

**Appendix 2: Draft Developer Contributions Supplementary
Planning Document – summary of
consultation responses**

Ref	Name	Paragraph/ Topic Ref	Comment	Proposed response to comment
Local Residents				
1.	Resident 01	3.4-3.5	Over 90% of new homes in Rushcliffe are unaffordable. Urges reversal of this trend and prioritization of affordable housing and housing for the homeless.	The Council recognises the concerns around housing affordability and is actively working to address them. This Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) forms part of a broader strategy to secure affordable housing and infrastructure through planning obligations, ensuring new development contributes meaningfully.
2.	Resident 01	3.26-3.48	Developers must replace any lost recreational facilities (e.g. countryside, brooks, woods) within the same locality. Off-site replacement should not be permitted.	This is a Local Plan policy matter and not something that would be addressed through the SPD. It is concerned with the process and mechanisms for securing new or improved infrastructure to support new development.
3.	Resident 01	3.57-3.59	Developers must contribute to NHS and health services to mitigate long-term risks (e.g. asbestos, radiation). Compensation and medical costs must be covered.	Through planning obligations, developers may be required to contribute to healthcare infrastructure where justified. While compensation for medical costs is outside the scope for planning obligations, the SPD supports contributions to NHS services to address increased demand and long-term community health needs.
4.	Resident 01	General	Developers must provide full insurance and indemnity against harm to workers, residents, and	While planning legislation does not permit conditions or planning obligations requiring

Ref	Name	Paragraph/ Topic Ref	Comment	Proposed response to comment
			future occupants. Liability must persist even if the developer goes bust or is acquired.	insurance or indemnity, developers must comply with statutory health and safety regulations
5.	Resident 01	General	Educational, training, and engineering resources displaced by development must be replaced locally with accessible public transport.	This is a Local Plan policy matter and not something that would be addressed through the SPD.
6.	Resident 02	3.57-3.59	The term “existing practices” is unclear—likely refers to General Practice but needs clarification. The section inconsistently refers to healthcare broadly and then narrows to General Practice. Also unclear whether contributions cover buildings only or include services.	<p>“Existing practices” refers to physical healthcare facilities, typically General Practice. Contributions are intended to support infrastructure, not ongoing service delivery.</p> <p><u>Modification</u> – for the purpose of clarity, change “existing practices” to “existing <u>medical facilities</u>”.</p>
7.	Resident 02	3.3-3.20	The Housing section (3.3–3.20) mostly repeats Local Plan policy and lacks clarity on developer contributions. Except for specialist accommodation, it doesn’t explain how developers are expected to contribute. Suggests either revising to include contribution details or removing the section.	The housing section is considered to provide useful detail, albeit that the requirements in respect of affordable housing are more comprehensively covered in the separate Affordable Housing SPD. It is, however, helpful to cross refer to this as affordable housing is typically secured as a planning obligation.

Ref	Name	Paragraph/ Topic Ref	Comment	Proposed response to comment
8.	Resident 02	3.65-3.68	Like the Housing section, this part doesn't clearly explain how developer contributions apply. Questions why it is included if it does not outline contribution mechanisms.	The section outlines the expectations for Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDs) and flood mitigation, which are typically secured via planning conditions or obligations. While not all elements require financial contributions, their inclusion reflects commitment to managing flood risk through design-led solutions.
9.	Resident 02	3.14-3.16	The 1% requirement for M4(3)(a) wheelchair adaptable homes is inadequate. Personal experience highlights the difficulty of finding suitable housing. Suggests developers should contribute to accessible infrastructure like dropped kerbs and pavement design to improve mobility for disabled residents.	<p>The 1% requirement reflects the current Local Plan policy requirement but will be kept under review. The SPD, however, needs to be clear that provision will be secured by means of a planning obligation and/or planning condition (paragraph 3.16 is therefore modified to identify that this is the case).</p> <p>Contributions to accessible infrastructure such as dropped kerbs and inclusive pavement design may be secured through planning obligations or design standards, supporting mobility and inclusion for disabled residents.</p> <p><u>Modification</u> Paragraph 3.16 –amend “...wheelchair adaptable homes and/or a relevant planning...”</p>
10.	Resident 03	General	Concerns over developers building on long-standing community	While the concerns are noted, this is not directly a matter for this SPD. It is concerned with the

Ref	Name	Paragraph/ Topic Ref	Comment	Proposed response to comment
			recreational areas (e.g. Nottingham Airfield), used for walking, horse riding, wildlife watching, and flying. Questions how such spaces can be meaningfully replaced.	process and mechanisms for securing new or improved infrastructure to support new development.
11.	Resident 03	General	Loss of skilled jobs (e.g. engineers and pilots at Nottingham Airfield) due to development. Argues that developers cannot replace such employment opportunities through housing plans.	This is not directly a matter for the SPD. While housing delivery is a priority, the Local Plan seeks to balance this with economic sustainability. Proposals will be assessed for their impact on employment, and where appropriate planning obligations may support local skills, training, or employment initiatives.
12.	Resident 03	3.73–3.80	Highlights the irreversible loss of biodiversity at development sites like Nottingham Airfield. Expresses concern that biodiversity net gain is not feasible in such cases.	The SPD supports national policy requiring measurable biodiversity net gain, but recognises that in some cases, full replacement may not be feasible. Proposals will be assessed rigorously, and off-site compensation may be considered where justified.
13.	Resident 03	General	Raises serious concerns about contaminated land at Nottingham Airfield and developers' poor track records in remediation. Calls for stronger due diligence and safety checks to protect future residents and the local community.	This is not a matter for this SPD. All development proposals must comply with national and local policies on land remediation, including thorough site investigations and risk assessments. Planning conditions will be used to ensure appropriate remediation is carried, with oversight from environmental health and relevant statutory bodies.

Ref	Name	Paragraph/ Topic Ref	Comment	Proposed response to comment
14.	Resident 04	General	Expresses grave concern over toxic contamination at the Nottingham Airfield site proposed for development by Vistry Group. Emphasizes that full remediation must be enforced and policed by Rushcliffe Borough Council (RBC). Warns that failure to do so could result in future health risks and shared liability between the developer and RBC.	This is not a matter for this SPD. All development proposals must comply with national and local policies on land remediation, including thorough site investigations and risk assessments. Planning conditions will be used to ensure appropriate remediation is carried, with oversight from environmental health and relevant statutory bodies.
15.	Resident 05	General	Recommends mandatory like-for-like replacement of recreational facilities lost to development, in line with NPPF Paragraph 104. Cites Nottingham City Airport as an example of a site with recreational value that should be replaced or compensated for.	This is a Local Plan policy matter and not something that would be addressed through the SPD.
16.	Resident 05	General	Highlights the need to replace skilled employment lost through development, such as engineering and aviation jobs. Suggests developers contribute to vocational training or new business premises to match the economic value of displaced enterprises.	This is a Local Plan policy matter and not something that would be addressed through the SPD.

Ref	Name	Paragraph/ Topic Ref	Comment	Proposed response to comment
17.	Resident 05	3.73-3.80	Opposes biodiversity offsetting and calls for strict enforcement of onsite biodiversity net gain. Warns against translocation of species and urges developers to exhaust all onsite options before considering offsite measures.	The SPD aligns with national policy requiring developers to prioritise onsite enhancements and avoid harmful practices such as inappropriate species translocation. All proposals will be assessed rigorously to ensure ecological integrity.
18.	Resident 05	3.57-3.59	Calls for additional health contributions when developing contaminated land, including funding for NHS services, health surveillance, and public education. Aligns with NPPF Paragraph 196 on contamination risk.	In line with NPPF Paragraph 196, developers must demonstrate that land is safe for use. Through planning obligations, developers may be required to contribute to healthcare infrastructure where justified. While compensation for medical costs is outside planning scope, the SPD supports contributions to NHS services to address increased demand and long-term community health needs.
19.	Resident 05	General	Recommends mandatory proof of insurance and indemnity for developers to protect against harm to workers, residents, and future occupants. Suggests this be a condition of planning approval.	While planning legislation does not permit conditions or planning obligations requiring insurance or indemnity, developers must comply with statutory health and safety regulations.

Ref	Name	Paragraph/ Topic Ref	Comment	Proposed response to comment
Councils & Parish Councils				
20.	Nottinghamshire County Council	2.31-2.40	<p>NCC should be explicitly referenced as a consultee in the negotiation process.</p> <p>NCC legal review costs should be covered by applicants.</p> <p>Welcomes reference to NCC as a signatory.</p> <p>SPD should include NCC's monitoring charges, as outlined in NCC's Developer Contributions Strategy.</p>	<p>Paragraph 2.25 already references the need to have regard to the Nottinghamshire County Council's (NCC) Developer Contribution Strategy; however, it is accepted that more explicit reference to NCC's role in the process of negotiating, securing and monitoring planning obligations would be helpful.</p> <p><u>Modifications</u></p> <p>Add the following new paragraph after 2.12: "The Council will charge a proportionate and reasonable monitoring fee for the monitoring of and reporting on the delivery of planning obligations and Section 106 agreements. The County Council will also charge a monitoring fee for planning obligations and Section 106 agreements together with a separate charge to cover its costs involved with administering payments in line with the County Council's Developer Contributions Strategy."</p> <p>Add to paragraph 2.22: "<u>Nottinghamshire County Council will also recharge developers for reasonable legal costs incurred in agreeing planning obligations for its services. Further details are referenced in its Developer Contributions Strategy.</u>"</p>

Ref	Name	Paragraph/ Topic Ref	Comment	Proposed response to comment
				<p>Add paragraph 2.31 reference to “<u>Nottinghamshire County Council</u>” in addition to Town/Parish councils.</p> <p>Add to the end of second paragraph of Appendix 1: “<u>, including details in respect of its fees for monitoring planning obligations.</u>”</p>
21.	Nottinghamshire County Council	3.21-3.25	<p>Add Public Rights of Way (PROW) to improvements list.</p> <p>Add paragraph on public transport services, including community/demand-responsive buses.</p> <p>Provide link or appendix for A52 Memorandum of Understanding.</p> <p>Add reference to NCC’s Developer Contributions Strategy for further guidance and costs.</p>	<p>Following these comments, changes to the document would be helpful. Although, it is not possible to provide a link to the A52 Memorandum of Understanding.</p> <p><u>Modifications</u></p> <p>Add new paragraph following 3.21: “<u>Enhancements to public transport services may be secured though planning obligation or condition and may include new routes or extensions to existing services designed to serve a new development. There might also be circumstances where a contribution is required for community or demand responsive bus services, in order to serve smaller sites including within rural areas.</u>”</p> <p>Add to list at paragraph 3.22: “<u>Public Rights of Way (PROW)</u>”;</p> <p>Add to end of paragraph 3.25:</p>

Ref	Name	Paragraph/ Topic Ref	Comment	Proposed response to comment
				<u>“Further guidance and costs for highways and transport infrastructure and services can be found in the County Council’s Developer Contributions Strategy.”</u>
22.	Nottinghamshire County Council	3.52-3.56	Clarify implications of secondary education being a CIL funding stream. Confirm when planning obligations would or would not be sought.	It is accepted that relevant text could usefully be added to document. <u>Modification</u> Add to the end of paragraph 3.56: “..., apart from the provision of a new secondary school on the East of Gamston/North of Tollerton strategic allocation site. This is expected to be provide by the developers as a planning obligation. This site is not subject to CIL payments.”
23.	Nottinghamshire County Council	3.62–3.64	Add explanation for stock-based contributions when physical expansion is not needed. Most contributions are for stock, not buildings.	The SPD already refers to “increasing stock levels at existing libraries” and cross refers to the County Council’s Developer Contributions Strategy. However, the suggested additional text is considered a helpful addition. <u>Modification</u> Add after paragraph 3.63 the following new paragraph: “Where a library building is able to accommodate the extra demand created by a new development, but it is known and demonstrable that the stock levels are inadequate to meet the needs of the additional population (based on

Ref	Name	Paragraph/ Topic Ref	Comment	Proposed response to comment
				<u>recommended stock levels), a contribution will be sought towards increasing the stock level at that library to accommodate the additional population generated”.</u>
24.	Nottinghamshire County Council	3.65–3.68	Supports references to NCC as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA).	Noted
25.	Nottinghamshire County Council	3.71	Supports reference to Household Waste Recycling Centres and NCC’s Developer Contributions Strategy.	Noted.
26.	Nottinghamshire County Council	Appendix 1 – Schedule of Financial Contributions	<p>Link to NCC’s Developer Contributions Strategy should point to the webpage, not the PDF.</p> <p>“Bus Infrastructure” should be renamed “Bus Infrastructure and Services.”</p> <p>Clarify that Travel Plan fees cover monitoring, not plan preparation.</p> <p>Add SEND education contribution: £104,556 per place.</p>	<p>Noted – the link will be changed to the webpage and not the PDF.</p> <p>The suggested amendments to Appendix 1 are appropriate.</p> <p><u>Modifications</u> Rename “Bus Infrastructure” as “Bus Infrastructure and Services.”</p> <p>Add the following text to the financial contribution column for Travel Plans: <u>“These fees for Travel Plans cover the monitoring of Travel Plans and not their preparation”</u></p>

Ref	Name	Paragraph/ Topic Ref	Comment	Proposed response to comment
				Add the following text to the financial contribution column for Education: " <u>Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) education contribution is £104,556 per place.</u> "
27.	Nottinghamshire County Council – Lead Local Flood Authority	3.65- 3.68	<p>Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) are discussed in the Residential Design Guide which we support.</p> <p>NCC (LLFA) suggests a number of detailed technical implementation requirements.</p>	While the comments are noted and are helpful, the suggested specific technical requirements for SuDS provision are considered too detailed for this SPD. The purpose of the SPD to support how SUDS are secured in association with new development, rather than provide detailed specifications for SuDS. These are possibly matters for other planning policy documents
28.	Gotham Parish Council	3.21-3.22	The Parish Council is disappointed at the lack of actual sustainable travel targets within the document and feel that every new development 'must' have a sustainable travel connection (cycle and pedestrian) to existing sustainable travel infrastructure.	The purpose of the SPD to support how sustainable transport measures are secured in association with new development, rather than detailed requirements or targets for those measures. These are matters for other planning policy documents
29.	Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council	2.24	Parish councils should be formally recognised as key stakeholders in identifying infrastructure needs, especially for community facilities, open space, and local transport.	The SPD already recognises the role and importance of parish councils at the pre-application and application stages. However, additional references to the need to engage with parish/town council are have been added to the document (see further responses below).

Ref	Name	Paragraph/ Topic Ref	Comment	Proposed response to comment
			Early engagement at the pre-application stage is essential to ensure local priorities are reflected in heads of terms.	
30.	Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council	Asset transfer	<p>Commutated sums must reflect realistic, inflation-adjusted to avoid unfunded liabilities. The SPD should commit to reviewing commuted sum calculations regularly.</p> <p>Parishes should retain the right to decline transfers where funding or capacity is insufficient.</p> <p>Clear guidance should be provided on the legal and financial process of asset transfer, including insurance and health and safety obligations.</p>	<p>To ensure that the SPD does not become out of date and that commuted sums are sufficient, its Appendix 1 indicates that financial contributions are indicative only and are subject to change based on the context of each individual application and subject to indexation.</p> <p>Parish councils would only be in receipt of commuted sums or new assets at their own agreement.</p> <p>The inclusion of the guidance sought in respect of asset transfer goes beyond the scope of the SPD.</p>
31.	Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council	Community facility priorities	The Parish Council identifies the key infrastructure items it believes the SPD must prioritise on the back of Radcliffe on Trent having already absorbed significant development in recent years and with further large-scale growth planned. This includes recreation and open space, community buildings, active travel	The role of the SPD is not to prioritise which infrastructure should be delivered and where. This is the role of, in particular, the Local Plan and its infrastructure delivery plan. This SPD focuses on the delivery mechanisms for new or improved infrastructure where has already been identified as necessary in accordance with Local Plan policy requirements.

Ref	Name	Paragraph/ Topic Ref	Comment	Proposed response to comment
			and public transport , flood mitigation and drainage, health care and education.	
32.	Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council	Transparency and accountability	<p>Parish councils require transparency in how developer contributions (whether via Section 106 or CIL) are allocated.</p> <p>Parish councils should be able to track Section 106 and CIL funds generated in their area and how they are spent.</p>	Annual infrastructure funding statements are published in line with national requirements, detailing S106 and CIL income and expenditure.
33.	Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council	3.2	Contributions should allow for flexible use to adapt to changing demographics and community needs over time.	Where appropriate, Section 106 agreements are drafted to allow for adaptable use within defined categories, ensuring contributions remain effective and relevant over time while meeting planning obligations.
34.	Ruddington Parish Council	General	Supports the Draft Developer Contributions SPD and welcomes its intent to provide clarity and consistency for developers and communities.	The Council welcomes the support for the Draft Developer Contributions SPD.

Ref	Name	Paragraph/ Topic Ref	Comment	Proposed response to comment
35.	Tollerton Parish Council	General	Supports the preparation of the SPD, which improves transparency and consistency in developer contributions.	The Council welcomes the support.
36.	Tollerton Parish Council	Planning obligation negotiation	<p>The SPD does not clearly explain the process or timing of negotiating planning obligations.</p> <p>Recommend inclusion of a workflow diagram showing key stages and when consultation with stakeholders (including parish councils) occurs.</p> <p>Suggest inclusion of standard templates for obligations and conditions, as supported by Planning Practice Guidance (ref: 23b-016-20190901), to improve accessibility for non-specialist audiences.</p>	The SPD is considered to provide sufficient clarity. While Planning Practice Guidance on Planning Obligations supports the use of standard forms and templates for planning obligations, given that these may need to change over time, inclusion of such templates within the SPD is not considered appropriate.
37.	Tollerton Parish Council	East of Gamston/ North of Tollerton strategic allocation	<p>The SPD references CIL as a key funding mechanism, but Gamston Fields is exempt from CIL.</p> <p>Request additional guidance in the SPD on how infrastructure (e.g. schools, healthcare, open space)</p>	The East of Gamston/ North of Tollerton strategic allocation is the only strategic site where CIL does not apply. Any additional guidance regarding infrastructure provision on this site specifically, including coordinating contributions across multiple developers, is better dealt with by the separate SPD being prepared for the site.

Ref	Name	Paragraph/ Topic Ref	Comment	Proposed response to comment
			<p>will be delivered on strategic sites without CIL.</p> <p>Recommend outlining a methodology or framework for coordinating contributions across multiple developers within strategic allocations.</p>	<p>The inclusion of guidance to deal with other potential future CIL exempt sites is not warranted because the rest of the Borough is covered by CIL charging zones where payments are applicable.</p>
38.	Tollerton Parish Council	3.44-3.46	<p>Parish Councils should be given first refusal for adopting and managing open spaces, parks, and leisure facilities within new developments.</p> <p>Tollerton Parish Council supports long-term stewardship of green infrastructure, including green buffer land at Gamston Fields (Policy 25), which aligns with the Neighbourhood Plan and local aspirations.</p> <p>The Parish Council welcomes the principle of long-term ownership and stewardship but highlights three key considerations for inclusion in the SPD:</p>	<p>Adoption arrangements are considered on a case-by-case basis and parish councils may be offered first refusal where appropriate but this cannot be insisted upon. The wording included in the SPD is considered appropriate in this respect.</p> <p>In response of the request for additional guidance concerning the functionality of open space and the early involvement of parish councils in their design and specification, the following text is proposed.</p> <p><u>Modification</u> Add the following text to paragraph 3.44: “Where a Parish/Town Council is expected to adopt and manage any play spaces, sports pitches or other recreational open space, they should be engaged with and given the opportunity to influence the design and specification of those spaces. This should include consideration as to whether</p>

Ref	Name	Paragraph/ Topic Ref	Comment	Proposed response to comment
			<p>A. design and functionality – spaces should avoid integrating sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) or biodiversity features that carry legal obligations beyond Parish Council powers. Clear separation of these elements is needed.</p> <p>B. early involvement – Parish Councils should be engaged in design and specification from the outset to ensure consistency and suitability for long-term management.</p> <p>c. financial support – transfers must include funding packages to cover maintenance for at least 10–15 years, as initial costs would otherwise impose a significant burden.</p> <p>The Parish Council also advocates for early pre-application discussions between developers and Parish Councils to address these issues.</p>	<p><u>features such as SuDs or biodiversity improvements can be incorporated within open space, given that this might impede a Parish/Town Council's ability to adopt the space.</u>"</p> <p>Mention is already included regarding the need to provide for 15-years of management and maintenance of the community open space, leisure and formal sports provision.</p>
Statutory Consultees and Local Groups				

Ref	Name	Paragraph/ Topic Ref	Comment	Proposed response to comment
43.	Canal & River Trust	General	Has no comments in the draft SPD.	Noted.
44.	Environment Agency	General	Has no comments in the draft SPD.	Noted.
45.	Historic England	Table 1 – Infrastructure Requirements	<p>Recommend inclusion of historic environment/heritage assets in Table 1 to clarify that contributions may be required for heritage-related works.</p> <p>Suggested entry:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Likely mechanism: Planning obligation and/or planning condition – Application: Housing developments and selected others – Threshold: Case by case – Policy: Local Plan Part 2 Policies 28 and 29. 	The remit of the SPD is specifically in respect of developer contributions towards new or improved infrastructure provision to support new development. This does not clearly relate to matters of heritage. It is accepted that heritage related matters may be the subject of S106 agreements, but it is not relevant for heritage matters to be specific covered within a Developer Contribution SPD such as this.
46.	Historic England	Appendix – Schedule of Financial Contributions	<p>Recommend adding historic environment/heritage assets as an infrastructure type.</p> <p>Suggested entry:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Consultee: Rushcliffe Borough Council. 	The remit of the SPD is specifically in respect of developer contributions towards new or improved infrastructure provision to support new development. This does not clearly relate to matters of heritage. It is accepted that heritage related matters may be the subject of S106 agreements, but it is not relevant for heritage

Ref	Name	Paragraph/ Topic Ref	Comment	Proposed response to comment
			– Financial contribution: Case by case basis.	matters to be specific covered within a Developer Contribution SPD such as this.
47.	Natural England	General	No comments are offered at this stage. If the SPD is amended in a way that affects the natural environment, further consultation is requested.	Noted.
48.	The Coal Authority	General	Has no comments in the draft SPD.	Noted.
49.	Leake Ward Independents	General	Public open space and facilities intended for general use should be adopted into the public realm and funded via council tax, supported by commuted sums. Highways, sports pitches, and drainage systems should be built to adoptable standards to enable future adoption.	The Council cannot insist on adoption and that open spaces and facilities are built to adoptable standards. It is not Borough Council policy to adopt and manage open spaces. This matter is outside the remit of the SPD.
50.	Leake Ward Independents	General	Town/parish councils, allotment societies, sports clubs, and community groups should be consulted early to determine appropriate provision and future management arrangements. Commuted sums should support long-term maintenance by relevant	The SPD refers to early engagement with external bodies where appropriate and specifically mentions town/parish councils. This is considered sufficient.

Ref	Name	Paragraph/ Topic Ref	Comment	Proposed response to comment
			organisations, avoiding reliance on resident management charges.	
51.	Leake Ward Independents	General	Larger areas of open space should be adopted; small, cosmetic green spaces often create unnecessary maintenance burdens and could be incorporated into private plots. Layouts should prioritise adoptable roads, street lighting, and visitor parking over narrow, unlit cul-de-sacs and shared drives.	The remit of this SPD is not to provide guidance on the design and layout of developments. These are matters for Local Plan policy or specific design related guidance.
52.	Leake Ward Independents	Section 106 Agreements	If residents are required to pay management charges, S106 agreements should insist on the model of a residents' management company which gives more rights than the embedded management company model.	There is no legal or policy basis on which this can be insisted.
53.	Leake Ward Independents	2.14	Add reference encouraging roads to be built to adoptable standards and adopted where possible. Public roads should meet consistent standards and not impose private maintenance costs on residents.	This SPD provides guidance on where planning obligations will be sought and the procedures around this. Matters such as whether roads should be adopted or not is outside the remit for the SPD.

Ref	Name	Paragraph/ Topic Ref	Comment	Proposed response to comment
54.	Leake Ward Independents	2.31	Amend to ensure Town/Parish Councils are always consulted, not just “where relevant.” Local representatives best understand community needs.	Changes to the paragraph are relevant. <u>Modification</u> Change third paragraph of 2.31 as follows: “Negotiation will involve consultation with internal departments and external bodies, which may include <u>including</u> Town/Parish councils <u>and Nottinghamshire County Council</u> where relevant , to determine the conditions and/or obligations necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.”
55.	Leake Ward Independents	3.15-3.16	Strengthen wording to increase and enforce provision of wheelchair adaptable dwellings. Current minimum does not reflect Rushcliffe’s ageing population.	This is a Local Plan policy matter. The SPD cannot introduce policy requirements; to do so would be outside the remit of this SPD.
56.	Leake Ward Independents	3.22	Add bullet: “Provision of pedestrian and cycling linkages between estates to encourage active transport and provide safe off road routes particularly for school routes.” Safe, off-road routes are essential, especially for school access.	In order to address a comment made by Nottinghamshire County Council, it is proposed that Public Rights of Way are included to the list. This is considered to also sufficiently address this point. <u>Modification</u> : Add to list at paragraph 3.22: “ <u>Public Rights of Way (PROW)</u> ”;

Ref	Name	Paragraph/ Topic Ref	Comment	Proposed response to comment
57.	Leake Ward Independents	3.30-3.31	Add requirement to consult Town/Parish Councils and local allotment providers. These groups understand local demand and may adopt/manage sites.	Some relevant wording is appropriate. <u>Modification</u> Add to paragraph 3.31: “ <u>Early engagement with the Council, relevant Parish/Town Council and/or other relevant body is important prior to the submission of a planning application.</u> ”
58.	Leake Ward Independents	3.39	Add to “In certain cases, it may be preferable to improve existing provision” the following text “ <u>or collaborate with adjoining developers</u> to provide more extensive shared facilities”. .” Shared facilities can offer better value and community benefit.	Agreed that this text would be useful. <u>Modification</u> – add to paragraph 3.39 “ <u>or collaborate with an adjoining developer to provide more extensive shared facilities.</u> ”
59.	Leake Ward Independents	3.43	Amend to include Town/Parish Councils explicitly. They manage local play spaces and reflect resident views.	Agreed it is appropriate to refer to Parish/Town Councils where appropriate. <u>Modification</u> –following “Early engagement with the Council..” at paragraph 3.43 add “ <u>and the relevant Parish/Town Council</u> ”.
60.	Leake Ward Independents	3.44	Add “and allotments” to list of facilities requiring management and maintenance.	Reference to “Community open space, leisure and formal sports provision” encompasses a range of such uses including allotments. Allotments

Ref	Name	Paragraph/ Topic Ref	Comment	Proposed response to comment
			Allotments need long-term oversight.	therefore do not require specific mention within paragraph 3.44.
61.	Leake Ward Independents	3.45	Amend to reflect that adoption may be appropriate in special cases. SPD should remain open to future policy changes and government direction. The suggested wording is: "The Council typically does not <u>normally</u> take on the management or maintenance of open space <u>at present but developers are invited to discuss this with the Council to ascertain if this is a special case or if a policy or regulatory change has occurred.</u> "	The existing wording is considered more appropriate and reflects current Council policy. The suggested wording would not help to clarify matters.
62.	Leake Ward Independents	3.46	Update tense: "has worked" and add link to the Guide. The Guide is now in place and should be referenced.	This change and the addition of a link to the guide is appropriate.. <u>Modification</u> At paragraph 3.46 amend "is working" to " <u>has worked</u> ".
63.	Leake Ward Independents	3.49-3.50	Clarify that contributions may also support community-run facilities (e.g. village halls, sports clubs). Not all indoor leisure is provided by RBC.	The paragraph relates to all indoor and leisure provision and does not specify who will run them. It is not considered necessary therefore to refer specifically to "community-run facilities".

Ref	Name	Paragraph/ Topic Ref	Comment	Proposed response to comment
64.	Leake Ward Independents	3.59	<p>Amend to refer to the nature of development: "...not only on the scale <u>and nature</u> of the proposed development..."</p> <p>Plus add: "and/or a specialist development creates additional healthcare needs." Some developments (e.g. for older people) may require higher or different contributions.</p>	<p>The paragraph considers needs arising from all development, whatever its type. It is appropriate to refer to "the nature" of development, but it is considered unnecessary to also refer explicitly to specialist accommodation.</p> <p><u>Modification</u> At paragraph 3.59, after "not only on the scale" add "<u>and nature</u>".</p>
65.	Leake Ward Independents	3.60-3.61	<p>Add requirement to consult local providers (e.g. parish councils, village halls). These groups best understand local needs and should not be burdened with management charges.</p>	<p>Add appropriate text to address this comment.</p> <p><u>Modification</u> Add to end of paragraph 3.60: "..., <u>Parish/Town Councils and any other bodies as appropriate.</u>"</p>
66.	Leake Ward Independents	3.65	<p>Add: "Direct engagement with the local Water Board is encouraged. In areas covered by an Internal Drainage Board, engagement with them is also encouraged." Holistic SuDS planning may be needed if future legislation changes.</p>	<p>Add appropriate text to address this comment.</p> <p><u>Modification</u> Add to paragraph 3.65: "<u>Such engagement may also be necessary with the Internal Drainage Board, in areas with one, and Severn Trent Water.</u>"</p>
67.	Leake Ward Independents	3.66	<p>Add "in perpetuity" to clarify long-term responsibility.</p>	<p>This addition reference is considered unnecessary.</p>

Ref	Name	Paragraph/ Topic Ref	Comment	Proposed response to comment
68.	Leake Ward Independents	3.68	Add following new paragraph: “Where the site includes a watercourse or is adjacent to a watercourse the management and maintenance of the watercourse should be included in the overall management scheme for open space, to ensure that the responsibilities as riparian landowner are met. A plan should identify the relevant watercourse(s).” Ensures riparian responsibilities are met.	Any riparian responsibilities relating to the management and maintenance of watercourses are not matters that can be dealt with directly through the planning system and its relevant legislation. This additional suggested text is therefore not appropriate for inclusion in the SPD.
69.	Leake Ward Independents	3.69	It is not clear what is intended here. These should not be close to housing as they would be unacceptable to residents. Provision within the site could be appropriate for the largest strategic sites perhaps?	The location of such facilities relative to new housing development would be a matter for individual planning applications. Guidance on what are appropriate locations for such facilities is not a matter for this SPD.
70.	Leake Ward Independents	3.70	The linked document should be updated	While the comment is noted, this advice document does not form part of the SPD.
71.	Leake Ward Independents	3.77	Add preference for on-site delivery and hierarchy for off-site gains.	The hierarchy of provision is not directly a matter for this SPD. Therefore, changes to the SPD are not appropriate.

Ref	Name	Paragraph/ Topic Ref	Comment	Proposed response to comment
			Contributions in lieu should be a last resort.	
72.	Leake Ward Independents	3.81	Add reference to EV charging infrastructure. Clarify policy basis to avoid appeal issues (e.g. 25/00508/FUL).	To make this a requirement would need to be dealt with through the Local Plan process. New policy requirements cannot be introduced through an SPD.
73.	Leake Ward Independents	3.84	Add paragraph encouraging provision of defibrillators, blood packs, or serviced locations for emergency equipment. Important for developments expanding away from existing services.	To make this a requirement would need to be dealt with through the Local Plan process. New policy requirements cannot be introduced through an SPD.
74.	Leake Ward Independents	Appendix 1	Add Town/Parish Councils and community sports providers as consultees under Indoor Sport and Leisure. Add Water Boards and Internal Drainage Boards as consultees under Flood Mitigation and Water Infrastructure. Update Wheeled Bins section to reflect new bin types and charges.	It is appropriate to add reference to own/Parish Councils and community sports providers as consultees under Indoor Sport and Leisure. It is appropriate to add reference to Internal Drainage Boards and Severn Trent Water For a new bins, the details are not yet included in the "Planning Advice Waste Collection Services Charging Developers for Wheeled Refuse Containers" document. <u>Modification</u>

Ref	Name	Paragraph/ Topic Ref	Comment	Proposed response to comment
				<p>At Appendix 1, add the following text to the consultee column for Indoor Sport and Leisure: <u>“Town/Parish Councils and community sports providers”</u></p> <p>At Appendix 1, add the following text to the consultee column for Flood Mitigation and Water Infrastructure: <u>“Internal Drainage Broads Severn Trent Water”</u></p>