

**Examiner's clarifying questions to Tollerton PC and Rushcliffe BC**

Having read the Plan and related material, I have two questions.

**Question 1 (EQ1) – Status of supporting documents**

Firstly, I would like some clarification as to which documents are intended to have a supporting role (and therefore which might be seen as material considerations in development management terms), as opposed to simply having been referred to for background.

The submitted TNP itself includes five appendices relating to shopfronts, character summary, heritage assets, local green spaces and junction improvements. These issues are dealt with within the Plan policies themselves, and the appendices contain further comment.

However, there is also a list of 15 “supporting documents” which appears on RBC’s website relating to the TNP. Some of these are clearly of some significance (for example, *Neighbourhood Design Guidelines for Tollerton*, April 2019), whereas others would seem to be historical in nature. The only specific reference in the Plan to this supporting material is in the introduction to Appendix B, which deals with character considerations (and which, incidentally, refers to a document dealing with design guidelines dated 2017, not 2019).

I am considering making a recommendation designed to clarify which of these supporting documents are expected to be taken into account in the decision-making process in addition to the NP policies themselves, but I need the councils' assistance on this. It would be helpful if TPC and RBC could provide a list of documents (other than the TNP itself) to which applicants for planning permission are expected to have regard when drawing up their plans, cross-referenced as appropriate to relevant policies in the Plan. An explanation of their status – in particular whether or not they can properly be described as being “Supplementary Planning Documents” [PPG on plan-making para 008] – would also be helpful.

**Question 2 (EQ2) – The Sustainable Urban Extension**

The second question is about the relationship between the NP and the “Sustainable Urban Extension” based around the airfield. The councils will be aware that representations made on behalf of developers take the view that the Plan should (effectively) not cover ground which is to be set out in the masterplan for the SUE.

Having considered the matter, and noted the scope of LP1 policies 3 and 25 (as well as generic policies in LP2), I am inclined to agree with the objections on this issue, for the reasons they give, but also because any unnecessary duplication would be confusing. I would appreciate the councils' observations on this matter, focusing in particular on the specific points raised by Savills, one of which is reference to the preparation of a supplementary planning document in relation to the SUE – what is the position here?

For both questions, I am happy to receive either a joint response or separate responses from the two councils.

A response to these questions by **Monday 27 November** would be much appreciated. If there is likely to be a problem in meeting this deadline, please let Penny O'Shea know by email via [mail@pennyoshea.co.uk](mailto:mail@pennyoshea.co.uk)

Please could RBC also ensure that these questions and the responses are posted on the TNP examination page of their website in due course.

David Kaiserman  
Independent Examiner  
15 November 2023