

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

**Matter 5: The Environment**

*Main issues: (i) Whether the ACS will protect and enhance the natural, built and historic environment appropriately, helping to improve biodiversity and green infrastructure, minimising waste and pollution, securing high quality design, safeguarding heritage assets, and mitigating and adapting to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy; (ii) Whether the policies are all justified and consistent with national policy.*

**Questions:**

1. Is Policy 1 of the ACS justified and consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), especially paragraphs 93 onwards? Does it support the targets of the Climate Change Act 2008 clearly?
2. Is the policy deliverable given the need for development to be viable?
3. Should targets for CO2 emissions and renewable energy generation be set for each planning authority as suggested by Nottingham Friends of the Earth?
4. Should Policy 1 be more locally distinctive eg. recognising that Nottingham City and the Trent Valley is an area where flood risk exists? Should it specify which future DPDs (Policy 1, section 4) and LDDs (section 9) will take the policy forward?
5. Is the requirement in 2 a) for water use of no more than 105 litres per person per day capable of being effective and monitored? And/or should it be amended to reflect more ambitious targets for the future?
6. Should paragraph 2.2.26 or others in the ACS refer to flooding from other sources such as pluvial, groundwater, minewater or drainage infrastructure?
7. Should paragraph 3.1.11 refer to all on-farm renewables not just biomass? And should references to the role of wind and solar power generally in achieving sustainable development be added?
8. Do the Spatial Portrait and Spatial Vision give sufficient recognition to Nottingham’s historic environment. Are its future preservation/enhancement covered appropriately by Policy 11, having regard for section 11 of the NPPF? Should the first sentence of that policy be changed to read “are conserved or enhanced”?
9. Does Appendix A take sufficient account of heritage, in particular the relationship of Nottingham City’s regeneration zones, land north

of Papplewick Lane and key settlements in Gedling, to conservation areas, listed buildings and scheduled ancient monuments?

10. Is sufficient weight given to safeguarding the DH Lawrence landscape in the ACS? If not, what should be changed?

11. Are Policies 16 and 17 consistent with section 11 of the NPPF on green infrastructure, parks and open space and biodiversity? Should they be more locally distinctive?

12. Having regard for Natural England's representations, should more detail about green infrastructure and targets for Accessible Natural Greenspace be included in the ACS?

13. Is Policy 16 (2c) too onerous in implying that all development should enhance the strategic GI network?

14. Is Policy 17 based on up-to-date evidence and site designations?

Jill Kingaby  
Inspector