



Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan Examination Matters, Issues and Questions

Inspectors: G Davies BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI
U P Han BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI
F Bradley BRP (NZ) MRTPI

Programme Officer: Ian Kemp, ian@localplanservices.co.uk

Examination Website: [Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan Examination](#)

21 May 2026

Introduction

This document sets out the Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQs) that will form the basis for discussions during the hearing sessions. Prior to the hearing sessions, written statements are invited from participants on these MIQs.

Participants may respond to issues relevant to points they have made in their earlier representations at the Regulation 19 consultation stage¹. All questions should be answered by the Councils unless already answered in response to our initial questions. Further information about the examination, the hearing and the format of written statements is given in the accompanying Guidance Note.

Please note that where reference is made to specific paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), these relate to the December 2023 version, unless otherwise stated. The preamble to Question 1 below provides further explanation.

The Councils have prepared schedules of main and additional modifications (GNC4A and GNC4B) which they propose are made to the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan (the Plan). The proposed modifications will be considered as part of the examination, and participants are invited to comment on them where relevant in their statements.

Matter 1: Legal and procedural requirements

The Plan is required to meet various legal and regulatory requirements as set out in the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and regulations. In our initial

¹ Unless otherwise stated, all references to regulations refer to the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012

questions to the Councils (ID1 and ID2) we sought information on how these requirements had been addressed. The Councils' responses are set out in GNC1 and GNC4, together with the associated appendices.

Issue 1: Legal compliance

Paragraph 234 of the National Planning Policy Framework of December 2024 sets out transitional arrangements for emerging plans. In response to our initial questions (ID2, Q30 and Q31), the Council confirmed that the version of the Framework which it considers relevant for the purposes of the examination is that published in December 2023 (GNC4).

Q1 Do the transitional arrangements set out in paragraph 234 of the 2024 Framework apply to the Plan?

Q2 For the purposes of this examination, is the relevant version of the Framework that published in December 2023?

Subject to any contrary view, when responding to our matters, issues and questions all references to the Framework should be to the December 2023 version.

A number of statements of common ground have been completed since the Plan was submitted for examination and are included in the examination library (GNC2, GNC3 and GNC6). Please would the Councils update us on progress on any outstanding statements of common ground.

Q3 What progress has been made on outstanding statements of common ground?

The Councils are required to publicise the draft Plan at the Regulation 18 and 19 stages. In response to our initial questions (ID2, Q1-Q3) the Councils confirmed that such publicity has been carried out in accordance with the regulations and that there have been no substantive representations criticising the procedure for commenting on the Plan (GNC4). We repeat the question here for other participants in the examination.

Q4 Have the Councils publicised the Plan in a manner consistent with their statements of community involvement? Are there any concerns about the procedures used for consulting on the Plan (as distinct from the Plan itself)?

The Framework says that strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum 15-year period from adoption. With the current plan period of 2023-2041 that is unlikely to be achieved. In reply to our initial question (ID2, Q32) the Councils have stated that they believe there are good reasons not to extend the plan period, as it would result in significant delay to the Plan's adoption (GNC4).

Q5 Should the plan period be extended to achieve a minimum 15 years from adoption? What would be the consequences of doing so and would they outweigh the advantages?

We also asked questions relating to the duty to cooperate (ID2, Q7-Q10). Following the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023 (Commencement No.11 and Saving and Transitional Provisions) Regulations 2026 coming into force on 25 March 2026, the legal requirement for local planning authorities to demonstrate co-operation on cross-border strategic matters no longer applies. However, effective cooperation between authorities remains national planning policy in the Framework. We will therefore consider cooperation on strategic planning matters as a soundness issue as part of other issues where appropriate.

Issue 2: Sustainability Appraisal

- Q6 Does the Sustainability Appraisal meet the requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment Regulations in relation to the identification, assessment and consideration of reasonable alternatives?**
- Q7 Have the likely significant effects of all the reasonable alternatives been adequately assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal? Has the scoring of the options against the Sustainability Appraisal objectives been applied consistently and fairly?**
- Q8 Have clear reasons been given for selecting the preferred options and rejecting the alternatives that were appraised? Is it clear how the Sustainability Appraisal has influenced the choices made in the Plan?**
- Q9 What justification underpins the site size thresholds used in the Sustainability Appraisal (SD/5) which are set out in paragraph 9.7 of that document?**
- Q10 Is the site assessment scoring process robust, transparent, and applied consistently across all sites?**

Matter 2: Sustainable Growth

Issue 1: Climate change – Policy 1

- Q11 Are the sustainable construction and design measures in Policy 1 consistent with national planning policy, including the December 2023 Written Ministerial Statement ‘Planning - Local Energy Efficiency Standards Update’?**
- Q12 Have the implications of the sustainable construction and design measures in Policy 1 for housing viability and affordability been robustly assessed?**
- Q13 Is the wording of Policy 1 effective on matters relating to ecology and flood risk?**

Issue 2: Spatial vision, strategy, and housing target – Policies 2 and 3

Q14 Does the spatial strategy reflect the spatial vision and objectives of the Plan?

Issue 3: Local housing need

In response to our initial question (ID1), the Councils have agreed to proceed on the basis that local housing need should be calculated using the standard method associated with the 2023 Framework. That calculation is based on a 4-step method including a 35% urban uplift. Using that method, the local housing need for the plan period 2023-2041 equates to 49,553 dwellings (GNC1). This approach differs from that adopted by the Councils for the submission Plan, where a lower local housing need of 48,572 is used based on the standard method associated with the 2024 Framework (HO/2).

Q15 Is the standard method associated with the 2023 Framework (4-step method plus urban uplift) the correct approach to calculating local housing need?

Q16 If so, should local housing need for the Plan be 49,553 dwellings? What is the local housing need for individual Councils on this basis?

Issue 4: Housing supply

In reply to our initial questions (ID2, Q37-38) the Councils have set out revised housing trajectories (GNC4C). The Councils propose that the revised trajectories should replace those contained in Appendix C of the submission Plan and those subsequently published in the Housing Background Paper Addendum (HO/2). The revised trajectories seek to address concerns raised in the Regulation 19 consultation on windfall calculation in Nottingham City, summarise information on Part 2 Local Plan sites, and recognise that a strategic allocation at the Former Stanton Tip (Policy 24) is now unlikely to come forward during the plan period.

Q17 Are the revised housing trajectories justified and realistic? Should they replace those in Appendix C of the submission Plan?

Q18 Is there compelling evidence that windfall sites will form a reliable source of supply over the plan period?

Q19 Is the inclusion of major sites justified as part of the windfall allowance?

Q20 Is there any under or oversupply from the early years of the plan period that needs to be redistributed to later years? If so, how has that been done?

Issue 5: Housing requirement

The housing requirement in the Plan is set at 47,600 dwellings, with individual requirements for each Council. This figure is referred to as a 'target' in the Plan but

for the purposes of the examination we will refer to it as the housing requirement for consistency with the phraseology used in the Framework. The figure is based in part on the Councils' initial belief that the minimum housing requirement should be based on 80% of local housing need calculated using the 2024 standard method. Having regard to our interpretation of national planning policy (ID1) and the Councils' response to our initial question (GNC1) we consider that approach to be incorrect. The housing requirement in the Plan is therefore below local housing need.

- Q21 Is there any justification for the housing requirement in the Plan to be lower than local housing need? How does it apply to individual Councils?**
- Q22 Have any of the Councils been requested to meet housing needs arising from between themselves or from neighbouring areas? Has effective cooperation in accordance with the Framework taken place between neighbouring authorities in addressing unmet housing needs?**
- Q23 Does the housing requirement align with demand arising from growth in employment envisaged in the Plan?**
- Q24 In light of the change in interpretation of how local housing need is calculated, should the housing requirement for the Plan be modified? How would that alter individual Councils' housing requirements?**
- Q25 If the housing requirement of the Plan were to be modified, could that be achieved within the housing supply anticipated to come forward over the plan period? What modifications to the Plan would be required to fully meet local housing need?**

Issue 6: Green Belt - Policy 4

The Plan proposes the release of Green Belt land as part of 3 strategic allocations at Toton and Chetwynd Barracks (Policy 21), the former Bennerley Coal Disposal Point (Policy 22) and the former Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station (Policy 32). These sites will be considered in more detail later under the relevant policies. In more general terms we seek views on the following questions:

- Q26 Are the reviews of previous Green Belt assessments (SS/2a, c and d) effective for the purposes of the Plan?**
- Q27 Do exceptional circumstances exist to justify the allocation of land within the Green Belt for housing, infrastructure and strategic distribution and logistics?**

Issue 7: Employment provision and economic development – Policy 5

Office and General Industrial/ Warehousing

- Q28** Does the Employment Land Needs Study 2021 (EM/5) and Employment Land Needs Study Update 2026 (GNC7) provide a robust and justified assessment of employment land need?
- Q29** Are the Plan's requirements for office and industrial and warehousing space justified, including allowing for flexibility and accounting for employment space losses?
- Q30** Are the sites identified in Appendix 1 of the Employment Background Paper (EM/2) suitable, available and achievable within the plan period, in particular those without planning permission and not within an existing or proposed site allocation?
- Q31** Is the spatial distribution of general industrial/ warehousing land proposed by the Plan justified?
- Q32** There appears to be discrepancies between Appendix 1 of EM/2 and GNC4 (response to Initial Question 42) and GNC4I. Please clarify the office and/ or industrial land supply position for:
- a. Royal Quarter, Burton Street (SR53) - the Council's response in GNC4 indicates that there is no office floorspace in the final scheme.
 - b. Toton and Chetwynd Barracks – Appendix 1 of EM/2 appears to indicate more supply than proposed in Policy 21.
 - c. Boots (14/02038/POUT) – how much of the 82,000 sq. m. is for office and how much for industrial?
 - d. RAF Newton - Appendix 1 of EM2 indicates that there is 4.1 ha remaining at RAF Newton while GNC4I states 6.5 ha.

Strategic distribution and logistics - Need

- Q33** Does the Logistics Study (EM/4) provide a robust and up-to-date assessment of need for strategic distribution and logistics space, and do all the local authorities within the Study area agree with its findings? Does the Logistics Study under- or over- estimate need within the Study area?
- Q34** Have the Councils translated the findings of the Logistics Study into a quantified need for the Plan area? If so, where is this set out?
- Q35** Given the Logistics Study runs to 2040, and the Plan period extends to 2041, is it appropriate to identify any additional need for the remaining year? If so, is it appropriate to roll the need forward?

Strategic distribution and logistics - Strategy

- Q36** What is the Plan's overall strategy for meeting the need for strategic distribution/ logistics land? How does it fit with, and relate to, the provision of strategic distribution and logistics land in other authorities

within the Logistics Study area? Is the level of provision made in the Plan justified?

Strategic distribution and logistics - Supply within the Study Area

The Councils have provided an update to the supply of strategic distribution and logistics sites (GNC4E and GNC4F), which supersedes the supply figures given in the Strategic Logistics Position Paper (EM/1).

- Q37 Are the sites identified in GNC4E and GNC4F suitable for strategic distribution and logistics purposes, and are they deliverable within the plan period?**
- Q38 Is the assumption that 10% or 20% of supply could be met through redevelopment of existing employment sites justified and underpinned by robust evidence? What are the Councils' reasons for taking a different approach to calculating the residual demand as set out in its response to Initial Question 43?**
- Q39 If strategic distribution/ logistics sites are to come forward from the redevelopment of existing 'general' employment/ industrial sites, has this loss of 'general' employment/ industrial land been taken into account?**

Strategic distribution and logistics - Supply outside the Study Area

The Councils' responses to initial questions Q43 and 44 (GNC4E and GNC4F) update Tables 5 and 7 of EM/1 which identifies 'additional potential supply and further potential supply not in the study area but in theory capable of contributing towards meeting need' and 'further potential supply not in study area but in theory capable of contributing towards meeting need'. However, the Councils' response to initial question Q43 in GNC4 also states that 'figures for supply close to the Study area are included for context only, as there is no cross-boundary agreement with these councils to meet needs attributed to the Study area.' In this context, the following questions arise:

- Q40 Are sites outside the Study area being relied upon to meet the Study area's need? If not, what is the purpose of identifying those sites? If so, is this approach justified, effective, positively prepared and consistent with national policy?**

Strategic distribution and logistics – Site Selection

- Q41 Are the site selection criteria for strategic distribution and logistics sites – including the minimum site size threshold and strategic rail freight connectivity – justified? Are the proposed site allocations consistent with those criteria and justified?**
- Q42 Does the Site Selection Report (SS/4), informed by the Sustainability Appraisal (SD/5), provide clear and robust reasons for the selection of**

the proposed strategic logistics sites and the rejection of alternative sites, and does this demonstrate a sound and justified site selection methodology overall?

Protection of existing employment land

Q43 Does Policy 5 of the Plan include an effective mechanism/ exception to allow alternative development to come forward where employment use is demonstrated to be undeliverable or unviable?

Issue 8: Centres – Policies 6-7

Q44 Are Policies 6 and 7 of the Plan positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with paragraph 90 of the Framework in their approach to the hierarchy, role and function of centres?

Q45 Is the proposed retail impact assessment threshold justified, proportionate, and consistent with paragraph 94 of the Framework?

Q46 Is Policy 6 consistent with paragraph 193 of the Framework in respect of the ‘agent of change’ principle?

Q47 Is Policy 6 effective in ‘managing the scale, concentration and regulation of pubs, bars, nightclubs, and other licensed premises, hot food takeaways and taxi ranks’?

Q48 In reference to Policy 6.1.e.viii of the Plan, what is the strategy for increasing public electric vehicle charging in Nottingham City Centre?

Matter 3: Places for People

Issue 1: Housing size, mix, design and the historic environment – Policies 8, 10 and 11

Q49 Does the Plan provide for different housing needs, including affordable housing, housing for the elderly and disabled, and self-build and custom build?

Q50 Are the requirements to meet nationally described space standards and compliance with the optional building regulation for accessible and adaptable dwellings justified? Is it clear when these standards are required?

Q51 Are the limitations on development relating to houses in multiple occupation sufficiently clear and robust?

Q52 Are the requirements for the proportions of affordable housing and affordable housing tenures justified and viable?

- Q53 Are the requirements relating to design sufficiently clear and robust?**
- Q54 Are the policies relating to design and the historic environment effective in identifying and preserving or enhancing the significance of heritage assets?**
- Q55 Does the design of development need to have regard to water courses?**

Issue 2: Gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople – Policy 9

The PPTS indicates that plans should set pitch targets for gypsies and travellers and plot targets for travelling showpeople based on identified needs and include requirements for both permanent and transit site accommodation over the Plan period. The Greater Nottingham and Ashfield District Council Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment, 2021 (GTAA) (HO/8) sets out permanent pitch requirements for each local authority within Greater Nottingham between 2020 and 2038. In this context, the following questions arise:

- Q56 Does the GTAA provide a robust and up-to-date assessment of need for gypsy and traveller accommodation? How does it address need over the remainder of the Plan period?**
- Q57 Should the pitch and plot targets be set out in the policy itself rather than the supporting text?**
- Q58 Given that the Councils' response to initial question Q57 in GNC4 indicates that the Plan does not seek to meet all identified need, please clarify the level of need the Plan intends to accommodate and explain the strategy for addressing any residual need?**
- Q59 Are the requirements of Policy 30 Strategic Allocation South of Clifton and Policy 31 Strategic Allocation East of Gamston/ North of Tollerton consistent with the PPTS, sufficiently clear in relation to gypsy and traveller accommodation, and would they be effective in delivering the intended provision?**

Issue 3: Local services, tourism and sport – Policies 12 and 13

- Q60 Given the response in GNC4 to our initial question Q61, are the assessments and strategies on which the Councils rely sufficiently up-to-date to be consistent with paragraph 102 of the Framework which refers to policies being based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the need for open space, sport and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision?**
- Q61 Is Policy 13 consistent with paragraph 103 of the Framework in protecting existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields?**

Issue 4: Transport and infrastructure – Policies 14 and 15

- Q62** Does the Plan actively seek to manage patterns of growth, including by locating development in locations which are or can be made sustainable and by encouraging active modes of travel?
- Q63** Has the Plan been prepared with the involvement of the local highway authorities, transport providers and operators? Has that engagement identified any unacceptable impact to highway safety or cumulative impacts on transport networks that would be severe?
- Q64** In Policy 14, what is meant by accessibility deficiencies needing to be fully addressed? Is that achievable and if so, how would it be measured?
- Q65** In Policy 14, is the requirement that strategic distribution development should have the potential for rail freight connection justified and achievable? Does it apply to all potential schemes?
- Q66** In Policy 15, are the transport schemes listed in section 4 essential to the delivery of the Plan strategy? If so, how likely is funding to be available to enable their delivery during the plan period?
- Q67** Does the capacity of M1 Junction 24 place constraints on the delivery or phasing of strategic allocation sites individually or cumulatively? What progress has been made on a strategy for increasing capacity at the junction and associated funding?

Matter 4: Our Environment

Issue 1: Blue and green infrastructure and biodiversity – Policies 16 and 17

- Q68** How have the policies in the Plan taken into account relevant Local Nature Recovery Strategies?
- Q69** Is Policy 16 of the Plan clear on when the need for new or enhanced blue and green infrastructure would be triggered?
- Q70** Do the terms ‘locally valued landscape’, ‘green routes’, ‘mitigation hierarchy’ need to be more clearly defined for effectiveness?
- Q71** Does the wording of Part 6 of Policy 16 give development plan status to the Greater Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment, despite it not forming part of the development plan?
- Q72** Does conflict arise between Part 4 and Part 5 of Policy 16 given that Part 5 provides for a ‘balancing exercise’ while Part 4 does not, but instead requires equal or better blue green infrastructure outcomes?

- Q73** Is Policy 16 consistent with paragraph 103 of the Framework on existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land? Would the Councils' suggested modification MM22 in GNC4A resolve any inconsistency?
- Q74** Is Policy 17 and its supporting text consistent with the mandatory biodiversity net gain requirements set out in the Environment Act 2021 and associated secondary legislation, as well as national policy and guidance?
- Q75** Is the requirement for 20% biodiversity net gain in Rushcliffe justified by robust and up-to-date local evidence? What is the justification for setting this higher than the mandatory 10% requirement?
- Q76** Does the viability evidence demonstrate that a 20% biodiversity net gain requirement is deliverable without undermining development viability in Rushcliffe, and how does the viability position differ in other parts of the Plan area? Are the cost assumptions reflective of current market conditions, including habitat creation, off-site unit values, and 30-year management requirements?
- Q77** Have the requirements of Policy 17 been factored into the assessment of the deliverability, capacity and viability of the proposed site allocations and other relevant sites in the housing supply? Should the policy include flexibility for developments that are unable to achieve the minimum 20% biodiversity net gain in Rushcliffe due to viability?
- Q78** How will the biodiversity net gain requirements be delivered and monitored? Are the other monitoring indicators for Policy 17 effective?
- Q79** Are there any conflicts or inconsistencies between Policies 16 and 17, and if so, how do these affect their soundness and effectiveness?

Matter 5: Strategic Allocations

Issue 1: Developer contributions – Policy 18

- Q80** Does the policy identify sufficient mechanisms and procedures to ensure its effectiveness?
- Q81** Has the issue of viability been taken into account when seeking contributions for developments?

Issue 2: Strategic allocations – Policies 19 - 32

Policy 19: Strategic allocation at Boots (Broxtowe)

- Q82** Is there evidence to support a higher capacity on the site without undermining the policy objectives?

- Q83** Part 2.A.1. of the Policy requires that residential development should achieve an “appropriate density”. Is this requirement sufficiently clear?
- Q84** Is the Policy sufficiently clear and robust in conserving and enhancing the historic environment? Does the Policy effectively meet the objectives set out in the justification text for the re-use of existing heritage assets within the site?
- Q85** Is the provision of new business and commercial space with a focus on the hi-tech sector and health and beauty referred to in part 2.B.3 included in the 82,000sqm of employment floorspace or in addition to it?

Policy 20: Strategic allocation Field Farm (Broxtowe)

- Q86** Is the allocation justified as it seeks to deliver “around 450 dwellings”, which is below the threshold of 500 homes for the Councils’ proposed definition of strategic sites?
- Q87** What improvements to road infrastructure have been secured through the extant planning permissions? Does part 2.D.4. of the Policy require additional improvements to be secured?

Policy 21: Strategic allocation at Toton and Chetwynd Barracks (Broxtowe)

- Q88** Is the need for the proposed junction and link road justified, and is the chosen location supported by robust evidence?
- Q89** How will the impacts of the proposed site allocation on the strategic highway network be mitigated, and would those measures be effective and deliverable?
- Q90** What is the justification for combining the two existing site allocations? Are there any implications on the delivery of development?
- Q91** Is the revised housing trajectory (GNC4C) and proposed employment floorspace realistic and deliverable within the plan period?
- Q92** What is the rationale for the Councils’ suggested modification MM29 in GNC4A to remove the requirements for a park and ride facility, extension of the tramway and provision for rail connection to the park and ride? How would the policy still achieve its transport objectives?
- Q93** What is the justification for limiting office development to Chetwynd South only, and has the potential for office development elsewhere within the site allocation been considered?

Policy 22: Former Bennerley Coal Disposal Point (Broxtowe)

Q94 Is the proposed site allocation deliverable within the plan period, having regard to viability, infrastructure requirements, physical and environmental constraints? In particular, is rail-freight connection to the site achievable and deliverable?

Q95 Para 3.22.9 of the Plan refers to potential to provide a secondary access from Shilo Way. Have the implications of this been fully assessed?

Policy 24: Strategic allocation Former Stanton Tip

Q96 What is the justification for the removal of this site?

Policy 25: Strategic allocation at Broad Marsh

Q97 Does the proposed number of dwellings make effective use of the site?

Q98 Is the proposed site allocation demonstrably viable and deliverable within the plan period?

Q99 Is the revised housing trajectory (GNC4C) for the proposed site allocation at Broad Marsh justified, effective, and deliverable within the plan period?

Q100 Should the requirement in paragraph 3.25.5 be part of Policy 25 rather than supporting text? Is that requirement as modified by the Council's OM60 justified and effective?

Q101 Is the policy sufficiently clear on the type and quantum of affordable housing required?

Q102 What is the rationale for excluding Broad Marsh Bus Station and land to the east of Middle Hill, Carrington Street and Albion House from the proposed site allocation?

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

Q103 Is Part 2.B.3. of the Policy effective in identifying the type of employment and employment generating uses that would be acceptable on the site?

Policy 27: Strategic allocation Land north of Bingham (Rushcliffe)

Q104 Are there any proposed changes to what has already been granted planning permission on the site?

Policy 28: Strategic allocation Former RAF Newton (Rushcliffe)

Q105 Are there any proposed changes to what has already been granted planning permission on the site?

Policy 29: Strategic allocation Former Cotgrave Colliery (Rushcliffe)

Q106 Is the allocation justified as it seeks to deliver “around 460 dwellings”, which is below the threshold of 500 homes for the Councils’ proposed definition of strategic sites?

Q107 Are there any proposed changes to what has already been granted planning permission on the site?

Policy 30: Strategic allocation South of Clifton (Rushcliffe)

Q108 Are the housing delivery rates set out in the trajectory (GNC4C) justified?

Q109 What is the evidence to justify the allocation being smaller than the area granted outline planning permission in 2019 as shown on the map submitted in response to initial question Q68 (GNC4H)?

Policy 31: Strategic allocation East of Gamston/north of Tollerton (Rushcliffe)

Q110 Is the allocation consistent with national planning policy and the Government’s General Aviation Strategy for recognising the importance of maintaining a national network of general aviation airfields?

Q111 What evidence is there to support the housing delivery rates for the site set out in the revised housing trajectory (GNC4C)?

Q112 What progress has been made on the masterplanning and design code process?

Q113 Is the allocation consistent with national planning policy relating to flood risk?

Q114 What evidence is there for contamination on the site and to what extent would that constrain development?

Q115 Would the Policy be effective in protecting or enhancing heritage assets on the site?

Q116 Would development of the site give rise to an unacceptable impact on highway safety or taken with other development in the area, the cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe?

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

Q117 Is the delivery of the proposed site allocation achievable within the plan period?

Q118 Would the 20% biodiversity net gain requirement apply to the proposed strategic allocation at Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station given that the Local Development Order specifies a 10% biodiversity net gain requirement?

Q119 What is the justification for limiting the total quantum of strategic distribution and logistics development to approximately 22% of the permitted floor area and restricting such uses to the Northern Area (north of the A453) only?

Matter 6: Implementation and monitoring

Q120 Is the Plan's monitoring framework robust and effective? Are the monitoring indicators clear and measurable?

Q121 The Plan contains references to future Part 2 plans and supplementary planning documents. Neither of these types of planning document are included in the new plan-making system introduced by the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023. In the light of that change, are references to such future documents justified and effective?