

**MINUTES
OF THE MEETING OF THE
CABINET
TUESDAY, 13 JANUARY 2026**

Held at 7.00 pm in the Council Chamber Area B, Rushcliffe Arena,
Rugby Road, West Bridgford
and live streamed on Rushcliffe Borough Council's YouTube channel

PRESENT:

Councillors N Clarke (Chair), A Brennan (Vice-Chair), R Inglis, R Upton, D Virdi
and J Wheeler

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Councillors S Calvert, J Chaplain, P Gowland, L Plant and J Walker

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:

L Ashmore	Director of Development and Economic Growth
R Clack	Deputy Monitoring Officer
A Hill	Chief Executive
P Linfield	Director of Finance and Corporate Services
H Tambini	Democratic Services Manager

49 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest made.

50 Minutes of the Meeting held on 25 November and 9 December 2025

The minutes of the meetings held on Tuesday, 25 November and 9 December 2025 were agreed as a true record and signed by the Chair.

51 Citizens' Questions

There were no Citizens' questions.

52 Opposition Group Leaders' Questions

Question from Councillor J Walker to Councillor Upton

"The mention of the site investigation and remediation in paragraph 4.22 of the report is welcome. What assurance can the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Housing provide that the local planning authority, Rushcliffe Borough Council will seek to ensure the site is investigated for contamination and any necessary remediation carried out?"

Councillor Upton advised that this matter will be considered during the planning application process. In consultation with the technical consultees, officers will

consider the wording of, and need for, any planning condition(s) relating to mitigating any potential contamination at that stage, as part of the planning process. When dealing with land potentially affected by contamination, planning conditions require the assessment and management of potential contamination to be undertaken in accordance with the well-established risk management framework provided in the Environment Agency's "Land Contamination Risk Management" guidance. Technical consultees will ensure that the information submitted to discharge the planning conditions is sufficiently robust to identify and address potential risks to human health and the environment.

Councillor Walker asked a supplementary question.

"The UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) wrote to Rushcliffe Borough Council on 7 November, stating that there was suitable justification for further radiation survey at Tollerton Park because Radium 226 was detected in Rushcliffe Borough Council's 2008 survey, and that subsequent ground disturbance, including new homes and services may have moved the detected contamination or exposed new contamination. UKHSA advised this to ensure that health risks remain low.

Can Cabinet confirm whether this survey has been scheduled and then provide the date, and if not, explain why this recommendation has not yet been acted upon?"

Councillor Upton stated that he was well aware of the 2008 report and the UKHSA's comments and advised that he was not aware that the survey had been undertaken yet, and that he would respond in 14 days if that information needed updating. He also questioned if Tollerton Park formed part of the airfield planning application.

53 East of Gamston/North of Tollerton Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document

The Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Planning and Housing, Councillor Upton, presented the report of the Director – Development and Economic Growth, which detailed the East of Gamston/North of Tollerton Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document.

Before Councillor Upton introduced the item, the Leader advised that this report was not seeking to grant approval of any planning application, it was to consider approval of a framework, under which planning applications would be determined in the future. Matters including potential flooding and land contamination would be considered during the planning application process, they were not part of this particular process.

Councillor Upton referred to the significant public interest generated in the proposed redevelopment and reiterated the Leader's comments. It was noted that in 2014 this strategic site was adopted as part of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1 for around 4,000 new homes, employment land and supporting infrastructure. The site was also included in the draft Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan, which would be publicly examined in the Spring. Councillor

Upton stated that during the last 11 years, discussions had taken place involving the Council, various consultees and stakeholders to develop a single-site Masterplan; however, progress had been slow, and limited to the last few years, resulting in the production of a Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). It was not necessary to have a Masterplan or an SPD; however, the Council felt that it was better to have a Plan, to coordinate development and avoid random development without any site planning. Councillor Upton confirmed that the SPD had been considered and unanimously supported at the cross-party Local Development Framework Group meeting last week. He advised that the SPD had to be approved by 30 June, to avoid the Government's cut-off date, missing that deadline would delay the process, causing significant delay to this site's vital contribution to maintaining the Borough's five year housing supply, which the Council required to manage development in the Borough. Councillor Upton stated that without the five year supply, the Council could not resist unplanned development, which had happened before, and it would also allow developers to submit appeals to the Planning Inspectorate for non-determination. He referred to the National housing crisis and the Government's ambition to build 1.5 million homes during this Parliament.

Nevertheless, Councillor Upton advised that the Council had listed to comments made following the public consultation, and it was proposed that the decision to adopt the SPD should be paused, to request more detailed information and he proposed the following revised recommendation:

It is RECOMMENDED that Cabinet:

- a) continues to support the principle of a Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the Gamston/Tollerton Sustainable Urban Extension;
- b) pauses the current SPD approval process in response to comments made to the public consultation, whilst more detailed information is requested on highways, especially the connectivity of the site to and across the A52;
- c) requests the Leader of the Council to write to:
 - the site owners/developers/promoters, including Nottinghamshire County Council as landowner of part of the site, to ask them to urgently provide the outstanding highways solution; and
 - Nottinghamshire County Council as Highways Authority and National Highways to work proactively and at pace to reach a satisfactory highways solution;

so that this SPD can be brought back to Cabinet by 10 March 2026 for further consideration.
- d) requires that any further detailed highways and Infrastructure Delivery Plan information is published for public consultation if appropriate;
- e) considers any future recommendations made by the Local Development

Framework Group; and

- f) thanks Council officers and others for the significant amount of work that has been done.

In seconding the revised recommendation, Councillor Brennan referred to the considerable misunderstanding regarding what this document actually represented and stated that if agreed, it did not mean that planning applications would automatically be approved. The SPD was not designed to address issues of potential contamination, flooding or highway matters, which would come forward in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). The Masterplan was designed to impose some order, to avoid uncoordinated development and to ensure high standards of development and timely infrastructure provision. She reiterated that officers had been working for years to encourage developers to work together, and to engage with National Highways; however, this had proved extremely challenging, hence not all information was currently available. Councillor Brennan referred to the potential risks of not taking a decision tonight, and that if the Secretary of State intervened, she was in no doubt that going forward housing development would take place on this site, with the Council no longer having any control or input. As Councillor Upton had mentioned, the Council had listened to and reflected on the concerns raised by local residents, and it was willing to pause approval and redouble its efforts to urge relevant parties to provide the outstanding information.

Councillor J Wheeler reiterated the importance of having a Masterplan for the site, referred to the hard work, time and resources taken to reach this stage, and expressed disappointment that important information was still unavailable. He stated that a decision had to be taken, or the Council could lose control, as had happened in the past, including the wider Gamston extension built over 40 years ago, where issues remained, and he did not wish to see history repeated. The Masterplan would ensure that a framework was in place, to hold developers to account and he reiterated that given the Government's housing targets, having a five year housing supply was crucial to avoid speculative development. Councillor Wheeler stated that if the additional information was not provided, the Council would have to make a decision without it.

Councillor Viridi stated that this was ultimately not about slowing progress, rather it was about strengthening it, and the SPD would provide clarity for both the Council and residents moving forward. He agreed that pausing was the responsible course of action and was happy to support this approach.

The Leader reiterated that the Council did not want the Government to intervene, removing its control, and that issues including highways, flooding and land contamination would have to be satisfied as part of any planning application process.

It was RESOLVED that Cabinet:

- a) continues to support the principle of a Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the Gamston/Tollerton Sustainable Urban Extension;

- b) pauses the current SPD approval process in response to comments made to the public consultation, whilst more detailed information is requested on highways, especially the connectivity of the site to and across the A52;
- c) requests the Leader of the Council to write to:
- the site owners/developers/promoters, including Nottinghamshire County Council as landowner of part of the site, to ask them to urgently provide the outstanding highways solution; and
 - Nottinghamshire County Council as Highways Authority and National Highways to work proactively and at pace to reach a satisfactory highways solution;
- so that this SPD can be brought back to Cabinet by 10 March 2026 for further consideration.
- d) requires that any further detailed highways and Infrastructure Delivery Plan information is published for public consultation if appropriate;
- e) considers any future recommendations made by the Local Development Framework Group; and
- f) thanks Council officers and others for the significant amount of work that has been done.

The meeting closed at 7.25 pm.

CHAIR