# Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan

# Sustainability Appraisal

# Note on updates following Post Hearing Note 2

# October 2026

Contents

1. Introduction ..... 2
2. Revised Geographical Scope ..... 3
3. Justification for Preferred Options ..... 5
4. Scoring changes made during preparation of the Strategic Plan ..... 9
5. Site Thresholds ..... 14
6. Summary of Policy Options and Reassessment ..... 16

# 1. Introduction

1.1 Following the examination hearing sessions in July 2026, the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) has been reviewed and updated in response to the matters raised by the Inspectors in Post Hearing Note 2 (ID/7). The purpose of the review was to ensure that the SA provides a clear and transparent account of how the revised geographical scope of the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan has been addressed, how the reasonable alternatives have been reconsidered, and how the appraisal has informed the selection of the preferred strategy and individual policy approaches.

1.2 The review has included:

- reconsideration of the implications of Gedling Borough Council's withdrawal from the Strategic Plan;
- reassessment of reasonable alternatives that previously included or referred to Gedling;
- clarification of the alternatives selected and rejected, including the reasons for those decisions;
- further explanation of changes in appraisal scoring between the Preferred Approach SA of December 2022 and the Publication Draft SA of March 2025; and
- an explanation of the thresholds used to determine which potential strategic sites were subject to detailed assessment.

1.3 The SA Main Report has also been updated to reflect the revised three-authority Plan area in its baseline information, maps, development figures, appraisal assumptions, monitoring arrangements and supporting evidence. Appendix D provides the detailed reassessment of the Plan objectives, policy options and final policies, including the implications of Gedling's withdrawal and clearer reasons for selecting or rejecting each reasonable alternative. The Non-Technical Summary has also been updated to reflect the changes. Changes made to the SA Main Report in response to Post Hearing Note 2 are shown in red.

1.4 Earlier appraisal work involving Gedling has not been retrospectively removed where it forms part of the audit trail showing how the Plan and its reasonable alternatives evolved. References have therefore been retained where they are necessary to explain earlier stages of plan preparation or remain relevant to cross-boundary and cumulative effects. However, policies, allocations and evidence applying solely to Gedling no longer form part of the current Strategic Plan or its SA.

1.5 The review of the SA was undertaken in the context of Gedling Borough having similar characteristics to Broxtowe and Rushcliffe Boroughs:

- The population of each is broadly similar (Mid-Year Estimates 2024, Broxtowe 114,565, Gedling 120,179, Rushcliffe 126,736).
- Each area has a similar settlement pattern, comprising suburbs of Nottingham, a rural hinterland with key settlements and smaller villages.
- All three rely on Nottingham City for higher order functions available in the City Centre, to which they are generally well connected.
- The un-urbanised parts of the Boroughs are in large part within the Green Belt or countryside, with no protected landscapes.

1.6 The overall conclusion of the review is that Gedling's withdrawal does not materially alter the findings of the SA, the identification of measures required to avoid or mitigate significant adverse effects, or the preferred strategy for Broxtowe, Nottingham City and Rushcliffe. However, the detailed reassessment has improved the clarity and transparency of the SA and provides a more complete explanation of how it has informed the Plan.

# 2. Revised Geographical Scope

2.1 Gedling Borough Council withdrew from the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan process in January 2025 in order to prepare its own Local Plan. The geographical scope of the Strategic Plan and the SA has been revised accordingly, and policies and proposed allocations relating solely to Gedling no longer form part of the Plan.

2.2 A review of the SA was undertaken to identify where the change in geography required amendments. References to Gedling as a participating authority have been removed or amended, together with policies, proposals and allocations that applied solely to Gedling. Plan area baseline information, housing and development figures, maps, monitoring arrangements, appraisal assumptions and other combined information have also been updated where necessary. Section 9B and the associated appendix dealing with Gedling strategic sites have been removed from the current SA.

2.3 Earlier material relating to Gedling has been retained where it provides an audit trail of reasonable alternatives considered before the Council's withdrawal. This is necessary to explain how the Plan evolved and does not imply that Gedling related policies, proposals or sites continue to form part of the current Strategic Plan. Gedling specific evidence has also been retained where it remains relevant to cross-boundary effects, including housing-market relationships, travel and transport, infrastructure, water and flood risk, air quality, biodiversity and blue-green infrastructure.

2.4 The SA objectives and both appraisal frameworks were reviewed to establish whether they remained appropriate for the revised Plan area. This review concluded that the environmental, social and economic issues represented by the SA objectives and decision aiding questions remain relevant to Broxtowe,

Nottingham City and Rushcliffe. Gedling's withdrawal did not introduce a new sustainability issue or remove an existing issue that would justify changing the appraisal framework. Retaining the established framework also allows reasonable alternatives to continue to be assessed consistently with earlier stages of plan preparation.

2.5 The Plan objectives were also reviewed. It is considered that the Plan continues to have substantially the same effect on their administrative areas and that the overall strategy and objectives remain appropriate. The compatibility appraisal therefore remains applicable to the revised Plan area.

2.6 The reasonable alternatives in Appendix D were then reviewed individually. Most concern strategic policy choices, development-management requirements or broad approaches to the distribution of growth, rather than Gedling-specific locations. Their relative sustainability effects are therefore driven principally by the nature of the policy approach and remain applicable to the revised geography.

2.7 Where an alternative contained a specific Gedling reference, it was amended. For example, the reference to development adjacent to Hucknall was removed from Option A under Policy 2. The redistribution options for Nottingham City's unmet housing need were revised to reflect redistribution between Broxtowe and Rushcliffe rather than across three districts. Gedling specific office and growth locations were also removed where they were no longer relevant.

2.8 The reassessment found that:

- the broad distinctions between the alternatives remain unchanged;
- the relative performance of the alternatives against the SA objectives remains applicable;
- no new reasonable alternative arises solely because Gedling is no longer participating;
- no significant effect or mitigation requirement has been overlooked as a result of the revised geography; and
- the preferred strategy remains supported by the SA.

2.9 The detailed findings are recorded under each policy appraisal in Appendix D and summarised in the accompanying policy table at the end of this note. Apart from the identified clarification to the scoring of the strategic distribution and logistics options, the review did not result in a material change to the appraisal scores or preferred options.

# 3. Justification for Preferred Options

3.1 Appendix D has been updated to provide a clearer distinction between the reasonable alternatives considered, the options selected as part of the preferred approach and the options rejected. The conclusions following each appraisal now explain the reasons for the decision, including where the preferred policy combines elements of more than one reasonable alternative.

3.2 The selection process has taken account of:

- the performance of each alternative against all 16 SA objectives;
- the significance and nature of positive and negative effects;
- whether adverse effects could be avoided or mitigated;
- relevant technical evidence;
- deliverability, viability and infrastructure requirements;
- the relationship with other policies in the Plan; and
- the need to balance housing and economic development with protection of environmental assets and natural resources.

**Spatial strategy**

3.3 For Policy 2, Options A and E have been selected in combination. Option A directs most development to the main built-up area and identified key settlements. It performs particularly well in relation to meeting housing needs, supporting existing infrastructure and services, making effective use of sustainable transport and prioritising brownfield opportunities.

3.4 Option E complements this spatial distribution by applying strategic sustainability criteria to development proposals, including the integration of blue-green infrastructure, sustainable transport and active travel, identified housing needs, attractive places and compact and connected neighbourhoods. It was added after the Preferred Approach stage as a package of sustainability criteria rather than as a separate spatial distribution.

3.5 Option B, dispersed development, was rejected because it performs less well in relation to transport, brownfield land, pollution and air quality, landscape and natural resources. It would be more likely to increase car dependency, require additional infrastructure and result in greater development of greenfield land. Options C and D contain important principles relating respectively to blue-green infrastructure and transport infrastructure, but neither provides a complete strategy for distributing all forms of growth. Their beneficial elements are instead reflected through the criteria incorporated into the preferred approach.

**Delivery of the housing requirement**

3.6 For the mechanism used to deliver housing, Option C has been selected. This provides for a combination of strategic sites allocated through the Strategic Plan and non-strategic sites identified through adopted or future local plans. It retains the infrastructure and service-delivery benefits of strategic development while providing greater flexibility to identify smaller sites and respond to local circumstances.

3.7 Option A, relying only on additional strategic sites, would provide less flexibility and is more likely to result in the use of larger greenfield sites with greater landscape effects. Option B, deferring delivery to future plans, would delay certainty over housing delivery and produces less favourable transport outcomes because of the potential for a wider distribution of smaller sites without the infrastructure benefits associated with strategic development.

**Housing need and housing requirements**

3.8 The appraisal considers lower, medium and higher growth alternatives. The preferred approach draws principally on Option B, while also incorporating an element of Option A through the housing requirements set for Broxtowe and Rushcliffe.

3.9 Option B limits the environmental effects associated with the highest growth option, particularly effects on greenfield land, landscape, pollution, water and natural resources. It nevertheless performs less strongly against the housing objective because it does not meet the full combined standard-method need across the Plan area. The higher-growth Option C performs strongly in relation to housing delivery but would increase pressure on environmental assets and infrastructure and generate greater adverse effects.

3.10 The selected approach reflects Nottingham City's constrained land supply while setting housing requirements for Broxtowe and Rushcliffe above their own standard-method needs. It therefore makes a contribution towards Nottingham City's shortfall without transferring all the associated environmental effects to the surrounding districts. This represents a balanced judgement between meeting housing need and achieving a sustainable distribution of growth.

3.11 The separate appraisal undertaken in response to the 2024 NPPF transitional arrangements has been retained to explain the development of the Plan and SA. Option D was the preferred Publication Draft approach under the Councils' interpretation of those arrangements. During the examination, however, the Inspectors confirmed that the 2023 standard method should underpin the Plan. The 2024 options therefore no longer provide the basis for the housing requirements and are retained for transparency only.

**Redistribution of Nottingham City's unmet need**

3.12 The preferred approach combines elements of Options B and C. Option B, redistributing all of Nottingham City's unmet need, performs strongly against the housing objective. However, it would place the greatest additional

pressure on greenfield land and environmental assets in Broxtowe and Rushcliffe.

3.13 Option C, under which the City meets as much of its need as its available supply allows and the residual need is not redistributed, would reduce environmental effects but would deliver a less positive housing outcome. The selected approach therefore enables Nottingham City to meet as much need as its capacity allows, with Broxtowe and Rushcliffe meeting part, but not all, of the residual unmet need. This balances the significant benefit of additional housing delivery against the environmental effects of accommodating all of the City's shortfall outside its boundary.

**Employment provision**

3.14 The preferred employment strategy combines complementary elements of the reasonable alternatives rather than relying on a single approach.

3.15 For the overall employment requirement, the selected approach combines the provision of attractive, market-facing employment sites with criteria guiding the location and assessment of strategic distribution and logistics development. This provides flexibility to meet office, industrial and warehousing requirements while enabling accessibility, environmental effects and infrastructure needs to be addressed.

3.16 For office development, the preferred package focuses significant office growth in Nottingham City Centre while also providing opportunities at the remaining sustainable urban extensions, Toton and locations supporting the science and knowledge economy. This performs more sustainably than reliance on a single type of location and supports both accessibility and economic diversification.

3.17 For existing and proposed employment sites, the preferred approach supports research, science and knowledge-based activity, makes provision for SMEs and start-ups, safeguards good-quality employment land and allows poorer-quality sites to be released or regenerated where justified. This avoids indiscriminate retention of land that no longer performs an effective employment function and can support regeneration, community safety, air quality and more efficient land use.

3.18 For strategic distribution and logistics, Option L performed best in relation to the quantitative provision of logistics land because it would meet all identified need. However, it was not taken forward in full because meeting the whole requirement was weighed against Green Belt and other environmental and policy considerations. Option O was selected as the preferred locational approach because it directs strategic logistics development to locations with good access to the strategic road and rail networks. The Plan therefore allocates two strategic logistics sites that make a significant contribution to identified need, rather than meeting the full requirement.

**Other policies**

3.19 Appendix D now contains a clear explanation of the preferred option or combined approach for each of the remaining policies. These include:

- selecting enhanced net-zero and blue-green infrastructure requirements under Policy 1 without the affordability and viability risks associated with the highest standards option;
- combining Green Belt review with compensatory improvements under Policy 4;
- increasing flexibility in the City Centre and other centres under Policies 6 and 7;
- strengthening requirements for housing choice, affordable housing, accessibility and space standards under Policy 8;
- planning positively for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople provision under Policy 9;
- strengthening design, heritage-led regeneration, healthy lifestyles and protection of community facilities under Policies 10 to 12;
- adopting more flexible approaches to culture, tourism and sport under Policy 13;
- prioritising sustainable modes and transport infrastructure under Policies 14 and 15;
- protecting and extending blue-green infrastructure, landscape and ecological networks under Policies 16 and 17; and
- linking growth to timely infrastructure and proportionate developer contributions under Policy 18.

3.20 The table accompanying this note summarises the alternatives assessed, the implications of Gedling's withdrawal, the outcome of the reassessment, the implications for the SA and preferred strategy, and the reasons for selecting the preferred option.

# 4. Scoring changes made during preparation of the Strategic Plan

4.1 The appraisal is an iterative process and the scoring has been reviewed as the Plan, policy wording and evidence base have developed. Differences between the Preferred Approach SA of December 2022 and the Publication Draft SA of March 2025 do not arise from the use of a different appraisal framework. They principally reflect more developed policy options, additional evidence, clarification of the likely effects and the correction or refinement of earlier professional judgements.

4.2 Appendix D now explains material changes in scoring associated with the spatial strategy.

| SA objectives | Difference between Preferred Approach SA and Publication SA |
|---|---|
| **1. Housing** | None. |
| **2. Employment and Jobs** | None. |
| **3. Economic Structure and Innovation** | None. |
| **4. Shopping Centres** | Increased positive score for Option A urban concentration, as this option is likely to best support existing shopping centres. |
| **5. Health and Well Being** | Increased positive score for Option C Protect and Enhance BGI due to acknowledged health benefits of access to BGI. |
| **6. Community Safety** | Reassessed as no effect rather than uncertain for all objectives. |
| **7. Social Inclusion** | Option A and Option C were considered to be a positive for this objective, rather than a neutral as previously. |
| **8. Transport** | Option B Dispersed Development was considered to score more poorly against the transport objective, as new infrastructure would be required and development would be likely to be more car dependent. |
| **9. Brownfield Land** | Option B has a lower score than previously due to it not incentivising the use of brownfield land for development as compared to option A. |
| **10. Energy and Climate Change** | Option C achieves an increased score (from uncertain outcome previously) due to the climate change mitigation potential of BGI. |
| **11. Pollution and Air Quality** | where options were previously identified as all uncertain outcomes, now each has a specific score linked to locational impacts of the objectives. |
| **12. Flooding and Water Quality** | None. |

| SA objectives | Difference between Preferred Approach SA and Publication SA |
|---|---|
| **13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure** | None. |
| **14. Landscape** | Option A upgraded due to lesser impact on landscape overall, whilst Option B was deemed more likely to have a negative impact on landscape. |
| **15. Built and Historic Environment** | Option C moved from uncertain to minor positive due to having minor benefits for historic assets and their settings. |
| **16. Natural Resources and Waste Management** | Option A was deemed to be a minor positive rather than uncertain due to its promotion of brownfield land, whilst Option B moved from uncertain to minor negative, due to likely greenfield development. |

4.3 The scoring for the redistribution of Nottingham City's unmet need has also been reviewed. At the Preferred Approach stage, the alternatives were assessed at a comparatively high level and before the scale and likely location of development were not as clearly established. At the Publication Draft stage, the assessment was informed by more detailed information about Nottingham City's land supply, the potential loss of protected open space and employment land if all need were met within the City, and the environmental implications of redistributing unmet need to greenfield locations in the surrounding districts.

| SA objectives | Difference between Preferred Approach SA and Publication SA |
|---|---|
| **1. Housing** | None. |
| **2. Employment and Jobs** | None. |
| **3. Economic Structure and Innovation** | Option A (City need met in full in City) reappraised from uncertain to minor negative due to the likely need to use employment land for housing, whilst Option C reappraised from minor negative to no effect, as a lower level of housing will require less employment land to be developed for housing. |
| **4. Shopping Centres** | All options are now assessed as uncertain outcomes (previously A and C were assessed as positive), as the impact on shopping centres depends on the final location of new development. |
| **5. Health and Well Being** | None. |
| **6. Community Safety** | None. |
| **7. Social Inclusion** | None. |

| SA objectives | Difference between Preferred Approach SA and Publication SA |
|---|---|
| **8. Transport** | Option C moved from positive to uncertain, as the impact on transport will depend on site specific factors and mitigation. (Same as Option B which is unchanged). |
| **9. Brownfield Land** | Option B moves from minor negative to major negative, due to the increase in housing provision in areas outside of the City and therefore more reliance on greenfield land. |
| **10. Energy and Climate Change** | All objectives move to a negative score, based on the number of new homes to be provided, as the greater the number of new homes, the more energy used and the more impact on climate change. (objectives A and C were previously assessed as minor positive). |
| **11. Pollution and Air Quality** | None. |
| **12. Flooding and Water Quality** | Option A moves from minor negative to uncertain as impacts can only be determined once development locations are known. |
| **13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure** | Option C assessed previously as uncertain effect now minor positive as providing fewer homes will impact less on greenfield sites. |
| **14. Landscape** | Previously assessed as uncertain for all options, now option B is assessed as minor negative due to exporting more homes to the two districts, whilst options A and C are minor positive because of no export of homes under these options. |
| **15. Built and Historic Environment** | None. |
| **16. Natural Resources and Waste Management** | Option C moves from minor negative to minor positive as it will potentially result in less greenfield land, less loss of best and most versatile agricultural land and less waste generation. |

4.4 The scoring for Housing Need and Targets has also been reviewed. There has been some refinement between the preferred option SA and the current SA, as many scores in the Preferred Approach appraisals were identified as uncertain, whilst this appraisal has aimed to be more specific in identifying impacts. Where the scoring for Sustainability Appraisal Objectives (SAOs) has changed significantly, these are:

| SA objectives | Difference between Preferred Approach SA and Publication SA |
|---|---|
| **1. Housing** | None. |
| **2. Employment and Jobs** | None. |

| SA objectives | Difference between Preferred Approach SA and Publication SA |
|---|---|
| **3. Economic Structure and Innovation** | None. |
| **4. Shopping Centres** | None. |
| **5. Health and Well Being** | None. |
| **6. Community Safety** | None. |
| **7. Social Inclusion** | All options previously assessed as no effect, reassessed as uncertain effect. |
| **8. Transport** | Option C reassessed from major positive to uncertain effect as less development is directed to the main urban area and strategic transport policies and site-specific development requirements will determine whether the level of housing will be accompanied by a reduction in car travel or improvement in accessibility. |
| **9. Brownfield Land** | All options previously assessed as uncertain, options A and C now assessed as minor negative due to the need to use greenfield land whilst option B assessed as minor positive as there would be less pressure to release greenfield land. |
| **10. Energy and Climate Change** | All options previously assessed as uncertain, options A and C now assessed as minor negative due to likely effects on climate change, whilst option B assessed as minor positive as this is a low growth scenario, therefore having a lesser impact on ecosystem services and the resilience of biodiversity to climate change. |
| **11. Pollution and Air Quality** | All options move from uncertain to negative impact, again based on the levels of housing provided by each option and likely effects on pollution and air quality. |
| **12. Flooding and Water Quality** | None. |
| **13. Natural Environment, Biodiversity, Blue-Green Infrastructure** | None. |
| **14. Landscape** | All options previously assessed as uncertain, options A and C now assessed as minor negative due to the impact of housing development on the landscape whilst option B assessed as minor positive as there would be less pressure on these factors. |
| **15. Built and Historic Environment** | All options previously assessed as uncertain, options A and C now assessed as minor negative due to the impact of housing development on the built and historic environment whilst option B assessed as minor positive as there would be less pressure on these factors. |

| SA objectives | Difference between Preferred Approach SA and Publication SA |
|---|---|
| **16. Natural Resources and Waste Management** | All options previously assessed as uncertain, Options A and B are now assessed as minor negative, with Option C as major negative, due to the relative impacts on use of best and most versatile agricultural land and amount of waste generated. |

4.5 Overall, the scoring changes are considered to represent reasonable refinements arising from the iterative development of the Plan and the availability of more detailed evidence. They do not indicate a change in appraisal methodology and do not undermine the overall conclusions of the SA.

# 5. Site Thresholds

5.1 The SA does not seek to appraise every site that may be promoted or subsequently allocated through a local plan. Its purpose at this stage is to assess reasonable alternatives for development of strategic significance to the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan. Thresholds have therefore been used to distinguish strategic site options from smaller, non-strategic sites that are more appropriately considered through existing or future local plans.

5.2 For housing, a strategic site is generally defined as a site capable of delivering at least 500 dwellings. Smaller sites may be considered collectively where they are grouped around the same settlement and together meet the strategic threshold. The threshold is applied principally to sites within or adjoining the Nottingham main built-up area or identified sustainable and accessible key settlements.

5.3 The 500-dwelling threshold reflects the approach used in the adopted Aligned Core Strategies and provides continuity with earlier strategic planning work across Greater Nottingham. The threshold within the adopted Aligned Core Strategy was used as this was considered to be a size threshold where infrastructure would be considered as a 'strategic level' (e.g. for planning of school provision where a 500 home development would support a one form entry primary school). It also reflects evidence on the delivery characteristics of large housing sites. The Lichfield's Start to Finish, Second Edition Study published in 2020 and Third Edition study, published in 2024, examines the delivery of sites of 500 or more dwellings and supports the use of this scale as an appropriate indicator of strategic housing development.

5.4 For general employment development, the threshold is 5 hectares or 20,000 square metres of floorspace. As with housing, smaller related sites may be grouped where together they fulfil a strategic employment role. This threshold also provides continuity with the adopted Aligned Core Strategies and derives from the Quality of Employment Land Study prepared by Roger Tym and Partners in July 2002.

5.5 Strategic distribution and logistics development has been treated separately because of its distinct scale, locational requirements, infrastructure needs and potential environmental effects. For this purpose, strategic warehousing is defined as development of approximately 9,000 square metres, or 100,000 square feet, and above. This is based on the definition used in paragraph 6.6 of the Nottinghamshire Core and Outer Housing Market Area Logistics Study prepared by Iceni in August 2022 and references 25 hectares as a suitable threshold for sites capable of being considered strategic.

5.6 The use of these thresholds provides a proportionate and consistent basis for identifying reasonable strategic-site alternatives. Sites below the thresholds have not been treated as unsuitable or as unavailable for development. Rather, they are not considered individually to represent strategic alternatives requiring assessment through the Strategic Plan SA. Such sites may still

contribute to housing or employment supply and can be assessed through future plan preparation or the development-management process, using the relevant evidence and SA or SEA requirements at that stage.

5.7 The thresholds therefore ensure that the SA remains focused on choices capable of materially influencing the strategic distribution and delivery of growth, while maintaining an appropriate distinction between strategic and non-strategic plan-making.

# 6. Summary of Policy Options and Reassessment

| Policy | Options Assessed | Implications of Gedling's withdrawal | Outcome of reassessment | Implications on the SA and Preferred Strategy | Justification for selecting preferred options |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Policy 1: Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction, Energy and Managing Flood Risk | A, B, C | The reasonable alternatives relate to development management requirements for climate change, sustainable design, energy efficiency and flood risk, rather than the location or distribution of development. The identified sustainability effects therefore remain applicable across the Plan area and no changes to the appraisal findings or scoring are considered necessary. | No further scoring change was required as a consequence of Gedling's withdrawal. | No change to the SA or to the Preferred Strategy. | Options B and C both perform strongly against the SA objectives and improve upon the existing policy approach. Option B is preferred as it delivers enhanced sustainability outcomes whilst avoiding the potential impact on housing affordability associated with the higher standards and build costs of Option C. |
| Policy 2: Spatial Strategy | A-D: alternative spatial distributions E: strategic | Option A has been amended to remove the reference to development adjacent to Hucknall. The alternatives remain | No further scoring change was required as a consequence | No change to the SA conclusions or Preferred Strategy. The appraisal and reasons for selecting the | Options A and E were selected in combination. Option A performs better than dispersed growth, particularly for housing, access to existing infrastructure, sustainable |

| Policy | Options Assessed | Implications of Gedling's withdrawal | Outcome of reassessment | Implications on the SA and Preferred Strategy | Justification for selecting preferred options |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | sustainability criteria | broad strategic approaches and are not dependent on any single authority or location. Although Gedling's withdrawal reduces the overall scale and geographical extent of development, it does not alter the key distinctions between urban concentration, dispersed growth, environmental asset-led growth, transport-led growth and the use of strategic sustainability criteria. | of Gedling's withdrawal. | preferred approach have been clarified. | transport and brownfield land. Option E adds strategic sustainability criteria, including integration with blue-green and transport infrastructure. Option B was rejected because of poorer effects on transport, brownfield land, pollution, landscape and natural resources; Options C and D contain useful principles but do not constitute complete spatial strategies. |
| Policy 3: Housing Requirements, Distribution and Strategic Sites | Delivering the identified housing targets: A-C | The alternatives concern the mechanism for delivering housing through strategic sites, future plan preparation, or a combination. These choices remain applicable to the revised Plan area and are not dependent on Gedling's inclusion. | No further scoring change was required as a consequence of Gedling's withdrawal. | No change to the SA conclusions. The preferred delivery mechanism remains a mix of strategic and non-strategic sites. | Option C is preferred because it combines the infrastructure and service benefits of strategic sites with the flexibility of non-strategic allocations through existing and future plans. It avoids the negative transport effects identified for Option B and the greater greenfield and landscape effects associated |

| Policy | Options Assessed | Implications of Gedling's withdrawal | Outcome of reassessment | Implications on the SA and Preferred Strategy | Justification for selecting preferred options |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | with relying only on additional strategic sites under Option A. |
| Policy 3: Housing Requirements, Distribution and Strategic Sites | Redistribution of Nottingham City's unmet need: A-C | Gedling's withdrawal means that any redistributed need would be directed to two districts rather than three. However, overall need is also reduced and the change falls within the scope of the existing appraisal. The relative effects of meeting need in the City, redistributing it, or not meeting it in full remain applicable. | No further scoring change was required as a consequence of Gedling's withdrawal. | The SA now provides a fuller explanation of the revised scoring and the balance struck between housing delivery and environmental effects. The Preferred Strategy is unchanged. | Predominantly Option C, incorporating an element of Option B. Option B performs strongly for housing but would have the greatest environmental effects if all unmet need were redistributed to greenfield locations outside the City. Option C has fewer adverse effects but a weaker housing outcome. The selected balance allows the City to meet as much need as its supply permits, with Broxtowe and Rushcliffe meeting part, but not all, of the remaining unmet need. |
| Policy 3: Housing Requirements, Distribution and Strategic Sites | Housing need and targets: A-C | The options test lower, medium and higher growth scenarios rather than authority-specific figures. They therefore remain appropriate following Gedling's withdrawal and continue to test the same strategic | No further scoring change was required as a consequence of Gedling's withdrawal. | The SA now gives clearer reasons for the selected balance. The Preferred Strategy is unchanged, subject to the housing requirement | A combination drawing principally on Option B, with an element of Option A, was selected. Option B reduces pressure on greenfield land, landscape and environmental assets but performs less well in meeting housing need. Option C was rejected |

| Policy | Options Assessed | Implications of Gedling's withdrawal | Outcome of reassessment | Implications on the SA and Preferred Strategy | Justification for selecting preferred options |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | choices about the scale of housing growth. | | modifications arising from the examination. | because, although it performs strongly for housing, it produces greater effects on pollution, water, landscape and natural resources. The selected approach reflects the City's constrained capacity while setting Broxtowe and Rushcliffe above their own need to help address the shortfall. |
| Policy 3: Housing Requirements, Distribution and Strategic Sites | Housing need and targets: 2024 transitional arrangements A-D | This appraisal was undertaken for the Publication Draft and is retained for transparency. Gedling's withdrawal does not change the broad comparison between the growth scenarios. | No further scoring change was required as a consequence of Gedling's withdrawal.; appraisal retained for information | The examination confirmed that the 2023 standard method, rather than the 2024 method, should underpin the Plan, so the preceding appraisal is the relevant basis for the updated conclusions. The appraisal of the 2024 transitional options is retained as part of the audit trail. | Option D was the Publication Draft preference because it balanced housing delivery and environmental impacts. Following the Inspectors' clarification, the 2024 transitional options are no longer the basis for the housing requirements and are retained only to explain the evolution of the Plan and SA. |

| Policy | Options Assessed | Implications of Gedling's withdrawal | Outcome of reassessment | Implications on the SA and Preferred Strategy | Justification for selecting preferred options |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | |
| Policy 4: The Green Belt | A-D | The alternatives concern the strategic approach to reviewing Green Belt boundaries, compensatory improvements and safeguarded land, rather than specific sites. The reduced extent of Green Belt following Gedling's withdrawal does not alter the fundamental comparison between the options. | No further scoring change was required as a consequence of Gedling's withdrawal. | No change to the SA or Preferred Strategy. | A combination of Options A and B is preferred. Reviewing boundaries is necessary to support identified housing and economic development, while compensatory improvements provide health, recreation, biodiversity and accessibility benefits. Option D would offer stronger protection for landscape and natural resources but would significantly constrain the ability to meet housing and economic needs. |
| Policy 5: Employment Provision and Economic Development | Employment land requirement: A-B | The options establish the overall employment land and office requirement rather than distributing development between individual authorities. The appraisal therefore remains applicable to the revised Plan area. | No further scoring change was required as a consequence of Gedling's withdrawal. | No change to the SA conclusions or Preferred Strategy. The updated evidence and supporting text should reflect the latest identified need and explain the level of provision. | All options would have a positive impact on several of the objectives, particularly those that related to employment land. Option A was selected for the overall employment requirement because it provides for a portfolio of market-facing employment sites and establishes the minimum employment land and office |

| Policy | Options Assessed | Implications of Gedling's withdrawal | Outcome of reassessment | Implications on the SA and Preferred Strategy | Justification for selecting preferred options |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | requirement. The approach to strategic distribution and logistics, including specific allocations and criteria for additional proposals, was determined separately through the appraisal of Options L to O. |
| Policy 5: Employment Provision and Economic Development | Office development: C-G | Gedling-specific sustainable urban extensions have been removed, but the principles of focusing offices in the City Centre, remaining sustainable urban extensions and Toton, and supporting the science and knowledge economy, remain applicable. | No further scoring change was required as a consequence of Gedling's withdrawal. | No change to the SA or Preferred Strategy. | Option C was selected as the preferred option, as it scored positively on several objectives but also allows for more office development in locations outside of Nottingham City Centre allowing for a range and choice of sites. This option delivers a sufficient range and choice of sites to also allow for elements of option G, which will allow appropriate sites to be allocated to meet the needs of high technology users. |
| Policy 5: Employment Provision and Economic Development | Employment sites: H-K | The appraisal concerns the promotion, safeguarding and regeneration of employment land. Toton | No further scoring change was required as a consequence | No change to the SA or Preferred Strategy. | In relation to 'Sites', options H, I and J were selected due to their positive assessments. Promoting sites including Toton and Ratcliffe-on-Soar |

| Policy | Options Assessed | Implications of Gedling's withdrawal | Outcome of reassessment | Implications on the SA and Preferred Strategy | Justification for selecting preferred options |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | and Ratcliffe-on-Soar are outside Gedling, and the distinctions between support for knowledge-based sectors, SMEs, good-quality sites and regeneration remain relevant. | of Gedling's withdrawal. | | Power Station scored particularly well, given the nature of those sites, when compared to a more general option of promoting a wide range of sites for small and medium enterprises. Retaining poor quality employment sites scored less well than redeveloping these sites, particularly in terms of the impact on community safety and air quality. |
| Policy 5: Employment Provision and Economic Development | Strategic distribution and logistics: L-O | The alternatives remain relevant because they test how much strategic logistics need should be met and whether provision should follow urban concentration or road and rail accessibility. Gedling's withdrawal does not alter those strategic distinctions. | Changes to scoring following reappraisal. Option M changed from major positive to minor positive for Objectives 2 (Employment and Jobs) and 3 (Economic Structure and innovation) as | No change to the site-selection conclusions or Preferred Strategy. Policy wording should remain clear, internally consistent and proportionate, including how additional proposals are assessed. | Option L performed best in relation to the quantitative provision of logistics land because it would meet all identified need. However, it was not taken forward in full because meeting the whole requirement was weighed against Green Belt and other environmental and policy considerations. Option O was selected as the preferred locational approach because it directs strategic logistics development to locations with |

| Policy | Options Assessed | Implications of Gedling's withdrawal | Outcome of reassessment | Implications on the SA and Preferred Strategy | Justification for selecting preferred options |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | would deliver less logistics provision. | | good access to the strategic road and rail networks. The Plan therefore allocates two strategic logistics sites that make a significant contribution to identified need, rather than meeting the full requirement. |
| Policy 6: Nottingham City Centre | A, B | The policy relates solely to Nottingham City Centre and is unaffected geographically by Gedling's withdrawal. | No further scoring change was required as a consequence of Gedling's withdrawal. | No change to the SA or Preferred Strategy, other than removal or updating of Gedling-specific references, evidence or projects where applicable. | Option B was selected. It allows greater flexibility and a broader mix of uses, supporting City Centre vitality and viability, housing and employment, linked trips and reduced car use, while retaining the City Centre's strategic role. Option A was not selected because retaining the existing approach would provide less flexibility to respond to changing patterns of use. |
| Policy 7: Role of Town and District Centres | A | The appraisal concerns a general policy approach for the remaining hierarchy of centres. Removal of Gedling's centres does not alter | No further scoring change was required as a consequence | No change to the SA or Preferred Strategy, other than removal or updating of Gedling-specific | Option A was selected. Allowing a wider mix of retail and non-retail uses can respond to changing shopping patterns, increase activity and diversity, support housing and |

| Policy | Options Assessed | Implications of Gedling's withdrawal | Outcome of reassessment | Implications on the SA and Preferred Strategy | Justification for selecting preferred options |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | the effects of allowing a more flexible mix of uses. | of Gedling's withdrawal. | references, evidence or projects where applicable. | jobs, and encourage linked trips, while keeping uses appropriate to each centre's role. |
| Policy 8: Housing Size, Mix and Choice | Housing mix: A-C Affordable housing: D-G Standards: H-K | The options are policy requirements applicable across the remaining authorities rather than choices dependent on Gedling-specific locations. The appraisal conclusions remain applicable. | No further scoring change was required as a consequence of Gedling's withdrawal. | No change to the SA or Preferred Strategy, other than removal or updating of Gedling-specific references, evidence or projects where applicable. | Options A, E, G, I and K were taken forward through Policy 8. These options provide a flexible, locally informed approach to housing mix; set affordable housing proportions and tenure requirements at local authority level; and require accessible, adaptable and space-standard compliant homes, reflecting identified needs, viability considerations, and positive effects on housing, health and social inclusion objectives. |
| Policy 9: Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople | A-B | The need and provision figures have been reviewed for the revised Plan area. The policy approach to meeting identified need and setting criteria for sites remains appropriate. | No further scoring change was required as a consequence of Gedling's withdrawal. | No change to the SA or Preferred Strategy, other than removal or updating of Gedling-specific references, evidence or | Option A was selected. It plans positively for identified accommodation needs through strategic allocations and future plan preparation and provides a criteria-based framework for considering sites and windfall proposals. |

| Policy | Options Assessed | Implications of Gedling's withdrawal | Outcome of reassessment | Implications on the SA and Preferred Strategy | Justification for selecting preferred options |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | projects where applicable. | Option B was not selected because deferring the matter entirely to future plans would provide no strategic framework and would perform less well for housing and social inclusion. |
| Policy 10: Design and Enhancing Local Identity | A-B | The design alternatives are development management approaches that apply consistently across the revised Plan area. Gedling's withdrawal does not materially change their effects. | No further scoring change was required as a consequence of Gedling's withdrawal. | No change to the SA or Preferred Strategy, other than removal or updating of Gedling-specific references, evidence or projects where applicable. | The approach taken forward in Policy 10 reflects Option A, as the policy requires development to have regard to local context, including landscape, townscape and heritage considerations, whilst establishing a framework through which detailed design requirements can be informed by best practice guidance, design codes and Supplementary Plans. This approach was selected as it provides a flexible basis for achieving high-quality design across the Plan area while allowing locally specific design guidance and requirements to be developed through future plan preparation. |

| Policy | Options Assessed | Implications of Gedling's withdrawal | Outcome of reassessment | Implications on the SA and Preferred Strategy | Justification for selecting preferred options |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Policy 11: The Historic Environment | A-B | The policy options concern strategic protection and enhancement of heritage assets rather than Gedling-specific allocations. The effects remain applicable to the revised Plan area. | No further scoring change was required as a consequence of Gedling's withdrawal. | No change to the SA or Preferred Strategy, other than removal or updating of Gedling-specific references, evidence or projects where applicable. | Options A and B were selected in combination. Option A retains the established protection and enhancement of designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings, while Option B adds explicit recognition of heritage-led regeneration. Together they provide a more positive strategy than retaining the existing approach alone. |
| Policy 12: Local Services and Healthy Lifestyles | A-C | The options concern plan-wide protection and provision of services, facilities and healthy-lifestyle measures. The appraisal remains relevant after the change in geography. | No further scoring change was required as a consequence of Gedling's withdrawal. | No change to the SA or Preferred Strategy, other than removal or updating of Gedling-specific references, evidence or projects where applicable. | Options B and C were selected in combination. Option B broadens the existing approach to promote healthy lifestyles, while Option C provides stronger protection against the loss of valued community facilities. Together they provide greater health and social-inclusion benefits than Option A alone. |
| Policy 13: Culture, Tourism and Sport | A-B | The options are strategic policy approaches and are not dependent on the inclusion of particular Gedling facilities. | No further scoring change was required as a consequence | No change to the SA or Preferred Strategy, other than removal or updating of | As elements of both options scored very well, a combination of both of the options has been selected and |

| Policy | Options Assessed | Implications of Gedling's withdrawal | Outcome of reassessment | Implications on the SA and Preferred Strategy | Justification for selecting preferred options |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | References and evidence have been updated where necessary. | of Gedling's withdrawal. | Gedling-specific references, evidence or projects where applicable. | the policy wording and justification text reflects this. |
| Policy 14: Managing Travel Demand | A-B | The policy approaches to reducing travel demand and promoting sustainable modes continue to apply across the remaining transport network and settlements. Gedling's withdrawal does not alter their relative performance. | No further scoring change was required as a consequence of Gedling's withdrawal. | No change to the SA or Preferred Strategy, other than removal or updating of Gedling-specific references, evidence or projects where applicable. | Both policy options would have a beneficial impact upon not only the transport objective, but a number of other objectives. Both options would secure a sustainable strategy for managing travel demand. As both options scored equally well, a combination of A-B have been selected. |
| Policy 15: Transport Infrastructure Priorities | A | Gedling-specific schemes have been removed where no longer relevant. The principle of identifying strategic transport priorities for the remaining Plan area is unchanged. | No further scoring change was required as a consequence of Gedling's withdrawal. | No change to the SA or Preferred Strategy, other than removal or updating of Gedling-specific references, evidence or projects where applicable. | Option A was selected. Identifying strategic transport priorities provides a clear basis for coordinating investment, supporting planned growth and encouraging non-car modes. Scheme-level environmental effects will be assessed and mitigated through delivery processes. |

| Policy | Options Assessed | Implications of Gedling's withdrawal | Outcome of reassessment | Implications on the SA and Preferred Strategy | Justification for selecting preferred options |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Policy 16: Blue and Green Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space | Blue-green infrastructure: A-E Landscape: F-G | The strategic networks and landscape evidence have been reviewed for the reduced Plan area. Removing Gedling changes the mapped geography but not the policy choices concerning protection, enhancement, connectivity and landscape character. | No further scoring change was required as a consequence of Gedling's withdrawal. | No change to the SA or Preferred Strategy, other than removal or updating of Gedling-specific references, evidence or projects where applicable. | The preferred approach builds upon the framework established in the Aligned Core Strategy (Option A), while also incorporating the findings and priorities of the updated Blue and Green Infrastructure Strategy (Option B). In addition, elements of Option C have been integrated through the inclusion of a policy approach that seeks to avoid, mitigate and address harm to blue and green infrastructure assets. Option F was selected to be taken forward as it was considered that locally valued landscapes should be identified through future plan preparation rather than as part of the Strategic Plan. |
| Policy 17: Biodiversity | Ecological networks: A-B Biodiversity net gain: C-E | The alternatives reflect plan-wide approaches to biodiversity protection, recovery and net gain. They remain applicable despite the revised | No further scoring change was required as a consequence | No change to the SA or Preferred Strategy, other than removal or updating of Gedling-specific | A combination of Options A and B was carried forward for biodiversity protection and ecological networks. The approach to biodiversity net gain draws partly on Option E, |

| Policy | Options Assessed | Implications of Gedling's withdrawal | Outcome of reassessment | Implications on the SA and Preferred Strategy | Justification for selecting preferred options |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | geographical scope, with references to the evidence base updated as necessary. | of Gedling's withdrawal. | references, evidence or projects where applicable. | with a minimum requirement of 10% in Broxtowe and Nottingham City and 20% in Rushcliffe. The differentiated approach reflects the SA findings alongside plan-wide viability work and local biodiversity evidence. |
| Policy 18: Infrastructure and Developer Contributions | A | The policy mechanism applies to development in the remaining authorities. Gedling's withdrawal changes the geographical coverage and infrastructure schedule but not the sustainability effects of requiring timely infrastructure and proportionate contributions. | No further scoring change was required as a consequence of Gedling's withdrawal. | No change to the SA or Preferred Strategy, other than removal or updating of Gedling-specific references, evidence or projects where applicable. | Option A was selected. It links growth to the timely delivery of transport, health, education, community and blue-green infrastructure and establishes the basis for proportionate developer contributions. This supports housing and economic development while ensuring that necessary mitigation and facilities are funded and delivered. |