

Appendix 2: Summary of consultation comments on proposed LDO amendments

Consultee**Summary of Comments****Local and Strategic Authorities**

East Midlands
Combined County
Authority

Concerns that the information provided is too limited to form a clear view, and the short holiday-period consultation has restricted proper consideration.

Unclear how the revisions affect ambitions for advanced manufacturing and green energy.

Unclear whether the changes alter the original very special circumstances.

Not enough detail on how the development mix across the site may shift.

Further evidence needed to justify claims of no EIA impact, particularly for water and energy.

Question remains on the value of undertaking only a partial review at this stage.

Nottinghamshire County
Council – Planning
Policy

Supportive of data centre use in principle but shifting it to the southern site could risk the commercial attractiveness and delivery of the wider scheme.

Clarification is needed on how investment will help unlock the northern site.

Potential loss of advanced manufacturing uses on the southern site raises concerns about changing the original vision for green, low-carbon and innovative industries.

Possible environmental impacts from data centres—carbon, water, heat, e-waste—may alter the scheme’s effects, requiring reassessment of the original EIA.

Uncertainty over whether the environmental implications of the proposed revisions have been properly reviewed under EIA regulations.

Existing minerals and waste operations at Winking Hill remain relevant and must continue to be considered.

Archaeological matters pose no concern provided the ARMP is implemented.

Transport and flood-risk teams raise no objections to the revisions.

| Consultee | Summary of Comments |
|--|---|
| Nottinghamshire County Council – Archaeology Officer | Has no objection to the amendments, noting they do not affect archaeology, provided the existing Archaeological Remains Management Plan is implemented. |
| Nottingham City Council Highways | Does not object to the proposal. |
| Nottinghamshire County Council Highways | Considers data centre use acceptable on the southern site, noting it would generate relatively low vehicle trips and could contribute S106 funding. Confirms traffic impacts will be addressed through Certificate of Compliance checks and raises no objection to the LDO amendment. |
| North West Leicestershire District Council | States that they have no objections to the proposal. |
| South Derbyshire District Council | It is noted that there are no objections in principle to the proposed revisions, provided other statutory consultees are satisfied on technical matters. |
| Broxtowe Borough Council | Does not object to the proposal. |
| Charnwood Borough Council | Supports the LDO amendments, recognising the site's regional economic importance and its role within the East Midlands Freeport. They say the changes will speed up development and improve implementation, though they reserve the right to reassess their position as the impacts become clearer. |
| Rushcliffe Borough Council – Conservation | No change to heritage impacts. No objection. |
| Rushcliffe Borough Council – Environmental Health | No immediate environmental health concerns identified, with technical impacts expected to be assessed at the detailed stage. On that basis, no objections in principle are raised to the revisions and no further issues highlighted beyond the option to follow up if needed. |
| Parish Councils and Ward Members | |
| Ruddington Parish Council | Does not object to the proposal. |
| East Leake Parish Council | Supports data centre use in principle but insists the 10% on-site biodiversity gain must be retained and not |

| Consultee | Summary of Comments |
|---|--|
| | <p>replaced with off-site contributions.</p> <p>Seeks assurance that environmental measures (e.g., green roofs, solar panels) remain required and raises concern that plot-by-plot labour plans could exclude shared-site employees.</p> |
| <p>West Leake Parish Meeting</p> | <p>There is disappointment that the original green-energy and Freeport vision has largely fallen away.</p> <p>Strong concern remains over developing Green Belt land south of the A453 given its high biodiversity and limited existing disturbance.</p> <p>Traffic effects on rural lanes continue to be a major worry, with no clear mitigation plan in place.</p> <p>Landscape and biodiversity proposals are viewed as inadequate, with significant loss of green space compared with the existing site.</p> <p>A data-centre-led approach could reduce building height and traffic, though the lack of clarity on its scale creates uncertainty.</p> <p>The amendments are seen as an opportunity to secure better on-site BNG, enhanced landscaping, and potentially a country-park-type approach.</p> <p>There is interest in further dialogue to shape traffic management and protect rural areas.</p> |
| <p>Gotham Ward RBC Councillors and Parishes</p> | <p>There is strong objection to allowing data centres on the Southern Site, seen as weakening the original green, net-zero-aligned land-use framework.</p> <p>Doubts are raised over the lack of evidence showing that existing permitted uses cannot be delivered, with no marketing or feasibility information provided.</p> <p>Concern remains that data centres do not match the climate-emergency justification previously used to support the LDO, given their high energy and water use and low long-term employment.</p> <p>The change is viewed as setting an unhelpful precedent for further incremental dilution of the LDO based on market arguments rather than planning rationale.</p> |

| Consultee | Summary of Comments |
|--|---|
| | <p>There is a call for a clear evidence base before any amendment is progressed, including marketing history, alternative uses considered, and why data centres cannot remain confined to the northern area.</p> <p>If data centres are permitted, there is an expectation that their extent be tightly capped and subject to strengthened environmental and job-verification safeguards.</p> <p>Objection is also raised to using the Strawberry Wood experience to justify changes to the BNG hierarchy, with concerns that delivery failures are being misattributed.</p> <p>Additional mitigation, such as a country-park-style scheme, is expected if data centre use is ultimately allowed.</p> |
| <p>Leake Ward Members – Cllrs Thomas, Billin and Way</p> | <p>Object to adding data centres on the southern site as it weakens the original green-technology and high-quality employment purpose for the land release.</p> <p>Concerns that the change shifts the intended development mix, reducing job density and undermining the strategic vision for advanced manufacturing.</p> <p>No evidence is provided to show that energy, heat and water demands would not materially affect environmental assessments or capacity.</p> <p>Relaxing the biodiversity hierarchy is seen as unjustified, allowing off-site measures without demonstrating on-site delivery is not possible.</p> <p>Uncertainty over the timing and merit of a partial review, especially given the linked Biodiversity Mitigation Strategy.</p> <p>Plot-by-plot labour agreements risk weakening whole-site coordination and leaving gaps in site-wide employment commitments.</p> |
| <p>Cllr J Walker</p> | <p>Raised concerns about potential biodiversity impacts and asks whether work has been undertaken on water use and grid capacity issues.</p> |
| <p>Statutory and Technical Consultees</p> | |
| <p>Environment Agency</p> | <p>They raise no concerns with adding the data centre use, have no objection to the revised mitigation hierarchy,</p> |

| Consultee | Summary of Comments |
|---|---|
| | and encourage prioritising a Fish Pass at Thrumpton Weir. |
| National Highways | Raised no objection to the proposal, confirming that the development presents no identified issues for the A453 Strategic Road Network, with reasons set out in their annex. |
| Historic England | No issues are identified from a historic-environment perspective, with no additional comments or concerns raised regarding the change. |
| UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) – Environmental Hazards | Have no comments for the LDO. |
| Sport England | States they have no comments on the proposed LDO revisions. |
| Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service | <p>Underlined that any buildings developed on the site would fall under the Fire Safety Order 2005 and relevant Building Regulations.</p> <p>Other than this statutory reminder, they offer no specific comments on the proposed LDO revisions.</p> |
| Aerodrome Safeguarding Authority | <p>Concerns about adding a data centre without a technical aviation-safeguarding assessment, particularly regarding any radio-frequency or electromagnetic emissions and how the facility will source its power.</p> <p>It is noted that the revisions will need to be incorporated into the site’s Bird Hazard Management Plan, as flat or warm roofs may attract birds and create aviation-risk issues.</p> |
| The Coal Authority | Confirm the site lies outside the defined coalfield and therefore they have no specific comments to make on the proposed LDO revisions. |
| NATS Aerodrome Safeguarding | No safeguarding objection to the proposal |
| National Grid | Some potential conflicts with NGET assets – request discussion with applicants. |
| NHS Nottingham and Nottinghamshire ICB | States they have no comment as no residential development is proposed. |

| Consultee | Summary of Comments |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board | <p>Advises that the Board's consent is required to erect any building or structure (including walls and fences), whether temporary or permanent, or plant any tree, shrub, willow or other similar growth within 9 metres of the top edge of any Board maintained watercourse or the edge of any Board maintained culvert. The Board's consent is required for any works that increase the flow or volume of water to any watercourse or culvert within the Board's district (other than directly to a main river for which the consent of the Environment Agency will be required). The Board's consent is required irrespective of any permission gained under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Other technical advice is provided that will be relevant to detailed proposals.</p> |
| Public and Other Bodies | |
| Canal & River Trust | <p>States they have no comment to make on the proposed LDO revisions.</p> |
| Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust | <p>There is disappointment that the preferred option for delivering biodiversity net gain (BNG) off-site within Rushcliffe is no longer prioritised.</p> <p>Uncertainty remains over how alternative mitigation proposals will be measured against BNG units, with no clear method provided for ensuring equivalence.</p> <p>Questions about how any alternative approach would be quantified, secured financially for the full 30-year period, and enforced robustly.</p> <p>Further clarification is needed before support can be given, particularly on long-term delivery and verification.</p> |
| CPRE Nottinghamshire | <p>Concerns about managing environmental impacts, particularly electricity demand, cooling water use and electronic waste.</p> <p>Strongly advocate that the LDO should incorporate National Grid's Chesterfield-to-Ratcliffe route as a preferable upgrade option, avoiding greater landscape and community harm associated with the Willington route.</p> <p>It is noted the southern area may allow faster delivery but stress the need for full understanding of its environmental footprint before any change is accepted.</p> |

| Consultee | Summary of Comments |
|--|---|
| East Midlands Freeport | <p>Supports the proposed revisions to the Local Development Order, stating they align with national policy, respond to market conditions, and will help accelerate comprehensive development of the Ratcliffe-on-Soar site.</p> <p>Considers the inclusion of data centres on land south of the A453 a catalyst for delivery of the wider site, enabling reinvestment in infrastructure and supporting Freeport objectives for job creation, investment, and regional economic growth.</p> <p>Requests clarification that the amendments comply with the existing Environmental Impact Assessment and that the LDO parameter plans are updated to reflect the proposed permitted uses, to avoid delays to delivery.</p> |
| Landowner | |
| Uniper | <p>Supports data centres on the southern site as a major investment opportunity aligned with national AI aims and existing infrastructure, noting it can be delivered far earlier than the northern site due to fewer constraints. States the amendment has minimal planning impact with no changes to key design or environmental parameters.</p> |
| Local Residents | |
| Residents 1, 7, 8, 18, and 19 | <p>Supports new development in principle but strongly opposes the loss of the cooling towers and chimney, arguing they are iconic heritage assets whose retention and reuse would be more environmentally sustainable than demolition.</p> |
| Residents 2, 5, 13, 14, 23, 24, and 26 | <p>Consider the proposals insufficiently ambitious and believes the site should instead deliver major energy infrastructure to support long-term economic growth, energy security, and reduced energy costs.</p> |
| Residents 4 and 9 | <p>State development should be confined to the existing brownfield power station land and not extend south of the A453, citing the absence of environmental baseline data and uncertainty around biodiversity net gain.</p> |
| Residents 5, 6, 11, 13, 23, 24, and 26 | <p>Object to data centre use, stating it is highly energy and water intensive, offers few long-term local jobs, and provides limited community benefit compared to alternative energy-based uses.</p> |

| Consultee | Summary of Comments |
|---|---|
| Residents 6, 10, 14, 15, 20, 23, 24, and 26 | Concerns about water use, pollution risk, and wider environmental harm associated with data centres, and requests clear forecasting of impacts on rivers, residents, and local infrastructure. |
| Residents 1, 6, 7, 8, and 15 | Suggest the site would be better suited to nature-led, cultural, or community-focused uses that prioritise public wellbeing and environmental enhancement. |
| Residents 9, 10, and 20 | Concerns about poor road conditions, construction traffic impacts, and flood risk, arguing that existing infrastructure is inadequate to support the proposed development. |
| Residents 4, 9, 17, and 22 | Objects to development south of the A453, arguing the land should remain undeveloped to protect biodiversity, rural character, and environmental mitigation capacity. |
| Resident 3, 16, and 25 | Strongly supports a data centre on the southern site, stating it aligns with national policy, attracts investment, supports local businesses and universities, and strengthens the local economy. |