

**Greater Nottingham - Broxtowe BC, Gedling BC and Nottingham City Council – Aligned Core Strategies (ACS) Examination
Inspector’s Matters, Issues and Questions**

Matter 3: The Green Belt

The main issue is: whether the Spatial Strategy and Policy 3 of the ACS are consistent with the fundamental aim and purposes of Green Belts as set out in the NPPF, and whether the proposals for alterations to Green Belt boundaries are underpinned by adequate review processes and justified by exceptional circumstances.

Questions

1. The Councils contend that, having objectively assessed the full need for housing across their areas and reviewed their strategic housing land availability assessments (SHLAAs), some alteration to Green Belt boundaries is required to accommodate the growth in housing and associated development. Is there substantive evidence to counter this argument?
2. The ACS is founded on a two stage review of Green Belt boundaries: (i) strategic assessment to find the most sustainable locations for large scale development around Greater Nottingham and define a limited number of strategic allocations for growth, and (ii) a detailed examination of individual sites and settlements suitable for sustainable growth with precise boundaries being established in subsequent development plan documents (DPDs). Given the commitment of the local authorities to produce core strategies and consequent, more detailed DPDs, what precisely is wrong with this 2-step approach to reviewing the Green Belt? Will it delay the development process unreasonably as some suggest?
3. Significant representations have been made for and against changes to the Green Belt at a local level, eg. at Field Farm, Brinsley, Greasley, , Calverton, Kimberley, Nuthall, and Toton. My understanding is that Top Wighay Farm and land North of Papplewick Lane are not within the Green Belt. They were identified as ‘safeguarded land’ in an earlier Local Plan. Is there any substantive evidence from detailed assessments of Green Belt in the above mentioned and other localities that the ACS contains flaws and should be changed?
4. Paragraph 3.3.4 of the ACS refers to existing safeguarded land in Gedling. Has ‘consideration’ been given to the appropriateness of its continued use in Gedling and to its use by the other authorities? Should the plan be clearer on its application? Is there a risk that safeguarding could provide an escape from debates on impact and mitigation?

Jill Kingaby
Inspector