tollerton Strategic Allocation	Objects to the omission of land south of the East of Gamston/North of Tollerton Strategic Allocation as a housing allocation.	The GNSP identifies sufficient provision for new housing within Rushcliffe. There is no requirement for this site to be identified as suitable for development. The site would extend the strategic allocation. It is not expected to be fully built out within plan period, and, therefore, an extension to the strategic site would not necessarily result in additional housing delivery within plan period.	None	1261356 1247044	Davidsons Developments Davidsons Developments
Omission site – south of Edwalton	Objects to the omission of land south of Wheatcroft Island, Edwalton as a	The GNSP identifies sufficient provision for new housing within Rushcliffe.	None	1261398 1246785	Barratt David Wilson Homes (North Midlands) and Averill Land

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	housing allocation.	There is no requirement for this site to be identified as suitable for development.			Limited Barratt David Wilson Homes (North Midlands) and Averill Land Limited
Omission site – Cotgrave	Objects to the omission of land at Hollygate Lane, Cotgrave as a housing allocation.	The GNSP identifies sufficient provision for new housing within Rushcliffe. There is no requirement for this site to be identified as suitable for development.	None	1261382	Barratt David Wilson (North Midlands)
Omission site – Tollerton	Objects to the omission of land east of Tollerton (north of Melton Road) as a housing allocation.	The GNSP identifies sufficient provision for new housing within Rushcliffe. There is no requirement for this site to be identified as suitable for development.	None	1260592 1246819	Harworth Group Harworth Group
Omission site – Gotham	In advance of the site being considered as part of Rushcliffe's	The GNSP identifies sufficient provision for new housing	None	1260147 1246611	William Davis Homes William Davis

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Part 2 Local Plan Review, the representations submitted in this document are made to reiterate that land off Leake Road, Gotham should be considered suitable, available, achievable, and deliverable as a housing allocation.	within Rushcliffe. There is no requirement for this site to be identified as suitable for development.			Homes
Omission site – East Leake	Objects to the omission of land off Stonebridge Drive, East Leake as a housing allocation.	The GNSP identifies sufficient provision for new housing within Rushcliffe. There is no requirement for this site to be identified as suitable for development.	None	1262487 1246793	Gladman Developments Ltd Gladman Developments Ltd
Omission site – Whatton	Objects to the omission of land south of the A52 at Whatton for strategic distribution and logistics purposes.	A shortfall has been identified across the Logistics Study area. However, this is larger than the Strategic Plan area.	None	1261371 1246958	Knightwood Developments Knightwood Developments

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		It is considered that two appropriate sites have been identified for logistics development in the Strategic Plan, both of which benefit from potential rail access. Alternative sites were assessed and considered not appropriate due to a number of constraints, including Green Belt.			
Omission site – Cropwell Bishop	Objects to the omission of land south of Nottingham Road, Cropwell Bishop as a housing allocation.	The GNSP identifies sufficient provision for new housing within Rushcliffe. There is no requirement for this site to be identified as suitable for development.	None	1259886 1246971	Mr Richards and Mrs Hurst Mr Richards and Mrs Hurst
Omission site – Bunny	Objects to the omission of land at Bunny as a housing	The GNSP identifies sufficient provision for new housing	None	1261300 1246943	Northern Trust Land Ltd Northern Trust

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	allocation.	within Rushcliffe. There is no requirement for this site to be identified as suitable for development.			Land Ltd
Omission site – Ruddington	Objects to the omission of land east of Loughborough Road, Ruddington as a housing allocation.	The GNSP identifies sufficient provision for new housing within Rushcliffe. There is no requirement for this site to be identified as suitable for development.	None	1259906 1246808	Mr Woodhouse Mr Woodhouse
Omission site – Cotgrave	Objects to the omission of land at Hollygate Lane, Cotgrave as a housing allocation.	The GNSP identifies sufficient provision for new housing within Rushcliffe. There is no requirement for this site to be identified as suitable for development.	None	1259981 1242053	Cora Cora
Omission site – Whatton in the Vale	Objects to the omission of land off Old Grantham Road,	The GNSP identifies sufficient provision for new housing	None	1262378 1246868	Hallam Land Hallam Land

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Whatton-in-the-Vale as a housing allocation.	within Rushcliffe. There is no requirement for this site to be identified as suitable for development.			
Omission site - Cotgrave	Objects to the omission of land at Cotgrave Wood as a site for mixed-use development.	The GNSP identifies sufficient provision for new housing within Rushcliffe. There is no requirement for this site to be identified as suitable for development.	None	1259944 1246867	Alexandra Blue (Cotgrave) Ltd PMC Land and Planning Limited
Omission site – Kingston on Soar	Objects to the omission of land in the vicinity of Kingston on Soar as a housing allocation.	The GNSP identifies sufficient provision for new housing within Rushcliffe. There is no requirement for this site to be identified as suitable for development.	None	1268601 1247186	Hallam Land and Davidsons Developments Hallam Land and Davidsons Developments
Omission site – Tollerton	Objects to the omission of land off Tollerton Lane,	The GNSP identifies sufficient provision for new housing	None	1268607 1290301	Ceylon Tea Growers Association Limited

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Tollerton as a housing allocation.	within Rushcliffe. There is no requirement for this site to be identified as suitable for development.			Ceylon Tea Growers Association Limited
Omission site – Bingham	Objects to the omission of land north of Bingham as a housing allocation.	The GNSP identifies sufficient provision for new housing within Rushcliffe. There is no requirement for this site to be identified as suitable for development.	None	1268927 1246610	The Crown Estate The Crown Estate
Omission site – Cotgrave	Objects to the omission of land at Colston Gate, Cotgrave as a housing allocation.	The GNSP identifies sufficient provision for new housing within Rushcliffe. There is no requirement for this site to be identified as suitable for development.	None	1268969 1246639	Parker Strategic Land Parker Strategic Land
Omission site – East Bridgford	Objects to the omission of land north of Butt Lane, East	The GNSP identifies sufficient provision for new housing	None	1268934 1246704	Stagfield Group Stagfield Group

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Bridgford as a housing allocation.	within Rushcliffe. There is no requirement for this site to be identified as suitable for development.			
Omission site – East Leake	Objects to the omission of land off West Leake Road, East Leake as a housing allocation	The GNSP identifies sufficient provision for new housing within Rushcliffe. There is no requirement for this site to be identified as suitable for development.	None	1268939 1246721	Bloor Homes East Midlands Bloor Homes East Midlands
Omission site – Ruddington	Objects to the omission of land north of Ruddington as a housing allocation.	The GNSP identifies sufficient provision for new housing within Rushcliffe. There is no requirement for this site to be identified as suitable for development.	None	1268942 1243757	William Davis Homes William Davis Homes
Omission site – Sutton Bonington	Objects to the omission of sites in various sustainable	The GNSP identifies sufficient provision for new housing	None	1268948 1246650	David Wilson Homes East Midlands

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	locations, including land off Landcroft Lane, Sutton Bonington as housing allocations.	within Rushcliffe. There is no requirement for this site to be identified as suitable for development.			David Wilson Homes East Midlands
Omission site – East Leake	Objects to the omission of sites adjacent to East Leake as housing allocations.	The GNSP identifies sufficient provision for new housing within Rushcliffe. There is no requirement for this site to be identified as suitable for development.	None	1268952 1247019	David Wilson Homes East Midlands David Wilson Homes East Midlands
Omission site – west of Sharphill Wood, Edwalton	Objects to the omission of land at Edwalton, west of Sharphill Wood, where there could be sustainable opportunities for future growth, as a housing allocation.	The GNSP identifies sufficient provision for new housing within Rushcliffe. There is no requirement for this site to be identified as suitable for development.	None	1268956 1243544	John A Wells Ltd John A Wells Ltd
Omissions site – A46, east of Cotgrave	Objects to the omission of land west of the A46, east of	A shortfall has been identified across the Logistics Study area.		1268961 1243545	John A Wells Ltd John A Wells Ltd

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	Cotgrave, as a strategic logistics allocation.	However, this is larger than the Strategic Plan area. It is considered that two appropriate sites have been identified for logistics development in the Strategic Plan, both of which benefit from potential rail access. Alternative sites were assessed and considered not appropriate due to a number of constraints, including Green Belt.			
Omission site – land at 'Edwalton Triangle'	Objects to the omission of land at 'Edwalton Triangle' as a strategic logistics allocation.	A shortfall has been identified across the Logistics Study area. However, this is larger than the Strategic Plan area. It is considered that two appropriate sites have been identified		1291896 1268965 1243721 1246990	Richborough Commercial Richborough Commercial

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		for logistics development in the Strategic Plan, both of which benefit from potential rail access. Alternative sites were assessed and considered not appropriate due to a number of constraints, including Green Belt.			
Omission site – Jericho Farm, A46	Objects to the omission of land at Jericho Farm, A46 as a strategic logistics allocation.	A shortfall has been identified across the Logistics Study area. However, this is larger than the Strategic Plan area. It is considered that two appropriate sites have been identified for logistics	None	1268967 1243674 1246698	The Trustees of the late George Henry Oxby Deceased and T W Herrick & Sons The Trustees of the late George Henry Oxby Deceased and T W Herrick & Sons
Omission site - Land at Margidunum, north of Bingham	Land at Margidunum, north of Bingham should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for	Sufficient sites are identified to meet employment requirements without this site.	None	1288918 1246946	Whitefields Farm (Mr & Mrs Hammond) Mr and Mrs Hammond

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
	employment development.				
Omission site – land south of Fairham	Objects to the omission of land south of Fairham (alongside the A453) for strategic logistics.	A shortfall has been identified across the Logistics Study area. However, this is larger than the Strategic Plan area. It is considered that two appropriate sites have been identified for logistics development in the Strategic Plan, both of which benefit from potential rail access. Alternative sites were assessed and considered not appropriate due to a number of constraints, including Green Belt.	None	1291634 1243571	Oxalis Planning Oxalis Planning
Omission site – Simkins Farm, Adbolton, West	Objects to the omission of land at Simkins Farm, Adbolton as an	The GNSP identifies sufficient provision for new housing for the reasons out in	None	1246948	Havenwood Construction

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Bridgford	allocation for housing.	the Housing Background Paper. There is no requirement for this site to be identified as suitable for development.			
Omission sites – various	The following land opportunities for development in Rushcliffe exist: • Land to the north of A52, Radcliffe on Trent; • Land between The Fosse and A46, Bingham; • Land to the north and south of Nottingham Road / east of the A46, Stragglethorpe	The exact location and boundaries of the sites are not defined. The GNSP identifies sufficient provision for new housing for the reasons out in the Housing Background Paper. There is no requirement for this site to be identified as suitable for development.	None	1243558	Hawksmoor (Jonathan Wood)
Omission site – land south of Flawforth Lane, Ruddington	Objects to the omission of land south of Flawforth Lane, Ruddington as an allocation for housing.	The GNSP identifies sufficient provision for new housing for the reasons out in the Housing	None	1243704	Barwood Development Securities

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		Background Paper. There is no requirement for this site to be identified as suitable for development.			

Omission Sites (Gedling)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
Omission Site Gedling	Objects to development of sites in Gedling.	Gedling has withdrawn from the GNSP and are preparing a separate Local Development Plan.	None.	1250392 1243678	Anthony Strother Mr Paul Plowright
Omission Site Gedling	Refers to a SHLAA site in Gedling, but no other information included.	Gedling have withdrawn from the GNSP and are preparing a separate Local Development Plan.	None.	1235464	Miss Charlotte Stafford
Omission site - Land North of Lodge Farm Lane	Objects to the omission of land North of Lodge Farm Lane	Gedling have withdrawn from the GNSP and are preparing a separate Local Development Plan.	None.	1288888	Trustees of Hammond Farm
Omission site: New settlement at Calverton	Objects to the omission of a new settlement at Calverton.	Gedling have withdrawn from the GNSP and are preparing a separate	None.	1247814	Persimmon Homes

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		Local Development Plan.			
Ommission site: New Farm Redhill	Objects to omission of New Farm, Redhill.	Gedling have withdrawn from the GNSP and are preparing a separate Local Development Plan.	None.	1243711	Trinity
Omission site: Land off Lodge Farm Lane/Stockings Farm	Objects to omission of Land off Lodge Farm Lane/ Stockings Farm.	Gedling have withdrawn from the GNSP and are preparing a separate Local Development Plan.	None.	1243381 1243427 1250374	Hammond Farms Langridge Homes Trustees of Hammonds Farm
Omission site: Middlebeck Farm, Mapperley Plains	Objects to the omission of Middlebeck Farm, Mapperley Plains.	Gedling have withdrawn from the GNSP and are preparing a separate Local Development Plan.	None.	1243718	Barwood Development
East of Teal Close	Objects to the omission of East of Teal Close.	Gedling have withdrawn from the GNSP and are	None.	1247686	Midlands Land Portfolio Ltd (Robert Eaton)

Plan Policy / Topic	Main Issues Raised	Councils' Response	Possible Plan Modification	Response ID	Respondents' Name
		preparing a separate Local Development Plan.			

Appendix 2: List of Respondents

Consultation	User ID	Name
2024	57030593	(DNC) - Richard Anderson
2024	38942689	4QPR and for SSHBRA (Mr Neil Humphrey)
2025	38942689	4QPR and for SSHBRA (Mr Neil Humphrey)
2024	56355105	Active Travel England (Sir/ Madam)
2024	56769121	Aerodynamics Dry Leasing Ltd (Mrs Gillian Courage)
2025	59154529	Aiko Ramdin
2025	57097857	Alan Wilkinson (Dr Alan Wilkinson)
2025	59156129	Aldergate Properties Ltd (C/O Agent)
2024	27225889	Aldergate Properties Ltd (Mr Wayne Scholter)
2025	59180769	Alexandra Blue (Cotgrave) Ltd (C/O Agent)
2024	56599393	Alison Alison Lees
2025	56599393	Alison Alison Lees
2024	57070209	Alistair Greer
2025	59164449	Amber Valley Borough Council (Rachael Coates)
2024	57045537	Angelorange Ltd (Mr Lukas Willcocks)
2025	57045537	Angelorange Ltd (Mr Lukas Willcocks)
2024	56418657	Anthony Ducker
2024	56993889	Anthony Strother
2024	56771201	AOPA Member (Mr Stephen Nuttall)
2025	59096033	Arc Partnership (Mr Steve Keating)
2024	56716993	Arcstone Ltd (Mr James Astor)
2025	59156001	Ashfield District Council (Christine Sarris)
2024	57020129	Ashfield District Council (Mrs Melanie Wheelwright)
2024	27210497	Avison Young (on behalf of National Grid) (Mr Matt Verlander)
2024	27186657	Awsworth Parish Council (Mrs Hayley Holt)
2025	27186657	Awsworth Parish Council (Mrs Hayley Holt)
2025	59325409	Barratt David Wilson (North Midlands) (c/o agent c/o agent)

Consultation	User ID	Name
2024	27218337	Barratt David Wilson Homes (Mr Robert Galij)
2024	44708897	Barratt David Wilson Homes (North Midlands) and Averill Land Limited (Simon A...
2025	44708897	Barratt David Wilson Homes (North Midlands) and Averill Land Limited (Simon A...
2024	57080737	Barwood Development Securities Limited (Mr Sam Wilkinson)
2024	57088577	Beeston Civic Society (Gary Smerdon-White)
2025	57088577	Beeston Civic Society (Gary Smerdon-White)
2024	57040289	Beth Holmes
2024	27223393	Bidwells (Ms Suzi Green)
2024	57090049	Bloor Homes (Ms Sally Smith)
2024	44237505	Bloor Homes (Sally Smith)
2025	44237505	Bloor Homes (Sally Smith)
2024	42075777	Bloor Homes East Midlands (miss Jenny Brader)
2024	56956097	Bloor Homes Limited (Sarah Milward)
2025	56956097	Bloor Homes Limited (Sarah Milward)
2024	57056993	Boots UK (Mr Stephen Boyce)
2025	57056993	Boots UK (Mr Stephen Boyce)
2024	42116257	Boyer (Amy Harrison)
2024	44453665	Boyer Planning (Miss Olivia Price)
2024	57088865	Boyer Planning (Ms Fiona Duffy)
2024	56763041	Bradair Aviation Consultancy Ltd (Captain Brian Bradley)
2024	27187425	Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum (Dr Paul NATHANAIL)
2025	27187425	Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum (Dr Paul NATHANAIL)
2024	57972417	Burhill Group Limited (Joe Wyatt)
2024	57022433	Calverton Parish Council (Jane Walker)
2025	59165889	Camelot Pictures Ltd (Mr Thomas Evans)
2024	57621857	Cameron Homes (C/O Agent)
2024	27196865	Canal & River Trust (Mr Ian Dickinson)
2025	27196865	Canal & River Trust (Mr Ian Dickinson)
2024	56873473	Captain Richard Keech

Consultation	User ID	Name
2024	49845409	CarneySweeney (Sophie Drury)
2024	57374657	Carter Jonas (Laura Stops)
2024	56414177	Catherine Middleton
2025	57094625	CBRE (Mr James Tullett)
2025	29549985	Ceylon Tea Growers Association Limited (Mr Edward Cursham)
2024	32655425	Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum (Mr David Lovett)
2025	32655425	Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum (Mr David Lovett)
2024	32760417	Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum (Mr Ian Craik)
2024	56601665	Chilwell School (Mr David Phillips)
2024	56763073	Chris Bigos
2025	58843809	Chris Wade Aviation Ltd (Mr Chris Wade)
2024	57418561	Churchill Living (Lauren Bishop)
2025	59449537	Churchill Living and Mccarthy Stone Retirement Lifestyles (Sir/ Madam)
2025	56772737	Colin Cave
2024	57422433	Colston Bassett Parish Council (Nick Stanford)
2024	56599713	Compass North Aviation (Adam Harris)
2024	57871809	Consortium of Developers
2024	57872769	Consortium of Parish Councils
2025	58689185	Coolex Heat Transfer Ltd (Captain Steve Parker)
2025	59183041	Cora (Matthew Westwood)
2024	44708001	Cora Homes Ltd (Mr Robbie Locke)
2024	56941697	Cory Christman
2025	59086881	Cotgrave Town Council (Mr Norman Stuart Monday)
2024	56947297	Councillor Chris Grocock
2024	44688993	Councillor Lee Waters
2025	58979489	Darren Williams
2024	56772065	David Lock Associates (Mr David Akam)
2024	32708577	David Rhead
2025	32708577	David Rhead

Consultation	User ID	Name
2024	57507649	David Wilson Homes East Midlands (C/O Agent)
2024	27195809	David Wilson Homes East Midlands (Ms Helen Bareford)
2025	27195809	David Wilson Homes East Midlands (Ms Helen Bareford)
2024	57505889	Davidsons Developments (C/O Agent)
2025	57505889	Davidsons Developments (C/O Agent)
2024	57510209	Davidsons Developments Ltd (C/O Agent)
2024	44218433	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mr Paul Hinton)
2025	44218433	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mr Paul Hinton)
2024	56956033	Define Planning and Design on behalf of Bloor Homes Limited (Mr Sam Perkins)
2025	56956033	Define Planning and Design on behalf of Bloor Homes Limited (Mr Sam Perkins)
2024	57092097	Derbyshire County Council (Mr David Michael Dale)
2025	57092097	Derbyshire County Council (Mr David Michael Dale)
2024	57088289	Director - PMC Land and Planning Limited (mr Philip Coyne)
2025	56987297	DLP Planning (Miss Abi Upton)
2024	56982305	Dominic Banks
2024	27179265	Dr Alan Folwell
2025	27179265	Dr Alan Folwell
2024	56945377	Dr Anne Felton
2025	56945377	Dr Anne Felton
2024	56981985	Dr Catherine Vass
2024	56924161	Dr Felicity Couldwell
2024	56982881	Dr Heather Dowsett
2024	56599617	Dr Ian Jalowiecki
2024	56948577	Dr Ian Smillie
2024	57045377	Dr Joe Brennan
2025	59094401	Dr Mark Lidgett
2024	56557185	Dr Martin Goodfellow
2024	56485665	Dr Mohsen Koupaie
2024	56830369	Dr Patrick Holden

Consultation	User ID	Name
2025	56830369	Dr Patrick Holden
2024	56745057	Dr Peter Riley
2024	56487041	Dr Robert Kemp
2025	58957345	Dr William Robotham
2024	57072513	Dr. John Bratty
2025	57072513	Dr. John Bratty
2024	57027585	EA Maven (Mr Darrell Swanson)
2025	57027585	EA Maven (Mr Darrell Swanson)
2024	31675393	East Leake Parish Council (Mrs Susan Lewis)
2025	31675393	East Leake Parish Council (Mrs Susan Lewis)
2024	57372161	East Midlands Combined County Authority (EMCCA) (Ken Harrison)
2024	57089889	East Midlands Freeport Ltd. (Mr Paul Miller)
2025	57089889	East Midlands Freeport Ltd. (Mr Paul Miller)
2024	56745121	Electsau Designs Ltd (Mr Mark Saunders)
2024	57081505	EMCCA (Mrs Gina Malia)
2025	59014145	Emily Franklin
2024	57096897	Environment Agency (Joshua Milsom)
2025	57096897	Environment Agency (Joshua Milsom)
2025	27215041	Environment Agency (Sir/ Madam)
2025	59181409	Erewash Borough Council (Andrew Johnson)
2024	27221953	Erewash Borough Council (Mr Steve Birkinshaw)
2025	32669313	F.H.Farms. (Mr. Nicholas Forman Hardy)
2024	27191457	FORESTRY COMMISSION (Mrs Sandra Squire)
2024	56716225	G MOTI (mr KEITH HUNT)
2024	56744161	Gavin White
2024	57088385	Gedling Borough Council (Cllr Stuart Bestwick)
2024	57101057	Gedling Borough Council (Cllr Sue Pickering)
2024	43826561	Gedling Borough Councillor (Mr Martin Smith)
2024	57087809	General Aviation Awareness Council (John Gilder)

Consultation	User ID	Name
2025	59097025	General Aviation Awareness Council (Ms Ann Bartaby)
2024	27194657	Geoffrey prince Associates Ltd (Mr Geoffrey Prince)
2024	29367361	George Pickering
2024	57071617	George Stephens
2024	56905505	Giles Greensmith
2025	56905505	Giles Greensmith
2025	33725921	Gill Stevenson
2025	58454497	G-INAS (Mr David Barrington-Bullock)
2024	44683457	Gladman Developments Ltd (Mr Richard Naylor)
2025	44683457	Gladman Developments Ltd (Mr Richard Naylor)
2025	61465665	GLP (C/O Agent)
2024	50262945	GLP GLP
2025	30096385	Gotham Ward Parishes and Borough Councillors (Councillor Rex Walker)
2025	50609985	Green 4 Planning (Mrs Tamsin Cottle)
2024	57073985	GRL Planning td (Mr Gary Lees)
2025	59158337	Habinteg Housing Association (Rosanna Tunnadine)
2024	29743457	Hall Construction Services Ltd (Sir/ Madam)
2025	29743457	Hall Construction Services Ltd (Sir/ Madam)
2025	59153217	Hallam Land (c/o agent c/o agent)
2024	57493473	Hallam Land (C/O Agent)
2025	57493473	Hallam Land (C/O Agent)
2024	57095329	Hallam Land (Will Martin)
2024	57095649	Hallam Land and Davidsons Developments (Hallam Land and Davidsons Developments)
2025	57095649	Hallam Land and Davidsons Developments (Hallam Land and Davidsons Developments)
2024	27200001	Hammond Farms (Mr Robert Hammond)
2024	44668385	Harworth Group (C/O Agent C/O Agent)
2025	44668385	Harworth Group (C/O Agent C/O Agent)
2025	31879169	Harworth Group (Sir/ Madam)
2024	44588833	Harworth Group Plc (Mr Stuart Ashton)

Consultation	User ID	Name
2024	57501857	Havenwood Construction (C/O Agent)
2024	48943681	Hawksmoor (Jonathan Wood)
2025	27220289	Hayhoe Marine Services (Mr Martin Hayhoe)
2025	58785281	Heaton Planning (Mrs Louise Thorne)
2025	59164289	Hinchley c/o Brown and Co (C/O Tim Brown)
2024	44907425	Historic England (Kezia Taylerson)
2025	59453761	Historic England (Rosamund Worrall)
2024	45131297	Home Builders Federation (Ms Rachel Danemann)
2025	45131297	Home Builders Federation (Ms Rachel Danemann)
2024	55057281	Homes England (Mr Sam Rosillo)
2024	57068673	Ian Longhurst
2024	27196833	IM Land (Mr Ian Deverall)
2025	27196833	IM Land (Mr Ian Deverall)
2024	57069953	Independent Clerk for School Admissions (Mrs Doreen Richens)
2025	59181281	Integrated Care Board (Susan Clarke)
2024	57031553	James Baldwyn
2024	56946817	James Smith
2025	59097665	Jan Arins
2024	56830849	Jane GIFFOULD
2025	58932097	Jen Saunders
2024	56601409	JetAviation (New Zealand) (Mr Scott Wood)
2024	57002753	John A Wells Ltd (Mr Brian Wells)
2025	57002753	John A Wells Ltd (Mr Brian Wells)
2024	57031681	John Akinin
2024	56600513	John Bloor
2025	58578465	Judith Efford
2024	56989825	Julian Owen Associates Architects (Mr Julian Owen)
2025	29445185	JW Planning Ltd (Mr John Wyatt)
2025	59096833	Katie KEATING

Consultation	User ID	Name
2025	58964833	Kenneth Brian Fairholme
2025	59165761	Keyworth Parish Council (Cllr Mary Butler)
2024	28564609	Keyworth Parish Council (Ms Mary Butler)
2025	28564609	Keyworth Parish Council (Ms Mary Butler)
2024	56716513	Kinoulton Parish Council (Neil Oxby)
2024	57502081	Knightwood Developments (C/O Agent)
2025	57502081	Knightwood Developments (C/O Agent)
2024	56925665	Krista Krista Livsey
2024	27189217	Langridge Homes Ltd (Mr David Fletcher)
2025	27189217	Langridge Homes Ltd (Mr David Fletcher)
2024	57093569	Leaders Romans Group (Mr David Hutchinson)
2024	57089761	Leicestershire County Council (Mr Tim Smith)
2024	27205217	Linby Parish Council (Ms Liz Gretton)
2024	57374177	Lone Star Land Ltd (Reuben Bellamy)
2025	57374177	Lone Star Land Ltd (Reuben Bellamy)
2024	57069121	Lucie Mills
2024	57087937	Lynsey Button
2024	57365441	Mansfield District Council (Andrew Norton)
2025	57365441	Mansfield District Council (Andrew Norton)
2024	57092641	Mark Jabbal
2025	57871649	Marrons (Ben Ward)
2024	56762785	MBC ltd (Mr Paul McDermott)
2024	57420993	McCarthy Stone (Lauren Bishop)
2024	56356705	Member of Parliament (Mr James Naish)
2024	56598241	Midland Air Training Ltd. (Mr Ron Walker)
2024	44697505	Midlands Land Portfolio Ltd (Robert Eaton)
2024	57331073	Ministry of Defence (Mr Chris Waldron)
2025	59153857	Miss Allison Clarke
2025	59098913	Miss Amy Hanrahan

Consultation	User ID	Name
2024	56433057	Miss Charlotte Stafford
2025	59096129	Miss Dee Scott
2025	58967809	Miss Emily Lockett
2024	57071105	miss faye handfield
2024	57069697	Miss Jenni Bishop
2024	56974401	miss Kathleen Stapley
2024	56984033	Miss Kathy Shaw
2024	57074337	Miss Kelly Valentine
2025	59133249	Miss Kim Armstrong
2024	57031617	Miss Natasha Jones
2024	57010465	Miss Nicole Hanratty
2025	58924865	Miss Nina Livsey
2025	59162977	Miss Sarah Wilkinson
2024	57009409	Miss Tracey Auty
2024	56600833	MOD (Mr George Puttock)
2024	56720001	Mr achyuth menon
2025	58922369	Mr Adam Bilyk
2024	57072897	Mr Adam Kingswood
2024	57072737	Mr Alan Wright
2024	56872385	Mr Albert Olivier
2025	59098689	Mr Alex Brady
2024	57501601	Mr and Mrs Hammond
2024	56828865	Mr andrew broome
2024	57071553	Mr Andrew Dyson
2025	59112833	Mr Andrew Jewell
2025	59154753	Mr Andrew McLaughlin
2025	58534401	Mr Andrew Paulson
2025	59094529	Mr Andrew Taylor
2024	56693089	Mr Angus Stewart

Consultation	User ID	Name
2024	56762529	Mr Anthony Oliver
2024	56946785	Mr Antony Nowak
2025	59012833	mr Arthur Goetsch
2024	28994177	Mr Atif Muneer
2024	57028865	Mr Benjamin Draper
2024	57030337	Mr Bradley Atkins
2024	56761697	Mr Brendon Moran
2024	57073249	Mr Brennig Jones
2025	57073249	Mr Brennig Jones
2025	59154945	Mr Bryan Woolley
2024	56941377	Mr c bentley
2024	57073409	Mr Cameron Bell
2024	29294785	Mr Chris Kemp
2025	59098369	Mr Chris Whitehurst
2025	58558913	Mr Christian Charalambous
2024	56870433	Mr Christopher Bull
2025	56870433	Mr Christopher Bull
2024	57088417	Mr Christopher Meadows
2024	27185537	Mr Christopher Smith
2024	56494625	Mr Craig McAlees
2025	59164673	Mr Daniel Hood
2024	57073601	Mr Darren Short
2024	57073313	Mr Darren Wheeler
2025	58505089	Mr David Carter
2024	56602401	Mr David Cottam
2024	56762721	Mr David Craik
2025	56762721	Mr David Craik
2024	57010273	Mr David Greenwood
2024	56716385	Mr David Guilor

Consultation	User ID	Name
2024	56985505	Mr David Hobbs
2024	56485601	Mr David Skelton
2024	56718593	Mr David Taylor
2025	59033377	mr digby emson
2024	53206721	Mr Dominic Sweeney
2025	53206721	Mr Dominic Sweeney
2025	58639809	Mr Douglas Poole-Reid
2024	57073921	Mr Duncan Wylie
2025	57073921	Mr Duncan Wylie
2024	56712609	Mr Edward Pinnegar
2024	27190977	Mr G Doug Smith
2024	57073665	Mr Gary Goldsmith
2024	57048385	Mr Gary Thomas
2025	59127169	Mr Geoff Underwood
2024	56787425	Mr Gideon Ewers
2024	56780385	Mr Greg DAWSON
2024	56485345	Mr Harrison Phillips
2024	31442753	Mr Hayden Lester
2024	57066817	Mr Ian Johnson
2024	57078561	Mr Jak Swain
2025	58956385	Mr Jason Rimell
2025	58936609	Mr Jerry Skinner
2024	56694433	Mr Joe Lewin
2024	57094721	Mr John David Manson
2024	56699041	Mr John Milner
2025	56699041	Mr John Milner
2024	57034433	Mr John Proudley
2024	56777601	Mr John Shankland
2025	59163969	Mr John Stephen Dixon

Consultation	User ID	Name
2025	59004929	Mr John Truman
2024	56715457	Mr Jon Noble
2024	29344769	Mr Jonathan Good
2025	29344769	Mr Jonathan Good
2025	59098881	Mr Jordan Burke
2024	57028033	Mr Julian Buckley
2025	59016225	Mr Kevin Cai
2024	56643137	Mr Kevin Savage
2024	56948513	Mr Kieran Lucey
2024	56694721	Mr Kieran Ruston
2025	56694721	Mr Kieran Ruston
2024	56695329	Mr Lewis Foster
2025	58450465	Mr Lewis Parnell
2024	57073505	Mr Liam Furniss
2025	59104705	mr Malcolm Black
2024	27206785	Mr Mansfield Barker
2025	58476961	Mr Marc Shaw
2024	56715777	Mr Marcus Clarke
2024	56771457	Mr Mark Batin
2025	56771457	Mr Mark Batin
2024	57072449	Mr Mark Hancock
2024	56730177	Mr Mark Hickman
2025	58510145	Mr Mark Jarman
2024	57028257	mr Mark Onyett
2024	57068705	Mr Mark Ruston MBE
2024	56893697	Mr Mark Trought
2025	56893697	Mr Mark Trought
2024	56712769	Mr Martin Bowles
2025	27226401	Mr Martyn Tongue

Consultation	User ID	Name
2024	56694401	Mr Matthew Kay
2024	57030689	Mr Matthew Temple - Fry
2025	58998881	Mr Michael Berry
2024	57073825	Mr Michael G. Dyer
2024	27208929	Mr Michael Lyons
2025	27208929	Mr Michael Lyons
2024	56777281	Mr Michael O'Neill
2025	59030049	Mr Mike Godwin
2024	56695521	Mr Mike Guppy
2025	56695521	Mr Mike Guppy
2024	56948225	Mr Navaz Dean
2024	57074273	Mr Neil Foster
2024	56618561	mr Neil Murgatroyd
2024	56507393	Mr Nick Stubbs
2025	59163201	Mr Nigel Barkley
2025	58467233	Mr Omar Zambon
2024	27212993	Mr Paul Fileman
2024	57090241	Mr Paul Plowright
2024	56599489	Mr Paul Wheal
2024	56374945	Mr peter Davies
2024	57081153	Mr Peter Howarth
2025	58975681	Mr Peter Langridge
2025	59097153	Mr Peter Peter
2024	56694977	Mr Peter Stephens
2024	56982561	Mr Philip Dunn
2025	58908353	Mr Philip Glenn
2024	56793057	Mr Philip Mickelborough
2024	56981857	Mr Philip Nodding
2025	56981857	Mr Philip Nodding

Consultation	User ID	Name
2024	56948417	Mr R Harcourt
2024	56977857	Mr R Jephson
2024	57002945	Mr R Taylor and Bloor Homes (Mr R Taylor)
2025	57002945	Mr R Taylor and Bloor Homes (Mr R Taylor)
2024	56925697	Mr Rich Williams
2024	44047201	Mr Richard Farnsworth
2025	44047201	Mr Richard Farnsworth
2024	56599873	Mr Richard Lewin
2024	56617569	Mr Richard Menage
2024	57503489	Mr Richards and Mrs Hurst
2025	57503489	Mr Richards and Mrs Hurst
2025	58906433	Mr Rick Goold
2024	56485249	Mr Robert Bush
2025	56485249	Mr Robert Bush
2024	56825985	Mr Robert Crunkhorn
2025	56825985	Mr Robert Crunkhorn
2024	56696513	Mr Robert Dawson
2024	56397089	Mr Robert Hurst
2024	27218593	Mr Robert Wilson
2025	27218593	Mr Robert Wilson
2024	56720801	Mr Robin Batchford
2025	59157281	Mr Roger Chamberlain
2024	56417825	Mr Sean Staley
2024	56998561	Mr Sebastian Willcocks
2025	56998561	Mr Sebastian Willcocks
2024	56762689	Mr Simon Hobson
2024	27220929	Mr Simon Robinson
2025	58499617	Mr Siu Ki Lee
2024	57031713	Mr Sten Lai

Consultation	User ID	Name
2024	56717409	Mr Stephen Pearl
2025	59113537	Mr Stephen Wainer
2024	56599521	Mr Steve Hornsby
2024	57089921	Mr Terry Anthony
2025	57089921	Mr Terry Anthony
2024	57043937	Mr Tim Bell
2024	57019745	Mr Tom Walton
2024	56696385	Mr Tomas Miskinis
2025	58549569	Mr Tony Medlar
2025	59140257	mr trevor sexton
2024	56601153	Mr Wayne Long
2025	56601153	Mr Wayne Long
2025	58968161	Mr Wayne Morris
2024	57094593	Mr Will James
2025	59098081	Mr William Howie
2024	57480161	Mr Woodhouse
2025	57480161	Mr Woodhouse
2025	58639393	Mr Zac Marsden
2024	56600065	MRAeS (Mr Daniel Hayes)
2025	56600065	MRAeS (Mr Daniel Hayes)
2024	56982753	Mre Alison G-palmer
2025	56982753	Mre Alison G-palmer
2024	56488545	Mrs Ann Adkin
2024	56863873	Mrs Barbara Pugh
2025	56863873	Mrs Barbara Pugh
2025	44084417	Mrs Beverley Leonard
2024	56981889	Mrs Bridgette Davis
2024	56422689	Mrs Carol Wright
2025	59013377	Mrs Carole Hall

Consultation	User ID	Name
2025	59012641	Mrs Caroline Warren
2024	27186817	Mrs Catherine Haskew
2024	56830433	Mrs Chloe Holden
2025	57822945	Mrs Claire Naylor
2024	44727745	Mrs Clare Farley
2025	44727745	Mrs Clare Farley
2024	56507361	Mrs Dawn Evans
2025	58922753	Mrs Denise Stamp
2024	27190337	Mrs Diane Kidger
2025	27190337	Mrs Diane Kidger
2025	58959073	Mrs Dilys Addey
2024	56782401	Mrs Donna Osmond
2024	56946881	Mrs Dora Kostiuk
2024	56981953	Mrs Elizabeth Bohane
2024	27192353	Mrs Emily Quilty
2024	56924641	Mrs Emma Emery
2025	56924641	Mrs Emma Emery
2025	58922433	Mrs Emma Hughes
2024	56853409	Mrs Emma Thomson
2025	56853409	Mrs Emma Thomson
2024	56983713	Mrs Frances Robinson
2025	56983713	Mrs Frances Robinson
2025	58811425	Mrs Hannah Foskett
2024	56763329	Mrs Hannah Yates
2024	44703905	Mrs Harriet Pashley
2025	44703905	Mrs Harriet Pashley
2024	56981569	Mrs Helen Holmes
2024	56504865	Mrs Helen Joyce
2024	57030849	Mrs Helen Lucey

Consultation	User ID	Name
2024	56443393	Mrs Helen Moore
2024	56946209	Mrs Helen Terrington
2025	56946209	Mrs Helen Terrington
2024	56600609	Mrs Helena Webster
2024	56947521	Mrs Jackie Salmon
2024	56916737	Mrs Jane Baxter
2025	59151809	Mrs Jane Cook
2025	59096705	Mrs Jane Swingler
2024	56981921	Mrs Janet Burgess
2024	56722305	Mrs Janet Eastgate
2025	56722305	Mrs Janet Eastgate
2025	59139809	mrs jennie crabot
2024	56782945	Mrs Jennifer Ellison
2025	59092897	Mrs Joanne Pullen
2024	57073569	Mrs Julia Paterson
2025	57073569	Mrs Julia Paterson
2025	59015009	Mrs June Ellerby
2024	27186145	Mrs Kathleen Scriven
2025	27186145	Mrs Kathleen Scriven
2024	53227073	Mrs Kathryn Bull
2025	53227073	Mrs Kathryn Bull
2024	57028353	Mrs L Onyett
2025	27204961	Mrs Linda Boothright
2024	56716321	Mrs Linda Gothard
2025	56716321	Mrs Linda Gothard
2024	56398017	Mrs Lisa Clifford
2024	56925857	Mrs Lisa Drury
2025	59097089	Mrs Lisa Williams
2024	56744065	Mrs Louise Gilmore

Consultation	User ID	Name
2024	56484033	Mrs Louise Gungaram-Rolph
2025	59098753	Mrs Lucy Adams
2024	56599457	Mrs Lynda Crunkhorn
2025	56599457	Mrs Lynda Crunkhorn
2024	56467841	Mrs Lynette Armstrong
2025	58638689	Mrs Madeline Farrar
2024	57073217	Mrs Margaret Barr
2025	59164705	Mrs Margaret Bonney
2024	56984513	Mrs Margaret Grocock
2025	56984513	Mrs Margaret Grocock
2024	56948737	Mrs Mary Rhind
2025	59158529	Mrs Mary Willcocks
2024	57091457	Mrs Melody Cotes
2025	57091457	Mrs Melody Cotes
2024	57069729	Mrs Michelle Harrison
2025	57069729	Mrs Michelle Harrison
2024	56574817	Mrs Minna Menon
2025	44704417	Mrs Nicola Staley
2024	56828929	Mrs Pam Hill
2024	56944545	Mrs Pat Waite
2024	56388321	Mrs Paula King
2025	59098273	Mrs Poppy Skelton
2024	56437473	Mrs Rachel Hallam
2025	28766433	Mrs Rachel Salmon
2024	56505345	Mrs Rebecca Jones
2025	58811457	Mrs Sarah Blackhurst
2024	56945697	Mrs Shari Osborne
2024	56492705	Mrs Sharon Roberts
2024	56981761	Mrs Sharon Sanchez

Consultation	User ID	Name
2025	59097185	Mrs Shirley Cooke
2024	56997377	Mrs Sue Henson
2025	59158081	Mrs Sue Sambells
2024	56947937	Mrs Susan Hopkins
2025	59092513	Mrs Susan Wilks
2024	56471713	Mrs Susanna Dermody
2024	57092961	Ms Charlotte Powell
2024	56945921	Ms Elizabeth Whitehead
2025	56945921	Ms Elizabeth Whitehead
2024	56947425	Ms Francesca Potter
2024	56745281	Ms Glynis Williams
2025	58820641	Ms Jean Pring
2024	56989857	Ms Katherine Wilson
2024	56982337	Ms Krista Dunning
2024	56982017	Ms Linda Hirst
2024	56982689	Ms mandy Taylor
2024	57068545	Ms Melissa Solomon
2024	44476353	Ms Nicola Shaw
2025	58510657	Ms Nina Fisher
2025	59093249	Ms Rosie Shread
2025	59156961	Ms Rowena Hayward
2024	53206561	Ms Sarah Deacon
2025	53206561	Ms Sarah Deacon
2024	27223137	Ms Susan Bell
2024	57003649	Ms Susan Dyke
2024	56992737	Ms Susan Edwards
2025	56992737	Ms Susan Edwards
2025	59153889	Ms Tessa Bunby
2025	59096929	Ms V Friend

Consultation	User ID	Name
2025	32637921	Ms. Sandra Atkin
2024	42098177	Mulberry Land (Mrs Emily Bishop)
2025	42098177	Mulberry Land (Mrs Emily Bishop)
2025	59374657	MyPad (C/O Agent)
2024	44715329	MyPad 2020 Limited (John Turner)
2025	27197153	N/A (Mr Ian Stanley)
2024	57073121	Natasha Bacciarelli
2025	57073121	Natasha Bacciarelli
2024	44591073	National Grid Electricity Distribution (South West) Plc (Mr Nick Buxton)
2025	44591073	National Grid Electricity Distribution (South West) Plc (Mr Nick Buxton)
2025	59074561	National Grid Electricity Transmission (c/o Agent)
2025	59166561	National Highways (Brittany Grosvenor)
2024	44843809	National Highways (Catherine Townend)
2024	44474497	Natural England (Mrs Roslyn Deeming)
2025	44474497	Natural England (Mrs Roslyn Deeming)
2025	27182977	Neill Buckley
2024	57090017	Network Rail (Miss Emma Foster)
2025	57090017	Network Rail (Miss Emma Foster)
2024	44673633	Newton Nottingham LLP C/O Agent
2025	44673633	Newton Nottingham LLP C/O Agent
2024	57366241	NHS Property Services (Daniel Fleet)
2025	57366241	NHS Property Services (Daniel Fleet)
2024	27214977	North West Leicestershire District Council (Sir/ Madam)
2025	27214977	North West Leicestershire District Council (Sir/ Madam)
2024	57501409	Northern Trust Land Ltd (C/O Agent)
2025	57501409	Northern Trust Land Ltd (C/O Agent)
2024	56935617	Nottingham City Airport (Mrs Yvonne Burn)
2025	56935617	Nottingham City Airport (Mrs Yvonne Burn)
2024	57095297	Nottingham College (Mr James Swift)

Consultation	User ID	Name
2024	57087777	Nottingham Open Space Forum (Mr Ben Hunt)
2025	57087777	Nottingham Open Space Forum (Mr Ben Hunt)
2025	41501857	Nottingham Students' Partnership (Edward Towers)
2024	57400705	Nottinghamshire Area Ramblers (Judith Anson)
2024	27221729	Nottinghamshire County Council (Mr Stephen Pointer)
2025	27221729	Nottinghamshire County Council (Mr Stephen Pointer)
2024	44440481	Nottinghamshire County Council and Hallam Land Management Ltd. (c/o Nick c/o ...
2024	57002785	Nottinghamshire Sports Properties (Mr Tim Loveridge)
2025	57002785	Nottinghamshire Sports Properties (Mr Tim Loveridge)
2024	27182561	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (Mr Ben Driver)
2025	27182561	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (Mr Ben Driver)
2025	44434113	Omnivale Ltd / Newsholme Developments (Mr Adam Jones)
2025	58489825	Owen Leung
2024	44607425	Oxalis Planning (Mr Ben Holmes)
2025	44607425	Oxalis Planning (Mr Ben Holmes)
2024	57003009	Oxalis Planning (Mr Ben Holmes)
2025	57003009	Oxalis Planning (Mr Ben Holmes)
2025	59204097	Parker Strategic Land (C/O Agent)
2024	27180289	Parker Strategic Land Limited (Mr Andrew Bamber)
2024	31652577	Parker Strategic Land Limited (site at Cotgrave) (Mr Andrew Bamber)
2025	59469697	Parker Strategic Land Limited and William Davis Homes (C/O Agent)
2024	57355041	Parker Strategic Land Limited and William Davis Limited (Gareth Wilson)
2025	27212417	Pedals (Nottingham Cycle Campaign) (Mr Peter Briggs)
2024	27196577	Pedals (Nottingham Cycling Campaign) (Mr. Hugh McClintock)
2025	27196577	Pedals (Nottingham Cycling Campaign) (Mr. Hugh McClintock)
2025	59193409	Persimmon Homes (C/O Agent)
2024	27193825	Persimmon Homes (Mr George Breed)
2025	27193825	Persimmon Homes (Mr George Breed)
2024	50096577	Peveril Securities Limited & Omnivale Pension Scheme

Consultation	User ID	Name
2025	50096577	Peveril Securities Limited & Omnivale Pension Scheme
2024	44812673	Peveril Securities Limited (c/o Agent c/o Agent)
2025	44812673	Peveril Securities Limited (c/o Agent c/o Agent)
2024	57072065	Prof Norbert Schmitt
2025	27214721	Q+A Planning Ltd (Mr Peter Keenan)
2025	56823233	Quiet Tiger Aviation (Mr Christopher Hives)
2024	27219841	R Whitehead Concrete Ltd (Mr Chris Foulds)
2025	27219841	R Whitehead Concrete Ltd (Mr Chris Foulds)
2024	56172929	Ravenshead Newsletter (Mr Iain Walton)
2025	32669153	Resident (Mr Christopher Bruce)
2024	57090145	Richborough Commercial (. .)
2025	57090145	Richborough Commercial (. .)
2025	61465793	Richborough Estates (Mark Dauncey)
2025	59141633	Richborough Estates (Mrs Anabel Christmas)
2025	59032033	Robson Handling Technology (Mr Kevin Fearn)
2024	56974049	Roebuck Land & Planning Ltd (Mr Jim Rawlings)
2024	56599201	Rohan Chotai
2024	57069217	Ross Dickie
2025	59113217	Rula Developments Ltd (Mr Mark Hawthorne)
2024	27194465	Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group (Mr Gordon Dyne)
2025	27194465	Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group (Mr Gordon Dyne)
2024	32635425	Ruth Morgan
2024	56982081	Ryan McCondach
2025	57068897	S CRAWFORD
2024	56982273	Sam Agar
2024	56981825	Sarah Davis
2025	58923713	Sarah Pickard Brace
2024	57027297	Sarah Smyth
2025	59138465	save DSA (mr Mark chadwick)

Consultation	User ID	Name
2024	29783777	Savills (Mr David Bainbridge)
2025	59180577	Scott Pendry
2024	56416449	Shane Meakin
2024	56601761	Shane Meakin
2024	57014753	Sheila Weston
2024	57537953	Sherwood Conservatives (Belinda Kalka)
2024	56829505	Sherwood Flying Club (Mr Martin Adamson)
2025	59136449	Sophie Sloan
2024	57022369	SP Ashton
2025	57022369	SP Ashton
2024	50058753	Sport England (Mrs Julia Baish)
2025	50058753	Sport England (Mrs Julia Baish)
2025	44714561	Stagfield Group (C/O Agent C/O Agent)
2024	31873761	Stagfield Group (Sir/ Madam)
2025	57095777	Stantec (Jonathan Protheroe)
2024	57086177	Stantec (Miss Lanica Agnew)
2024	27224609	Stantec (Mr Tim Coleby)
2025	57094657	Stantec (Oliver Haydon)
2025	27221601	Stephanie Palmer
2024	57085697	Stephen Messenger
2024	44668417	Strawson Group Investments Ltd (C/O Agent C/O Agent)
2025	44668417	Strawson Group Investments Ltd (C/O Agent C/O Agent)
2024	56912001	Susannah Steel
2025	59092417	Swift Aero Maintenance (Mr Mark Davies)
2024	57085729	Swifts Local Network: Swifts & Planning Group (Mr Mike Priaulx)
2025	57085729	Swifts Local Network: Swifts & Planning Group (Mr Mike Priaulx)
2024	56946369	Swords Aviation (Ms Tetyana Shevchenko)
2025	56946369	Swords Aviation (Ms Tetyana Shevchenko)
2024	31993633	Taylor Wimpey (Land West of Ruddington) (Sir/ Madam)

Consultation	User ID	Name
2025	31993633	Taylor Wimpey (Land West of Ruddington) (Sir/ Madam)
2024	31997313	Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land (Land East of Gamston) (Sir/ Madam)
2025	31997313	Taylor Wimpey and Barwood Land (Land East of Gamston) (Sir/ Madam)
2024	57333089	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land (James Beverley)
2025	57333089	Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land (James Beverley)
2025	59156993	The Coal Authority (Melanie Lindsley)
2024	27215265	The Coal Authority / The Mining Remediation Authority (Mrs Melanie Lindsley)
2025	27215265	The Coal Authority / The Mining Remediation Authority (Mrs Melanie Lindsley)
2025	59205121	The Crown Estate (C/O Agent)
2024	57085889	The Crown Estate (Iona Cameron)
2025	57085889	The Crown Estate (Iona Cameron)
2024	56235553	The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council (Cllr Steve Calvert)
2025	56235553	The Labour Group, Rushcliffe Borough Council (Cllr Steve Calvert)
2024	57089153	The Trustees of the late George Henry Oxby Deceased and T W Herrick & Sons (. .)
2025	57089153	The Trustees of the late George Henry Oxby Deceased and T W Herrick & Sons (. .)
2024	57471745	The Trustees of the late George Henry Oxby Deceased and T W Herrick & Sons (N...
2024	57366817	The Victoria Centre Partnership (Holly Ganderton)
2024	44636321	The Woodland Trust (Ben Green)
2024	27215169	Theatres Trust (Mr Tom Clarke MRTPI)
2025	27215169	Theatres Trust (Mr Tom Clarke MRTPI)
2024	56594401	Theta Squared Aviation (Mr Paul Tolhurst)
2024	56712897	Tim Ball
2024	56694785	Tim Pinder
2025	56694785	Tim Pinder
2024	29932321	Tollerton Parish Council (Sir/ Madam)
2025	29932321	Tollerton Parish Council (Sir/ Madam)
2024	44704481	Tollerton Park. (Mr Ian Martin)
2025	44704481	Tollerton Park. (Mr Ian Martin)
2024	56781569	tor&co (Miss Zarina Ali)

Consultation	User ID	Name
2024	56981601	Town councillor (Mr Darren Stothard)
2024	29768033	Trinity College (Sir/ Madam)
2024	57970497	Trustees of Hammond Farm
2025	57970497	Trustees of Hammond Farm
2025	52237793	Turley (Holly Okey)
2025	59138177	Turley (Simon Zargar)
2024	27180865	Uniper UK Limited (Dr Andy Read)
2025	59181505	VCP Nominees Victoria Centre (C/O Agent)
2024	56600481	Victoria Webster
2025	57501217	Vistry Homes Ltd (C/O Agent)
2024	57501249	Vistry Homes Ltd (Jonathan Porter)
2024	57093441	Waverider Holdings Ltd (Mr Carrick Casson-Crook)
2025	57093441	Waverider Holdings Ltd (Mr Carrick Casson-Crook)
2024	57029697	Wellesbourne Matters (Mt Duncan Mackillop)
2025	31711169	Whitefields Farm (Mr & Mrs Hammond)
2024	45188129	William Davis (Miss Ellie Smith)
2025	45188129	William Davis (Miss Ellie Smith)
2025	28336033	William Davis (Mr Tom Dillarstone)
2024	57093377	William Davis Homes (Hannah Price)
2025	57093377	William Davis Homes (Hannah Price)
2024	48549761	William Davis Homes (Mrs Hannah Price)
2024	32000449	Wilson Bowden Developments (Land at New Farm, Nuthall) (Sir/ Madam)
2025	59075201	Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd (c/o Agent)
2024	57621249	Woolbro Morris Limited (C/O Agent)
2024	57096385	WSP (Mr Sam Pullar)